

REPORT TO EXECUTIVE

**PORTFOLIO AREA:
INFRASTRUCTURE,
ENVIRONMENT AND
TRANSPORT**

Date of Meeting:	28TH OCTOBER 2002		
Public			
Key Decision:	Yes	Recorded in Forward Plan:	Yes
Inside Policy Framework			

Title: REVIEW OF RURAL HOUSING IN RELATION TO PPG3

Report of: DIRECTOR OF ENVIRONMENT AND DEVELOPMENT

Report reference: EN.120/02

Summary:

This report considers the responses to consultation on an Interim Housing Statement in relation to the provision of rural housing. After considering the responses the report provides an Interim Statement for use by Development Control Officers covering all the Housing Policies in the Local Plan.

Recommendations:

That the Interim Housing Policy Statement is approved by the Executive as a guide to the implementation of Local Plan Housing Policies, in consideration of PPG3.

Mike Battersby

Director of Environment & Development

Contact Officer: Chris Hardman **Ext:** 7190

Report to Executive EN.120/02

1. BACKGROUND INFORMATION AND OPTIONS

1.1 Members received Report EN.101/02 at the meeting of Executive on the 30th September 2002. The report provided an update on the consultation responses received. A late response from Government Office North West required additional work by officers. This work has now been completed and is attached to this report.

1.2 Appendix 1 to this report is a summary of the responses received to the consultation. Appendix 2 contains the proposed Interim Housing Policy Statement, which is to be used as an internal working document for Policy implementation and therefore supersedes some of the individual comments raised in Appendix 1, which referred to the suggested Policy changes to Policy H5.

1.3 PPG3 was issued in March 2000 and in paragraph 38 it states that "Local Authorities should have regard to the Policy contained in this PPG as material considerations, which may supersede the Policies in their plan." Whilst individual Statements have been made in relation to some planning applications, the Council has not issued a comprehensive Statement on how Officers will deal with PPG3 in relation to its Policies. Local Plan Housing Policies will be contained in the review of the Local Plan, which will follow the current review of RPG and the Structure Plan.

1.4 Any interim Statement cannot make changes to the Policy, that has to be the focus of a review or alteration to the Local Plan. Supplementary Planning Guidance is a tool for adding additional information to existing Policies in the Local Plan and Government Office consider this is not an appropriate tool in this instance. Any Guidance produced must remain as a Council Policy and not attempt to change Local Plan Policies. The fact that the Policy Statement clearly relates to PPG3, should provide sufficient weight for the Policy advice to be able to stand at any appeal. Bearing this in mind it has been necessary for Officers to change the Interim Statement from the version originally under consultation.

Report to Executive EN.120/02

1.5 In general several of the comments received relate to the specific wording and named settlements that were proposed for removal from the Policy. The Interim Statement cannot make these specific changes. The Interim Statement makes reference to the need for settlements to have services and public transport, in order to provide an alternative for people to use without having to use a car for every journey. No settlement will be removed from the Policy but by implication the smaller more isolated settlements, which may have provided housing in the past, will not be considered suitable to

provide a continued supply of housing. The individual wording relating to a definition of minor infill can now not be added into the Policy until considered at review stage and the reference to small scale remains.

1.6 Some concerns were raised to the provision of housing for local need. The exceptions, Affordable Housing Policy in the Local Plan, would enable housing to be provided for local need on the basis of that need being identified. These Policies remain with reference to Guidance produced after the Local Plan was adopted.

1.7 The extensive comments of Government Office North West and CPRE (Cumbria Association) raise a number of issues relating to the distribution of housing throughout the District, in the context of National Policy. The Interim Statement is intended only to provide a short-term measure to deal with issues in the context of existing Housing Policies. Changes, such as revisions to the settlements and further consideration of the distribution of housing between the urban and rural area, will require a revision of the Policies through a review of the Local Plan. The Statement requires Officers to take note of PPG3 when dealing with any application for housing.

2. CONSULTATION

2.1 Consultation to date has been with Parish Councils, local architects and agents, CPRE (Cumbria Association) and Government Office for the North West.

2.2 At the time of writing the report Government Office for the North West has been consulted on the revised Statement.

3. STAFFING/RESOURCES COMMENTS

3.1 No implications for staff or resources.

Report to Executive EN.120/02

4. CITY TREASURER'S COMMENTS

4.1 The Treasurer has been consulted.

5. LEGAL COMMENTS

5.1 The City Secretary and Solicitor has been consulted.

6. CORPORATE COMMENTS

6.1 None.

7. RISK MANAGEMENT ASSESSMENT

7.1 None.

8. EQUALITY ISSUES

8.1 None.

9. ENVIRONMENTAL IMPLICATIONS

9.1 The intention of the revised Statement will be to concentrate on sustainable development.

10. CRIME AND DISORDER IMPLICATIONS

10.1 None.

11. RECOMMENDATIONS

11.1 That the Interim Housing Policy Statement is approved by the Executive as a guide to the implementation of Local Plan Housing Policies, in consideration of PPG3.

Report to Executive EN.120/02

12. REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS

12.1 To enable the Council's Development Control Section to properly take into account PPG3.

Mike Battersby

Director of Environment & Development

Contact Officer: Chris Hardman **Ext:** 7190

Responses received to consultation on INTERIM HOUSING POLICY
STATEMENT – AMENDED HOUSING POLICY H5

Name/Address	Comments Received	
<p>Mrs E Auld Clerk to Dalston Parish Council</p>	<p>Welcomed the proposed amendments to a certain extent.</p> <p>Clarification required regarding inclusion or otherwise of Highbridge under Stockdalewath and Lakerigg and Cardew with Cumdivock. It was felt that these settlements should be included in the list of those being removed from Policy H5.</p> <p>In addition Raughton Head should be removed from the list.</p> <p>Further clarification and a fuller definition of brownfield sites was requested. In this context were farm buildings included in the statement on previously developed land defined by PPG3 Annex C?</p> <p>There was a desire to keep young people in rural areas and low cost housing available in the area should be for local need as a priority.</p>	<p>High not I could remov</p> <p>Whil unde suite deve level suite</p> <p>Agric cons</p> <p>Whe a rec forw:</p>
<p>Clive Moth Clerk to Scaleby Parish Council</p>	<p>Whilst understanding the broad approach, members were concerned that the policy would bring about a virtual ban on housing development in the Parish. This would deny opportunity for say low cost housing development.</p> <p>Recent permissions have been for large expensive houses and if there was any chance of more affordable housing this would now be denied.</p>	<p>Som addi surv hous to sa</p>
<p>Gillian Kartach Wetheral Parish Council</p>	<p>The members are in agreement with the sentiments and reasoning of the document and fully agree with the comments made. However, the members agree that the recommended policies will only be useful if consistently applied once in force.</p>	<p>It wil Deve impl Loca mon hous</p>
<p>Bernard Spears 12 Grace Street Carlisle</p>	<p>Whilst I agree with the general intent and the majority of proposals put forward. Suggests minor amendments that would come closer to achieving the aims of sustainable development within the long term.</p>	<p>The avail serv publ for d cons</p>

The following settlements should not be removed from H5 : Broadwath, Burnrigg, Cardewlees, Fenton, Milton, Rickerby, Stainton, Todhills, and Wetheral Pasture. (additional information provided on each settlement)

local
neec
serv

The primary reason for retaining these settlements, and encouraging modest expansion, is to concentrate development within existing transport corridors, and in particular to promote the viability of existing railways. Within the next 30 years the scarcity of fossil fuels, and the resulting cost of vehicle fuel, is certain to render the private motor vehicles an unaffordable luxury for most people. Housing built now is designed to last in excess of 50 years, and should remain viable beyond the life of the motor car.

Whe
becc
deve
part
of hc

With regard to the proposed list, I believe the following settlements should be removed:

Beaumont, Burgh-by-Sands, Cargo, Carleton, Castle Carrock, Cotehill, Cumwhitton, Durdar, Faugh, Great Orton,, Hallbankgate, Hethersgill, Irthington, Lanercost, Laversdale, Low Crosby, Monxhill, Moorhouse, Raughtonhead, Smithfield, Talkin, Walton, Warwick-on-Eden and Warwick Bridge.

In cc
houc
wast
acc
Loca

My primary concern is that the majority of these settlements are remote from any major transport route and therefore totally unsuited to development that is not directly related to agriculture or other rural industry within the immediate vicinity. In addition the supply of water in many instances is limited, and the means of disposal of domestic effluent problematic. Many streams and rivers are already severely polluted from inadequately maintained and controlled septic tanks, and small village sewerage works. Whilst the extent of this pollution is often dwarfed by agricultural run-off, it cannot be ignored.

