

DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE

FRIDAY 15 FEBRUARY 2019 AT 10.00 AM

PRESENT: Councillor T Sidgwick (Chairman), Councillors Christian, Collier (as substitute for Councillor Bloxham), Earp, Glendinning, Graham, McDonald, Nedved (as substitute for Councillor Mrs Parsons), S Sidgwick (as substitute for Councillor Brown), Shepherd, Tinnion and Mrs Warwick.

ALSO

PRESENT: Councillor Betton attended the meeting having registered a right to speak in respect of application – 18/0899 – Land to the South East of Durranhill Road, adjacent Barley Edge, Carlisle, CA1 2SZ.

Mr Allan – Flood and Development Officer, Cumbria County Council

OFFICERS: Corporate Director of Governance and Regulatory Services
Corporate Director of Economic Development
Development Manager
Principal Planning Officer
Planning Officer x 3

DC.016/19 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were submitted on behalf of Councillors Bloxham, Brown and Mrs Parsons.

DC.017/19 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

In accordance with the Council's Code of Conduct the following declarations of interest were submitted:

Councillor Earp declared an interest in respect of application 18/1059 – Land at Haithwaite Land End, Penton, Carlisle, CA6 5QB. The interest related to objectors being known to him.

Councillor Graham declared an interest in respect of application 18/0928 – Land adjacent Meadow Cottage, Tarraby, Carlisle, CA3 0JS. The interest related to the applicant being known to him.

DC.018/19 PUBLIC AND PRESS

RESOLVED – That the Agenda be agreed as circulated.

DC.019/19 MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETINGS

RESOLVED – 1) That the minutes of the meetings held on 11 January 2019 and 13 February 2019 (site visits meeting) be approved.

DC.020/19 PUBLIC REPRESENTATIONS IN RESPECT OF PLANNING APPLICATIONS

The Corporate Director of Governance and Regulatory Service outlined, for the benefit of those members of the public present at the meeting, the procedure to be followed in dealing with rights to speak.

DC.021/19 CONTROL OF DEVELOPMENT AND ADVERTISING

1) That the applications referred to in the Schedule of Applications under A be approved/refused/deferred, subject to the conditions as set out in the Schedule of Decisions attached to these Minutes.

(2) That the applications referred to under the Schedule of Applications under B be noted.

1) Change Of Use of byre and sunroom to enable the keeping of up to 100no. rescue cats (Part Retrospective), Kershope Lodge, Kershope Foot, Penton, Carlisle, CA6 5QL (Application 18/0766).

The Planning Officer submitted the report on the application which had been the subject of a site visit by the Committee on 13 February 2019. The application sought Planning Permission for the use of the byre attached to the property to be used to accommodate cats. The building had been converted to provide an internal living area, storage, food and washing area together with an enclosed external area constructed with a timber framed and wire mesh structure.

To the rear of the property, it was proposed to convert the existing conservatory to provide a second internal living area that would also be extended with a timber framed and wire mesh structure.

Slides were displayed on screen showing; location plan; site plan; proposed floor plan; elevation plans, and photographs of the site, an explanation of which was provided for the benefit of Members.

The applicant intended to relocate the existing rescued cats to the property but did not plan to continue with her charity therefore, the principle of the change of use of the building was acceptable. The proposed physical alterations were considered to be of an appropriate scale and appearance that would not be obtrusive within the context of the character and appearance of the area.

Given the physical relationship of the property with neighbouring dwellings together with the intended use, the proposal would not adversely affect the residential amenity of the occupiers of neighbouring properties.

The Planning Officer advised that from 1st January 2020, waste discharged directly to a river or stream from a septic tank must be updated to take in a small sewage treatment plant or make some other arrangements. The applicant was aware of this requirement and had confirmed that the upgrading of the septic tank was within her schedule of works and would be completed in accordance with the required deadline.

No highway or biodiversity issues were raised by the application and in all aspects the proposal was considered to be compliant with the objectives of the relevant Carlisle District Local Plan 2015 – 30 (Local Plan) policies. Accordingly, the Planning Officer recommended that the application be approved, subject to the imposition of the conditions detailed in the report.

The Committee then gave consideration to the application.

