

DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE

FRIDAY 16 DECEMBER 2011 AT 10.00 AM

PRESENT: Councillor Mrs Parsons (Chairman), Councillors Bloxham, Cape, Craig, Mrs Farmer, Layden (as substitute for Councillor M Clarke), McDevitt, Morton, Mrs Riddle, Mrs Rutherford, Scarborough and Mrs Warwick

ALSO

PRESENT: Councillor Atkinson attended the meeting in his role as Ward Councillor having registered a right to speak in respect of application 11/0863 (Land at Norfolk Street, Denton Holme, Carlisle, Cumbria)

Councillor Mrs Robson attended the meeting in her role as Ward Councillor for Yewdale Ward having registered a right to speak in respect of applications 11/0595 and 11/0701 (Waverley Viaduct, River Eden, Willowholme, CA2 7NY)

DC.85/11 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

An apology for absence was submitted on behalf of Councillor M Clarke

DC.86/11 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillor Bloxham declared a personal and prejudicial interest in accordance with the Council's Code of Conduct in respect of Applications 11/0818, 11/0859 and 11/0872. The interest related to the fact that he was a member of Two Castles Housing Association.

Councillor Bloxham declared a personal interest in accordance with the Council's Code of Conduct in respect of Application 11/0922. The interest related to the fact that he was a member of the Council's Executive Committee.

Councillor Craig declared a personal interest in accordance with the Council's Code of Conduct in respect of Applications 11/0595 and 11/0701. Councillor Craig stated that the declaration was not based on pre-determination but was based on the fact that certain members of the public had seen fit to publish comments on the internet which wrongly implied that he would support the opening of the viaduct for public access and use his position as a member of the Planning Committee to secure that support.

Councillor Layden declared a personal interest in accordance with the Council's Code of Conduct in respect of Application 11/0955. The interest related to the fact that he was the Ward Member and would be speaking on behalf of the applicant.

Councillor McDevitt declared a personal interest in accordance with the Council's Code of Conduct in respect of Application 11/0863. The interest related to the fact that he was the Ward Councillor and the residents had contacted him about the application.

DC.87/11 MINUTES

The Minutes of the site visit meeting held on 14 December 2011 were noted.

DC.88/11 PUBLIC REPRESENTATIONS IN RESPECT OF PLANNING APPLICATIONS

The Legal Services Manager 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.89/11 CONTROL OF DEVELOPMENT AND ADVERTISING

RESOLVED – That the applications referred to in the Schedule of Applications under A, B, C and D be approved/refused/deferred, subject to the conditions as set out in the Schedule of Decisions attached to these Minutes.

(1) Temporary consent for retention of existing steel palisade security fences located at each end of viaduct for a further 3 years, Waverley Viaduct, River Eden, Willowholme, CA2 7NY (Application 11/0595)

The Planning Officer submitted the report on the application which was the subject of a site visit on 14 December 2011. He outlined for Members the background to the proposal, design and site details, together with the main issue for consideration, which was the impact on the character of the area and on the listed viaduct.

The Planning Officer presented photographs of the viaduct and the fencing.

The application had been publicised by means of site and press notices, as well as notification letters sent to 10 neighbouring properties. In response, 26 letters of objection and 2 letters of support had been received. A petition had also been received to allow public access across the viaduct. While that was not a planning matter a report would be presented to the Council's Executive in due course. The Planning Officer summarised the issues raised and support therein. He reminded Members that consideration must be given to planning and Listed Building consent to retain the fencing and not the wider issues.

The Planning Officer reminded Members that:

- there was no public right of way over the viaduct
- the land on the north side of the river was privately owned and the landowner supported the application to retain the fencing he did not want public access over the viaduct, and

- if planning permission was refused BRB had stated that they would revert back to the palisade fencing that was in place when the bridge was listed in 1994. Whilst that may look less unsightly than the present fencing it would be less effective at preventing public access than the current fencing.

In conclusion the Planning Officer advised that whilst the current fence was unsightly and had an adverse impact on the character of the area and on the listed viaduct, its retention for a further temporary 12 month period would be acceptable while the issues over the long-term future of the viaduct were explored. He explained that discussions were ongoing with BRB and the landowner on the north side of the river about the future of the viaduct. BRB was seeking to prevent public access until a long term solution was resolved. He therefore recommended that a further 12 month temporary consent be approved in order that further discussion could take place with the council or other bodies about the long term future of the viaduct.

Mr Jones (Objector) stated that he lived at Willowholme. He believed that BRB was a large organisation and should obey and support the letter of the law and support planning law. Had BRB applied to erect fencing along the sides of the viaduct in 2008 Officers would have ensured the fencing would be robust and appropriate for the area. The barriers were erected in 2009 following approval of a retrospective application. That was to be a temporary solution to March 2011. From the time the application was approved nothing had been done with regard to the fencing until the current application.

With regard to the private land on the north side of the river it was not the responsibility of BRB to fence that land. Vandalism had been an issue with sandstone blocks being thrown into the river; however Mr Jones believed that that was due to the barrier being badly maintained.

Mr Bain (Objector) advised that he was speaking on both the applications relating to Waverley Viaduct. He stated that the unsightly barriers had been in place for more than 2 years. He was concerned that there had been no input from the Council's Heritage Officer as his predecessor had pointed out the security arrangements had been "temporary" since 1998 and he favoured an approach whereby the onus was on BR to devise a scheme that would allow safe access onto the viaduct together with some timescales for future action. However no scheme had been developed and therefore the application should be refused.

The report referred to ongoing discussions with BRB. However the details of those discussions were very sparing and in reality the contact had been sporadic. The Planning Officer had stated that the barriers had reduced public access but the Countryside Officer had stated that people were climbing around the barriers at great risk to themselves.

Mr Bain added that the viaduct should be treated as a monument to the City's industrial past and should not be allowed to deteriorate. The Council encouraged people to walk and therefore the viaduct should be opened up to demonstrate the Council's commitment. At present the only footbridge over the river was the Memorial footbridge in Rickerby Park. Whilst there had been a lot of publicity about the efforts to get the viaduct re-opened there had been liaison over the issue and Mr

Bain believed that the Council should work more closely with the County Council otherwise the viaduct would continue to be a blot on the landscape.