Also object to any development in either the Caldew or Petteril Valleys, or the agricultural land between (i.e.Durdar). This area is an important storm weather refuge for birds from the Solway Firth, and the valleys also support a wide variety of flora and fauna. There is already vandalism in the Wreay Woods Reserve, despite a distance of nearly 3

The
char

	<p>miles to the nearest housing at Harraby. More housing equates with more surface water run-off, and an increased flood risk from the Petteril in the Warwick Road area of Carlisle.</p>	<p>to. T revie area deve mea</p>
<p>Friends of the Lake District as CPRE (Cumbria Association)</p>	<p>Acknowledge that the proposed changes have made an attempt to recognise the emphasis in PPG3 on the principles of sustainable development and how that effects the rural part of the district.</p> <p>FLD has fundamental concerns about the proposals, in so far as they do not reflect the specific advice, nor the methodological approach now embodied in PPG3.</p> <p>In summary FLD considers that the proposed revisions fall well short of the requirements of PPG3 for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • overall there does not appear to have been any re-assessment of the Local Plan’s broader housing policy strategy objectives 1-8, nor is this clearly set out in the subsequent Policy justification text as a result of the change to policy H5; • there is no indication of the need for emphasis upon more sustainable patterns of development, i.e. concentrating development in the major urban areas like Carlisle, accessible to jobs, education, health facilities, shopping, leisure and local services; • under the broader strategy umbrella, there is no reference to the Plan, Monitor and Manage approach, whereupon housing needs are planned for set against capacity, and the supply is monitored so that the level of provision is managed and adjusted annually to ensure there is a sufficient supply, but that there should not lead to an oversupply; • connected to the above, there is no reference to the advice contained in "Planning to Deliver – The Managed Release of Housing Sites: Towards better Practice, which sets out three approaches to the managed release of housing sites; • the revised Policy H5 does not deal with the assessment of "need" with regard to the current supply of housing land and the current JSP 	<p>Offic raise and PPG</p> <p>The the r focu: polic reco cons will k appl in th polic</p> <p>It is i state revie Cap: and impl forw:</p> <p>The char and</p> <p>Som requ char the r Loca the u supp point supp Addi issue This polic tight to be</p>

requirement up until the end of the Plan period 2006. The revised RPG figures will also come into force in due course, which would inform the level of housing required beyond 2006;

- the revision does not therefore address the sequential approach, with preference given to the use of previously-developed land rather than greenfield sites;
- equally the revision does not make reference to the Council's Urban Housing Capacity Study (UHCS) as a means to inform itself of the availability of previously-developed sites within the urban area, and therefore what level of greenfield sites must be brought forward elsewhere to meet the need up until 2006;
- there is no reference to the need to annually re-assess existing greenfield allocations, and where incompatible they should be withdrawn;
- there is no reference of the need to assess the sustainability and suitability of individual sites allocated or those brought forward as windfalls, as set out in the five tests in paragraph 31 of PPG3;
- there is no indication of how windfalls would be dealt with as set out in paragraphs 35-36;
- there is no advice given in policy terms to the raised housing densities required as a result of PPG3 to encourage greater efficiencies in the use of land;
- a significant failure is whether or not development in other remaining villages retained in Policy H5 actually meet the tests set out in paragraphs 69-71 of PPG3. There is no evidence in the revised policy to specifically assist DC officers and developers as to whether or not a proposed development would "in principle" be acceptable and sustainable in these villages; that assessment should have been based on, for example, individual local housing needs surveys, and assessment of the level of local services, such as schools or shops or so on.

The draft changes appear to be a limited, ad hoc, knee-jerk reaction, following lengthy objections to various housing applications that were not compatible with PPG3 but were nevertheless given planning permission incorrectly by the planning authority. FLD is disappointed that our previous

The
Coun
inter
cons
not i
there
the L
proc

objections have so obviously been ignored, despite evidence from appeal decisions throughout the country, which had indicated that our general approach had been a correct one. The nature and extent of Carlisle City Council's reaction clearly demonstrates the failure of the Authority at a Development Control level to properly implement PPG3 in the past. Yet these proposed revisions to Policy H5 would continue that failure to address any of the principles required in PPG3.

The revision set out is a rather blunt and perhaps desperate way of reducing the supply of land in rural areas. It seems to otherwise lack the benefit and support of proper wider analysis justification or reasons, based on local needs or capacity, as to why individual villages have been identified as being no longer suitable for housing development. Likewise there is no evidence, analysis, justification or reasons given, based on needs or capacity, as to why the other remaining villages have been left out in the Policy H5 list. The clear lack of documentary assessment in every respect fails the requirements of PPG3.

The only statement to this effect is a single, two-line sentence in paragraph 4.3 of the officer's report to committee. On individual planning applications in the past this has been sadly lacking, despite the requirements of PPG3. Furthermore, in order for the current proposed revisions to H5 to be robust, rigorous and transparent, **all** the villages in H5 would have required a full assessment in accordance with PPG3. No evidence has been put forward in any public document that FLD is aware of to demonstrate the results of an assessment in the way PPG3 requires. That is only part of the criticism, and why we consider the proposal is rather ad hoc, rather than adopting the strict methodology envisaged by PPG3.

The Planning Inspector in considering the appeal at Carleton Heights, Penrith stated the Eden District Council's assertion that there was no need for a review of its housing allocations in the light of PPG3 was **untenable**. He had stated in relation to the Eden Local Plan that this review was a **pressing priority** given the number of other recent planning permissions that had been granted, which were **not**

compliant with PPG3.

That appeal decision demonstrates that the approach made by Carlisle City Council to revise policy H5 in the manner it has proposed is **flawed**, and completely ignores the methodological advice contained in PPG3. The proposed revision to Policy H5, no matter how temporary it may be intended, is itself **untenable**, given the overriding requirements of PPG3. FLD believes the revision could **not** be relied upon if tested on **appeal** or in **any legal challenge**. In many respects there are a great many similarities between the situation in Eden District and Carlisle City regarding the inadequacies of implementation of PPG3. FLD has passed those concerns on to Government Office for the North West.

The City Council's attention is drawn to the fact that the Council's Housing policies will be fully tested as to whether or not they are PPG3 friendly at the forthcoming call-in Inquiry into the Morton allocation. It is obvious that the Planning Inspector will identify any failing in the adoption of PPG3 by the Authority. Aside from the merits or otherwise, success or failure in that case will depend upon the satisfactory implementation of PPG3. As with Carleton heights Penrith, failure to properly implement PPG3 at the Local Plan level would have major implications for Carlisle City Council. **It is inevitable that the Planning Authority therefore demonstrates at this Inquiry that it understands and has already implemented the full requirements of PPG3 at both Development Control and the Local Plan level.**

For the reasons set out above, FLD strongly objects to the proposed revision to Policy H5, and recommends an **immediate full review of the Local Plan Housing policies in accordance with the advice contained in PPG3.**

Mr D H Murray
Chairman of
Upper Denton
Parish Council

The Parish Council believe every application should be judged on its merits, in respect of the guidelines provided by the Local Plan policy of course, but with the change you have currently administered can and will be detrimental to the best interests of planning policy to our rural areas. Our local knowledge of the parish is vital to any development and greater

Ever
its m
esta
the a
The
ever

	<p>consultation with planning officers should be encouraged.</p> <p>The amended H5 statement gives the opportunity to censor all rural developments without looking at the impact upon rural life. The ability for any development to support local services is very different in rural areas as compared to city/town life. Recent enquiries and lessons learned from FMD highlight this lack of understanding about the ways and lives of rural communities.</p> <p>We hope Carlisle City Council will endeavour to bring together the feelings of rural village and farming communities to accommodate all viable opportunities within a broad, sensible policy with greater individual parish consultation.</p>	<p>The serv of ru</p> <p>In ge prom help agric dimi the L disc paris</p>
<p>Mrs P Heggie Clerk to Burgh-by-Sands Parish Council</p>	<p>Although there is general support for the policy it was thought that there is much of it that is open to interpretation and more definition is required as to what is considered large and small scale development.</p>	<p>Due in H to de area deve need local</p>
<p>Taylor & Hardy 9 Finkle Street Carlisle (on behalf of W & T Little)</p>	<p>Comments with particular reference to planning application to demolish existing vacant farm buildings at Linden Farm, Baldwinholme and the erection on the site of 5 dwellings.</p> <p>It is considered that the proposed amended policy for the list of settlements to be deleted from Policy H5 is too restrictive. The proposed amended policy ought to be revised to include for residential development opportunities on sites which do not come within the PPG3 definition of previously developed land but are occupied by buildings and related hardstandings, yards, etc., previously used for agriculture but which are no longer required for agricultural purposes.</p> <p>It is considered that the wording "...minor infilling of 1 or 2 dwellings" is too prescriptive and is at odds with criterion 2 of policy H5. The wording ought to be changed to allow for greater flexibility dependent on the particular characteristics of the site proposed for housing and its surroundings.</p>	<p>The not i prop state</p> <p>Clari prev redu has Offic clas: barn thou for a</p>
<p>Taylor & Hardy</p>	<p>Have been discussing a proposal to erect a single</p>	<p>The</p>