A Member expressed strong reservations about approving the application due to his concerns regarding the management of waste from the site. He referred to paragraph 4.3 of the report which summarised correspondence received since the Committee's deferral of the application at its January 2019 meeting, noting that waste arrangements were described as "yet to be

finalised” and concerns that the existing septic tank was not working properly. He questioned whether the application was compliant with Local Plan policy CM 5 – Environmental Amenity and Protection and whether the septic tank could be made up to standard prior to the new legislation coming into force in 2020.

The Planning Officer confirmed that the arrangements for waste disposal (Condition 5) were yet to be finalised, he suggested that the Condition be reworded to require submission to and approval by the Local Planning Authority of the waste disposal scheme. The Member agreed the proposal.

With regards to the faulty operation of the existing septic tank, the Planning Officer noted that the comments had been made by objectors to the scheme, but that no evidence to substantiate the claim had been provided. He advised that such matters were dealt with under separate regulatory regime. In terms of requiring the applicant to upgrade the system prior to the enactment of new legislation in 2020, the Planning Officer did not consider it reasonable to impose such a requirement on the Consent. He reminded Members that the applicant was aware of the new legislation and had included works to bring the system up to standard by the required date.

Another Member noted that the new legislation regarding septic tanks had been publicised for some time and that property owners selling dwellings with septic tanks had from 2015 been required to provide waste disposal equipment which would comply with the 2020 legislation.

Mr Allan advised that the Environment Agency were the appropriate regulatory body dealing with septic tanks. He was not able to comment on the details of an individual property sale about which he had no information.

A Member who had worked for many years as a veterinary surgeon sought clarification on the following matters:

- Floor covering – was it be stone flags or wall to wall seamless linoleum to assist in the washing out of the area;
- Ventilation – what system was proposed;
- Animal isolation unit – was one included in the proposal for the housing of sick animals?

The Planning Officer appreciated the Member’s comments and noted that the proposed scheme was not a common arrangement. He reminded the Committee that in determining the proposal its main considerations related to the proposed land use. He confirmed that the applicant proposed a wall to wall seamless linoleum floor covering for the byre and it was expected that the arrangement would be used throughout the scheme.

The applicant had many years’ experience of homing cats, details of ventilation and isolation unit(s) had not been submitted as part of the application, however, the Planning Officer undertook to discuss those issues with her to make her aware of the Committee’s concerns.

Another Member asked who was responsible for monitoring the number of cats at the site.

The Planning Officer explained that the number of cats at the site was limited by Planning Condition, were any reports of a breach received, the appropriate investigatory work would be undertaken.

Responding to a further question from the Member about whether the applicant would take additional cats in the event that they were brought to the site, the Planning Officer explained that the applicant had stated that she did not wish to home any further cats.

A Member moved the Officer's recommendation which was seconded, and it was:

RESOLVED: That the application be approved, subject to the implementation of relevant conditions as indicated within the Schedule of Decisions attached to these minutes.

2) Erection of 2no. detached dwellings, Land adjacent to Meadow Cottage, Tarraby, Carlisle, CA3 0JS (Application 18/0928)

The Planning Officer submitted the report on the application which had been the subject of a site visit by the Committee on 13 February 2019.

Further to the publication of the report an additional four letters of representation had been received, one of which had been included in the Supplementary Schedule. The Planning Officer summarised, for the benefit of Members, the main points of the remaining three representations.

The Council's Conservation Area Advisory Committee had considered the proposal at its meeting of 11 December 2018. The minutes meeting recorded two bullet points of discussion as follows:

- Consider density, building form, layout and impact on the Conservation Area to be acceptable.
- Suggestion that native tree planting and hedgerow strengthening is clarified.

Notwithstanding, these points of discussion the Committee's formal resolution was to recommend that no comment be made on the application. In the interests of openness, the Planning Officer noted that the Applicant's Agent was the Chairman of the Conservation Area Advisory Committee, however, it was understood that he had stepped out of the meeting at the point where the Committee made its recommendation.

Slides were displayed on screen showing; the applicant's location plan; location plan and Conservation Area Boundary; proposed layout plan; proposed elevation plans; aerial photographs of the settlement from 2003 and 2018, and photographs of the site, an explanation of which was provided for the benefit of Members.