Mr Ramshaw (Objector) reminded Members that there had been a campaign to re-open the viaduct as he believed there were many reasons for it to be re-opened. The two previous applications had both been retrospective with the previous application being approved with a condition that a permanent resolution was achieved. To date little or no progress had been made and there had been little or no contact between the City Council and BRB. Mr Ramshaw believed that there should be a safe pedestrian access across the bridge and that approval of the application would make no difference to the condition of the viaduct. He added that the City Council should support the re-opening of the viaduct and that if the application was approved for a 6 or 12 month period Officers should ensure that a firm decision was made and that steps could be taken to achieve it.

Councillor Mrs Robson (Ward Councillor for Yewdale Ward) stated that she objected to the proposal as the current barricades were unsightly. She reminded Members that the City Council attracted people to the Hadrians Wall path and Castle Street and then on to the viaduct. She believed that the barricades were a magnet for vandalism and that whilst she understood the health and safety issues she believed that it would be in everyone's interests if BRB repaired the parapet wall and installed paladin anti-climb fencing along the centre of the viaduct. That would be a less unsightly approach to making the viaduct safe.

The Committee then gave detailed consideration to the application.

A Member stated that it had been useful seeing the barricades on the site visit and reminded Members that consideration could be given only to that issue and that the Committee could not give permission to re-open the footpath. The Member added that the permission that was granted retrospectively 18 months ago had run out and that no enforcement had been undertaken. The structure was a Listed Building but had been vandalised and damaged and the Member was concerned at the number of Listed structures that were in a bad condition and stated that the Council should be doing something by taking relevant legal action to return the structures to a decent condition.

The Member stated that if approval was granted for 12 months he would want to know what action the Planning Officers would take to make BRB make the viaduct more acceptable. He added that he would not be happy to give permission for a further 12 months only to have another application submitted. Following the approval of the last application it was agreed that there would be discussions between the City and County Councils and BRB. Some of those discussions had taken place but the situation had not been rectified.

In response to a query regarding the Council's duty of care the Legal Services Manager advised that if the application was refused BRB had stated that they would revert to the palisade fencing that had been in place when the viaduct was listed. The responsibility for safety would be with BRB but the Council could be seen to have contributed as the Committee had refused the application and made BRB remove the barricade. The Planning Officer advised that the palisade fencing would

be between 1.8m and 2.1m high and that it would be easier to get past than the metal sheeting currently in place.

A Member disagreed with a comment that the City Council was not committed to people using the viaduct. However he did not believe that the correct course of action was to remove the current fencing. He reminded Members that some of the graffiti on the barriers was in favour of the viaduct being re-opened. The Member was also concerned about the duty of care and stated that he would not like to refuse the application only for the metal sheeting to be removed then someone fall from the viaduct.

The Assistant Director (Economic Development) advised that she would write to the relevant parties with regard to re-opening the viaduct and ask the applicant what their intentions were with respect to the viaduct.

A Member moved the Officer's recommendation for a 12 month period as he believed that to go back to the palisade fencing would be a backward step but felt that the Council had little room for manoeuvre on the matter.

A Member seconded the proposal to approve the Officer's recommendation and added that the 12 month period would focus the mind of the applicants to resolve the issue.

In response to a request from a Member the Assistant Director (Economic Development) confirmed that she would write to the County Council Highway Department with regard to the footpath. The Planning Officer also confirmed that he would write to the applicant and advise that the application had been reluctantly approved and that if a future application was submitted it was likely that it would be refused.

In response to a query from a Member the Legal Services Manager confirmed that a condition had been included that would require the fencing to be removed by a specific date.

A Member stated that whilst he had sympathy with those who wanted to see the footpath reinstated the responsibility was with BRB and the City Council could not continue to agree to extensions to the retention of the fencing.

A Member stated that she was concerned that another retrospective application had been submitted, on this occasion for a further 3 year period. She believed that that action did not indicate that BRB were taking negotiations seriously and that permission should be given for 6 months rather than 12 suggested by the Planning Officer.

The Planning Manager advised that the application had been submitted as a result of contact by the Planning Officers when the previous application expired. No further action could be taken whilst the current application was being determined.

Following a vote it was:

RESOLVED – That permission be granted for a 12 month period, subject to the conditions indicated in the Schedule of Decisions attached to these Minutes.

(2) Temporary consent for retention of existing steel palisade security fences located at each end of viaduct for a further 3 years (LBC), Waverley Viaduct, River Eden, Willowholme, CA2 7NY (Application 11/0701)

The Planning Officer submitted the report on the application which was the subject of a site visit on 14 December 2011. He outlined for Members the background to the proposal, design and site details, together with the main issue for consideration which was the impact on the listed Waverley Viaduct.

The application had been publicised by means of site and press notices, as well as notification letters sent to 10 neighbouring properties. In response 26 letters of objection and 2 letters of support had been received. The Planning Officer summarised the issues raised and support therein.

In conclusion the Planning Officer recommended that the application be approved for a 12 month period.

RESOLVED: That permission be granted, subject to the conditions indicated in the Schedule of Decisions attached to these Minutes.

(3) Erection of 9no 126 metre high (to tip) wind turbine generators, transformer housings, control room, 80m high meteorological mast and formation of associated laydown area, crane pads and access tracks, associated change of use to mixed use comprising operational peat works and wind farm, Beck Burn Peat Works, Springfield, Longtown, Cumbria, CA6 5NH (Application 10/1102)

The Planning Officer submitted the report setting out the background to the application, which was the subject of a site visit on 14 December 2011, together with a description of the proposal, design and site details, together with the main issues for consideration.

The Planning Officer advised that the submitted Statement of Community Involvement explained that the applicant had undertaken pre-application consultation exercises in August and September 2010. In total 39% of respondents stated their support for the Beckburn Wind Farm proposals with a further 27% undecided. Following receipt, the application had been advertised in the form of a press notice, the display of site notices around the perimeter of the application site, and written notification to the occupiers of 109 neighbouring properties inclusive of those who responded to the initial consultation exercise undertaken by the developers. At the time of preparing the report 275 letters or e-mails had been received of which 161 raised objections with 110 expressions of support. One petition objecting to the proposal had also been received along with 3 letters of comment. The Planning Officer summarised the issues raised and support therein. Since the report had

been published a further letter of objection had been received from FORCE (Friends of Rural Cumbria's Environment), which had been included in the Supplementary Schedule.

The Planning Officer explained that the proposal was in accordance with the overall objectives of Government energy policy. That was in the context where Cumbria had a target of providing 201MW by 2010 rising to 247.5MW by 2015 with actual provision standing at 143MW. The benefits included effective protection of the environment through the reduction of greenhouse gas emissions and the prudent use of natural resources by reducing reliance on fossil fuels. Key principle (iv) of PPS22 required that the wider environmental benefits of proposals be given significant weight.