<p>9 Finkle Street Carlisle (on behalf of Messrs Taylor)</p>	<p>dwelling on land which has previously been granted planning consent. If the proposed policy change were acceptable only developments of 1 or 2 dwellings on sites which were brownfield would be acceptable.</p> <p>This policy change for Little Orton, which is only a short distance from Carlisle, would be too restrictive, would essentially mothball the settlement and not provide scope for any new build residential development in the village at all.</p> <p>Proposed policy change ought to be amended to allow, in settlements like Little Orton which are, in relation to Carlisle, in sustainable locations, for limited infill development on land which is not defined as brownfield.</p>	<p>does state appl Any will k asse pern</p>
<p>Taylor & Hardy 9 Finkle Street Carlisle (on behalf of Messrs Nelson)</p>	<p>Acting on behalf of clients who have been in discussions with the Highway Agency in respect of the access aspects of a proposal to erect a single infill dwelling within the cluster of development along the south side of the A69 at Low Row.</p> <p>If the changes proposed are adopted the prospect for my client's proposals would be lost as paragraph 4.46 would be deleted from the Local Plan.</p> <p>This policy change for the group of houses on the trunk road at Low Row and only a short distance from Brampton would be too restrictive.</p> <p>The proposed change ought to be amended to allow, in groups of dwellings such as those at Low Row which are, in relation to Brampton, in sustainable locations, for limited infill development on land which is not defined as brownfield.</p>	<p>The withi for r relat serv furth the brow</p>
<p>Taylor & Hardy 9 Finkle Street Carlisle</p>	<p>It is clear from your previous report that the over supply in the rural area is slight i.e. apparently 11 units per year.</p> <p>An item of greater concern is the under supply in the urban area of nearly 800 units. It may be that there is a causal relationship between the two factors, i.e. a reduction in supply in the urban area leading to increased demand and slight over provision in the rural.</p> <p>Your report assumes all the units with planning</p>	<p>The betw note state exist supp The laps deve peric</p>

permission will be developed within 5 years. National practice is to allow for a 10% slippage. This would reduce the supply to 1762 units compared to the current Structure Plan requirement of 2000 units to maintain a five-year supply.

It may be that reducing the units in the rural area impacts upon the ability to maintain a 5 year supply. In that context we have some reservations as to whether the current approach is either necessary or justified.

It may be that in order to provide much-needed flexibility in the interim and to reflect the advice of PPG3 regarding brownfield sites that policy H4 in the Local Plan should be re-written. (wording suggested along lines similar to that advised by South Lakeland Local plan Review Inspector)

Suggest that a spatial dimension should be added to the review of settlements rather than based on facilities. Based on distance from Carlisle, Brampton, Longtown and Dalston. Suggest that the following settlements should be retained in the body of H5:

Aglionby; Baldwinholme; Brisco; Brunstock; Cardewlees; Cumdivock; Farlam; Gaitsgill; Kirkandrews-on-Eden; Knells; Linstock; Little Orton; Milton; Newtown; Rickerby; Stainton and Townhead. These should be defined as "local service centres" in accordance with PPG3.

Similar principles could also be applied to infill development in smaller hamlets and groups. A distinction could be drawn within 6km of Carlisle and 4km of Brampton, Longtown and Dalston.

Believe that criterion 2 which deals with scale should prevail and the preamble should be less prescriptive (not refer to minor infill of 1 or 2 dwellings).

Bearing in mind the local circumstances in Cumbria, and the location of farm buildings in and on the edge of settlements there may be scope for extending the definition of previously developed land to incorporate redundant agricultural steadings within that definition.

The
requ
Plan
relat
be c
dime
cons
rema

The
will b
cons
bein
Struc

Mrs B Watson Clerk to Stanwix Rural Parish Council	<p>Although the new listing will be of value within the defined settlements of Brunstock, Knells, Linstock and Rickerby, the deleting of Paragraph 4.46 of Policy H5 removes an important caveat from the policy which should be retained.</p> <p>Harker, Houghton, Low Crosby and Tarraby remain at risk from progressive development.</p> <p>The Parish Council press for these settlements to be scheduled similarly to Brunstock, Knells, Linstock and Rickerby, as being suitable for minor infill only.</p> <p>Houghton and latterly Linstock have both suffered greatly from extensive developments, which have had a major detrimental effect upon their character. Low Crosby is in danger of suffering the same fate having already reached its saturation point, in terms of development and expansion.</p> <p>Suggest within the opening paragraph of H5 replace "will normally" with "may" i.e. Proposals for small scale residential development may be acceptable providing that...</p> <p>Also to be used in the introductory paragraph of the new listing of redefined settlements "In addition the following settlements formerly in Policy H5 may be suitable for minor infill"</p> <p>Consider that the words "formerly in H5" should be deleted. If they are to be governed by the criteria defined by H5, the settlements listed must themselves be subject to Policy H5.</p> <p>Paragraph 4.46 should be retained. If not retained the sentence "It is however, the case that not all infill sites are suitable for development, particularly where it would merely extend ribbon development, or involve the development of visually important open space" should be inserted in the new paragraph referred to above.</p> <p>Harker, Houghton and Low Crosby should be defined similarly to Brunstock, Knells, Linstock and Rickerby, as being suitable only for minor infill, subject to the defined criteria. Tarraby should also be defined this way, but should also highlight as being in a conservation area and as such, is</p>	<p>The has of de requ limit prop this char new a ch. take Loca</p> <p>Offic shou H5 a appl char settl</p> <p>Para from state issu deve acc in th</p>
---	--	--

	afforded the additional protection of specific policies.	
<p>Coates Associates</p> <p>Chartered Town Planners</p> <p>Stainton Court</p> <p>Stainton</p> <p>Kendal</p>	<p>Consider that Cumrew should not be removed from the list of villages of suitable development. There are other existing policies that would prevent inappropriate development and to remove the village would result in the stagnation of the village, without catering for any natural organic growth.</p> <p>Small scale should be defined as not exceeding 4 dwellings. In addition the wording of the policy should include "...will not normally exceed 4 dwellings unless circumstances indicate otherwise. To include the word "normally" allows an element of flexibility where circumstances allow, but at the same time would enable the Council to maintain control numbers on sites, to ensure that the layout and form is of style which reflects the character of the area.</p>	<p>Propo</p> <p>villag</p> <p>have</p> <p>trans</p> <p>requ</p> <p>indig</p> <p>iden</p> <p>As th</p> <p>of th</p> <p>there</p>
<p>Taylor & Hardy</p> <p>9 Finkle Street</p> <p>Carlisle</p> <p>(on behalf of Story Homes Ltd)</p>	See comments above as Taylor & Hardy.	
<p>Mrs M E McKenna</p> <p>Clerk to Beaumont Parish Council</p>	<p>The Council welcomes the proposal to remove Grinsdale and Kirkandrews-on-Eden from the settlements included in H5. However, the Council regrets the decision to leave Beaumont and Monkhill within that policy and calls for those settlements also to be removed from it for the following reasons:</p> <p>Beaumont – is located within an AONB as such its inclusion would appear to conflict with paragraph 2 of the Housing Strategy; the village is on the line of Hadrian’s Wall (World Heritage Site) which would suggest any development should be discouraged; the only amenities available within the village are a bus service and a Parish Church; and, the absence of mains drainage causes particular problems, because the clay subsoil renders the alternative of septic tank disposal problematic.</p> <p>Monkhill – Monkhill is located is located on a narrow but comparatively busy road serving Burgh-by-</p>	<p>Whil</p> <p>remc</p> <p>State</p> <p>resp</p> <p>cons</p> <p>appl</p> <p>Loca</p>

