

## SCHEDULE A: Applications with Recommendation

20/0279

Item No: 06

Date of Committee: 04/12/2020

**Appn Ref No:**  
20/0279

**Applicant:**  
Gladmans

**Parish:**  
Wetheral

**Agent:**

**Ward:**  
Wetheral & Corby

**Location:** Land at Rookery Park (South of Alders Edge), Scotby, Carlisle CA4 8EH

**Proposal:** Erection Of Up To 90no. Dwellings, Public Open Space, Landscaping And Sustainable Drainage System (SuDS) And Vehicular Access Point From The Scotby To Wetheral Road (Outline/Revised Application)

**Date of Receipt:**  
30/04/2020 15:01:24

**Statutory Expiry Date**  
03/08/2020

**26 Week Determination**

---

### REPORT

**Case Officer:** Christopher Hardman

#### 1. Recommendation

1.1 It is recommended that this application is refused.

#### 2. Main Issues

- 2.1 The Principle Of Development
- 2.2 The Layout, Scale, Appearance And Landscaping
- 2.3 Impact On Landscape
- 2.4 Whether The Proposal Would Adversely Affect The Amenity Of The Occupiers Of Neighbouring Properties
- 2.5 Highway Issues And Accessibility
- 2.6 Flood Risk And Foul and Surface Water Drainage
- 2.7 Archaeology
- 2.8 Affordable Housing, Education and Recreation Provision
- 2.9 The Effect Of The Proposal On Nature Conservation Interests
- 2.10 Other Matters

#### 3. Application Details

**The Site**

- 3.1 This application relates to 5.41 hectares of an agricultural field on the edge of Scotby village. The northern boundary fronts onto the Scotby-Wetheral Road with the recently developer Alders Edge housing fronting the roadside. Residential properties adjoin the site to the west with part of the village green to the north-western corner of the site and a copse of trees to the south western corner. To the east are residential properties separating the site from Pow Maughan beck. To the south is a continuation of this and other agricultural fields leading to a strong treelines and hedgerow boundaries.
- 3.2 The land fronting the road to the north is relatively flat with a gentle slope downwards to the east. The land rises suddenly to the south part way through the site with just over 11metres difference between the lowest and highest points of the site.

### **The Proposal**

- 3.3 This application is seeking outline planning permission including access for the erection of up to 90 dwellings with public open space, landscaping and sustainable drainage system (SuDS) and vehicular access point from the unnamed Scotby to Wetheral road. Matters such as appearance, landscaping, layout and scale are reserved for a later application. A development framework for the site has been submitted which indicates that the housing development will form the north-eastern and south-western parts of the site with a central green swathe. The net area to be developed is 2.64 hectares. The submitted layout is summarised in the Design & Access Statement which highlights:
- the scheme has been developed embracing the twelve Building For Life criteria developed by CABI and the HBF;
  - the site is located on the eastern edge of Scotby close to the centre of the village;
  - the development will provide for a broad mix of dwellings and house types, ranging from 1-5 bed units offering a mix from first time homes to larger family homes;
  - Green infrastructure (2.7ha) will create linked corridors of open space including natural and semi-natural greenspace creating a range of wildlife habitats;
  - Local equipped children's play area within an area of open space;
  - An attenuation basin will be provided within the green infrastructure;
  - A simple street hierarchy for legibility of the site;
  - A main street provides the primary route through the site ensuring connectivity to the village. There will be secondary streets and private drives;
  - There will be two key character areas to create a sense of place and legibility of the site, a main street and a broad swathe of green space lined with avenue trees between the residential parcels of south and north with landscape buffers;
  - Landmark features and focal buildings will enhance the layout and increase legibility;
  - Detailed block and street layout will be arranged to comprise a series of attractive views and vistas;

- Traditional building materials will be used to reflect local reference examples and relate to local character.

3.4 In addition to the submitted plans, the application is accompanied by:

- an Archaeology and Built Heritage Assessment;
- an Arboricultural Assessment;
- an Affordable Housing Statement;
- a Design and Access Statement;
- a Landscape and Visual Assessment;
- an Ecological Appraisal;
- a Flood Risk Assessment;
- a Foul Drainage Analysis;
- a Soakaway Test Report;
- a Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment;
- a Transport Assessment;
- a Travel Plan;
- a Planning Statement;
- a Noise Assessment;
- an Air Quality Assessment;
- a Statement of Community Involvement;
- a Socio-economic Sustainability Statement.

## Background

3.5 In June 2019 application 18/1044 which contained similar proposals to this application was refused for the following reasons:

1. **Reason:** *Policy HO2 (Windfall Housing Development) of the Carlisle District Local Plan 2015-2030 seeks to ensure that the scale and design of the proposed development is appropriate to the scale, form, function and character of the existing settlement. The scale of the proposed development would not be appropriate to the scale and character of Scotby. At present the majority of housing is located in a linear form and this development would extend the historic core to the east. In addition, the policy seeks to ensure that sites are well contained within existing landscape features, physically connected to and integrate with the settlement, and does not lead to an unacceptable intrusion into the open countryside. The perception of this site is one of open countryside and not well contained or integrated into the village. The proposal would, therefore, be contrary to Criteria 1, and 3 of Policy HO2 (Windfall Housing Development) of the Carlisle District Local Plan 2015-2030.*
2. **Reason:** *Criterion 8 of Policy SP2 (Strategic Growth and Distribution) states that within the open countryside development will be assessed against the need to be in the location specified. The applicant has failed to demonstrate an overriding need for the additional housing to be sited in this location.*

3. **Reason:** *The application site has been considered throughout the Local Plan process, including the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment process, from the inception of the Local Plan. It has been considered against alternative sites and against the Sustainability Appraisal principles. This culminated in the site being omitted from the Local Plan. The site was specifically excluded due to its landscape impact. Policy GI1 of the Local Plan seeks to ensure that development should be appropriate to its surroundings and suitably accommodated within the landscape. When viewing the site from the central section of the village the landscape is typical of the Landscape Character Guidance sub-type 5b. The open nature of this landscape would be eroded by the development and would be harmful contrary to Policy GI1 (Landscape) of Carlisle District Local Plan 2015-2030.*

3.6 Since refusal of the above application, the agent has amended their proposals to try to overcome the reasons for that refusal, resulting in this application before members.

