

# Minutes of Previous Meetings

## DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE

**FRIDAY 11 OCTOBER 2019 AT 10.00 AM**

**PRESENT:** Councillor Tinnion (Chairman), Councillors, Mrs Bowman (as substitute for Councillor Collier), Mrs Bradley (as substitute for Councillor Mrs Glendinning), Christian, Meller (as substitute for Councillor Tarbitt), Morton, Nedved, Patrick and Shepherd.

**OFFICERS:** Corporate Director of Governance and Regulatory Services  
Development Manager  
Mr Allan, Flood Development Manager, Cumbria County Council  
Principal Planning Officer  
Planning Officer x 3

### **DC.092/19 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

Apologies for absence were submitted on behalf of Councillors Brown, Collier, Mrs Glendinning, and Rodgers, and the Corporate Director of Economic Development

### **DC.093/19 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

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

Councillor Mrs Bowman declared an interest in respect of application 19/0374 – Land to the rear of Broomfallen Road, Scotby, Carlisle, CA4 8DE. The interest related to objectors approaching her.

Councillor Christian declared an interest in respect of application 19/0374 – Land to the rear of Broomfallen Road, Scotby, Carlisle, CA4 8DE. The interest related to an objector being known to him.

Councillor Morton declared an interest in respect of application 19/0535 – Land at field 3486, Monkhill Road, Moorhouse, Carlisle. The interest related to objectors being known to him.

Councillor Birks declared an interest in respect of application 19/0513 – Fairfield Cottage, Wetheral Pasture, Carlisle, CA4 8HR. The interest related to the architect being known to her.

Councillor Tinnion declared an interest in respect of applications:

- 18/0239 – Holme Eden Farm, Warwick Bridge, Carlisle. The interest related to objectors being known to him.
- 19/0535 – Land at field 3486, Monkhill Road, Moorhouse, Carlisle. The interest related to the developer being known to him.
- 19/0607 – Scotby Church of England Primary School, Park Road, Scotby, Carlisle, CA4 8AT. The interest related to a relative living in proximity to the application site.

Application 19/0196 – Land opposite Hawthorn Cottage, Unthank, Dalston, Carlisle, CA5 7BA had previously been deferred following discussion and consideration at the 30 August 2019 meeting of the Committee. Due to not having participated in those earlier discussions, Councillors Mrs Bowman, Morton, Patrick and Tinnion indicated that they would not take part in the determination of the application. Councillor Tinnion (Chairman) further indicated that he would facilitate the meeting by chairing that item of business.

## **DC.094/19 PUBLIC AND PRESS**

RESOLVED – That the Agenda be agreed as circulated.

## **DC.095/19 MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETINGS**

RESOLVED 1) The Chairman signed the minutes of the meetings held on 5 June, 5 June (site visits), 7 June, 17 July (site visits) and 19 July 2019.

2) That the minutes of the meeting held on 30 August and 9 October (site visits) 2019 be approved.

## **DC.096/19 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.097/19 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.

- 1. Conversion of existing redundant buildings to form 8 residential units without compliance with Condition 3 imposed by Planning Permission 12/0449 to allow minor alterations to units 3, 5 and 8 and formation of vehicular access for maintenance only purposes, Holme Eden Farm, Warwick Bridge, Carlisle (Application 18/0239).**

The Principal Planning Officer submitted the report on the application which had been subject of a site visit by the Committee on 9 October 2019.

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

The proposed alterations to the dwellings were summarised for the benefit of Members. The Principal Planning Officer set out the planning history of the site noting that during the course of the application process, the proposed location of the car park had been altered. Originally, it had been sited to the east of the site, the applicant had then proposed its siting at the west of the site. Following concerns from the Environment Agency in relation to flooding, the applicant had amended the location of the car park to the east of the site once again.