The Planning Officer advised Members that the application site fell within Landscape Character Sub Type 2b Coastal Margins – Coastal Moss. Under the Cumbria Wind Energy Supplementary Planning Document that landscape was acknowledged as having a capacity to accommodate schemes of 3-5 turbines, or exceptionally 6-9 turbines. It was considered that the proposal would not cause unacceptable harm to the landscape character, the proposed turbines would be noticeable but their presence would not be dominating or overbearing. Subject to conditions, there would be no unacceptable impact on the living conditions of local residents through noise and disturbance, or shadow flicker.

Conversely, the MoD had confirmed that the proposed turbines would interfere with the operational functionality of the Eskdalemuir Seismological Recording Station that ensured the UK complied with the Comprehensive Nuclear Test Ban Treaty. Key Principle 1 of PPS22 stated that renewable energy developments should be capable of being accommodated throughout England in locations where the technology was viable and environmental, economic and social impacts could be addressed satisfactorily. As it stood, the proposal had not achieved that because the impact on the effective operational use of the Eskdalemuir Station could not be deemed to have been "addressed satisfactorily". It was considered that that negative aspect of the proposal outweighed the benefits it would bring. While conditions could address many of the matters raised, such as noise, shadow flicker, design, contamination, etc, the absence of any proposed solution (based on verified technical data and the agreement of the MoD) meant that they could not address the impact on Eskdalemuir Station. Correspondence had been received from the applicant regarding the use of a Grampian condition to resolve the outstanding Eskdalemuir issues that related to the time of a potential condition to June 2012. However, as that would still not encourage the Ministry of Defence to withdraw their objection the City Council did not consider it was appropriate to use a Grampian condition whether or not it was time limited. Therefore the Planning Officer recommended that the application be refused as it was considered that the impact on Eskdalemuir could not be deemed to have been addressed satisfactorily.

The Chairman advised Mrs Trotter that she could speak for 6 minutes as she was speaking on behalf of herself and Mr & Mrs Kirkbride, who had registered a right to speak but did not attend.

Mrs Trotter (Objector) stated that she lived in close proximity to the site and that she did not believe that Solway Moss was an appropriate site for a wind farm. There were EU regulations to protect peat land and the residents in the area wished to see that happen. The proposal would damage the site and whilst there was a requirement to return the site to its original condition the concrete would not be removed. The proposal was not environmentally friendly and would have a visual impact on the M6, M74 and the mainline railway as well as the Solway Coast, south west Scotland and the Lake District.

Mrs Trotter believed that the height of the proposed turbines would be oppressive and dominating and could not be screened by trees. The proposal was on a massive scale and 9 turbines would be intrusive in the outlook from many of the principle rooms and outdoor areas of residents' properties and would therefore have a detrimental effect on the living conditions of the residents. Many of the people worked in the area as well as living in the area and therefore their work life would be affected as well as their home life.

The environmental statement acknowledged the potential damage as a result of the proposal but that the noise assessment had underestimated the noise levels and that the noise from 9 turbines would affect the residents' sleep.

Recent photographs in the press of the damage to a wind turbine in recent storms had increased residents' concerns and Mrs Trotter urged the Members to refuse the application as it was out of place and would affect the quality of amenity and life in the area.

Mr Wilson (Objector) advised that he had lived and farmed in the area most of his life and had taken a keen interest in the wildlife in the area. There was European interest in the wildlife on the site which was in close proximity to Solway Moss and the Solway Firth. Mr Wilson listed some of the birds that could be regularly seen in the area and stated that while geese would fly over a wind turbine, in fog or stormy weather there was a danger that they would fly into the blades. Swans were regularly seen on ponds in Longtown and they would have difficulty avoiding the turbine blades. Mr Wilson also named several species of bird that were in decline in the area.

Mr Wilson stated that he was also concerned about the use of concrete for the site. The applicant had advised that after 25 years use of the turbines would be stopped but the concrete and metal work would remain. His view was that if it could not be removed it should be put in.

County Councillor Tarbitt (Objector) stated that she was the County Council Member for Longtown and Bewcastle and the proposed site lay within her division. She reminded Members that the planning application had been submitted in December 2010 and the delay and uncertainty had had a devastating effect on the lives of the residents. In addition to that the speculation around the potential intrusion of 9 wind turbines would give some understanding of why the residents had asked for the application to be refused. The technical facts regarding the inefficiencies of wind turbines and the financial benefits to energy companies and landowners were well rehearsed. County Councillor Tarbitt asked Members to consider the detrimental

impact on the wildlife as well as the damage to the ancient moss and battlefield. She believed that this part of Cumbria had reached saturation point in terms of the number of turbines visible from the shores of the Solway. Added to those points raised, and the proximity of the site at Eskdalemuir, County Councillor Tarbitt requested that the Committee join with the Cumbrian MPs, as well as the residents and refuse the application.

In response, Mr Scorer (Agent) stated that the report had comprehensively covered all the issues. There had been a similar number of people in support of, and objecting to, the proposal. Several people had also attended a public exhibition. He assured the Committee that the peat moss would be restored to its previous condition. With regard to noise, that had been monitored at hub height in accordance with Government guidance. With regard to the birds in the area Mr Scorer reminded Members that there had been no objection from either Natural England or the RSPB. Mr Scorer advised that the report covered the relevant planning policies and issues and concluded by stating that he had nothing further to add but was willing to respond to any questions from Members.

The Committee then gave consideration to the application.

A Member stated that the site lay in his Ward and the site visit had given Members the opportunity to see the affected area including the size of the roads around the site. The Member understood that something could be done to widen the roads as a single turbine blade would take up one vehicle. On the site visit a large number of geese flew overhead at the height of the proposed turbines. The Member stated that he was concerned about the concrete bases and the amount of energy expelled to produce the proposed development.

The Member added that trees would screen the site when they were in leaf but they were part of sustainable forests and would be cut down at times. The Member was also concerned about the effect the proposal would have on the highway and Solway Moss and reminded Members that the Government had paid millions of pounds to contractors to stop the peat extractors as they did not want the site to be damaged further.