The Planning Officer explained that the proposed properties would be set back approximately 15m from the highway and orientated on an alignment that was at odds with the prevailing pattern of development which followed Tarraby Lane with properties fronting the highway. The proposed scheme straddled the Conservation Area however, both dwellings constructed almost entirely outside of the Conservation Area boundary thus extending the built form into the undeveloped countryside setting of the Tarraby Conservation Area which framed the village and added to its character and visual quality.

In respect of Conservation Areas, the Planning Officer stated that there was no objection in principle to new development, subject to suitably designed schemes which took into account local character and complemented existing patterns of development. The current proposal would extend the built form of the village into the adjacent countryside and therefore beyond the Conservation Area boundary which the Planning Officer considered would result in a harmful erosion of the setting of the Conservation Area compromising views into, through and out of that designated area.

The National Planning Policy Framework was clear that Heritage Assets such as Conservation Areas were irreplaceable and therefore great weight was given to their preservation. Any harm

to Heritage Assets or their settings required clear and convincing justification and had to be balanced against any public benefits offered by the proposal. Such an approach was consistent with the statutory duty set out at Section 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 which instructs Local Planning Authorities to pay special attention to the preservation or enhancement of Conservation Areas.

In terms of design, the palette of material indicated was considered appropriate to the character of the village. However, the introduction of architectural details such as dormer windows, a corbelled projecting dormer and two storey projecting bay windows were considered inappropriate detailing as they were not found in the existing settlement.

The design, layout and orientation of the proposed dwellings being set back from the highway and at odds with the established tight knit settlement pattern was considered to result in a harmful intrusion into the undeveloped countryside and therefore contrary to Local Plan policies HO 2 – Windfall Housing Development and SP 6 – Securing Good Design.

The applicant's agent and those in support of the proposal had referenced two other housing developments within the village in justification of the current proposal: Paddock Cottage – Application 14/0483 and, Land adjacent to Wendsleydale – Application 15/0179.

It was the Planning Officer's view that those two examples were not comparable to the current application site, he reminded Members that planning proposals must be considered on their own individual planning merits with regard to any site-specific constraints or other material considerations. The key planning considerations pertaining to the application were the design, layout and relationship of the proposal with the existing built form of Tarraby and the resulting effect on the character and appearance of the Conservation Area and its undeveloped setting.

If approved, the proposal would result in the addition of two new homes, the Planning Officer stated that did not amount to any significant public benefits which would outweigh the harm to the Conservation Area and its setting. The proposal was therefore contrary to Local Plan policies SP 6 – Securing Good Design, SP 7 – Valuing Our Heritage and Cultural Identity and HE 7 – Conservation Areas, which sought to provide protection to Conservation Areas and the historic environment. Furthermore, the Council's Heritage Officer agreed with this assessment and objected to the development.

Overall, the Planning Officer considered that the proposal would have a detrimental impact on the character and appearance of the area and was therefore contrary to paragraph 127 of the NPPF which requires development to be sympathetic to local character and history, including the surrounding built environment and landscape setting.

Accordingly, the Planning Officer viewed that the proposal was in conflict with both local and national planning policies and he recommended that the application be refused for the detailed reasons set out in Section 8 of the report.

Mr Kelsall (Agent) addressed the Committee and displayed slides on screen showing: Land Registry Field Plans; location plan; site plan; aerial photographs of the settlement; elevation plans, and artist's impression of the current and proposed views of the existing settlement.

Mr Kelsall asserted that the application site was formed from a garden area associated with an existing property, consequently, it was not an area of open countryside, and as such the proposed scheme was compliant with Paragraph 78 of the National Planning Policy Framework and Local Plan policy SP 1 – Sustainable Development. He outlined the development history of the dwellings adjacent to the application site.

In terms of layout and character, Mr Kelsall noted that the constructed form of Tarraby was that of a series of dwellings built around courtyards and that the current proposal was in-keeping with that form.

With respect to design features such as dormer roofs, Mr Kelsall noted that there were already examples of such forms in the existing settlement. Turning to the matter of scale, Mr Kelsall advised that the previously approved Wendsleydale was 9.4m in height were as the proposed dwellings were only 7.1m in height.

The Committee then gave consideration to the application.