	<p>Sands and smaller settlements further afield. There is restricted visibility for traffic joining this road at the crossroads and because of existing buildings this is not susceptible of improvement; the only amenities available within the village are a bus service, Methodist chapel and a public house. There is no school or shop; the village has seen a number of recent developments, the cumulative size of which is significant as a proportion of the pre-existing village. It is felt that Monkhill should be protected from further development in the foreseeable future.</p>	
<p>M Bodell Principal Planning Officer Cumbria County Council Community, Economy and Environment Citadel Chambers Carlisle</p>	<p>I have considered your amendment to Policy H5 of the Local Plan. You will appreciate that the Structure Plan promotes a fairly flexible attitude to new housing provided it relates to existing settlements ie villages and hamlets. The scale of housing in each settlement should however be determined through Local Plans. Your revised policy still sets this framework. Whilst some very small hamlets will now be excluded as suitable for housing development minor infill housing development is still permitted in the larger hamlets and small scale development in villages where it would sustain facilities. I am therefore happy the Local Plan continues to conform to the existing Structure Plan.</p> <p>Importantly your amendment will help promote a more sustainable pattern of development consistent with PPG3 and PPG13. PPG3 will of course require a more focused approach to the amount, location and type of new housing and this will need to be carried forward into both the Structure and Local Plan.</p>	<p>Note spec appr focu: have trans PPG focu: boar PPG</p>
<p>Taylor & Hardy 9 Finkle Street Carlisle (on behalf of Messrs Thompson)</p>	<p>Proposals have been submitted for the erection of 6 dwellings on land part of Fenton Farm. The proposals are fundamental to a rationalisation of the farm enterprise prompted by the economic pressures presently facing the agricultural sector and which would leave part of the existing farm steading vacant and part still in active agricultural use.</p> <p>If the proposed residential development is not regarded as acceptable then to become viable the diary herd will have to be increased and additional farm buildings, slurry storage facilities, etc. will need to be built. Changes will clearly impact on the</p>	<p>Clari prev redu has Offic clas: barn thou for a farm is cu in U: Any</p>

	<p>existing dwellings within the village.</p> <p>It is proposed to remove Fenton from the list of settlements identified under Policy H5.</p> <p>My clients have been advised that the Local planning Authority may approve some redevelopment of farmsteads for residential purposes but only where the scale of the proposed redevelopment is regarded as acceptable and the whole farmstead is vacant and redundant.</p> <p>The proposed policy changes as described above raise difficulties as my client's site does not fall within the definition of brownfield as set down in PPG3, nor is the farmstead wholly vacant and redundant.</p> <p>The proposed amended policy for the list of settlements is too restrictive. The policy ought to be revised to include for residential opportunities on sites which do not come within the definition of previously developed land but are occupied by buildings and related hardstandings, yards, etc. previously used for agriculture, whether whole or parts of farm steadings, but which are no longer required for agricultural purposes.</p> <p>In addition it is considered the wording "....minor infilling of 1 or 2 dwellings" is too prescriptive and is at odds with criterion 2 of Policy H. The wording ought to be changed to allow for greater flexibility dependent upon the particular characteristics of the site and its surroundings.</p>	<p>take shou offic appl</p> <p>The not i prop state</p>
<p>Carlisle Parish Council's Association</p>	<p>The Association is very pleased to have the chance to comment on this policy.</p> <p>The CPCA supports the overall policy objective including the limitation on high cost executive housing as infill.</p> <p>We are concerned however about the opportunities for low cost /affordable housing being blighted by the policy. There is also concern that the list of locations in the policy is based on historical considerations rather than reflecting current issues such as low cost housing and post FMD funding opportunities. The policy needs to reflect a sensitivity to current initiatives from all agencies</p>	<p>The affor there it ca Polic</p> <p>To e oppo may than Plan Loca issue polic</p>

	offering development funding/help to avoid confusion.	circu
Mrs E Auld Clerk to Dalston Parish Council	<p>It was noted that the proposal refers to settlements outside Carlisle, Brampton, Longtown and Dalston. It was agreed that Dalston should not be grouped with Carlisle, Brampton and Longtown in terms of housing development for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dalston is not a market town but a village • The population is not comparable with a market town, but more in line with Wetheral, which is included in Policy H5 • There is no town centre infrastructure such as foul drainage and parking facilities suitable for large scale development. • The primary school is not of sufficient size to cope with large scale housing development • The secondary school situation relates to the geographical catchment area not to the size of the village • The proposed amendments to Housing Policy H5 are to redress the balance between the urban/rural development. Dalston is a village in a rural area. 	The alter the p one as p
Government Office for the North West	<p>We appreciate and support Carlisle to bring policies more up to date in line with national guidance in PPG3. An interim policy is not the appropriate method of doing this. Local Authorities cannot make changes to Plan policy through policy statements or through SPG. The statement could have no validity in terms of altering Local Plan policy.</p> <p>A better option would be to outline the considerations they will have to take into account in light of the publication of PPG3 and how the Council will actually do this practically. PPG3 is a material consideration, which can and should be taken into account when considering planning applications. The key aim is to ensure the Council is actively considering PPG3 advice when looking at future planning applications.</p> <p>The actual proposed change to policy H5 would</p>	<p>Offic com the c Offic polic</p> <p>The supp for h in re</p> <p>Offic ahead Hou: are r issue thro cons state</p>

serve as a basis for explaining the policy statement. It is not legitimate to impose a blanket refusal of consent, but it would be appropriate to point out that development will not be permitted if there are sequentially preferable options, be they in the urban area, adjoining it or in better placed villages.

conc
guid.

No detailed background is given of the current housing supply situation and what has happened since the plan was adopted. The revised wording still does not reflect the consideration that previously developed sites should be developed before greenfield sites. At present the policy still encourages windfall greenfield development.

Would support a policy statement that explains how existing policy would be applied in light of PPG3 but does not alter the policy itself.

Strongly recommend you review existing policies and allocations as soon as possible. The decisions on Morton should not prevent you from using your urban capacity study results to review housing allocations in light of PPG3 and the overall housing supply situation since the adoption of the Local Plan.

Such an alteration/review needs to cover the following issues

- seek only to identify sufficient land to meet the housing requirement set as a result of RPG and strategic planning processes.
- Reassess any greenfield sites allocated for housing in the adopted plan
- Manage the release of sites over the plan period
- Bear in mind advice regarding density
- Have regard to advice on design
- Adopt a recycling target
- Include a policy explaining your authority's approach to meeting rural housing needs and on the use of conversion of rural sites and buildings
- And take opportunity to review your affordable housing policy to be in line with Circ 06/98/

INTERIM HOUSING POLICY STATEMENT

The Carlisle District Local Plan was adopted in September 1997. The policies within the plan guide development up to 2006. Since the publication of the plan additional guidance from Government in the form of Planning Policy Guidance Notes and Circulars has been issued in relation to Housing development.

A review of the Local Plan will commence later this year. This will consider policies relating to all topics in the Plan as well as proposed alterations to the Development Plan system by the Office of the Deputy Prime Minister. The Housing policies in the Plan will be subject to this review and will be set within the context of Regional Planning Guidance and the Structure Plan, both of which are currently under review at the moment.

The review of Regional Planning Guidance concentrates on urban renaissance with an emphasis on development in the conurbations of the north west. It establishes a reduced rate of development for Cumbria. The Structure Plan is considering how this rate should be applied to the each of the Districts. For Carlisle this potentially means a reduction in the current rate of development. The future rate of development will be a determinant factor in the location of housing for Local Plan review and any revision to the existing policies and strategy.

Planning Policy Guidance 3: Housing which was published in March 2000 establishes a number of principles for residential development. This guidance is a material consideration in dealing with applications for housing within the District. PPG3 establishes a Plan, Monitor and Manage process, by which Carlisle City Council has a duty to manage the release of housing. The City Council regularly monitor the number of planning permissions and development rate of new housing in order to monitor its housing policies in relation to the Local Plan Strategy, Policies and PPG3. As part of the manage process that follows the monitoring, the Council now needs to ensure that the implementation of policies is consistent with PPG3. It will also consider changing policies as part of its review of the Local Plan.