The Member advised that the visual impact would be unacceptable and stated that the issues around the hydrology had not been discussed in the meeting. The Member informed the Committee that in 1771 the peat bog had exploded as a result of natural disturbance to the water table and questioned whether something similar could happen as a result of the development. The peat lands were formed very slowly and there were different types of peat bogs which were essential to service wildlife, biodiversity, preserving carbon dioxide emissions as well as producing food and being an important part of the water cycle. In the UK the peat reserves store the majority of carbon dioxide emissions and many of the peat lands had been degraded due to human intervention. DEFRA had a policy to preserve peat soils. It was evident that there were underground gas pockets as gas was currently being extracted in Longtown and Netherby. There was a danger that digging into the peat would hit one of the gas pockets.

The Cumbria Wind Energy Supplementary Planning Document also referred to the effects on the infrastructure and the applicant would have to demonstrate that the development would be able to accommodate trailers and heavy loads and the Member did not believe that the current application achieved that.

The Member reminded the Committee that the site had archaeological and historic significance. He did not believe that the production of energy could be used to justify approval of the application.

A Member seconded the proposal to refuse the application and advised that his main reason for refusal was the potential impact on Eskdalemuir.

A Member agreed with the recommendation for refusal and reminded Members that the Wind Turbines (Minimum Distances from Residential Premises) Bill was currently going through Parliament and would possibly be law within the next 12 months. The Bill would limit the distance from wind turbines to a minimum distance of 2km. As the application proposal would be in place for 25 years the Member believed that consideration of the Bill should be taken into account.

A Member believed that Cumbria was a magnet for such developments at the present time and that the facilities in the area were being eroded by Government departments and developers wishing to be in the area.

A Member stated that it would be irresponsible if the Committee approved the application that could have a detrimental impact on the site at Eskdalemuir, and its role in the associated Comprehensive Nuclear Test Ban Treaty, when people from the area were in the forces in areas of conflict.

RESOLVED – That the application be refused for the reasons outlined in the Schedule of Decisions attached to these minutes.

The meeting adjourned at 11:15 and reconvened at 11:25.

(4) Proposed student accommodation comprising 495no bedrooms with social hub and associated parking, access and landscaping, Land at Norfolk Street, Denton Holme, Carlisle, Cumbria (Application 11/0863)

The Principal Planning Officer (Development Management) submitted the report on the application, which was the subject of a site visit on 14 December 2011, setting out the background to the application, together with a description of the site and proposed design and outlined the main issues of the application.

The application had been publicised by means of site and press notices, as well as notification letters sent to 78 neighbouring properties. In response to the original plans submitted 63 letters of objection had been received. Two separate petitions with a total of 124 signatories had also been received along with a further letter offering comments on the scheme. Since the Supplementary Schedule had been circulated a further 2 letters of objection had been received. The Principal Planning Officer advised that as well as the issues indicated within the report a further 3 issues had been raised. The objections raised were that the accommodation would

be vacant outside of term time and that was a potential security issue, not all accommodation provided a wheel chair accessible WC to the ground floor and a concern about the foundation beneath the proposed Block L. The University of Cumbria had also written offering their support for the scheme.

The Principal Planning Officer informed Members that Councillor Atkinson (Ward Councillor) had requested that the application be deferred to allow additional time to investigate the risk of contamination.

Correspondence had also been received from the Highway Authority who had identified that the travel bond should be £50,000 and an issue with the 6 parking spaces adjacent to the gable of 35 Richardson Street. The Highway Authority had stated that as the access was currently adopted highway the use of those spaces should be available to the existing residents. The applicant had agreed to that and therefore the number of available parking spaces on the proposed site would be reduced to 42.

The Principal Planning Officer explained that in overall terms the principle of the development was acceptable. Officers were satisfied that adequate separation distance had been provided to ensure that the living conditions of the neighbouring properties would not be adversely affected through loss of light, privacy or over dominance. Adequate amenity space and incutillage parking provision would be available to serve the townhouses. The new accesses to be formed and the anticipated level of traffic generated by the proposal would not prejudice highway safety. In all aspects the proposals were compliant with the objectives of the relevant Local Plan policies.

The Principal Planning Officer also reminded Members that, if minded to approve the application, it would be necessary to undertake an "Assessment of Likely Significant Effect" under the Habitats Regulations given the potential impact upon the River Eden and Tributaries Special Area of Conservation and Site of Special Scientific Interest. The assessment needed to be agreed by Natural England. However, the Officers did not envisage that the outcome of the assessment would preclude planning permission being granted. Clearly, however, if it were found to give rise to such concerns the application would be brought back before Members. It was, however, requested that in granting authority to issue approval Members authorise Officers to make any necessary changes to the prospective conditions if requested by Natural England.

In conclusion the Principal Planning Officer recommended that the application be approved subject to the completion of a Section 106 Agreement as indicated in the report.

The Legal Services Manager explained that the use of a Section 106 Agreement with regard to the restriction of parking permits would not be appropriate as it would not meet the tests required under either S106 or Regulation 123 CIL. While the University could agree to impose terms in the student leases, those would be for the University to enforce, rather than the City Council.

Mrs Crack (Objector) stated that she objected to the application as she believed that the scale was too big for the site. Similar concerns had been raised when the Denton Holme/Longsowerby Planning Agreement was being drawn up. Whilst there were some taller buildings in Denton Holme they were from the area's historic past and in recent years all buildings had been 2 storey residences. Mrs Crack referred to previous proposed developments in other areas of Denton Holme that had been approved with 2, 3 and 4 storey buildings. However they were in an area where there were housing, retail and industrial buildings.

Mrs Kew (Objector) stated that there was a potential error with regard to Block L. An area of the proposed building would be on disused air raid shelters; a fact that had been pointed out to Border. There had been attempts to remove the air raid shelters but they had been unsuccessful. It had also been alleged that attempting to remove the shelters would cause damage to the surrounding properties. If Block L was not constructed that would leave Block M standing alone and that could be a potential security issue.

Mrs Kew was also concerned about the reports that there was arsenic on the site and therefore believed that it was unsuitable for residential properties. She added that the report stated that the site could be cleaned up effectively but that would take time and Border would need the site to be up and running ready for the intake of students at the end of the summer which she believed would not allow sufficient time to clean the site.

Mrs Guy (Objector) stated that she believed that the application had been rushed through with little consideration for the residents. She explained that she had been speaking with Border on behalf of the residents since 2007 and asked for a public meeting. She added that a 2 storey development would be acceptable and that there was a substantial case for the plans to be revised and scaled down to fit in with the surrounding area and comply with the Denton Holme/Longsowerby Planning Agreement. Border had taken consideration of some of the residents' concerns and had moved Block M further from the houses and the number of students had been reduced by 3.