A Member commented that he understood the Officer's primary justifications for refusing the application were that approving the application would cause harm to the view of the Conservation Area and that the design was not in-keeping with the existing settlement. He stated that during the site visit he had observed a number of different types and designs of dwellings in the vicinity to the site. Furthermore, regarding the Officer's contention that the proposed scheme would harm views into and from the Conservation Area, he considered that approving the application would offer an improvement of the views as it would soften the view of The Paddocks. He asked how harm was to be assessed in a Planning context and, how the area of boundary of the Conservation Area had been defined.

The Development Manager explained that in terms of a Conservation Area, the core principle to consider when assessing development was that an application for development should seek to preserve or enhance the area, not make it worse. The issue of harm was therefore subjective and a matter for Members to determine.

The Tarraby Conservation Area had been created in 1969, the Development Manager noted that the original reports detailing its purpose were no longer available. The area reflected the setting of the settlement and in particular its hedgerows which the designation sought to protect.

The Planning Officer added that, following a contextual analysis he considered that there was an element of harm in the design of the proposed scheme in that it did not mirror the densely packed form of the existing settlement. He referred Members to paragraph 6.15 of his report for a full discussion of the matter.

The Member responded that the boundary of the Conservation Area appeared to be outwith the application site, therefore, development was permitted to take place. He further considered that the policy justifications put forward by the Officer were equally grounds for approving the scheme.

With reference to aerial photograph reproduced on page 68 of the Main Schedule, a Member noted that at the top left of the picture, there were two enclosed areas which he considered, similar to the application site which were deemed to be garden. Looking at the village as a whole he felt that the proposed dwellings were in line with the adjacent dwellings in The Paddocks. Moreover, he did not agree that the design was out of keeping with that already existing in the Conservation Area.

The Member moved that the application be granted permission on the grounds that the proposal was compliant with Local Plan policies SP6, HO 2 and HE 7

The Planning Officer responded that Local Plan policy HO 3 referred to development in garden areas, an assessment of the application under that policy was contained in paragraph 6.63 of the report, and concluded that the proposed scheme was not deemed compliant with that policy.

A Member agreed with the view that the proposed scheme would enhance the area, as it would clear up an untidy section of the settlement. The development would be largely outside the Conservation Area, and in his view was not an intrusion into the open countryside. He seconded the proposal that the application be approved.

The Development Manager advised that were the Committee to approve the application, Officers would draw up a Consent based on standard planning conditions.

The Chairman noted that a proposal to grant permission to the application had been moved and seconded, she put the matter to the vote and it was:

RESOLVED – That the application be approved, subject to the implementation of relevant conditions as indicated within the Schedule of Decisions attached to these minutes.

Councillor Graham abstained from the vote.

The Committee adjourned at 11:04am and reconvened at 11:17am.

3) Change Of Use from agricultural use to overspill car park for staff and customers, Land at Haithwaite Lane End, Penton, Carlisle, CA6 5QB (Application 18/1059)

The Principal Planning Officer submitted the report on the application which had been the subject of a site visit by the Committee on 13 February 2019.

Slides were displayed on screen showing; location plan, site plan, and photographs of the site, an explanation of which was provided for the benefit of Members.

The Principal Planning Officer advised that the existing car park had 19 spaces which was not large enough for the facility which had 9 hotel rooms, a restaurant with 60 covers and employed 20 staff. A staff car park had been created to the rear of Haithwaite Cottage for which a retrospective application had been submitted: that application was withdrawn, due to highway safety issues and the facility was to be removed.

The current application, as originally submitted requested permission for 58 spaces, but was subsequently amended to 31 spaces including 2 electric charging points. Consequently, the frontage of the facility was reduced from 90m to 45m.

The Principal Planning Officer acknowledged that there would be a localised landscape impact, but that would be mitigated by re-planting of hedgerow outside the visibility splays and further landscaping. Given land ownership issues, the proposed scheme was considered the most suitable location for the car park. Therefore, the application was recommended for approval, subject to the imposition of the conditions detailed in the report.

The Committee then gave consideration to the application.

Members expressed their support for the proposal and indicated that they were minded to approve the scheme. However, given the location of the site close to the brow of a hill, it was felt that the installation of signage along the highway advising road users of the car park was necessary.

Mr Allan (Cumbria County Council) explained that the Highway Authority had assessed the proposal and concluded that signage was not necessary due to the visibility splays, grass verge and tarmac entrance. He undertook to look at the matter again.