In the short term the Council considers it appropriate to issue further guidance on residential development to explain how the Local Plan policies are to be implemented in relation to PPG3. This statement does not change the policies of the Local Plan. This statement explains how officers must use PPG3 in relation to applications for housing development. Each application must be treated on its merits in relation to the adopted Local Plan and PPG3.

The table below sets out the rate of housing development over the Plan period based on the position at 31st March 2002.

Total Urban Rural

Structure Plan allocation 1991-2006 6000

Local Plan Provision 1991-2006 **6858 4801 2057**

Completions 1991-2002 **4286 2652 1634**

Residual requirement 2002-6 **2572 2149 423**

On initial examination of the total of dwellings to be completed to achieve the Structure Plan allocation the development rate is only 2.6% below the anticipated rate. It is however, the location of that development which has raised concerns. PPG3 puts an emphasis on urban and brownfield locations and an initial look at the table above indicates a development rate that is greater than planned in the rural area. Additional reference below looks at the brownfield and greenfield development rates.

The supporting reasons/explanations to Proposal H1 in the Local Plan (see below) establish a policy framework for 70% of housing in the urban area and 30% in the rural area. The actual numbers planned for are shown in the table above. The urban emphasis of this policy is consistent with PPG3 guidance. However the rate of development indicates a different trend.

A higher rate of development in the rural area and a lower rate of development in the urban area indicate a need to manage the supply more closely in line with the Plan Strategy and PPG3. The completion of new dwelling units indicates a 38% development rate in the rural area, which are nearly 350 units higher than the 30% rate anticipated. However, in the context of the 15-year plan period the figures above indicate that at 73% of time through the plan period, 79% of the rural supply has been completed resulting in an oversupply of 125 units throughout the rural area. In contrast the urban area has developed only 55% resulting in an under supply of over 850 units.

Planning applications already given consent will feature in the future rate and location of development. In order to achieve a complete picture of the pattern of development, the table below takes these into account.

Total Urban Rural

Total with Planning permission 1928 1195 733

Completions 1991-2002 4286 2652 1634

Projected total for plan period **5751 3560 2191**

(estimate up to 2006)

Local Plan Provision 6858 4801 2057

Whilst not all planning consents get developed and some may take longer than the plan period before being completed, the trend of development is clear. An increasing number of consents in the rural area and a shortage of supply in the urban area are not achieving the urban emphasis of the Local Plan strategy nor PPG3.

In addition to the urban emphasis, PPG3 brings additional guidance on how the Government's targets for brownfield housing development are to be achieved. The Government's national target for brownfield housing development is 60%. Regional Planning Guidance currently indicates that Cumbria should achieve 50%. The Structure Plan may identify a target for Carlisle District. However as this is not yet established the City Council is looking to provide about 50% of its housing on brownfield sites. The Council's Infrastructure Overview and Scrutiny Committee have recently considered this issue and acknowledged that the Council's Interim Housing Policy Statement will assist in achieving this target until the Local Plan is reviewed.

The Council undertook an Urban Capacity Study in 1998 as part of the preparation for Regional Planning Guidance. This has been updated to a base date of October 2001 and the results of this are taken into account in consideration of PPG3.

The Urban Capacity Study establishes the potential for sites to come forward for housing development and how many units could be developed on those sites. The detailed study is published under separate cover. However the indicative results are that the estimated discounted capacity is 1183 units. Of the identified sites, 118 units already have planning permission and are included in the previous tables.

In 2001-2002, the City Council's development rate was 45% on brownfield sites. This has been an increase on recent years. However additional measures need to be taken to increase the level whilst recognising the potential for brownfield sites in Carlisle.

At 31st March 2002, 47% of outstanding planning permissions for residential development were on brownfield land. Whilst this is close to the brownfield target for the District, there is no guarantee that development of the brownfield sites will occur at the same rate as greenfield and of those sites under construction 37% are brownfield indicating a potential decline in the rate developed.

Achieving the Government's brownfield target for housing is not a blanket indication that any brownfield housing site would be given permission. PPG3 applies a sequential approach to development taking into account sustainability principles. The Carlisle District Local Plan is based upon promoting sustainable development. However the additional emphasis of brownfield development needs to be recognised in the implementation of the policies.

Interim housing policy

The Council will adopt a 50% brownfield development target for housing

The following sections of this statement consider each of the housing policies of the Local Plan and how this policy will be implemented in light of the above position.

Housing Proposal H1

Proposal H1

Allocation of Housing Land

To provide for housing needs an additional 4,664 dwellings are required between April 1st 1994 and April 1st 2006. Making allowances for sites with planning permission and windfall sites provision, land for a further 2,146 dwellings is allocated for primary residential purposes, providing for a variety of housing needs. These additional sites, are:

Site Ha. Dwellings

- | | | |
|---|--------------|--------------|
| 1. Morton, Carlisle | 41.00 | 1,025* |
| 2. Garlands, Carlisle | 17.80 | 445* |
| 3. Warwick Road, Carlisle | 5.10 | 128* |
| 4. Brisco Road, Carlisle | 3.30 | 83* |
| 5. RAF 14MU Site No.4 | 3.50 | 90* |
| 6. Windsor Way, Carlisle | 8.04 | 200* |
| 7. Scotby, Carlisle | 2.30 | 58* |
| 8. William Howard Lower
School, Brampton | 1.00 | 25* |
| 9. Barras Lane, Dalston | 2.99 | 50 |
| 10. Nook Lane, Dalston | 1.47 | 20 |
| 11. Ladyseat, Longtown | 0.87 | 22* |
| Total | 87.37 | 2,146 |

*Site capacity for these sites is based on 25 dwellings per hectare.

Proposals for residential development not included in the above allocations will be assessed according to Policies H2-H7.

All housing developments will be closely monitored to ensure that the scale of residential development relates to the Structure Plan requirement

"Planning to deliver" a guide on the implementation of PPG3 recognises that

Local Plans should identify suitable sites after making an allowance for windfall, to meet housing requirements. Of the above sites the current position is as follows:

Site Dwellings PPGranted No.Completed

Allocated By 31/03/02

1. Morton, Carlisle 1,025 168 48
2. Garlands, Carlisle 445 462 148
3. Warwick Road, Carlisle 128 175 160
4. Brisco Road, Carlisle 83 0 0
5. RAF 14MU Site No.4 90 0 0
6. Windsor Way, Carlisle 200 160 35
7. Scotby, Carlisle 58 77 30
8. William Howard Lower
School, Brampton 25 60 60
9. Barras Lane, Dalston 50 55 55
10. Nook Lane, Dalston 20 31 31
11. Ladyseat, Longtown 22 0 0

The majority of sites have permission granted and are well under construction leaving little scope for change to the site's rate of development especially where there is no phasing condition within the planning permission.

This statement is not able to allocate new sites which is a matter for review of the Local Plan. It will consider how the development of existing allocated sites complies with PPG3 in the context of housing development since the Plan's adoption. This will take into account the location of the sites, the ability to achieve the brownfield targets and the future development rates required.

Site 1 Morton - Development has started on part of the site. However the remainder of the site currently has applications called-in by the Secretary of

State. The site's development has been the subject of public debate over a number of years although it was allocated after debate at Local plan Inquiry. The site has potential to provide housing in association with employment, leisure and retail as a mixed use urban extension to the south west of Carlisle and as such is considered to be a sustainable extension in relation to paragraph 67 of PPG3. The site is located on the edge of the urban area, but is classed as greenfield. Whilst not contributing to the brownfield development in Carlisle the ability to plan for such a large scale of development allows for a more sustainable approach to Carlisle's pattern of development. The larger area will provide facilities for the south west of Carlisle thus reducing the need for travel for many existing residents as well as providing for new residents.

A Masterplan has been developed and adopted as Supplementary Planning Guidance for the site. The Council has also considered officer reports, which set out the principle of the site in relation to PPG3. (Report reference EN.108/01)

In accordance with PPG3 this scale of development would require phasing. An initial phase has already been started by Crowther Homes and it is envisaged that a development rate of about 100 per year would be feasible. This would ensure a phased release of greenfield development in Carlisle. Given the limited scope for brownfield development identified in the Urban Capacity Study, and the desire to reduce the sporadic nature of development through greenfield windfall sites in the rural area, a planned sustainable extension is the most consistent approach with PPG3.

Other greenfield sites have been developed previously without any phasing to the development rate. This has led to a higher proportion of greenfield land being developed. It is important that a phasing programme is established for any allocated greenfield sites which are to be developed to ensure a balance between brownfield and greenfield development is achieved in a sustainable manner.