Residents had raised by concerns regarding the potential for traffic using the car park to travel against the one-way system thus exiting from a different junction. The proposed access for maintenance purposes had been another issue raised by objectors. The Principal Planning Officer understood that such access would be required on a bi-annual basis: he proposed the imposition of a further condition stipulating that the access was only to be used for maintenance purposes and shall not be used by the occupiers of the proposed dwellings.

The Principal Planning Officer recommended that the application be approved, subject to the imposition of the conditions detailed in the report and the additional condition restricting the use of the access for maintenance purposes only.

Mr Bertram (Objector on behalf of Mrs Munro) addressed the Committee noting that the residents of Holme Eden Gardens had no objection to the proposed development other than the access arrangements. He asked who would be responsible for managing the access of maintenance vehicles once the developer had completed works at the site. Mr Bertram requested that consideration be given to the drawing up of a covenant stipulating the frequency with which maintenance vehicles were permitted to access the site, along with a definition of what constituted maintenance works, he indicated that were such a provision to be made, objectors concerns would be satisfied.

The Committee then gave consideration to the application.

A number of Members shared the objector's concerns regarding: what constituted maintenance; whether a banksman was required to assist in the egress of maintenance vehicles, and whether a gate ought to be installed to prevent use of the car park by residents.

The Principal Planning Officer responded that the term maintenance was able to be defined in the appropriate condition contained within the Consent, and he undertook amend condition 17 accordingly in the event of the permission being granted.

In relation to the suggestion that a banksman be used, the Principal Planning Officer, considered that was an issue for those carrying out the maintenance works, he judged that the imposition of a condition on the matter was unreasonable.

With regard to the provision of a gate at the car park, the Principal Planning Officer did not deem it necessary, however, were Members minded to require it, a condition was able to be imposed stipulating one be installed.

A Member moved the Officer's recommendation, and the imposition of conditions to define the term maintenance and, requiring the provision of a gate at the car park entrance. The proposal 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 1no. dwelling (Outline/Revised Application), Land opposite Hawthorn Cottage, Unthank, Dalston, Carlisle, CA5 7BA (Application 19/0196).**

The Development Manager submitted the report on the application which had been subject of a site visit by the Committee on 9 October 2019.

The report outlined the key policies which were to be considered relating to the principle of development, the Development Manager advised that the Carlisle District Local Plan 2015 - 30 ("the Local Plan") was to be read as a whole and consideration given to more than one policy. In addition to the Local Plan, the site was within Dalston Parish therefore, the Dalston Neighbourhood Plan was a relevant consideration.

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

During the Committee's consideration of the application at its meeting of 30 August it had been confirmed by the applicant that the proposal was on land purchased as garden land and was for a family member. In terms of detailed elements relating to a dwelling those were all able to be overcome by the use of planning conditions and, as the report concluded, the primary consideration for Member was the principle of development in the location.

Members had been advised by a representative from Dalston Parish Council at the August 2019 meeting that it was not the intention of the Dalston Neighbourhood Plan to prevent development throughout the whole of the Parish as that would effectively preserve smaller groups of housing, such as Unthank, in aspic. The point had also been reiterated by Councillor Allison, Ward Member in his previous verbal representations to the Committee.

The Development Manager stated that whilst it may not be the Parish Council's intention to limit development, Dalston Neighbourhood Plan Policy DNP-H2 referred only to the hamlets of Raughton Head and Gaitsgill as being appropriate area for new housing and; with development in other hamlets only being acceptable in special circumstances, none of which were satisfied by the proposal. The Parish Council may have had other intentions for their policies, however, the Committee had to work with the Written Statement which formed part of the Development Plan.

The Parish Council had cited other examples where windfall development had been allowed. The Development Manager reminded Members that each application was to be treated on its merits and there were examples of other applications refused (and upheld on Appeal) where the development was not in a sustainable location. Moreover, the Committee needed to consider any precedent that may arise from planning decisions. Were Members to resolve to approve the application a clear rationale of the merits of the proposed scheme would be required.

The Development Manager recommended that the application be refused for the reasons set out in the report.

The Committee then gave consideration to the application.