#### 4. Summary of Representations

- 4.1 Notification of this application was sent to 231 neighbouring properties and previous correspondents regarding this site, along with the posting of a site notice and press notice. In response 130 letters of objection, a petition of objection and 1 letter of support have been submitted raising the following points:

##### Objections

###### Principle/Housing

The land in question was not included in the local plan for development, so what's the point of producing a local plan after due consultation if it is not followed.

There are currently 4 developments in and around Scotby, with houses that do not appear to be selling quickly, where is the evidence that there is demand for or need for more?

The site is not part of the Carlisle CC Local Plan and is "discounted" for housing development because of the landscape impact. It is unnecessary over-development in an area with sufficient housing already earmarked and would be totally out of scale with the village.

As this application has previously been declined I am surprised to see it being submitted again. The village of Scotby should be left as that, building here will not only spoil the natural beauty but will also encroach on the green belt.

In the 3 mile radius of Scotby there are numerous new builds - Botcherby, Durrhill, Wetheral and one in Scotby itself so justifying another 90 houses in a small rural village is not feasible.

Why spoil a lovely village by flooding it with housing estates, there has been a number of developments in recent years without any investment in the village school and the village does not need the extra traffic.

Inappropriate for the size of the village

Too large to be considered 'windfall' development.

(Windfall development is loosely defined as land becoming available unexpectedly

and usually on a site being vacated and generally less than 1 hectare)

It would have a detrimental effect on the character of the village;

Scotby is a village of low density housing and to place an estate of 90 properties at high density directly in front of the village green will adversely affect the character and visual aspect of the centre of the village both from the village green and the approach from Wetheral.

This land is not on the approved Local Plan for residential development.

With other existing projects in place, including St Cuthberts Garden Village there is no need for this development.

Scotby and the surrounding villages have been inundated with new housing in the last few years. I live in Cumwhinton and there are 13 plus new developments within a mile of my house. We do not need any more housing in these villages spoiling what is such a beautiful rural area.

Not needed in the village, there are already enough new developments going on in the village. Story site on Broomfallen Road, Lambley Bank numerous houses going up & only not long ago The Ridings being built (another Story's site directly across from this proposed land).

This village has to be careful not to become a town, hence so many unhappy people & signatures on the petition against this pointless development on what is agricultural land (not to be built on).

No need no demand

I don't quite understand how an area that the planners can class as "an unacceptable landscape impact" back in 2015 can now be built on. Scotby is a village of low density housing and an additional estate of 90 properties within the visual aspect of the centre village is completely inappropriate.

I also presume the council still has its garden village plan for building new residential builds etc. I seem to recall that houses being built in Scotby were not part of this plan. I assume this will it have changed this year?

Scotby is a village; there is no evidence of more family housing being needed as there are several houses/developments already which are not selling.

Yet again we find ourselves having to compile a list of reasons why this proposed development within the small, rural village of Scotby should not go ahead, despite this having been specifically turned down both at a Parish and City level not more than 12 months ago. No amount of smooth talking 'persuasion' by the planners can alter the following facts:

I emphasise the words 'small' and 'rural' as that is what Scotby was designed to be, despite that fact that both large and small plots of land have already been developed recently within the village and more on the way, all of which will put a strain on the existing village area and facilities.

We do not need another building site in the village! Already too many going on and they are unfinished! Scotby must stay a village!!!

That land must remain as it is forever!

Please don't approve anymore planning application in our village! Enough is enough!

This proposal would have significant adverse impact upon the open landscape in regard to the scale, form, function & character & result in the loss of amenity for Scotby Village.

Under Section 54A of the Town & Country Planning Act 1990, all planning applications have to be determined in accordance with the Development Plan; for Carlisle it is the Carlisle District Local Plan 2015/2030.

As part of the examination process for the Development Plan sites were considered & assessed by a SHLAA (Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment) process. The City Council planners currently discount this site SC14 from housing development on grounds of

"the landscape impact of development here would be unacceptable.

The site is therefore not considered suitable for development.

The site is so prominent that it would be highly unlikely that a design could be put

forward that would reduce its impact to acceptable levels.

Also, despite its close proximity to Scotby, the site is in an area that has a distinctly rural & out of village feel that further renders it unsuitable for development."

<https://www.carlisle.gov.uk/Portals/24/Documents/SHLAA/SHLAA%202014%20Cons>  
73

To diverge from the Local Plan strategy without adequate justification would be to undermine its aims.

This proposal is contrary to & would prejudice the deliverability of the policies contained in the Carlisle District Local Plan 2015/2030.

Under policy HO1 Housing Strategy & Delivery, it can be demonstrated that there is a supply of specific deliverable sites sufficient to provide a five year housing land supply within Scotby Village & Wetheral Parish.

This proposal can neither be considered as a windfall site. Policy HO2 Windfall Housing Development. Ref: Page 98. " the development must not prejudice the delivery of the spatial strategy of the Local Plan"

3/ "does not lead to an unacceptable intrusion into the open countryside"

5.10/ "does not adversely impact on wider views into or out of a village.

The development will also irreversibly and negatively alter the character of Scotby as a village. Unlike Durranshill and Garden Village, Scotby stands alone from Carlisle, separated by the M6. This has allowed Scotby to retain a village character, with recent developments being small and "infill" in nature. This would be neither and would significantly increase the village footprint.

It is incumbent on the council to stand by its earlier decision on this unnecessary and intrusive development. It makes a mockery of local plans and the authority of the council.

We do not need or want anymore development in our village. Surely the City Council will look back at the objections from the last time these bullies tried this. Nothing has changed, we want to remain a village not a suburb of Carlisle.

This site was considered as unsuitable in the 2015 city plan

This plan was adopted in November 2016 and as such is very much current.

The plan allocates sites within the Wetheral Parish that includes Scotby. These sites were chosen as preferred sites for development in the village, taking into account the amount of development that has occurred recently, the capacity of local services and infrastructure and the form and layout of the village. The local plan and the site allocations contained within it are considered by an independent planning inspector who was satisfied that they were the right site allocations for the village, that the correct process had been followed and that no additional or alternative sites were required.

The land in question is referred to by Carlisle City Council as SC14

The Council discounts this site due to its landscape impact and the potential for the development of the open area to adversely affect the setting and character of this part of the village. this is a large, open area onto open countryside. It is deemed an unacceptable intrusion into open countryside which is something policies in the Local Plan seek to resist. The aforementioned points are precisely why the case officer refused Outline Planning previously. Furthermore this one of the main reasons the site was discounted from the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) in 2014 and therefore why it was subsequently not considered for allocation in the Local Plan

To diverge from the Local Plan strategy without adequate justification would be to undermine its aim.

