

Development Control Committee Supplementary Schedule

Containing information received
since the distribution of the
main schedule of applications

17TH March 2017

17 Gilbert Road
Cummersdale
Carlisle
CA2 6BJ

Mr Chris Hardman
Planning Department
Carlisle City Council
Rickergate
Carlisle.

16th December 2016

Dear Mr Hardman,

**Application 16/0831 Holly House Nurseries
Reserved Matters.**

I write as ward councillor following approaches from residents relating to the above application. I visited the site to get a understanding of the issues they raised

This is the second occasion recently where I have been approached where an outline planning application has been granted subject to reserved matters where the subsequent full application is fundamentally different to the original. In my opinion this comes across as manipulation of the planning system. In this particular case outline permission was granted for 2 bungalows on the site, now replaced by 9 three storey executive houses as shown in the photo montages In the applicant's planning statement these are described as two storey.

I refer to the response of the County Council. They recommend refusal on the grounds of inadequate information on access, off street parking , road construction and surface water drainage. I note that 16/0989 has recently been submitted for widening of the entrance, although it is claimed that it is not related to this application.

Drainage

The County Council are right to raise drainage as an issue. No 389 has already been subject to flooding. I share the residents' concerns about the raised level of the adjacent plot which already has permission. Apparently a number of trees have been removed in preparation for the development. These would have promoted the permeability of the ground in this area and this will be lost. Logic suggests that the runoff from the proposed 9 house development will be significantly greater then would have been the case with the original 2 bungalows.

As for the level of the water table in this location, according to the residents a pond immediately to the East of the area was filled in to make the large car park for Carlisle Racecourse. Clarification is also needed on the capacity of the foul drainage system. It seems that there have been instances in the past where sewage has emerged from the manhole in the adjacent property.

Quite separate to this application, I am involved with residents further down Durdar Road who have a long standing problem of flooding of the rear of their properties from the fields behind.

Policy

Given the predominance of bungalows in the immediate area, 9 three storey executive houses are out of character and inconsistent with planning guidelines on this aspect.

Policy HO1

The ECDLP document specifically identifies South Carlisle for development. Random developments in the periphery are to be discouraged. The applicant points out that Policy 1 of 1

ECDLP states that "small scale developments of less than 10 units will be exempt from any tariff style planning objections". It is argued that 9 houses are insignificant and as such will not prejudice delivery of Carlisle South. Granting permission at the very launch of the ECDP sets a precedent and will encourage other similar applications for 9 units. The applicant acknowledges the decline of the nursery business which has released this plot for development. It leaves the door open at some stage for a second phase on the remaining land adjoining this site.

An amendment to this policy may be appropriate to discourage phased developments which could circumvent Policy1.

This application for 9 executive style houses does not contribute to the overall mix of dwellings and types to meet identified local housing need. The original application for bungalows was more appropriate to meet Carlisle's demographic profile.

Policy HO2 (Windfall Housing Developments) states

1) The scale and design of the proposed development is appropriate to the scale, form, function and character of the existing settlement..

5) The proposal is compatible with adjacent land uses.

Para 5.17. Applicants will be expected to work closely with those directly affected..... to take into account the views of the community applicants are expected to demonstrate that they have complied with this policy requirement.

I see no evidence of compliance with these obligations.

Policy HO4 (Affordable Housing)

This is to achieve mixed and inclusive neighbourhoods.

If this development is in Zone B or Zone C the threshold for this obligation is 11 units. .As such no contribution would be required. (See earlier comment on phased development).

Policy IP3 (Car parking provision)

For dwellings of 3/4/5 bedrooms County Highways require the provision of 3 car spaces. This is designed to prevent parking on the highway or encroachment onto neighbouring property. . Para 6.17 of ECDLP states; garages of less than 6m length and 3m width are not considered large enoughto accommodate the average family car and will not be counted as a parking space.

Conclusion

This application under Reserved Matters bears no relation to the original outline permission. This sets a precedent at the launch of the ECDLP (now adopted) and in some areas undermines the ethos and aims of the Plan.

As a ward Councillor, I request that this goes to committee to allow members to form their own judgement on the issues I have raised here and that this be facilitated with a site visit.

Yours sincerely
Trevor Allison.