A Member stated that he had considered the policy context relating to the application and concluded that the proposed development was in an unsustainable location in the open countryside and as such was contrary to Local Plan policies HO 5 – Rural Exception Site and HO 6 – Other Housing in the Open Countryside, accordingly, he moved the Officer's recommendation.

Another Member had also looked into the policies pertaining to the application in detail, he was of the view that the principles were clear and that the proposed scheme was contrary to Local Plan policy HO 2 – Windfall Housing Development, and the Dalston Neighbourhood Plan. Furthermore, the site visit had brought him to the view that development of the site was not appropriate. He seconded the proposal to refuse the application

The Chairman noted that a proposal to refuse the application had been proposed and seconded, he put the matter to Members who had indicated their agreement and it was:

**RESOLVED:** That the application be refused for the reasons indicated within the Schedule of Decisions attached to these minutes

**3. Erection of 1no. dwelling and provision of refuse bin access point, Land to the rear of 48 – 52 Broomfallen Road, Scotby, Carlisle, CA4 8DE (Application 19/0374).**

*Councillor Christian having declared an interest in the item of business removed himself from his seat and took no part in the discussion nor determination of the application.*

The Planning Officer submitted the report on the application which had been subject of a site visit by the Committee on 9 October 2019.

The Planning Officer noted that it would be the proposed dwelling's eastern ground floor walls that would act as retaining walls not its western walls as stated in paragraph 3.8 of the report. The proposed split level dwelling would be set into the slope by approximately 2.3 metres.

Wetheral Parish Council had responded outside the consultation period, however, it had not raised any new issues beyond those highlighted within section 5 of the report, other than it would be advantageous for each of the proposed dwellings to have its own motorised trolley for bins.

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

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

Mr Acton (Objector) spoke against the application in the following terms: the proposal was not substantially different to application 18/0506 which had been refused permission by the Council and was the subject of an unsuccessful Appeal with the Planning Inspectorate; the lowering of the ridge height by 0.6m and the reorientation and re-siting of the building were not significant alterations and the proposed building was virtually identical to that proposed for Plot 4 of the refused permission; the lower number of dwellings at the site would not reduce the scale and massing of the scheme, nor would it affect the view of the site from the southern aspect of the public road; the Inspector had dismissed the appeal in respect of application 18/0506 on the grounds of appearance, character, scale and massing; no assurances had been given in relation to the proposed ridge height; excavation work at the site had impacted on its ability to cope with surface water, and Mr Acton's property had been flooded three times since works had commenced; no test results were available on the stability of the ground at the reconfigured site; the provision of a motorised trolley for refuse bins indicated a problem with the site; the proposal was not in accordance with Local Plan policy SP 6 – Good Design, criteria 1, 2, 3 and 7

Ms Lightfoot (Agent) responded in the following terms: the site had Outline Permission for 3 dwellings, 2 of which were under construction, approval of the current application would see the site developed in line with the previously granted permission; following the refusal of application 18/0506, the developer had worked with Officers to address the issues raised; the principle of developing the site had been approved and was consistent with the Local Plan and the National Planning Policy Framework; the reorientation and re-siting of the proposed dwelling along with the altered ridge height meant it was substantially different from that of the reused application; the existing boundary treatment was to remain and be strengthened, mitigating the visual impact of the development; the scale and massing of the scheme was fundamentally different to that in the refused application; a property was already under construction that would provide a buffer between the proposed dwelling and those existing on Broomfallen Road; the required minimum separation distances between properties had been achieved; the proposed motorised trolley would be available to all properties at the site; the split-level nature of the proposed dwelling meant that it was able to provide for a range of possible circumstances; no technical consultee had objected to the proposal; the access road to the site would be finished in tarmacadam; drainage infrastructure would be installed at the earliest possible stage; the two dwellings under construction at the site were not germane to the current application.

The Committee then gave consideration to the application.