A Member responded that he felt signage was necessary to notify other road users of the car park, particularly those approaching the facility from the other side of the hill.

The Corporate Director of Economic Development undertook to write to Cumbria County Council to request the installation of road signage.

A Member expressed concern that in order to access the Penton Bridge Inn, users of the car park would be required to walk along the edge of the highway, he asked whether it was possible for a footpath to be included between the access point at the car park and the access point to the Inn?

The Principal Planning Officer responded that the car park design included a pedestrian access opposite the access point for the Inn, therefore he felt that users of the facility would take that route. He further noted that it was not usual to require a footpath where grass verge and hedgerow were already in place.

Turning to the issue of lighting, a Member felt that the proposed two metre high columns were not in-keeping with the surroundings, he asked whether consideration could be given to either only using the lights when the facility was in use or installing lit bollards instead.

In response, the Corporate Director of Economic Development advised that Officers would undertake discussions with the applicant regarding appropriate lighting.

A Member moved the Officer's recommendation which was seconded, and it was:

RESOLVED: 1) That the application be approved, subject to the implementation of relevant conditions as indicated within the Schedule of Decisions attached to these minutes.

2) That the Corporate Director of Economic Development write to Cumbria County Council to request the signage be installed on the road in the vicinity of the site advising road users of the car park.

4) Erection of 15no. Dwellings with associated infrastructure and landscaping; amendment to turning head adjacent to plots 122 and 142 on Previously Approved Permission 17/0669, Land to the South East of Durranhill Road, adjacent, Barley Edge, Carlisle, CA1 2SZ (Application 18/0899).

The Planning Officer submitted the report on the application which had been the subject of a site visit by the Committee on 13 February 2019. The proposed development was a mix of 12 detached properties and three terraced properties that would be affordable dwellings. The development would be served by a shared vehicular and pedestrian access with boundary fencing and a landscaped bund immediately to the east of the properties.

Slides were displayed on screen showing; location plan; floor plans; elevation plans; site section plans, and photographs of the site, an explanation of which was provided for the benefit of Members.

In terms of the Swept Path Analysis and the footpath referenced in paragraph 6.37 of the report, the Planning Officer recommended that condition 4 be amended to require that a Swept Path Analysis be used to support the layout the carriageways.

The current application site represented a logical and sustainable extension of Carlisle which was reflected in its allocation for residential development under Policy HO1 – Housing Strategy and Development of the Local Plan.

On the matter of design the Planning Officer considered that the proposal would reinforce existing connections; provide a mix of dwelling types and tenures that suited local requirements; sought to create a distinctive character with well-defined and legible streets/ spaces; had streets designed to encourage low vehicle speeds; provide sufficient and well integrated resident and visitor parking; had clearly defined public and private spaces; there was adequate external storage space for bins and recycling as well as cycles; and adequate/effective open space.

Sufficient off-street parking would be provided within the site and the buildings would not adversely affect the living conditions of the occupiers of neighbouring properties. Planning conditions would ensure that in the short-term period of construction, the residents would be adequately protected from the works, as far as reasonably practicable.

The supporting documents accompanying the application effectively addressed matters relating to contamination, trees and hedgerows, surface water and ecology was also be addressed through the imposition of relevant conditions.

The Planning Officer considered that the proposal would neither be detrimental to the character of the area nor the living conditions of neighbouring residents. On that basis, the Planning Officer recommended:

- a) That Authority to Issue approval subject to the completion of an appropriate Section 106 Agreement regarding the provision of affordable housing (two shared ownership and one affordable rent) and the payment of £4,425 for the open space contribution.
- b) That should the legal agreement not be completed within a reasonable time, delegated authority be given to the Corporate Director of Economic Development to refuse the application.
- c) That Condition 4 be amended to require that a Swept Path Analysis be used to support the layout the carriageways.

Councillor Betton (Councillor) objected to the application in the following terms: Durranhill Road was an extremely busy and dangerous road with insufficient pavement provision for pedestrians; the existing traffic calming measure on the road did not adequately address highway safety issues; HGVs used Durranhill Road, despite there being a ban in place; the infrastructure required to support the development was not in place; the proposed drainage was not acceptable; the proposal was not compliant with Local Plan policies IP 1- Delivering Infrastructure and CM 3 – Sustaining Community Facilities and Services.