Gladman's aggressive approach, threatening to undermine the councils strategy and following on very swiftly from a unanimous rejection of a previous, very similar plan is the cause of grave concern

Any development of this scale is inappropriate for a village of this size. It is double the size of Alders Edge ,the largest single development in Scotby to date. There are already a number of approvals for significant housing developments elsewhere in

Scotby that have either not been started or have slowed down for what ever reason. In any event Scotby's contribution to meeting future housing needs exceeds that which should reasonably be demanded from a village of this size. Clearly this proposal would have a detrimental effect on the character of the village.

This application makes a mockery of the city council's plans. The proposed site was rejected just last year as the site is not designated for housing and is on a landscape that is enjoyed by the whole village of Scotby. There is no housing need as the council's planning for housing need is well met and Carlisle also plans a garden village which we were promised would stop the blight of endless housing on local villages which are already over developed. This application is based on pure greed. Easy bucks to be made from destroying a greenfield site rather than actually enhancing brownfield sites that are available

Planning Statement: In section 1.6.3 the previous reason for refusal was "The applicant has failed to demonstrate an overriding need for the additional housing to be sited in this location as required by Policy SP2". In section 1.7.3 Gladman have still failed to clearly respond and state that there is a need for additional affordable housing in Scotby.

In section 1.6.3 the reason for refusal was stated as "The scale of the proposed development would not be appropriate to the scale and character of Scotby, contrary to Policy HO2". Gladman have replied in section 1.7.2 stating "This Statement sets out clearly that 90 dwellings at Scotby is appropriate at this settlement". This is all they have quoted. There is no justification, no reasoning or logical explanation. Policy HO2 refers to access to services in the location or immediately neighbouring villages. Scotby primary school is currently cutting its capacity by 25% which will already impact on existing residents. Primary health care and Dental are located in Wetheral and already running at capacity

There are several other active building projects under construction in the village - what evidence is there that another 90 are required

"The Council has already confirmed at August 2018 that it can demonstrate a 5 year housing land supply and has also recently won Government support to go ahead with a "garden village" development of 10,000 houses only 10 minutes or so from Scotby. This suggests that there are ample opportunities to meet identified needs without requiring Scotby to accommodate further significant development amounting to 100% more than that allocated to it in the Local Plan. as mentioned previously"

A very similar application was rejected by the authorities last year and I feel that nothing has materially changed since then, that would be reason to overturn that decision.

The Carlisle area has a plan to develop a Garden Village on the outskirts of the city and I was led to believe that all new major housing construction would take place in that area, the Gladman proposal goes against that plan.

Scotby is a village, it's residents have no wish to have it turned into a small town and I therefore ask that the Gladman plans be refused

Unnecessary development on inappropriate and unsuitable land

In the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) 28 July - 1

September 2014 Representations, Council Officer responses to two comments were:

1. "Despite the presence of housing opposite, this site has a distinctly open setting and feels very much like it is no longer within the village of Scotby. This side of the road has not been developed, and even the housing opposite, it could be argued, it also separate from the village. As such is considered to be part of the open countryside, and is therefore not considered suitable for housing development. Site status remains unchanged" (page 72).

2. "... this site is so prominent that it would be highly unlikely that a design could be put forward that would reduce its impact to acceptable levels. Also, despite its close proximity to Scotby, the site is in an area that has a distinctly rural, and out-of-village

feel that further renders it unsuitable for development. No change in SHLAA status." (page 73).

The Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) December 2014 Update discounted this site for development because of the 'unacceptable landscape impact' that would result. In the Local Plan, Policy HO1 (Housing Strategy and Delivery) identifies a number of sites for development (one of which is of a size to accommodate a similar number of houses to those in this application) which demonstrates that there is sufficient housing land allocated for development in, and on the outskirts of, the village.

In addition, allowing the proposal to proceed could prevent the delivery of the Local Plan and contribute to piecemeal development rather than support developments already identified including the Garden Village proposal (page 37). Policy HO1 (Housing Strategy and Deliver) states that: 'Any unallocated sites which come forward for development and which would prejudice the delivery of this strategy will be resisted' (page 92, point 1 of Local Plan).

It runs contrary to city council housing policy which states that this location is to be "discounted" for housing because of the unacceptable landscape impact, as detailed in the Local Plan 2015-2030.

The developer has failed to demonstrate an overriding housing need. Indeed, nothing has changed since the development control committee unanimously rejected a similar outline scheme by the same company less than one year ago.

Scotby has several sites designated for housing by the city council to serve the area in the long term, and careful consideration must be given to avoid the growing urbanisation of this small, essentially rural village.

You have a clear long term council policy that points developers to certain preferred, designated housing locations; and this is not one of them!

There are hundreds of developments already play built all over the outskirts of the city turning villages into suburbs and merging villages into one. Schools and medical services are going to struggle to cope with the influx of people into these areas, let alone the roads.

Please consider the environment, the village and the residents and stop this ridiculous building regime

This development is far too big for a village the size of Scotby, and could lead to over-development of the village as there are 2 sizable sites being built on Broomfallen Road

Currently there is already an excess of housing in the village demonstrated by the number of unsold houses for sale.

This development is unnecessary since there are a number of sites with permission or more appropriate for development within the area

The development of this site has now been omitted from The Local Plan - specifically excluded due to its landscape impact. Policy GI1 of The Local Plan.

The size of this development is totally inappropriate for the village of Scotby. There has already been many small developments such as Alders edge and Kinmont rise plus Taylor Wimpey are building in excess of 100 houses at the end of Park Road.

The school is too small to support multiple admissions and the access to the proposed development is in a very bad place.

The village needs to remain a village not another suburb of Carlisle

As a considerable number of local new dwellings have either recently been completed or are under construction, there is no housing need in the vicinity

This development would be detrimental to the village and add no value. It takes away open green space and creates many issues in additional traffic and would add as was raised before issues regarding the capacity of the local school which would not be able to support further numbers. Carlisle has a new garden village proposed and this and other developments already commenced would clearly meet any other housing requirements. I would like to turn the question and ask the council planners to ask themselves "Why this site"? Why is this site so important to Gladman? Why



this site when there are countless others that would be more suitable and not have the devastating impact on the village character that the choice of this site would? I understand that all building sites were once greenfields but this is not just a green field is it. It's so very much more than that to this village Given the original refusal of the planning permission and the decision that this was not a suitable site to delegate for building upon, what difference does a few more trees make to this particular application? How are we to be protected from their desire to simply wear us down We already have Story's being built in the village with only approx 1/3 being sold! We already have an unfinished building site on Scotby Road from Robinson Dixon with only the first phase of the site being complete and the remaining second phase with only foundations being built and this has been this way for 2 years if not more! We have a new house being built on Broomfallen Road and three new houses to be built at the back of this also. We have the new Garden Village being built with thousands of houses. If we are not careful in giving companies planning permission, we will no longer have nice rural villages they will merely just blend into one and become an extension of Carlisle City!