A Member understood that the applicant had an agreement with a local farmer to discharge surface water from the site into an adjacent field where it would run-off into a nearby beck, he

asked whether that agreement was verbal or a written legal document. He further sought assurance regarding the effectiveness of the proposed drainage scheme.

Mr Allan (Cumbria County Council) responded that, due to the soil type of the site, the applicant was required to submit a Construction Water Management Plan (CWMP). With the aid of photographs of the site displayed on screen, the proposed drainage scheme for the site was outlined for the benefit of Members. The applicant had installed a bund to assist with the management of surface water; however, Mr Allan stated the Members needed to acknowledge that the site was currently under construction which would impact on the ground's ability to process surface water. As the proposed drainage infrastructure was incorporated into the site, surface water management would improve and no further flooding would take place. With reference to the objector's comments regarding flooding, it was noted that the most recent event had taken place when 70mm of rain had fallen in 24 hours and that flooding had occurred in a number of places across the district. In future, the applicant would periodically remove debris from the surface water bund in order that sufficient flow rates were maintained Mr Allan stated that he was satisfied with the proposed drainage arrangements.

In response to a question from a Member regarding the management of the ongoing maintenance of the drainage system and the forms of redress residents would have in the event of a flood, Mr Allan explained that were the bunds to fail, the Lead Local Flood Authority would look to the applicant to resolve any such issues.

Another Member sought clarification on the timescales for the periodic clearance of the surface water bunds.

Mr Allan advised that forecasts were checked in advance and site inspections were carried out, were any issues to be identified clearance of the bunds would be requested. However, he assured the Committee that the other infrastructure making up the drainage system would keep the bunds clear.

A Member asked who would be responsible for the motorised trolleys were they to become defective.

The Planning Officer advised that the cost of fixing any defects to the trolley would be borne by the residents of the three properties at the site.

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.

*Councillor Christian resumed his seat.*

#### **4. Erection of detached double garage with office together with re-siting of access, Fairfield Cottage, Wetheral Pastures, Carlisle, CA4 8HR (Application 19/0513).**

The Planning Officer submitted the report on the application which had been subject of a site visit by the Committee on 9 October 2019.

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

The area surrounding the site was generally characterised by front gardens, with any garages or outbuildings set back from the public highway, and the front boundaries to dwellings along that part of Wetheral Pasture were predominantly defined by trees and shrubs, low walls and hedges.

Given that all other properties along that part of Wetheral Pasture were set back from the highway, and that there was already an existing roadside garage abutting the highway, the cumulative effect of an additional roadside structure would reduce the openness of the area, causing an enclosing and overbearing impact upon the street scene.

The Planning Officer noted that despite attempts to negotiate a more acceptable proposal, the applicant had stated he did not wish to revise the scale or the location of the proposed structure. Accordingly, the proposal was considered unacceptable in its current form.

It was the Planning Officer's view that proposal failed to complement the existing dwelling. Due to its scale and location, it would not be a subservient addition, and the proposed structure would therefore, by virtue of its location, size and massing, be an incongruous and unduly obtrusive feature in the street scene and harmful to the visual amenity of the area.

As the site already had ample in-curtilage parking spaces, the Planning Officer considered that the proposal would not have any benefits that outweighed the harm caused upon the character of the dwelling and the street scene. On that basis, the Planning Officer recommended that the application be refused, as it failed to comply with policies SP 6 – Good Design and HO 8 – House Extensions the Local Plan, and Paragraphs 127 and 130 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

Mr Andrew (Agent) addressed the Committee noting that the Officer's central objection was that the proposed structure would not be subservient to the existing buildings, he was of the opinion that requiring such subservience was wrong.

No neighbours had objected to the proposal, though one had indicated they would, were the building to be sited further back in the plot, which was not feasible as it would prevent access to the garden at the application site.

Mr Andrew stated that the character of buildings in the rural areas of Cumbria was that of a patchwork of settlements, farmsteads and building in a variety of sizes and orientations, he felt that the reasons for the Officer's refusal meant that he was attempting to impose a linear, urban arrangement in the rural area.