Councillor Betton displayed slides on screen showing: a bullet point of the history of Durranhill Road 2009 – to date; extracts from Local Plan policies IP 1 and CM 2 and, examples of the poor traffic and pedestrian safety of Durranhill Road and associated pavements.

Mr Hutchinson (Agent) responded that the application site had been designated an allocation site for housing during the process of the Council adopting of its Local Plan, as site U18. The primacy of Local Plan was enshrined in law under Section 38(6) of The Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 1990, as such there was no in principle objection to development of the site.

In March 2018 the Committee granted permission for the erection of 198 dwellings on adjacent land (Application 17/0669), the current application had been deliberately designed to include open space along the eastern boundary parallel with the M6. The road layout, access, and drainage were approved under application 17/0669 in the knowledge that development would take place at site U18. Consequently, neither the Highway Authority nor the Lead Local Flood Authority had not objected to the proposed scheme.

Furthermore, under application 17/0669, contributions had been made to Cumbria County Council to make highway improvements including: cycle network; bus stops on Montgomery Road and Durranhill Road and, footpath links including pedestrian crossings. The pedestrian crossing would be provided when the trigger point of 50 houses had been constructed. The developer was not to be blamed for the inappropriate use of Durranhill Road by HGVs.

The proposal represented sustainable development consistent with the Council's Local Plan and fulfilled the associated economic, social and environmental roles identified in the National Planning Policy Framework.

The Committee then gave consideration to the application.

Several Members expressed concern regarding the impact on the safety of the highway network and the mitigation measures employed to address them in relation to application 17/0669. Additionally, a number of Members were dissatisfied that the development was recommended for approval without what they regarded as the necessary infrastructure in place to support the scheme.

Mr Allan (Cumbria County Council) advised that the Highway Authority, when assessing application 17/0669, had been aware that the current application site had received an allocation for housing as part of the Local Plan, for up to 20 dwellings, and had taken it into account when requesting the imposition of conditions on the previous application.

The Planning Officer added that due to a number of road works occurring in the area at the present time it was unlikely that current traffic surveys would produce valid results. He noted that further traffic calming measures were to be installed at the bottom of Durranhill Road once the 50th house on the adjacent development was constructed.

A Member asked, given the objector's comments about the adequacy of existing traffic calming measures, whether those mechanisms were deemed to be successful.

Mr Allan responded that the photographs shown by the objector represented a snapshot in time, given the roadworks being undertaken nearby on the highway network may not be demonstrative of normal traffic flow or behaviour. Moreover, it was difficult to assess the overall impact of the measures until the second phase at the bottom of the hill had been installed.

In response to a Member's question about HGV's using Durranhill Road being associated with the construction of development on adjacent land, the Corporate Director of Economic Development undertook to write to Cumbria County Council to seek clarification on the matter.

A Member who represented the Ward in which the application site was located requested that the Open Space contribution be allocated within the Ward.

The Planning Officer advised that the allocation of Open Space contributions were approved in consultation with the Council's Green Spaces Team.

A Member requested that a condition be imposed restricting the use of deciduous trees near the railway line.

The Development Manager explained that the matter would be addressed as part of the landscaping scheme, he further noted that the restriction of deciduous trees was ordinarily requested as a standard condition by Network Rail.

A Member considered that the Committee needed to be consistent in the granting of Planning Permission and noted that there were many examples of developments permitted in the countryside where footpaths were not provided. The proposed scheme amounted to a 7.6% increase in the total number of new dwellings when combined with the adjacent Taylor Wimpey development, which in his view would not seriously affect the conditions on the surrounding highway network.

A Member moved the Officer's recommendation which was seconded, and it was:

RESOLVED: - 1) That Authority to Issue approval subject to the completion of an appropriate Section 106 Agreement regarding the provision of affordable housing (two shared ownership and one affordable rent) and the payment of £4,425 for the open space contribution.

2) That should the legal agreement not be completed within a reasonable time, delegated authority be given to the Corporate Director of Economic Development to refuse the application.

3) That Condition 4 be reworded to require that a Swept Path Analysis be used to support the layout the carriageways.

4) That the Corporate Director of Economic Development write to Cumbria County Council raising Members' concern regarding the use of Durranhill Road by HGVs.