Mrs Guy explained that Denton Holme had always been regarded as a village and the influx of so many students, in conjunction with a further 195 on another development would have a dramatic effect on the village atmosphere and the environment. The residents were happy that there were plans to revitalise Denton Holme but not on the scale being proposed.

Mr Dodd (Objector) stated that his objections related to the way the application had been processed, the contamination issues and the details of the proposals themselves.

Mr Dodd explained that it had been difficult to follow the planning process online as there had been changes and additions and the period for consultation had ended the day prior to the meeting. Mr Dodd believed that was not good practice.

With regard to contamination Mr Dodd advised that the applicant's consultants stated that in relation to the planned residential end use of the site risks remained high to

medium for future users. There was no indication of how the site would be cleaned and made safe and without detailed information queried how the residents could be satisfied that the contamination would not leak into the river and that the site would be suitable for residential development. Mr Dodd queried how fruit and vegetables could be grown in the area as indicated within the design statement.

With regard to the proposal Mr Dodd believed that 495 students would be too many and that the developers had crammed too many students into a small space. That would have an adverse impact on the neighbouring residents. There had been no mention of the Denton Holme/Longsowerby Design Statement in the report and advised that, had the developers submitted plans for accommodation for 250-300 students there would not have been such an impact on the residents and it would have been better for the students. Mr Dodd therefore requested that Members look again at the plans and provide quality accommodation for the students.

Mr Harrison (Objector) stated that his objections were around the scale, design and mass of the proposal, the potential loss of amenity, the appearance of the development and the Denton Holme/Longsowerby Design Statement. Mr Harrison advised Members that 4 storey buildings would over-shadow his home and garden and compromise his privacy. Local children would not be able to play in the lanes as Mr Harrison believed that the students' bins would need to be placed in those lanes. That would attract vermin and scavenging animals in an area where children currently play.

With regard to the appearance of the development Mr Harrison quoted from the Supplementary Planning Development Document which he believed that the developer had ignored. Mr Harrison also believed that the developer had ignored the Denton Holme/Longsowerby Design Statement.

The issue about the contamination had been well publicised and as it was proposed that buildings would be constructed on top of the concrete cap the infrastructure would be underground and Mr Harrison was concerned that the pile drivers could cause damage to his and neighbours' properties and possibly disturb the toxins.

Councillor Atkinson (Ward Councillor) (Objector) stated that he had requested a deferral of the application in order to give further consideration to the application as he did not believe the site was suitable for residential use. Councillor Atkinson added that he was not against accommodation for students but sought a better design. He stated that the current proposal was out of character in Denton Holme and the height and scale of the development would detract from the residential properties. He acknowledged that the minimum distances had been exceeded but was concerned about the level of parking in the area and added that he was not convinced by the Planning Officer's assurances and that the matter would need to be addressed.

Councillor Atkinson reminded Members that the students would come and go while the residents would remain and it was important that the development was right for the residents who were keen to work with the developers to get the design right. Councillor Atkinson stated that student accommodation would enhance and benefit Denton Holme but not in the form of the current application. The Councillor

requested that the Committee reject the application and negotiate with the developers for a better scheme that would benefit Denton Holme.

Mr Wishart (Agent) responded by advising Members that the development was a high quality development and was an economically, environmentally and ecologically sustainable form of housing with high quality external finishings. Following the meetings with residents the applicants had amended the plans and sought to address some of the concerns.

With regard to density and size Mr Wishart advised that he was aware of the concerns but stated that the accommodation would be managed with staff on site and he was satisfied that the students' behaviour would be appropriate.

With regard to the contamination Mr Wishart advised that most brownfield sites contained some contamination and he reminded Members that proposals were approved for the site in 2008. A consultant employed at that time had updated the information and determined that the levels had not changed. The proposed work would deal with the contamination safely and would prevent any future risk to residents.

Mr Wishart added that he was aware of the parking issues but it had been agreed that the students would not be allowed to apply for residents parking permits and that it would be at the University's discretion whether to let students park on the site. As the site was near the city centre students would be encouraged to walk or cycle and in conjunction with an agreed car parking management strategy it would ensure that parking spaces on site would be allocated and limited within the site.

With regard to the local economy Mr Wishart believed that the construction phase would bring employment into the area and that there would be economic benefits by the students coming into the area and spending locally. There would also be staff employed on the site and he believed that the development would be of benefit to the city and to the growth of the University of Cumbria.

Mr Berry advised that he was a representative of the University of Cumbria and that the University's role was to bring in and retain students. He explained that when students made their initial queries with the University they enquired about accommodation. This had been a problem this year and students had been accommodated as far as Penrith. Mr Berry believed that the proposed scheme could deliver all that was required and whilst they were aware of the challenges the University and the developer had been working closely together.

Mr Berry accepted that the application had been produced quickly but stated that it was a high quality and award winning scheme. He confirmed that the accommodation licences would be strict in terms of conduct and the University had received numerous testimonials that confirmed that the students had been good tenants.

The Committee then gave consideration to the application.

Several Members stated that they were concerned about the proposed height of some of the buildings and advised that they would be happy with the development if the scale and heights of the buildings were reduced.

A Member reminded Members that the Denton Holme/Longsowerby Design Statement had been approved by Council as part of the planning process. He queried whether the height of the buildings was appropriate to the site.

The Member confirmed that there were problems with parking in the area and that the area was very busy and it was often difficult to park. He added that 4 parking spaces would not be enough for the staff at the hub. The Member proposed that the application be rejected and re-submitted with a better scheme. He suggested that the money within the Section 106 Agreement could be used for off road routes to Denton Holme and would therefore not incur an additional cost. The Member reminded the Committee that there had been an issue with regard to a resident who had been refused a parking permit in the area, who had then appealed and won that appeal.

With regard to the scale of the development the Member stated that he did not believe the development was appropriate for Carlisle or Denton Holme. He reminded Members that Denton Holme was designated as an Urban Village and was the first in England to have its own Design Statement. Therefore he proposed that the application be refused.

A Member stated that Members were not against student accommodation as they all wished to see the University survive and grow but he was concerned about the number of available parking spaces on the site and the height of the buildings. The Principal Planning Officer confirmed the number of parking spaces on the site available to students would be 18 but added that he was confident that management strategy would deal with the issue. He reminded Members that the Highway Authority was comfortable that they had dealt with a previous issue regarding a resident's parking permit. The Principal Planning Officer stated that the proposal was an acceptable use of the site and would create less traffic than if it was a housing development as residents would then be eligible to apply for a parking permit. The Member did not believe the parking arrangements could be enforced and that students would park on the street.