Site 4 has outline planning permission. Part of this land was used as a former tip and there are serious contamination issues to be overcome before it can be developed. As it is a brownfield site and should therefore still be considered suitable for development. Although this site should be brought forward sooner than the Morton development the contamination issues may make this unlikely.

Site 5 is a brownfield site. Its allocation was defined as contributing to the urban area. However its location can be considered as a rural expansion under paragraph 38. The site is a former RAF Maintenance Unit area and whilst the majority of land around Carlisle associated with this use has been developed for industry this site is close to the village of Cargo and residential use was considered appropriate by the Local Plan Inspector. In accordance with PPG3 however the density of development should be increased above the 90 in this policy. It is not intended to phase this development and it should be brought forward soon.

Site 11 is a greenfield site on the edge of a market town. Longtown has qualified for funding under the Market Towns Initiative and part of the Healthcheck identified a need for housing. The Action Plan is still being developed but reference to the need for housing is a local issue. Brownfield sites have been given permission for housing in Longtown however there are no further alternatives to Greenfield development. The Market town provides employment and services for local people and the allocation of housing to serve local needs is important for the local economy. In order to allow for development in a sustainable manner this site should still be promoted under this proposal. This is a small site and the density of development should be increased to comply with PPG3. As the site is greenfield its development should be phased to complement the brownfield sites already given planning permission.

Interim Policy Statement Policy H1

In implementing this policy officers will take into account the need to plan sustainable development and the phased release of sites in accordance with paragraphs 32-34 of PPG3. In recognition of PPG3 sites 4 (subject to contamination issues being able to be resolved) and 5 should be brought forward initially. Site 11 should be phased in order to allow for brownfield sites to be developed. Site 1 should be phased over a longer term to provide an increased urban emphasis to the development pattern and a planned sustainable urban extension. The development of this allocated site will provide for the majority of greenfield land over forthcoming plan periods and provide the prerequisite for other housing policies in the plan to promote brownfield development.

Housing Policy H2

Policy H2

Primary Residential Areas

Within the Primary Residential Areas defined on the Inset Maps for Carlisle, Brampton, Longtown and Dalston, proposals for new residential development will be acceptable provided that:

- 1.existing areas of open space and other amenity areas are safeguarded; and
- 2.the proposed development does not adversely affect the amenity of adjacent residential property; and
- 3.the proposed development complements or enhances existing adjacent residential areas and their amenity; and
- 4.satisfactory access and appropriate parking arrangements can be achieved.

Proposals for uses other than residential will not be permitted in Primary Residential Areas other than where they do not adversely affect residential amenity. Development that would create unacceptable noise, smell, safety and health impacts or excessive traffic generation will not be acceptable. Such

schemes falling within the scope of this Policy will be considered against the above criteria as well as other Policies of the Plan appropriate for the proposed use.

The designation of Primary Residential Areas within the Local Plan indicates the urban emphasis of development. The policy aims to protect recreational and open space and therefore provides the basis for brownfield development. Fifty-five per cent of the sites identified within the Urban Capacity Study are within the primary residential area. These sites can therefore come forward under this existing policy.

The policy includes the market towns of Brampton and Longtown as well as the large village of Dalston. All of these locations have a number of facilities and good opportunities for alternative forms of transport to the car. These locations are considered suitable in relation to PPG3. Their designation and role in providing for housing within the district will be considered further in Local Plan review. However this current policy provides a focus on the existing built residential area as providing potential for additional housing.

The areas identified as primary residential will provide the location for the majority of brownfield windfall sites coming forward and are consistent with areas considered as part of the Council's Urban Capacity Study.

Interim Policy Statement Policy H2

In implementing this policy officers will take into account the contribution towards urban brownfield sites that can be achieved within areas defined by this policy in accordance with paragraph 35 of PPG3. The locations identified by this policy are consistent with the sustainable and sequential emphasis of PPG3 in achieving development of previously used land.

Housing Policy H3

Policy H3

Capon Tree Road

Within the Capon Tree Road area of Brampton, shown on the Brampton Inset Proposals Map residential development will be permitted, provided:

- 1.the proposed development is of high quality, sympathetic to the character of the area;*
- 2.the proposal is of low density with no more than five dwellings per hectare;*
- 3.the proposed development does not involve the loss of existing mature trees.*

This policy relates to an area of land approximately 1km from the centre of Brampton. The policy is aimed at protecting the high landscape quality of the area. The density of development in this policy is inconsistent with the aims of PPG3, which seek to make the best use of land. After taking account of PPG3 it is considered that this policy is inconsistent with advice in Paragraph 57. Given the material weight attributed to PPG3 and the nature of this policy only exceptional local need circumstances supported by statement will be considered suitable in this location. Furthermore, paragraph 40 of PPG3 considers the non-renewal of outline planning permissions where applications are inconsistent with the intentions of PPG3. In light of the policy it is considered that outline planning permissions in this area should not automatically be considered for renewal.

Interim Policy Statement Policy H3

In implementing this policy officers will take into account paragraph 58 of PPG3. In order to protect the high quality landscape and be consistent with the efficient use of land in PPG3 officers will take account of exceptional local need if proposals are to be considered in relation to this policy.

Officers will also take account of advice in paragraph 40 of PPG3 in considering the renewal of any outline applications for housing in the area covered by this policy.

Housing Policy H4

Policy H4

Housing Elsewhere

Within Carlisle, Brampton, Longtown and Dalston, outside the Primary Residential Areas and sites allocated under Proposal H1, applications for residential development, including redevelopment and the change of use of vacant and underused buildings, will be permitted provided that:

- 1.satisfactory housing conditions can be achieved; and*
- 2.the proposal will complement the existing character of the area; and*
- 3.the proposal will not adversely affect the amenity of the area; and*
- 4.satisfactory access can be provided; and appropriate parking arrangements can be made.*

This policy continues to emphasise the urban areas and will help to redress the balance towards urban development. The areas referred to in this policy contain the remainder of the sites identified in the Urban Capacity Study. Some of these sites are in alternative uses and not able to be developed for housing in the short term. Such sites may also be suitable for retail, office, and

commercial or leisure development, which are other uses subject to the sequential approach. The current policy allows for their favourable consideration and this should continue to be emphasised to bring forward brownfield sites. The Council will be considering the review of Employment sites and allocations as part of the Local Plan review. However, in the short term this policy enables proposals to come forward. Where there is a need for employment allocations/sites as part of the Council's economic strategy, alternative proposals will not be considered until a comprehensive assessment has been made of all allocations/sites.

Interim Policy Statement Policy H4

In implementing this policy officers will consider the context provided by paragraph 41 of PPG3 and the Council's Urban Capacity Study to enable further brownfield development within the urban areas of Carlisle. Proposals will also be considered in Longtown, Brampton and Dalston as sustainable rural locations for development.

Housing Policy H5

Policy H5

Village Development

Within the following settlements, large scale residential development will not be permitted. Proposals for small scale residential development will normally be acceptable providing that:

- 1.the site is well related to the landscape of the area and does not intrude into open countryside; and*
- 2.the scale of the proposed development is well related to the scale, form and character of the existing settlement; and*
- 3.the layout of the site and the design of the buildings is well related to existing property in the village; and*
- 4.the siting and design of the buildings is well related to and does not adversely affect the amenity of neighbouring property; and*
- 5.appropriate access and parking can be achieved; and*
- 6.the proposal will not lead to the loss of amenity open space within or at the*

edge of the settlement; and

7.the proposal will not lead to the loss of the best and most versatile agricultural land.

Aglionby Baldwinholme Banks Barclose

Beaumont Blackford Blackwell Boltonfellend

Boustead Hill Broadwath Brisco Brunstock

Burgh-by-Sands Burnrigg Cardewlees

Cargo Carleton Castle Carrock Cotehill

Cumdivock Cummersdale Cumrew Cumwhinton

Cumwhitton Durdar Easton Farlam

Faugh Fenton Gaitsgill Gilsland

Great Corby Great Orton Grinsdale Hallbankgate

Harker Hayton Heads Nook Hornsby

Houghton How Mill Irthington Kirkcambeck

Kirkandrews on Eden Knells Lanercost

Laversdale Linstock Little Orton Low Crosby

Longburgh Low Row Lyneholmeford Midgeholme

Milton Moat Monkhill Moorhouse

Newby East Newtown Raughtonhead Rockcliffe

Rickerby Scaleby Scotby Smithfield

Stainton Stockdalewath Talkin Tarraby

Thurstonfield Tindale Todhills Townhead

Walton Warwick-on-Eden

Warwick Bridge (including Little Corby & Corby Hill)

Westlinton Wetheral Wetheral Pasture

The distribution of housing within the rural area of Carlisle District is focussed on the above settlements and a number of smaller hamlets considered under paragraph 4.46 of the Local Plan. In considering the pattern of development the Council has consulted on the potential to remove settlements from the list and provide a more sustainable focus to rural development. This would also assist in reducing the amount of rural housing coming forward and increase

the urban emphasis of the Local Plan strategy.