5) Erection of 1no. Detached Dwelling (Plot 4) (Revised Application), Land between Wetheral Methodist Church and Redcroft, Wetheral, Carlisle (Application 18/1058).

The Planning Officer submitted the report on the application noting that the site had previously been previously granted Outline Planning Permission in 2014. The current application related to plot 4 which was at the easternmost side of the site and which already had a Reserved Matters application for a two storey dwelling approved.

Slides were displayed on screen showing; site plan; block plan; floor plans; elevation plans; proposed drainage plan, and photographs of the site, an explanation of which was provided for the benefit of Members.

The Planning Officer explained that foul drainage would be dealt with by means of a new treatment plant with the outflow discharging into a tributary of Pow Maughan Beck. The surface water drainage would have an attenuated flow into the roadside ditch alongside Scotby Road. These drainage methods have already been approved under the Reserved Matters application for the site.

In conclusion, the Planning Officer recommended that the application be approved, subject to the imposition of the conditions detailed in the report.

A Member sought clarification that the waste treatment plant proposed in the current application was the same as in the preceding applications.

The Planning Officer confirmed that the waste treatment plant was as per previous applications.

The Member commented that over time, due to operation, the treatment plant would cease to be compliant with the General Binding Rules.

A Member moved the Officer's recommendation which was seconded, and it was:

RESOLVED: That the application be approved, subject to the implementation of relevant conditions as indicated within the Schedule of Decisions attached to these minutes.

6) Erection of 1no. Dwelling (Outline) Land to the rear of Croft House, Thurstonfield, Carlisle, CA5 6HE (Application 18/1020).

The Planning Officer submitted the report on the application which sought Outline Planning Permission for the erection of one detached dwelling with All Matters Reserved except for the means of access which would utilise the existing vehicular entrance between the two adjacent properties.

Slides were displayed on screen showing; location plan; existing and proposed block plans, and photographs of the site, an explanation of which was provided for the benefit of Members.

The site was located on the edge of Thurstonfield for which two previous planning permissions have been granted. The application was supported by the NPPF and the Local Plan and as such, the principle of development remained acceptable. Additionally, the scale and design were considered appropriate to the site and would not result in an adverse impact on the character or appearance of the area.

The submitted plans took account of the highway issues and the living conditions of the occupiers of the neighbouring properties would not be prejudiced subject to the imposition of conditions. The means of foul and surface water drainage were able to be suitably addressed through the imposition of planning conditions.

In overall terms, the proposal was considered to be compliant with the objectives of the relevant Local Plan policies and the NPPF. Accordingly, the Planning Officer recommended that the application be approved, subject to the imposition of the conditions detailed in the report.

A Member commented that the Parish Council objected to the proposal and had requested that a site visit be undertaken.

Another Member noted that the Committee had visited the site on two previous occasions, he therefore felt that a site visit would be of little benefit to Members.

A Member moved the Officer's recommendation which was seconded, and it was:

RESOLVED: That the application be approved, subject to the implementation of relevant conditions as indicated within the Schedule of Decisions attached to these minutes.

DC.022/19 SCHEDULE B

The Development Manager submitted the Schedule B report.

A Member sought clarification that Officers had taken part in the consultation on the application.

The Development Manager confirmed that Officers had submitted comments in respect of the application, which had been determined by another authority.

RESOLVED - That the applications referred to under the Schedule of Applications under B be noted.

DC.023/19 QUARTERLY REPORT ON PLANNING ENFORCEMENT

The Planning/Landscape Compliance and Enforcement Officer submitted report ED.05/19 – Quarterly Report on Planning Enforcement which set out details of a number of enforcement case being dealt with by the Council and analysis of quarterly and annual figures. She provided a verbal update on progress regarding several of the cases therein.

The Committee gave consideration to a number of enforcement cases set out in the report.

A number of Members thanked the Officer for her work, particularly in relation to longstanding enforcement cases, and noted that the work would on occasion be challenging.

A Member moved the Officer's recommendation, and that the Officer be thanked for her work which was seconded, and following voting it was:

RESOLVED – 1) That the content of the report be noted.

2) That the Planning/Landscapes Compliance and Enforcement Officer be thanked for her work.

[The meeting closed at 12:40pm]