The Member stated that he believed that at least one of the 4 storey buildings would be oppressive to people living in the area. He proposed that the application be deferred to allow Planning Officers and the developer the opportunity to reduce the height of at least that particular block or to remove it altogether and create more parking spaces.

A Member queried the proposed transport plan and queried what would happen at the end of the 5 year plan and suggested that parking would become a major issue. The Assistant Director (Economic Development) confirmed that although the transport plan was for 5 years the policies would continue through the life of the student accommodation.

A Member suggested that alternative sites were available that would be more appropriate for such a development. However the Principal Planning Officer advised that while that may be the case Members had to deal with the application before them. He reminded Members that another site had a comparable number of parking spaces and no restrictions. The Member stated that that site was next to an industrial estate on the edge of the city.

In response to a query from a Member the Principal Planning Officer clarified which of the buildings would be 3 storey and which would be 4 storey. The Member stated that the Design Statement had only been referred to briefly in the Officer's report and requested that in future there should be more liaison with residents as well as the statutory organisations. The Member added that while she welcomed students coming into the city and was excited by the new techniques used within the design she did not approve of the height of the buildings. The Member also stated that the main concern about the underground bunkers had not been addressed and that that part of the site would be difficult to build on. With regard to the height of the buildings the Member stated that if the taller buildings were sited in the centre of the site and further away from neighbouring properties that would be more acceptable. The Member also suggested that all the buildings could be 3 storey.

With regard to car parking the Member acknowledged that it was difficult for young people to obtain cheap car insurance and that may deter students from bringing cars into the city. The Member queried the car usage of the current students. The Principal Planning Officer advised that he did not have that information but confirmed that the Highway Authority would have taken that information into account. With regard to Block L being constructed on top of the underground bunkers the Principal Planning Officer advised that using modern technology it would be possible to build on that part of the site. The Member seconded the proposal to defer consideration of the application and requested that car usage be included in the further investigations.

A Member stated that the majority of Members were in favour of student accommodation in Denton Holme and believed that the site could be developed following further negotiations with the developers. Therefore he agreed that the application be deferred.

A Member who lived close to Carlisle College advised that there was no shortage of student cars and that parking in the area was a problem. The Member stated that she believed that 4 storey buildings would be too high and supported deferment of the application.

Following a vote it was:

RESOLVED – That consideration of the application be deferred to enable the applicant to consider changes to the scheme, in particular the height of the units and the level of car parking to be provided, and to await a further report on the application at a future meeting of the Committee.

(5) Erection of 14no dwellings comprising affordable housing and housing for the elderly (Outline Application), Land adjacent Beech Cottage, Cumwhinton, Carlisle, CA4 8DL (Application 11/0730)

The Principal Planning Officer (Development Management) submitted the report on the application which was the subject of a site visit on 14 December 2011, and outlined the background to the application and described the design and site of the proposal. The Principal Planning Officer explained the main issues for consideration.

The application had been advertised by means of a site notice and press notices as well as notification letters sent to 10 neighbouring properties. In response 24 letters of objection had been received and the Planning Officer summarised the main issues raised. The Ward Councillor had also written to the Council identifying his support for the application, but in doing so had highlighted that measures must be taken to safeguard the living conditions of the occupier of Beech Cottage.

The Principal Planning Officer advised that in overall terms the principle of the development was acceptable and would assist in reducing the recognised shortfall of affordable housing in the rural area. Whilst no detailed designs had been submitted at this stage, Officers were satisfied an appropriate scheme could be negotiated through a subsequent Reserved Matters application to ensure that the design was appropriate and the living conditions of residents were safeguarded. A series of planning conditions were also recommended to control detailed aspects of the design and to prevent any potential adverse effects that might occur without such controls. In all aspects the proposals were compliant with the objectives of the relevant Local Plan policies.

The Principal Planning Officer advised that since the report had been produced the County Council had provided additional justification in respect of the contribution requested in respect of the burden placed on the primary school. While the applicant had agreed to provide the money Officers had questioned whether it was reasonable. Therefore the Principal Planning Officer requested that authority to issue approval be granted subject to the completion of a Section 106 Agreement as specified within the report with an additional caveat that the applicant provided the £30,000 if Officers considered that the County Council request was justified.

The Committee then gave consideration to the application.

In response to a query from a Member the Principal Planning Officer confirmed that no development would commence until the indicated strip of land had passed to the ownership of the owner of Beech Cottage. The Principal Planning Officer stated that the occupier was happy with that arrangement but not with the application. The width of the strip of land would be clarified when the Reserved Matters application was considered.

With regard to the school a Member hoped that the school could sort out the matter of the catchment area. On those grounds the Members proposed that the Officer's recommendation be approved. The Principal Planning Officer confirmed that he would negotiate with the County Council to clarify the situation.

A Member queried whether the Committee was in a position to impose a condition in relation to the strip of land. The Legal Services Manager confirmed that it could be done as it was part of a planning matter and could be imposed as a Grampian condition.

A Member seconded the proposal to approve the Officer's recommendation with conditions and stated that a 5m strip of land would be more acceptable as the proposed development would be adjacent to the property's living area.

RESOLVED – That authority to issue approval of the application be given to the Assistant Director (Economic Development) subject to the conditions indicated in the Schedule of Decisions attached to these Minutes.

SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDERS

During consideration of the above Item of Business, it was noted that the meeting had been in progress for 3 hours and it was moved, seconded and RESOLVED that Council Procedure Rule 9, in relation to the duration of meetings be suspended in order that the meeting could continue over the time limits of 3 hours.

It was proposed that items 7 (Application 11/0716) and 10 (11/0955) be considered prior to item 6 (11/0818) to enable visitors to the meeting to witness consideration of the applications before a break be taken.

(7) Change of use of land to domestic garden, erection of general purpose building, Ardneil, Aglionby, Carlisle, CA4 8AQ (Application 11/0716)

The Planning Officer submitted the report on the application that had been the subject of a site visit on 14 December 2011, and outlined the background to the application and described the design and site of the proposal. He explained that the description of the application had been amended and now read "change of use of land to garden".

The Planning Officer explained the main issues for consideration which were whether the scale and design were acceptable and the potential impact of the proposal on the living conditions of the occupiers of any neighbouring properties.