A Member appreciated the Agent's comments on the nature of rural settlements, however, the Committee site visit had afforded him the opportunity to view the site; he considered that the Officer's assessment of the application was fair as proposed building would be incongruous with its surroundings. The Member moved the Officer's recommendation.

Another Member agreed that the proposal was not in keeping with the character of development in the area, nor was it in accordance with Local Plan policy SP 6 – Good Design. He seconded the proposal to refuse the application.

The Chairman noted that a proposal to refuse the application had been moved and seconded. The Committee indicated its agreement and it was:

**RESOLVED:** That the application be refused for the reasons indicated within the Schedule of Decisions attached to these minutes.

**5. Erection of 9no. dwellings (Reserved Matters Application Pursuant to Outline Application 16/0387) Land at field 3468, Monkhill Road, Carlisle (Application 19/0535).**

The Planning Officer submitted the report on the application which had been subject of a site visit by the Committee on 9 October 2019.

Members' attention was drawn to page 1 of the Supplementary Schedule, where a written response from Historic England confirming it had no objection to the proposal had been reproduced. The Planning Officer noted that response confirmed the verbal indication the Statutory Consultee had provided which had been referred to in paragraph 6.32 of the report.

Burgh by Sands Parish Council responded outside the consultation period; however, it had not raised any issues other than those set out within section 5 of the report.

Slides were displayed on screen showing: location plan, proposed site plan; street scene images from Monkhill, and photographs of the site, an explanation of which was provided for the benefit of Members.

The application site was identified under Policy HO1 of the Local Plan as Allocated Site 'R12'. Outline planning permission for the erection of 9 dwellings was granted by the Committee at its meeting in July 2016. As such, the principle of development of the site was established together with the access and layout. The application before Members sought approval for the remaining Reserved Matters namely: appearance; landscaping; and scale.

The Planning Officer advised that pre-commencement conditions imposed by the Committee during the determination of the earlier outline planning approval, included those relating to drainage and archaeology, would be subject of further applications and consultations with the relevant Statutory Consultees were the current scheme to be approved.

The Planning Officer advised that the hedgerows at the site had recently been trimmed exposing several gaps therein. The issue had been raised with the Agent and a revised drawing received illustrating that the hedgerow would be reinforced with a double staggered row of hawthorn whips. Were Members to approve the application, it was recommended that condition 3 be reworded to ensure that the hedgerow, where sparse, be reinforced with staggered double rows of hawthorn plants.

The Planning Officer recommended that the application be approved, subject to the imposition of the conditions detailed in the report, and the rewording of condition 3 to require the reinforcement of the hedge with staggered double rows of hawthorn plants.

Mr Cowx (Objector on behalf of himself and Ms Howe)

Slides were displayed on screen showing: an excerpt of the letter from the Council setting out the reasons for refusal of application 02/0691; a letter from the County Councillor regarding flooding issues (dated 16 February 2015); video footage of previous flood events in Moorhouse; date stone for Fairfield House; picture of students visiting Fairfield House and, a statement from Mr A Gibbons, Fellow of the Society for the Protection of Ancient Buildings regarding Moorhouse.

Mr Cowx stated that drainage was a longstanding issue in the area, which the proposed scheme did not address. In 2003 as part of an application to develop the site, an analysis of the site had been conducted using percolation tests and samples. The assessment concluded that water was not able to soakaway from the site. Mr Cowx was of the view that Officer had been dismissive of concerns relating to drainage in the assessment of the application and was anxious that if



permitted the development would increase flood risk and may have an impact on the foundations of Fairfield.

Mr Cowx asserted that in 2016, the Council had been under pressure to allocate land for housing, the application site had been approved for development as a result of that pressure, along with less in-depth inquiry into the conditions at the site than had been carried out in 2002.

Mr Cowx further raised concerns relating to: the dating of Fairfield as shown in the report: that the hedge being maintained at 1.8metres; that the Officer had shown a limited amount of dwelling types in Moorhouse in her presentation in an attempt to play down the historic character of the area; a full archaeological survey of the site was needed.