In PPG3 rural housing is considered in paragraphs 69-71.

It is not the role of this Housing Policy Statement to revise the policies of the Local Plan but to provide the focus of how the policies will be implemented in light of national policy.

PPG3 recognises that most proposals for additional housing in rural areas will involve infill development or peripheral expansion. This would be allowed under the current policy of the Local Plan. In order to increase the urban emphasis and reduce the amount of rural housing coming forward the implementation of this policy needs to be more focused. This is primarily an issue for review of the plan. However officers must take key indicators from PPG3 in assessing proposals for rural housing.

There are three factors referred to throughout PPG3.

- 1 Good public transport corridors
- 2 The availability of local services
- 3 Local need

These feature in paragraphs 69-71 of PPG3 in relation to new settlements and significant additional housing.

Taking into account the rural supply of housing within the district, these principles should be applied for minor infilling proposals. Implementation of this policy will focus on settlements with public transport links to the main settlements and Carlisle, the availability of local services (school, shop, PH, garage, etc) where additional housing may contribute to their viability, and local need (see policies on affordable housing).

With regard to need, some work has been undertaken on local need to inform the existing Local Plan. Further work has been undertaken on a sporadic nature throughout the rural area and additional research is being undertaken on affordability. This will inform the review of the Local Plan.

Paragraph 70 of PPG3 relates to significant additional housing. Housing Policy H5 provides for small-scale proposals and proposals for significant rural housing are contrary to this policy. Paragraph 4.40 refers to proposals of over 20 dwellings however the preceding sentence states the "what constitutes large and small-scale will vary considerably from settlement to settlement". Significant additional housing referred to in PPG3 will be considered in this context.

Applications for renewal of outline planning permission in locations where there are no local facilities or public transport, and no local need has been identified, will be considered against paragraph 40 of PPG3. Renewal of planning permission should not be assumed to be automatic.

Interim Policy Statement Policy H5

In implementing this policy officers will take into account the principles of PPG3 and references to rural housing in paragraphs 69-71. In order to reduce the rate of rural development and provide the urban emphasis of PPG3 proposals for small scale housing will be considered in settlements that have public transport and local facilities. Proposals for housing in settlements which have no facilities and no public transport services will be considered to be inconsistent with the approach contained in PPG3. Proposals for significant rural housing development are not consistent with this policy.

Renewal of outline planning permission will be considered against paragraph 40 of PPG3 in light of the above implementation of this policy.

Housing Policy H6

Policy H6

Agricultural and Forestry Need

Within the remainder of the Plan area, outside areas covered by Proposal H1 and Policies H2 - H5, permission will not be given for dwellings, except where applications are supported by a proven agricultural or forestry need.

The need for essential housing for workers in agriculture and forestry is not referred to in the revision to PPG3. There is therefore no change to the implementation of this policy. Land and buildings in agricultural use are considered greenfield and any development of this nature will inevitably mean that greenfield land is taken. Officers will continue to require proven need to be demonstrated before planning permission is granted.

Interim Policy Statement Policy H6

There is no change to the implementation of this policy.

Housing Policy H7

Policy H7

Remote Rural Area

Within the Remote Rural Area (as defined on the Proposals Map), large-scale development will not be permitted. Proposals for small-scale development within existing hamlets or groups of houses will be acceptable in principle provided that:

1.the proposal is well related to existing local landscape features and is sited in such a way as to make maximum use of such features for screening and does not adversely affect the landscape; and

2.the proposal complements the character and size of the hamlet or group of dwellings; and

3.appropriate access and parking can be obtained.

In addition proposals will be acceptable for additional accommodation on farm complexes which contain an existing occupied dwelling. However, in these cases clear evidence of the need for such development must be given. Such consents will be limited to one additional dwelling per farm.

Within the remote rural area there have been few proposals for residential development. Between the 1st April 1997 and 31st March 2002 there had been only 19 houses completed and a further 12 with planning permission. The policy in the Local Plan is intended to provide for special nature of the area, which has no pattern of definable settlements. In general this policy is encouraging rural housing development in a remote area. However the extent of that development has not given rise to concern locally.

It is intended that this policy remains in force with no alteration to its implementation. The local needs of the area in general are being supported only on a small scale over a large area and officers will monitor the effect that any changes to the implementation of rural housing policies will have on this area. Officers will however consider the efficient use of land in considering any proposals for housing, and ensure that such proposals relate well to existing development as referred to in paragraph 4.53 of the Local Plan and where possible re-use previously developed land.

Further consideration will be given this policy in reviewing the Local Plan.

Interim Policy Statement Policy H7

In implementing this policy officers will take into account the special qualities of the area when implementing policies in relation to PPG3 and ensure that proposals for development relate well to existing development and re-use previously developed land wherever possible.

Housing Policy H8

Policy H8**Affordable Housing on Large Sites**

The City Council will, where appropriate, negotiate with developers for an element of affordable housing to be included in larger housing developments.

The Local Plan identifies the needs for affordable housing within the plan period. The ability to achieve this is reliant upon allocations for housing providing the bulk of these units.

The reasons/explanations supporting the policy relate to Circular 16/96 and PPG3. This has been superseded by advice contained in Circular 06/98 and the revised PPG3. In considering affordable housing development on larger sites the officer will have regard to the Council's Housing Strategy in order to achieve the correct mix and number of units for each site. The Council's Housing Services will be involved in negotiations on the type of housing to be provided to ensure local need is being addressed.

Interim Policy Statement Policy H8

In implementing this policy officers will take into account paragraphs 15-17 of PPG3. Officers will also consider advice in Circular 6/98, which was published after the Local Plan policy was adopted, when determining applications for housing. To be consistent with that advice officers will consider a requirement for affordable housing on sites of over 25 units or 1 Hectare in relation to Carlisle (over and above allocated sites). Outwith the urban area of Carlisle consideration will be given to local need for affordable housing on sites over 0.5 hectare.

Housing Policy H9**Policy H9****Rural Exception Sites**

Notwithstanding Proposal H1 and Policies H2-H5 and H7, proposals for residential development may be permitted in locations where such development would not usually be permitted, where the following conditions are met:

- 1.the proposal is for low-cost housing to meet an identified need; and*
- 2.the proposal is supported by a detailed agreement which will satisfy the requirement that once built the residential units are retained for the benefit of successive as well as initial occupiers; and*
- 3.the proposal is well related to the settlement where the need has been identified and does not involve a significant impact on the local landscape.*

Rural exception sites are few in numbers in Carlisle District. However when a need is identified it is important to address this need. Housing Policy 5 aims to

reduce the overall number of new dwellings in the rural area and this may have a subsequent effect on the potential to build contributions to affordable housing supplies on larger housing sites. This policy will therefore have a significant role to play where affordable housing is required.

Interim Policy Statement Policy H9

In implementing this policy officers will take into account paragraph 18 and Annex B of PPG3 and Circular 6/98.

Housing Policy H10

Policy H10

Flats Over Shops

Proposals for the residential use of upper floors over shops will be encouraged and permitted provided that:

- 1. where appropriate, access and car parking provision can be achieved; and*
- 2. the proposal does not result in the creation of substandard units; and*
- 3. adequate internal and external space is provided.*

This policy is consistent with PPG3 as this policy allows for brownfield windfall and encourages re-use of underused buildings. An allowance for conversions is taken into account in the Council's urban capacity study.

Interim Policy Statement Policy H10

In implementing this policy officers will take into account paragraph 41 of PPG3. Officers will consider the flexible approach referred to in the guidance.

Housing Policy H11

Policy H11

Backland Development

Proposals for housing development in large back gardens or behind existing housing developments will be acceptable providing that:

1. the scale, design and siting of the proposal is appropriate for the site and is in keeping with the character and quality of the local environment; and
2. there is no loss of amenity to surrounding properties; and

3.existing landscape features are retained, and additional planting is included as an integral part of the scheme; and

4. appropriate access and car parking can be achieved.