The application had been advertised by means of a site notice and notification letters sent to the occupiers of 5 neighbouring properties. Five letters of objection had been received and the Planning Officer summarised the main issues raised.

The Planning Officer presented slides of the former village hall, the field to the rear of the site and the site itself. The applicant had advised that the Animal Refuge would be using the field to keep some of their horses and ponies and therefore part of the building would be used to store hay and feed.

Objectors had expressed concerns that the applicant may run a business from the site. However the applicant had confirmed that it would not be used for business purposes and that would be ensured by condition.

The Planning Officer advised that the scale and design of the proposal would be acceptable. It would not have an adverse impact on the living conditions of the occupiers of any neighbouring properties through loss of light, loss of privacy or over-dominance. In all aspects the proposal was compliant with the objectives of the relevant adopted Local Plan policies. Therefore the Planning Officer recommended that the application be approved with conditions as indicated within the report.

RESOLVED – That permission be granted, subject to the conditions indicated in the Schedule of Decisions attached to these Minutes.

(10) Levelling of terraced garden, erection of retaining wall together with timber panelled fencing above and additional landscaping (Retrospective Application), The White House, Main Street, Brampton, Cumbria, CA8 1SB (Application 11/0955)

The Planning Officer submitted the report setting out the background to the application, together with a description of the site and proposal. The Planning Officer outlined the main issues for consideration by Members, which were whether the development was appropriate to the character and appearance of the Brampton Conservation Area and the impact of the proposal on the living conditions of neighbouring residents.

The application had been advertised by means of a site notice and direct notification letters sent to the occupiers of 16 of the neighbouring properties. Four letters of objection and 7 letters of support had been received and the Planning Officer summarised the issues raised. An additional letter of support had also been included in the Supplementary Schedule.

The Planning Officer presented slides of the fence which was within the curtilage of the property and the views from the road. The Heritage Officer had confirmed that the executed works had a detrimental impact on the character of the area.

The Planning Officer advised that in overall terms, the development adversely affected the character of the Brampton Conservation Area due to its scale, design and dominance within the street scene. Furthermore, the relationship with the neighbouring residential properties was unacceptable due to its visual dominance. For those reasons the Planning Officer recommended that the application be refused.

The Committee then gave consideration to the application.

A Member stated that he would be happy with the fencing provided it was a different colour.

It was moved and seconded that a site visit should be undertaken and a further report be submitted at a future meeting of the Committee.

The Chairman advised Councillor Layden, who had registered a right to speak on the application, that he could speak at the meeting or reserve his right to speak to a future meeting when the application was re-submitted. Councillor Layden agreed to speak at a future meeting.

RESOLVED – That consideration of the application be deferred to allow a site visit to be undertaken and a further report be submitted at a future meeting of the Committee.

(6) Erection of 8no dwellings for affordable rent with associated parking and landscaping comprising 4no 2 bed bungalows and 4no 3 bed houses together with new access road, Land adjacent The Sheiling and Meadow View, School Road, Cumwhinton (Application 11/0818)

Having declared a personal and prejudicial interest Councillor Bloxham left the meeting and took no part in the consideration of the application.

The Planning Officer submitted the report on the application and outlined the background to the application and described the design and site of the proposal. The Planning Officer explained the main issues for consideration.

The application had been advertised by means of a site notice and the direct notification to the occupiers of 22 of the neighbouring properties. Seven letters of objection had been received as well as a petition containing 25 signatures. The Planning Officer summarised the main issues raised.

The Planning Officer advised that in overall terms the principle of the development was acceptable and would assist in reducing the recognised shortfall of affordable housing in the rural area. Officers were satisfied that the scale, layout and design of the proposals were acceptable and it would not have an adverse impact on the character or appearance of the area. The dwellings could be accommodated on the site without detriment to the living conditions of the neighbouring properties through loss of light, privacy or over dominance. Adequate amenity space and car parking provision would be available to serve the dwellings.

A series of planned conditions was also recommended to control detailed aspects of the design and to prevent any potential adverse effects that might occur without such controls. In all aspects the proposals were compliant with the objectives of the relevant Local Plan policies. The Planning Officer requested, if Members were minded to approve the application, that authority to issue approval be given subject to the completion of a Section 106 Agreement as specified within the report.

The Committee then gave consideration to the application.

A Member queried on what basis the Education Authority were seeking a contribution. The Assistant Director (Economic Development) stated that Officers would seek clarification and for that reason a condition had been imposed.

A Member was impressed with the energy efficiency properties of the proposed dwellings.

A Member was concerned about drainage on the site. The Planning Officer advised that part of the reason the land had become available was due to the slope of the field. The playing field directly opposite the school would be retained.

A Member was pleased the housing would be affordable housing.

RESOLVED – That authority to issue approval of the application be given to the Assistant Director (Economic Development) subject to the conditions indicated in the Schedule of Decisions attached to these Minutes.

Councillor Bloxham returned to the meeting.

(8) Proposed female and family accommodation comprising 10no residential units with communal and staff facilities, associated parking, vehicle access and landscaping, land at Water Street, Carlisle, CA2 5AW (Application 11/0922)

The Planning Officer submitted the report on the application that had been the subject of a site visit on 14 December 2011, and outlined the background to the application and described the design and site of the proposal. The Planning Officer explained the main issues for consideration.

The application had been advertised by means of a site notice and direct notification letters sent to the occupiers of 16 of the neighbouring properties. At the time of writing the report no written or verbal representations had been received.

The Planning Officer advised that in overall terms the female and family accommodation facility represented an appropriate use of a brown field site within the boundaries of the urban area. The principle of development within the site was considered to be acceptable and the building would be contemporary but well related to the existing buildings and would not result in any harm to the visual amenity of the area. The design and siting of the building would allow the Council to fulfil a statutory function to be provided in a purpose built, energy efficient and DDA compliant building. The fenestration and the use of materials were appropriate.

In addition to the report the Historic Environment Officer had raised no objection in light of the exploratory grounds works undertaken to explore the potential for archaeological remains. The Planning Officer advised that the play area would be located in the landscaped area indicated on the plans and would include a couple of pieces of equipment suitable for younger residents.

The Planning Officer confirmed that the Flood Risk Assessment and the Exception Test had been completed and the scheme had passed the test and the information passed to the Environment Agency. Although they had yet to respond they had indicated that the scheme was acceptable and they had no objections to raise.

The Planning Officer presented slides of the site.

In conclusion the Planning Officer recommended that the application be approved subject to there being no objection received from the Environment Agency.

The Committee then gave consideration to the application.