Mr Grieg (Agent) responded that Surface Water was not a Reserved Matter, as it was approved by as part of application 16/0837, therefore it was not procedurally correct for it to be considered in the Reserved Matters application. The only matters which were open to consideration by the Committee were landscape, scale and appearance which had been adequately covered by the Officer's report.

The Committee then gave consideration to the application.

A Member stated that whilst he appreciated the Agent's comments, he felt it was important that any issues related to flooding were clarified.

Mr Allan responded that the video footage of flooding shown by the objector had taken place in 2015 and 2016. The Lead Local Flood Authority and United Utilities had undertaken works to the drainage system in 2017, and whilst in periods of heavy rain flooding still occurred on the highway it was not of the same magnitude as that shown in the objector's video footage.

In terms of the proposed drainage system, Mr Allan advised Members that the proposals would be robustly considered in light of the Non-Technical Statutory Standards to ensure the mechanisms were acceptable. A drainage system that would allow for flooding to take place would not be permitted and there were suitable conditions imposed on application 16/0837 to manage the process.

A Member asked whether the proximity of the proposed scheme to nearby Listed Buildings was categorised as causing significant harm to them.

The Planning Officer advised that she had assessed the proposal, using Historic England's details pertaining to those building as was standard practice. Given the proposed boundary treatments and Historic England's response to the consultation, she was satisfied that less than substantial harm would be caused to the Listed Buildings in the vicinity of the application site.

The Member responded that he considered: the proposed boundary treatments to be good; that the location of the buildings within the site would reduce the scheme's impact on nearby Listed Buildings, and that the development was low density. On that basis he moved the Officer's recommendation, and the imposition of the reworded condition.

Another Member indicated that they were satisfied with the low density of housing proposed in the scheme, and subject to the rewording of condition 3 to require the reinforcement of the hedge with staggered double rows of hawthorn plants, she was happy to second the proposal to approve the application.

The Chairman noted that a proposal to approve the application, subject to the imposition of conditions had been moved and second.

The Committee indicated its agreement 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.

*The Committee adjourned at 11:25am and reconvened at 11:40am.*

**6. Erection of Temporary Modular Building for use as a classroom, Scotby Church of England Primary School, Park Road, Scotby, Carlisle (Application 19/0607).**

The Planning Officer submitted the report on the application which had been subject of a site visit by the Committee on 9 October 2019.

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

The applicant anticipated that the cabin would be in use for approximately 2 years, and the facility would not be used as a classroom as such, rather it would be used for one to ones and as a break out area for small groups.

The Agent had requested that it be reported an indicative parking plan for the site had been drawn up which proposed 22 spaces including provision for disabled drivers, four more than the perceived existing number of formal spaces. The Planning Officer advised Members that the drawing did not form part of the application, but it sought to indicate a possible solution.

The Agent further requested the following points from the Supplementary Statement be reported to the Committee:

- The cabin was not intended for use as a classroom as such, but for an extra space to be used for individual children or small groups;
- The single parking space where the proposed cabin was to be sited was difficult to use, therefore it's loss would be acceptable;
- Traffic management and road safety were significant concerns and the school, in partnership with the County Council and Police, were constantly reviewing the situation, implementing whatever measures were available to reduce the effects, for example coning alongside the school frontage in the zig-zag line area;
- Use of alternative locations within the school grounds would mean the loss of part of playing field therefore, the current option was preferred.

Photographs submitted by the Parish Council were displayed on screen showing parking in the vicinity of the school.

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

The Committee then gave consideration to the application.

A Member commented that he did not object to the proposal in principle, however, he felt that more information was needed in respect of:

- whether the parking layout plan showing 22 car parking spaces was to be included as part of the application;
- whether the applicant/school would consider including the grassed area within the car park (at the slope) as a provision for further car spaces.