There already has been significant development in Scotby. The extra housing is unnecessary in this area and the garden village planned by the council is supposed to stop the over-development of local villages.

As far as I can see the elderly, the children, families and the environment will suffer if this development is allowed to go ahead and the developer will have made a mockery of the council and its planning.

There are already other housing estates being development in Scotby & there is not enough room in the village for more properties for the size of the school. In addition this development does not fit into the plan of housing development & the garden village so I do not agree with this proposal at all & completely object to this

Should this proposal go ahead it has the potential to undermine the case for the Garden Village, which is a flagship development for Carlisle and much more important for the future prosperity of the City. This proposal should be roundly rejected again.

Such a large construction proposal would be totally out of keeping with the neighbouring properties, which are mainly smaller cottage style houses, private detached dwellings single story buildings.

There are already multiple new housing developments underway within the parish that exceed the District Local Plan 2015-2030

This piece of land has not been included in the Carlisle and District Local Plan for Development 2015 - 2030, this alone should preclude planning permission from being granted. Little point in the local council making planning decisions if they are going to be ignored.

The population of Carlisle & District has only increased by 6452 people since 2001 (101,940 in 2001 & an estimated 108,400 in 2010).

This works out at 370 people per year on average.

At present there are over 20 housing projects being built around Carlisle City.

These account for thousands of houses, some of which have been built Clover Fields 800+; Kingmoor 1000+; The Coppice Estate 189; Durranhill extension 198; to name but four totalling over 2000.

There are proposals for

480 houses between Wigton Road & Orton Road; 81 in North Scotby,

As the average household contains 2.5 persons this would require the population to increase by 2500 per 1000 houses built.

All these projects, existing or proposed are well over 3000 houses which would require a population growth of 7000 to 10,000 in the next few years.

There is no precedent for this as the population has only grown by 900 since the 2011 census.

Housing development in rural villages can have many effects, some positive & some negative.

In the case of Scotby, large scale developments would merely lead to it becoming an outer suburb of Carlisle & losing its character.

It lies far too close to the existing city boundary.

The housing developments at the Garlands & Durranhill are pushing the boundary ever closer to the M6 & to the village of Scotby itself.

So much so that the new 'Meadowbrook' estate has come under the Parish Ward. It was always planning policy to try & avoid this scenario until regulations became more "relaxed".

There are multiple 'brownfield' sites available between Carlisle, Scotby & surrounding area that must be considered by the council prior to destruction of rural village based greenfield sites.

The scale of the proposed development would not be appropriate to the scale and character of Scotby..

The existing Local Plan specifically excludes this site from development because of the impact on the landscape. The proposal will increase the "urbanisation" of Scotby and in no way reflects the current linear nature of the village. Any development will undoubtedly have a detrimental effect on the setting and character of the area. Refusal Reason 2 related to Criterion 8 of Policy SP2 for strategic growth and distribution, which states that 'within open countryside development will be assessed against the need to be in the location specified'. Again Gladman have failed, with this new proposal, to demonstrate an overriding need for additional housing to be sited in this specific location. Especially as there is adequate land available for housing that has been allocated within the Carlisle District Local Plan 2015- 2030 and there have been significant housing developments and a number of smaller developments already locally. The need for housing, including affordable housing, can and should be met within existing developments and land already identified by the Council as deliverable. Locally, in Scotby, there is already a significant housing development at one end of the village and also land identified as deliverable at the other end of the village near the A69. The Taylor Wimpey Meadowbrook development, on the outskirts of Scotby and within the Wetheral Parish, is currently advertising it will bring 198 new homes, of which 31 plots are classed as affordable.

There are already small new developments being built in the village. Surely we don't need any more? There is new construction going on round the area. Scotby is almost joined now to Carlisle. We need to preserve village life, not simply make it just another area of a larger town that also has excess housing capacity at present..

Scotby has suffered considerable development in recent times, to the south of the Village at Broomfallen Road (28 dwellings) and Alders Edge (45 dwellings). In addition to these developments there is also the land off Scotby Road ("The Plains"), which is partially been developed for 42 dwellings. Planning permission has also been granted for numerous other residential sites within Scotby that include a further 18 applications off Broomfallen Road, 12 off Lambley Bank, 4 on Parkett Hill, 4 on Ghyll Road, 4 on Scotby Road, 2 on Park Road and 1 in Wellgate.

I understand the Plan allocates a further site in Scotby for residential development. to the north (referred to as being "off Hillhead" but actually land within the junction of Scotby Road and the A 69 trunk road) went through extensive assessment and consultation and is now subject to an Option to Purchase in favour of a significant developer. The Local Plan identifies a "yield" of 90 houses at this site. This sites were chosen by the City Council as the preferred site for development in the village, taking into account the amount of development that has occurred here recently, the capacity of local services and infrastructure, the form and layout of the Village, and comments received during the consultation process

We do not need any more houses in Scotby! It would totally alter the structure of the village

The planning application seeks only outline planning permission with all matters (apart from in relation to the access) being left to the Reserved Matters stage. As such, this new application is essentially identical to that submitted by the same

applicant in 2018 (18/1044), which was unanimously refused by the Council's Development Control Committee as recently as June last year.

Nothing has changed. In particular, none of the planning policies of the Council has been in any way amended. That being so, it follows that the new application should be refused for the same reasons as that previous application was refused.

In summary, the new application is contrary to the policies contained in the Carlisle District Local Plan 2015-2030 particularly the following:

Policy GI1 (Landscape) for which reason it was specifically excluded from the Local Plan following the SHLAA process due to its landscape impact.

Policy SP2 (Strategic Growth and Distribution) to the effect that development in rural settlements must be of "an appropriate scale and nature", "commensurate with their setting" and "enable rural communities to thrive", and by reference to criterion 8 there is no overriding need for the additional housing to be sited in this location.