This policy aims to make more efficient use of land that may be land locked behind other residential development. The policy aims to protect residential amenity but provide opportunity for some development. There are two aspects to this application. Where development proposals are for development in large back gardens, this is consistent with the re-use of previously developed land and would be consistent with PPG3. Where the proposal is solely to get access to land, which has not been developed at the rear, the policy could be used to promote access to greenfield land. Officers will consider the location of any proposals in relation to other policies in the Local Plan when considering applications for backland development. Locations consistent with the implementation of Housing policies 2, 4 or 5 will be suitable for backland development.

Interim Policy Statement Policy H11

In implementing this policy officers will take into account the location of such proposals in relation to implementation of Policies H2, H4 and H5 in line with PPG3.

Housing Policy H12

Policy H12

Conversions in the Rural Area

Proposals for the conversion of non residential property to provide residential accommodation in locations where planning permission for new build residential development would not be granted will not be approved unless:

- 1.the building is of permanent construction; and
- 2.the building can be converted without extensions or major alterations which would destroy its character; and
- 3.the details of the proposed conversion respect the building's character; and
- 4.adequate access and appropriate car parking can be achieved.

Where appropriate, in order to retain the character and fabric of historic farm buildings, development rights originally permitted by Class A of Part One of Schedule Two to the Town and Country Planning General Development Order (1988 as amended) may be withdrawn by a condition attached to a planning consent.

The conversion of recently constructed or very remote rural buildings will not be

permitted.

Barn conversions are considered to be greenfield under the definition of previously developed land in Annex C of PPG3. No allowance should be made for greenfield windfall and whilst PPG3 does not prevent all greenfield sites, the emphasis is to reduce the reliance on greenfield windfall sites being developed. In the rural parts of Carlisle District, over 100 units currently have planning permission for conversion from barns and contribute 30% of the supply of rural housing on small sites. Whilst this policy provides for conversion of barns, PPG7 encourages commercial, industrial or recreational uses in the first instance (See Local Plan Employment Policy EM11). The guidance on non-residential uses will be taken into account when considering applications for barn conversions. This policy also allows for conversion of other buildings in the rural area which dependent upon their location would be consistent with PPG3.

Interim Policy Statement Policy H12

In implementing this policy officers will take into account guidance in PPG7.

Housing Policy H13

Policy H13

Replacement Dwellings

The replacement of recently occupied permanent dwellings, with existing use rights, will be permitted provided that:

- 1.the new dwelling is located on or close to the site of the original dwelling; and
- 2.the scale and design of the replacement dwelling is appropriate to its location and complements the character and size of other dwellings in the locality; and
- 3.the proposal does not adversely affect the amenity of the area or adjoining property; and
- 4.appropriate access and parking arrangements can be provided.

This policy emphasises the re-use of sites already established for housing.

Whilst PPG3 seeks to make efficient use of land the replacement of dwellings has an impact on residential amenity. Furthermore, the replacement of dwellings by ones of larger scale can have an impact on the local housing

stock. These considerations are taken into account in this policy. Whilst PPG3 is a material consideration, the desire to make efficient use of land needs to be balanced against local circumstances.

Interim Policy Statement Policy H13

It is considered that there should be no change to the implementation of this policy to take into account PPG3.

Housing Policy H14

Policy H14

Extensions to Dwellings

Applications for extensions to existing dwellings will be approved provided the City Council is satisfied that the proposals are appropriate to the dwelling, its design and setting. Inappropriate extensions which adversely affect the amenities of adjacent properties by poor design, unreasonable overlooking and/or unreasonable loss of daylight and sunlight will not be permitted.

This policy is not affected by additional guidance in PPG3.

Interim Policy Statement Policy H14

It is considered that there should be no change to the implementation of this policy to take into account PPG3.

Housing Policy H15

Policy H15

Access Newbuild

Within the Plan Area, where there is evidence of need, developers will be encouraged to meet the needs of disabled people. In these instances dwellings should be readily accessible for disabled people and be capable of adaptation to meet the needs of any future disabled resident.

This policy is not affected by additional guidance in PPG3.

Interim Policy Statement Policy H15

It is considered that there should be no change to the implementation of this policy to take into account PPG3.

Housing Policy H16

Policy H16

Design Considerations

High standards of design in new housing sites and dwellings will be required. Matters to be considered include: the layout of roads and buildings, footpaths and cycleways; the retention of existing trees and hedgerows; planning out crime; the provision of public open space; and the relationship to adjacent development.

There are a number of references in PPG3 to improving the quality of design and layout of residential areas. PPG3 seeks to combine the efficient use of land with a high quality and attractive environment. Additional emphasis is placed on good design and encouraging local planning authorities to reject poor design. Officers will take account of advice in paragraph 63 of PPG3 in assessing the design of development proposals.

The existing policy does not contain any reference to density. Paragraphs 57 and 58 advise on the density of development to ensure the best use of land. Officers will consider the development of land for Housing in Carlisle at a density over 30 dwellings per hectare. Outside the urban area the density should seek to make efficient use of land. Proposals for lower density than 30 dwellings per hectare will need to justify the density proposed. They should not rely on neighbouring recent developments but consider the site-specific circumstances.

Road layout and car parking also has an effect on the design of residential areas. PPG3 offers guidance on parking standards, which will be taken into account when assessing planning applications.

Interim Policy Statement Policy H16

In implementing this policy officers will take into account paragraphs 52-64 of PPG3. Officers will consider how proposals for housing satisfy the additional guidance in relation to greening the residential environment, the quality of design, the best use of land (including appropriate density of development), and parking standards.

Housing Policy H17

Policy H17

Residential Amenity

The amenity of residential areas will be protected from inappropriate development where that development:

- 1.is for a use inappropriate for residential areas; and/or
- 2.is of an unacceptable scale; and/or
- 3.leads to an unacceptable increase in traffic or noise; and/or
- 4.is visually intrusive; and/or
- 5.leads to a loss of housing stock.

This policy is not affected by additional guidance in PPG3.

Interim Policy Statement Policy H17

It is considered that there should be no change to the implementation of this policy to take into account PPG3.

Housing Policy H18

Policy H18

Subdivision of Houses and Houses in

Multiple Occupation

Proposals for the subdivision of houses into smaller units, or for change of use to a house in multiple occupation will be acceptable provided that :

- 1.there is no loss of amenity to surrounding residential properties; and
- 2.appropriate access and car parking provision can be achieved; and
- 3.the proposal does not result in the creation of substandard units; and
- 4.adequate internal and external space is provided.

This policy is consistent with the principles of increasing density and reusing existing buildings as long as the location of the residential unit is considered to be a sustainable location. The policy currently applies to all residential properties. To be consistent with PPG3 this policy should be interpreted to consider residential properties for conversion, which have an urban emphasis in locations defined as H2; H4 or those defined by the interpretation of H5. This emphasises the need to have the provision of facilities and not relate to isolated residential properties.

Interim Policy Statement Policy H18

Officers will consider the location of houses for subdivision in relation to the interpretation of Housing Policies H2 and H5 in this statement.

Intensification of use of buildings is consistent with PPG3. However this should not generate an increase in residential activity in isolated locations.

Housing Policy H19

Policy H19

Special Needs

Proposals which relate to special or particular housing needs (e.g. the elderly, mentally and physically disabled, the homeless etc) will be acceptable, provided that:

- 1.they are consistent with other Policies of the Plan; and
- 2.the City Council being satisfied there is a need which is not being met elsewhere; and
- 3.the site being appropriate for that need.

This policy is not affected by additional guidance in PPG3.

Interim Policy Statement Policy H19

It is considered that there should be no change to the implementation of this policy to take into account PPG3.

Housing Policy H20

Policy H20

Gypsies

Where there is an identified need the City Council will consider the provision of Gypsy Caravan Sites. Proposals for Gypsy sites will be acceptable providing that:

- 1.the proposal is not within an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty or County Landscape; and
- 2.there would be no adverse impact on the local landscape; and
- 3.appropriate access and parking can be achieved; and
- 4.the proposed site is reasonably accessible to community services; and

5.the proposal would not adversely affect the amenities of adjacent occupiers by way of noise, vehicle or other activities on site.

This policy is not affected by additional guidance in PPG3.

Interim Policy Statement Policy H20

It is considered that there should be no change to the implementation of this policy to take into account PPG3.