A Member queried the use of a part of the site indicated plain on the plan. The Planning Officer confirmed that there was no development shown on that part of the site but if there was a need and the budget was available, it may be the subject of future expansion. The site could also be used as a play area.

A Member stated that the area was surrounded by a high brick wall and although there was a secure play area indicated he believed that there was to be a recreation space in that area. The Resource Planning Manager advised that the original concept had a 6ft wall around the perimeter and there was a need to have the play area within the development. The Assistant Director (Economic Development) suggested that she could negotiate with the developer on the issue.

A Member agreed that there was not much play provision within the development and nothing in the area.

RESOLVED – That authority to issue approval of the application be given to the Assistant Director (Economic Development) subject to the conditions indicated in the Schedule of Decisions attached to these Minutes.

(9) Raising of existing roof, erection of two storey extension together with internal reconfiguration to provide study, dining room, hall, living room, kitchen/family room, WC, utility, store and garage with 2no en-suite bedrooms, 1no bedroom, gallery and bathroom above, 11 Holme Fauld, Scotby, Carlisle, Cumbria, CA4 8BL (Application 11/0941)

The Planning Officer submitted the report providing background information, together with details of the design and application site. He outlined for Members the main issues for consideration in determining the matter.

The application had been advertised by the direct notification of 3 neighbouring properties. In response the occupiers of 4 properties had raised objections. The Planning Officer summarised the grounds of the objections. The Planning Officer reminded Members that whilst the neighbours had concerns about being overlooked from the conservatory, that did not require planning permission as it would be constructed under Permitted Development.

The Planning Officer presented slides of the plan and the site of the application.

The Planning Officer advised that in overall terms the proposal did not adversely affect the living conditions of adjacent properties by poor design, unreasonable overlooking and unreasonable loss of daylight or sunlight. The scale and design of the proposal was considered acceptable in relation to the dwelling and its substantial curtilage. The proposal would not have a detrimental impact on highway safety or biodiversity. In all aspects the proposal was considered to be compliant with the

objectives of the relevant adopted Local Plan policies. Therefore the Planning Officer recommended that the application be approved.

RESOLVED – That permission be granted, subject to the conditions indicated in the Schedule of Decisions attached to these Minutes.

(11) Variation of Condition 7 (revised drainage details) relating to Planning Ref: 08/1089, Caxton Road, Newtown Industrial Estate, Carlisle, CA2 7HS (Application 10/0986)

The Principal Planning Officer (Development Management) informed Members that the application had been withdrawn by the applicants.

A Member reminded the Committee that there had been issues with the application since 2008. She requested that the Officer prepare a report outlining how the City Council would deal with the applicant. The Assistant Director (Economic Development) acknowledged Members' concerns and stated that Officers would look at the issues and prepare a report for a future meeting.

A Member indicated that there had been no comment from the Council's drainage engineer. He did not believe that was acceptable as the Officers were planners and not drainage engineers. He therefore queried what steps could have been taken if the application had been refused. The Planning Manager confirmed that he would look at the issue regarding the drainage engineer.

A Member stated that the applicant was a large national company and knew what was required from the previous planning application. She believed that enforcement action should be taken whether or not the application was withdrawn and queried what action could be taken. The Legal Services Manager advised that the position was the same as if the application had been submitted and refused. The matter would be discussed at the next meeting when a report would be presented outlining the enforcement options. The Principal Planning Officer explained that the applicant was hoping to resolve any issues through a revised application that may be submitted for the next meeting.

RESOLVED – The application was withdrawn by the applicant.

(12) Variation of Condition 12 (restriction of length of letting period) of previously approved Planning Application 02/0342 to increase from 21 day let to up to 56 day let, 2 Roman Retreat, Burthorpe, Walton, Brampton (Application 11/0822)

The Planning Officer submitted the report setting out the background to the application, together with a description of the proposal and the main issues to be considered by Members which were whether the variation of the condition restricting the occupancy of the holiday unit was acceptable and the effect on the living conditions of the occupiers of neighbouring properties.

The application had been advertised by means of a site notice and direct notification to the occupiers of 6 of the neighbouring properties. Five letters of objection had been received and the Planning Officer outlined the issues raised.

The Planning Officer advised that in overall terms the site was not in a sustainable location but the principle of holiday accommodation had been accepted. The principle of the development of the variation of the planning condition would not prejudice planning policy objectives. The living conditions of the occupiers of neighbouring residential properties would not be adversely affected by the extended occupancy period. In all aspects the proposal was considered to be compliant with the objectives of the relevant Local Plan policies.

RESOLVED – That permission be granted, subject to the conditions indicated in the Schedule of Decisions attached to these Minutes.

(13) Display of 2no fascia signs and 1no hanging sign (non illuminated) (LBC), Two Castles Housing Association, 3 Castle Street, Carlisle, CA3 8SY (Application 11/0859)

Having declared a personal and prejudicial interest Councillor Bloxham left the meeting and took no part in the consideration of the application.

The Planning Officer submitted the report setting out the background to the application, together with a description of the site and proposal.

The application had been advertised by means of site and press notices as well as notification letters sent to 2 neighbouring properties. No verbal or written representations had been received during the consultation period.

The Planning Officer advised that in overall terms the proposal would not have a significant adverse impact on the character or appearance of the listed building. In all aspects the proposal was compliant with the objectives of the adopted Local Plan policies. Therefore the Planning Officer recommended that the application be approved.

RESOLVED – That permission be granted, subject to the conditions indicated in the Schedule of Decisions attached to these Minutes.

(14) Display of 1no external fascia sign and 1no hanging sign, display on 2no internal fascia signs (non illuminated) (LBC), Two Castles Housing Association, 3 Paternoster Row, Carlisle, CA3 8TT (Application 11/0872)

Having declared a personal and prejudicial interest Councillor Bloxham left the meeting and took no part in the consideration of the application.

The Planning Officer submitted his report setting out the background to the application, together with a description of the site and proposal.

The application had been advertised by means of a site and press notices as well as notification letters sent to 2 neighbouring properties. No verbal or written representations had been made during the consultation period.

In conclusion the Planning Officer reported that the proposal would not have a significant adverse impact on the character or appearance of the listed building. In all aspects the proposal was compliant with the objectives of the adopted Local Plan policies. Therefore the Planning Officer recommended that the application be approved.

RESOLVED – That permission be granted, subject to the conditions indicated in the Schedule of Decisions attached to these Minutes.

[The meeting ended at 2.05pm]