Policy HO2 (Windfall Housing Development) in that the scale of the proposed development is inappropriate to the scale, form, function and character of Scotby; it is not necessary to enhance or maintain the vitality of the rural community; it is on the edge of the existing settlement but is not well contained within existing landscape features, physically connected or integrated with Scotby and it does lead to an unacceptable intrusion into open countryside; although there are services in the village they have been stretched to breaking point by existing developments and those proposed on allocated land; it is certainly not compatible with adjacent land users

These houses are not needed because the council already has plans to provide adequate house building in the area.

The proposal would give rise to significant overdevelopment. Land to accommodate some 800 new dwellings has been allocated/permissions granted in East Carlisle, 350 in Wetheral Parish and approximately 215 in Scotby

This proposed development is inappropriate in size (90 dwellings and possible future mission creep), nature and scale for this historic village. Already there has been an increase of 350 plus dwellings and proposed dwellings in a village of a mere 500 dwellings. It is clear to all who live here that the village infrastructure is failing to cope with this increased demand.

Since the first application for this site was roundly defeated at Development Control committee in June last year, an attempt has been made, by means of cosmetic enhancements, to make the second application more palatable. None of these enhancements, however, come close to overriding the reasons for the refusal of permission last year.

Scotby has, by any reasonable judgement, undergone its share of residential development since the inception of the current Local Plan. Criterion 8 of Policy SP2 (Strategic Growth and Distribution) states that development in open countryside will be assessed against the need for it to be in the specified location. Nowhere does the application succeed in demonstrating an overriding need for additional housing in this location. Further, this Policy states that developments must be of 'an appropriate scale and nature' and 'commensurate with their setting' and must 'enable rural communities to thrive'. It is difficult to see how this development, bringing almost 100 houses and more than 2,000 vehicle movements a week can be of an appropriate scale. Nor, by putting such additional strain on already overburdened infrastructure - roads, health facilities, drains, schools - can it enable the community to thrive. A development which severs a valued village green's physical and visual connectivity with the countryside beyond is not commensurate with the setting of the village. Again, by the damage it would do to the sense of community, place and history, it would fail to enable the community to thrive.

Policy HO2 (Windfall Housing Development) of the Local Plan seeks to ensure that the scale and design of proposed developments are appropriate to the scale, form, function and character of the existing settlement. Scotby is primarily a settlement of linear form. Further, proposed developments must be well contained within existing

landscape features and physically connected to the settlement and must integrate with it. They must not intrude unacceptably into open countryside. Development on this site would be neither well contained nor integrated and it would intrude into open countryside, contrary to criteria 1 and 3 of Policy HO2.

Policy GI1 (Landscape) of the Local Plan seeks to ensure that development will be appropriate to its surroundings and suitably accommodated within the landscape, and that landscapes 'will be protected from excessive, harmful or inappropriate development'. Following the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment, this site was specifically excluded from the Local Plan, as the open nature of the landscape would be eroded and harmed by development, contrary to Policy GI1

It is contrary to policies contained in the Local Plan 2015-2030, which was adopted in November 2016 and is therefore still very current. Additionally, the Plan and the allocations contained in it were considered by an independent planning inspector who was satisfied that they were the right allocations for Scotby Village and that no additional or alternative sites were required.

This is important because the National Planning Policy Framework makes clear that the presumption in favour of sustainable development it contains "does not change the status of the development plan as a starting point for decision-making". It continues that the Local Plan can be departed from "only if material considerations in a particular case indicate that the plan should not be followed".

In accordance with the Plan, permission has been granted for residential development recently built or currently in progress within Scotby at Alders Edge (45), The Plains (8), Kinmont Rise (28) and for numerous other smaller sites including, according to my researches, a further 18 applications on Broomfallen Road, 8 on Lambley Bank, 6 on Parkett Hill, 3 on Ghyll Road, 6 on Scotby Road, 2 on Park Road and 1 in Wellholme Lea. There is also the major development known as Meadowbrook (213) which although on the far side of the M6 is within Wetheral Parish. A grand total of 338 dwellings in all. Additionally, the land known as "off Hillhead" (R15), is identified as having a yield of 90 homes and the land now known as The Plains is identified as having yield of 40 homes (of which 8 have been built as indicated above). These are the sites that were chosen by the City Council as the preferred sites for development in the Village taking into account recent development, the capacity of local services and infrastructure, the form and layout of the Village and comments received during the consultation process.

The principle of 'windfall' development is acknowledged but the Council's policy (HO2) includes that windfall development must not prejudice the delivery of the spatial strategy of the Local Plan and, therefore, the viability of sites, such as are referred to above, that have been allocated as part of the Local Plan's strategy. This proposal for 90 dwellings is contrary to that policy.

More particularly, the proposed development offends against the criteria detailed in that policy HO2 as follows: its scale and design is not appropriate to the scale, form, function and character of Scotby; the scale and nature of the development will not enhance or maintain the vitality of Scotby; it is on the edge of Scotby but is not well contained within the existing landscape features, is not physically connected and integrated with the settlement, and will lead to an unacceptable intrusion in the open countryside and adversely impact on wider views into or out of Scotby Village.

Two matters arise in respect of the second criterion. The first is that in his report in respect of the previous identical application (18/1044), the Planning Officer states, "this further application will not enhance or maintain the vitality of the village but add to existing pressures"; the second is that in the letter of objection submitted by the CPRE to that previous application it was stated,

"To thrive, communities of all kinds require many aspects to be taken into account beyond economic gains; health and well-being, and a sense of community, place and history are all important. By compromising ..... the village green that plays a key role in these factors, this proposal will not enable Scotby to thrive in these ways."

Additionally, referring to Policy SP2, the applicant has not shown any overriding need for additional housing on this site. Further, the open nature of the landscape, which would be despoiled by this development, would be contrary to Policy GI1.

An important consideration in this connection is that this proposed site has not been simply overlooked in previous assessments of land suitable for development in the area. On the contrary, it was specifically considered in the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) as recently as 2014. During the public consultation on the SHLAA, the Council was "urged" to reclassify it as deliverable. The Planning Officer's rebuttal of that representation was stark, "Disagree – this site is so prominent that it would be highly unlikely that a design could be put forward that would reduce its impact to acceptable levels". This is important given that it is said of the SHLAA that, "It aims to identify all suitable sites with the potential to meet housing requirements up to and beyond the 15 year plan period".