The Planning Officer commented that patch of grassed land in the middle of site was not currently used for parking due to its gradient. Should Members require that it be looked at, he would liaise with the applicant accordingly.

The Member appreciated the Officer's point, and whilst he did not wish to delay the application, he felt it was important that any impact on traffic at school times needed to be fully considered.

Another Member noted that parking at the school at pick up and collection times could be challenging, he was aware that the school, Police and Cumbria County Council were working together to address the issue.

Members also sought clarification on whether: the additional class space would give rise to an increase in staff numbers, and whether the cabin would be placed over a manhole/drain cover located in the vicinity of the site.

The Development Manager noted the Members concerns, in relation to the indicative parking layout he advised that the Committee, at that time, did not have the appropriate authority to agree the relevant drawings, and further detail would be required from the Agent. Were Members minded to defer the application so that the identified issues may be explored, it was up to them to propose an appropriate resolution.

A Member moved that determination of the application be deferred in order that further information be secured as to whether:

- 1) The parking layout plan showing 22 car parking spaces was to be included as part of the application;
- 2) The applicant/school would consider including the grassed area within the car park (at the slope) as a provision for further car spaces;
- 3) The additional class space would give rise to an increase in staff numbers;
- 4) The proposed cabin would be placed over a manhole/drain cover located in the vicinity of the site.

The proposal was seconded, and it was:

**RESOLVED:** That determination of the application be deferred in order that further information be secured as to whether:

- 1) The parking layout plan showing 22 car parking spaces was to be included as part of the application;
- 2) The applicant/school would consider including the grassed area within the car park (at the slope) as a provision for further car spaces;
- 3) The additional class space would give rise to an increase in staff numbers;
- 4) The proposed cabin would be placed over a manhole/drain cover located in the vicinity of the site;

and to await a further report on the application at a future meeting of the Committee.

**7. Erection of 3no. linked bungalows, Land to the rear of Barnskew, Station Road, Cumwhinton, Carlisle, CA4 8DJ (Application 19/0611).**

The Principal Planning Officer submitted the report on the application which had been subject of a site visit by the Committee on 9 October 2019.

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

The proposed scheme would result in the loss of a grassed amenity as that would be given over to parking provision associated with the dwellings. The Parish Council supported the proposal as there was a need in the area for 2 bedroomed bungalow properties. An amenity area would be retained to the south of the application site, the Principal Planning Officer advised that a condition had been suggested requiring that the area be landscaped.

Cumbria County Council as Highway Authority had requested some funding for a gateway feature to reduce speeds of vehicles entering the village from the west. Given that the proposal was for 3 two bedroomed bungalows it was the Principal Planning Officer's view that the proposed scheme would not lead to a significant increase in traffic levels in the village. Therefore, the Highway Authority's request was unreasonable and would not meet the tests for planning obligations set out in the National Planning Policy Framework.

The Principal Planning Officer recommended that the application be approved, subject to the imposition of conditions detailed in the report

Mrs Fairless (Objector) objected to the proposal in the following terms: the adjacent development site had increased from 25 to 39 dwellings; the application site had been approved as a recreation area under previously granted planning permission; views from existing dwellings would be lost; the scheme would necessitate more construction works at the site which would be disruptive to existing residents; the road layout in the existing scheme was not safe as pavements had not been provided.

Mr Hutchinson (Agent) responded in the following terms: some of the issues raised by the objector did not relate to the application before Members as they pertained to the wider Thornedge development; a landscaped amenity of 20 metres was to be retained; there had been no objection from Cumbria County Council on highways or drainage ground; the County Council's request for a gateway feature did not meet all the necessary tests set out in the National Planning Policy Framework; the proposal was unlikely to generate demands upon the local school; the scheme was compliant with national and local planning policy.

The Principal Planning Officer acknowledged the objector's frustrations, however, he explained that they were not sufficient grounds for refusing the application.

A number of Members concurred with the Officer's sentiments,

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.

[The meeting closed at 12:16pm]