More generally, there is an abundant supply of housing land within Carlisle District. As is apparent from its up-to-date Local Plan and as required by National planning policy, the City Council can demonstrate a five-year supply of housing land comprising both a number of deliverable allocations and a wide range of planning approvals. This has been confirmed fairly recently in the Council's "Five Year Housing Land Supply Position Statement" of April 2019. In the documents it has submitted with this application the applicant has sought to cast doubt on this by stating, for example, "Carlisle claim a 5.27 housing land supply", "Gladman's view is that the council supply position is under five years" and "Gladman's consider that there is a shortfall in housing land supply in Carlisle". Indeed, in paragraph 4.6.2 of the submitted Planning Statement, this has evolved into a very firm statement that "Gladman consider that due to the lack five year supply, policies that are most important for determining the application are not up-to-date". Despite this 'sniping' the applicant has not advanced any empirical evidence that I have been able to identify in support of these contentions.

In any event, as was stated in the report of the Planning Officer in respect of the previous application (18/1044), even if a less than five-year supply were to be proven, this "does not provide for granting permission on sites that are considered to be unsustainable due to their impacts". All in all, therefore, there is no pressure or obligation upon the Council to consider sites such as this, which would not be in conformity with the Local Plan.

Are more house really necessary in the village. who is going to live in them?  
I expect that they will be too expensive for the people who really need better housing.

When covid 19 ends there could be many unoccupied houses.

This really is the ultimate infill of the centre of the village.

We think we have enough new houses now in Scotby.

I feel that the provision of 90 houses will have an unacceptable impact on the village. Little thought has been given to the mix of properties. The Introduction document provided by Gladman's remains sufficiently vague in its description the proposal: "A residential development of 90 new homes of varying sizes, types and tenures, including affordable housing."

I think that any development of this number of dwellings, should take into account the needs of the village and not that of the profits of the developer. The further provision of more 4/5 bed Executive homes, while perhaps producing the greater return for the developer fails to guarantee the sustainability and continuity of the village community.

Carlisle City Council has plans for the Garden Development when the southern ring road is built. Who the heck is going to be wanting to buy houses in this area - what industry and jobs are likely to come into our area in the current climate.

I prefer to look at the green fields rather than another massive new estate in Scotby. Scotby is a village not a town and is quite large enough without any more properties being built

This development of 90 houses will overwhelm the current balance and wellbeing of this small village. It is not needed and the village will not be able to cope with the influx of more residents. This development also flies in the face of Carlisle city council's plans for the urban village to be developed just south of the city and only a few miles from Scotby village. An additional 90 properties in this small village is not sustainable in my opinion.

In 2018 Gladman Developments Ltd. submitted their first planning application for 90 houses Ref. 18/1044. You recommended refusal and the D. C. Committee agreed unanimously to reject this application.

We are now faced with a second application purportedly different from the first. In my opinion the only alteration is an avenue with trees. In essence no significant difference whatsoever. Therefore our original observations still apply:-

- a) The loss of visibility from the centre of the village to the open landscape towards the North Pennine AONB
- b) Over development- In the Carlisle District Local Development Plan 2015/30 three areas in Scotby had allocated permission totalling some 328 properties and there has also been some 115 windfall applications. Therefore, Scotby has fulfilled its allocation
- c) The access and egress to and from the site, with possibly 180 vehicles per day, is on an incline, with restricted visibility both ways.
- d) The Village School of which I am the Chair of Health and Safety is lowering its intake of year 1 pupils. In the new Autumn term numbers will be dropped to 30 pupils per class and the total number of pupils within a few years will drop from 264 to 210.
- e) It is my considered opinion that a development of this magnitude be refused. The whole ethos of the Council's Garden Village is to stop over development in villages.

This is a beautiful part of this small village which has plenty of other developments ongoing. the aspect from the village green would be ruined for local people. The council has already objected to this money making company's proposal with very good justification in doing so. Please don't make a mockery of the whole system in letting them try again.

Gladman's make a case for 300,000 houses to be built each year, this is actually the Governments target for the mid 2020's. Gladmans, who to my knowledge have never built a house, would seem quite happy if all 300,000 were built in Scotby. Would that solve the nation's housing needs I think not. Carlisle City Council do have to ensure sufficient houses are in the pipeline, however again that does not mean all the houses have to be built in one locality. Scotby is already "full" or it will be when the houses already planned are built. The proposed site is not in the City's housing plan, it has already been refused. Nothing has changed as far as the public know. The application should be refused for the same reasons as before

### Affordable Housing

Affordable Housing Document: Carlisle City Council's latest Strategic Housing Market Assessment July 2019 states "Overall, in the period from 2013 to 2030 a net deficit of 5,011 affordable homes is identified (295 per annum)."

vi. The Local Plan identifies a need for a total of 9,606 homes across that period, meaning the identified affordable need is 52% of the total need, significantly higher than the policy requirement.

The Garden Village being built in the south of Carlisle is 10,000 homes. Mute point. Scotby development is therefore NOT needed. Please see this website:

[www.stcuthbertsgv.co.uk](http://www.stcuthbertsgv.co.uk)

Please also note that the development in Scotby Plains has not completed its development and has been at a standstill for 3 years+ and has not sold all houses that have been completed.

Please also note that the Story Development at Kinmont Rise is not yet complete and as part of the development is already providing affordable housing for Scotby. The application makes reference to the provision of affordable housing. Once more, however, this is only an outline application and there is no reference in the draft Heads of Terms for the section 106 Agreement to the provision of 27 affordable homes. In this regard, although affordable housing provision is important, such affordable housing has been provided within Scotby in the developments at Kinmont Rise (7) and Meadowbrook (34) while the applications in respect of The Plains and the land off Hill Head respectively gave provision for 10 and 24 affordable homes.

#### Landscape/Countryside/Village character

Scotby is a beautiful English country village, the aspect to the Pennines from the village centre really makes the village, without it the village will become nothing more than an extension of Carlisle, another urbanisation rather than village. We cannot just allow villages that are quintessentially English to be destroyed, there are plenty of brown field sites to develop.

This is a greenfield site - there are plenty of other brownfield sites which are crying out for planning applications.

It would destroy the areas beauty.

Consideration should also be taken to loss of trees.

I object to this planning due to it being in a conservation area. Carlisle has a lots of areas of natural beauty that are declining due to houses being built. There are plenty of new houses available we don't need another conservation area being destroyed to build more.

This is an unnecessary development of the green belt land within our village boundaries. Which will destroy the look of and from the village green

The area in question was discounted by the city planners when making their local plan for Scotby in 2015 as "Unacceptable landscape impact" People may be concerned that "Loss of view" is cited as something not to be taken into account.

This might simply mean loss of individual view i.e. from a private residence.

However, a valid objection is "amenity" (i.e. loss of landscape, green space etc for the community as a whole via the view from the village centre & green) as is "conservation" (of landscape?), as is "appearance of the development" (i.e. blight on the landscape).

This development would ruin the rural village character of this village.

Not only that but this application would take away from the beautiful landscape of our village in Scotby, you only have to go to the village green to take photos of the views/landscape it would eat up.

Not only that but this application would take away from the beautiful landscape of our village in Scotby, you only have to go to the green to take photos of the views/landscape it would eat up.

We feel this would take away from the peaceful environment that we have lived in for 14 years.

To even consider an estate on that land and the impact it would have with the loss of landscape and green space for the whole community would be a complete disregard to all the Scotby residences

Scotby is a lovely idyllic village & the development will totally ruin the appearance of the village.

This is green belt/agricultural land giving a scenic vista from the village centre for all to enjoy.

The proposed development would put a large visual 'scar' on the central aspect of the village, being just off the village green, and completely ruin it's rural appearance, the countryside and wildlife contained within it.

To allow a further 90 properties to be built right in the heart of the 'village' would, without a doubt, create traffic problems with an outflow of at least 2/3 vehicles per

household x 90 coming onto a small, narrow rural road, pollution would increase, both in the air and dark skies, the already overstrained local school would not be able to cope, our Doctor's surgeries are already under pressure to cope with existing numbers and the bottom line is that the entire heart and soul of the village would be utterly ruined.

There is already a huge development of 190 properties just outside the village at Meadowbrook. Why do we need another 90 right in the heart of this village? The very virtue of why these people want to build here, i.e. the peaceful, rural setting, would be utterly ruined by the development! It would be the end of the very British-ness of rural England, most particularly Cumbria, known for its beautiful countryside and should not be tolerated.

This build should not go ahead: not only does the village not have the capacity in terms of roads and amenities to support extra housing, but Scotby is an area of natural beauty home to many wildlife species that should not be disrupted.

The proposal would have a detrimental effect on the character of the village. Scotby is a village of low density housing and to place an estate of 90 properties at high density directly in front of the village green will adversely affect the character and visual aspect of the centre of the village both from the village green and the approach from Wetheral.

If you wish to destroy the character and 'village' of Scotby then this is the place to build 90 more houses.

Adverse impact this development would have on the very essence of the village of Scotby. A major community asset is the stunning open view from the heart of the village looking out towards the south east fells. This lovely view is often remarked on by visitors to Scotby and instils a feeling of wellbeing amongst the community. Any development on this site would destroy irrevocably the sense of Scotby being a village.

Indeed, the area in question was identified as offering important and significant views out of the village in the City Planners Scotby Appraisal plan in January 1983.

This planning document is now defunct but the issue remains valid with the local plan for Scotby in 2015 where the City Planners state that this site should be discounted for development because of its "unacceptable landscape impact"

The whole character of this rural village would be destroyed

This development is a large site in a picturesque part of the village and is poorly related to the linear character of the village. It encroaches into open countryside and is a prominent site that would detract from the open character of this part of Scotby. Such a development would have unacceptable impacts on the landscape character and settlement character, including the setting of Scotby and clearly conflict with relevant local plans

A housing development on this greenfield site, however carefully designed would destroy the striking panoramic views across the land to the north Pennines. It would also adversely impact on the character of the village as a whole. Design of the houses, site layout, sight lines and landscape buffering/tree planting around the development would not mitigate the siting problem

This beautiful village has already changed beyond recognition since I was a child! It's already over developed, & losing its character! The amenities & roads will be overstretched, & there is already more new houses going up as I write! Plus the new 'Garden Village' (not wanted either!) on the outskirts of town, destroying more green belt land!

I strongly object to this plan which would totally destroy the rural character of Scotby. The scale of development is totally out of scale with the village and would destroy a much cherished open countryside view from the village green.

It clearly would not integrate with the village

Please stop these relentless companies determined to build in beautiful village settings ruining the views and the village layout, it is disproportionate and very unwelcome.



Remember the main reason the plan was rejected last time was because the site had been officially "discounted" for housing because of the landscape impact

The only material difference in the new application compared with the old is that the applicant has submitted an indicative drawing showing open space through the middle of the housing development. In the Statement of Community Involvement it states, "Public open space would be created through the centre of the Proposed Development, maintaining a connection from the village green, through the site and to the wider countryside beyond". Similarly, in the Landscape and Visual Appraisal document it is stated as follows:

"A broad swathe of public open space is proposed through the centre of the site. It would effectively extend open space from the village green, thereby maintaining key views from the village, across the site and to the wider countryside beyond.

"Gateway avenue tree planting will frame views along the open space proposed within the site, celebrating long distance views from the village towards the North Pennines AONB."

The above statements are more or less repeated in the Design and Access Statement and a similar point is made in the Planning Statement,

"Retention of a vista through the site to the open countryside beyond the site from the village green"

Two obvious points arise from the above. First, and importantly, apart from in relation to the access, the planning application seeks only outline planning permission with all matters such as the final housing layout being left to the Reserved Matters stage. As such, the indicative drawing and the above statements are meaningless. It is notable that there is no reference whatsoever to the provision of the "broad swathe of public open space" in the draft Heads of Terms proposed for the section 106 Agreement.

Secondly, the provision of such a corridor through a development of 90 houses comprising 2 storey and 2.5 storey dwellings is little more than 'smoke and mirrors' deliberately designed to 'con' the easily misled. It will readily be apparent that no amount of public open space within a substantial housing estate can come close to the present unadulterated agricultural landscape beyond which the "long distance views from the village towards the North Pennines AONB" referred to can indeed be celebrated; to adopt the applicant's word.

This point is actually made for me by the applicant in the submitted Landscape and Visual Assessment document in which it is acknowledged as follows:

"the site does provide a connection to the wider countryside notably with key views from the village green."

"The Proposed Development will alter the character of the site from agricultural land to residential" and will have "adverse" landscape effect.

The development breaches the development line and is out of character and of a scale which would adversely impact the village.

The scale and design of the proposal is not appropriate to the character of the existing settlement. The proposal would be an unacceptable intrusion into the open countryside. Policy HO2 of The Local Plan.

The plan for up to 90 dwellings will ruin the landscape of the village. It is far too grand in scale and design and, sitting within sight of the village green, will spoil the aspect of the village for hundreds of residents and visitors.

The centre of Scotby is tranquil and relatively unspoiled - the addition of 90 new houses on what is an unspoiled beautiful view across to the Pennines would frankly be an eyesore

The planning committee made it perfectly clear the reasons why planning was last refused. The striking view from the centre of the village should be cherished for all residents and visitors to enjoy, rather than destroyed forever as this opportunist application sets out to do

I am all for change and strategic growth but not for wantless destruction of one of the best, in fact arguably the best view of the village

The view of the open landscape from Scotby green is one enjoyed by all residents, especially the elderly, and is important for maintaining the quality of life and the village atmosphere which I'm sure most of us deliberately moved here to enjoy. The scale of the development would not be appropriate to the scale and character of Scotby village and there would be unacceptable intrusion into the open countryside. Building on the area would change the entire picturesque landscape of the village, not to mention ruin the habitat for birds of prey which I have seen on the proposed land.

The proposal to construct up to 90 dwellings will overlook multiple properties; this will lead to a loss of privacy and will certainly impact on the peaceful enjoyment of many Scotby residents, homes and gardens.

90 new houses could significantly change the nature of the village.

The land in question has a verity of wild birds, some of which are nesting on the ground and rare like lapwings and skylarks. I often visit my relatives in the village and love the surrounding view. I would politely ask the planners to have a look at how much housing has already been built in the village in recent years and take this into account when making your decision. When the land is gone it's gone and you'll never get the rich diverse wildlife back for future generations to enjoy.

The building proposal will be visually overbearing. It is an inappropriate design for this part of the village, and is unacceptable intrusion into the open countryside.

The Carlisle District Masterplanning document of January 2013 has the following to say about Scotby

"The architectural character of the ancient core is strong & fairly cohesive."

This has been largely maintained as the more recent Alder's Edge is tucked away behind Scotby Steadings & trees.

However the proposed development of "Rookery Park" would totally destroy this character as it is on rising ground & would totally overshadow this ancient core to the detriment of the settlement.

Scotby is very much a linear village in 3 parts.

The core within the railway lines, the South along Broomfallen Road & the North along Scotby Road & Park Road.

Historically suburbanisation has occurred largely to the North leaving the core & the South largely intact.

This proposal would totally destroy this well managed policy.

Refusal Reason 1 The scale and design of this new development is similar in size and scope to the previous development plans. Although this time Gladman have accommodated a view, through the development, in their redesigned proposal, this view is impoverished compared to the panoramic views currently enjoyed from the centre of the village. The fact remains that the density and 'scale of the proposed development is not appropriate to the scale and character of Scotby.' This site is 'one of open countryside and is not well contained or integrated into the village.' The Policy HO2 seeks to 'ensure that sites are well contained within existing landscape features, physically connected to and integrate into the settlement, and does not lead to an unacceptable intrusion into open countryside.' Clearly this new proposal fails to meet this Policy criteria.

Reason 3 This site has been considered and omitted from the Local Plan, 'specifically excluded due to its landscape impact. Policy GI1 of the Local plan seeks to ensure that any development should be appropriate to its surroundings and suitably accommodated within the landscape.' Again even with amended proposals the open nature of this landscape would be eroded by this new development and harmful to Policy GI1 of the Carlisle District Local Plan 2015- 2030.

My object is to leave the land as it is. This is a lovely village, it would spoil the landscape. Too much greenbelt is been developed. I sold some land a few years ago, and bee keeps are on this land now, no houses just wild life.

The dwellings would completely destroy the views from the popular village green.

The view of the open landscape from Scotby green is one enjoyed by all residents,

especially the elderly, and is important for maintaining the quality of life and the village atmosphere. The striking views through this open land from the very heart of the village are the foundation of Scotby village's unique character which must be preserved for all residents and visitors to enjoy, rather than being destroyed forever as this opportunist application sets out to do.

A housing development on this greenfield site, however carefully designed would destroy the village's landscape setting of striking panoramic views across the land to the North Pennines and in so doing adversely impact on the character of the village as a whole. Design of the houses, site layout, sight lines and landscape buffering/tree planting around the development, however much the proposer attempts to tweak and adjust them will not mitigate the inappropriate use of this particular area of land for built development.

This is a green belt site and I was under the impression that they were "sacred" Building so many dwellings on this site will bring detrimental change the character of the village and destroy an iconic view to the fells from the village centre.

The proposed development would have an unacceptable impact on the landscape.

Even the applicant accepts that in that it notes that the site, as it stands presently, does provide "a connection to the wider countryside notably with key views from the village green", and that "The Proposed Development will alter the character of the site from agricultural land to residential" and will have "adverse" landscape effect

Do not allow this to go ahead and ruin such a beautiful and healthy village

This proposed development is inappropriate in size (90 dwellings and possible future mission creep), nature and scale for this historic village

I think it is really important that our green places are protected.

Green spaces across the UK need to be protected

I believe this will take away from the rural village. Keep the green space green!

The site is open farmland across which there are far reaching views to the north Pennines AONB; the view is much cherished locally and is the only publicly available viewpoint in the village which is also a central hub position. It is not possible to develop this land and retain its existing character which is why this land is correctly designated within the Local Plan.

The scale of the development is inappropriate for the village and cannot be carried out without changing its essential character

Far too many green spaces are being lost all over England

The area is at risk of becoming spoiled due to sprawling identikit housing that is surplus to requirements. I grew up in the area and know the special character of Scotby/Wetheral would be lost if this were to go ahead.

The site is a greenfield site and I object to the development of greenfield sites and the change in land use from agriculture. The use of greenfield sites damages the natural environment and reduces biodiversity and is unjustified since there are plenty of alternative brownfield sites in the Carlisle area that could be developed instead.

Greenfield sites should be protected for our children not eaten up by relentless and unnecessary development.

This application has already been rejected once and for good reason - It is a totally Unacceptable intrusion into the countryside

### Traffic/Transport/Highways

Traffic around the school during drop off and pick up is already at dangerous levels, adding more traffic during these times from parents or residents through traffic will present an increased risk to the children.

The traffic through the village could not cope with another potential 90 cars.

This will also cause increased traffic which is already at peak. This project will cause reduce in highway safety and will generate additional traffic.

The roads cannot cope with existing traffic, additional pressure on the A69 turning into village.

The access point from the Wetheral Road to the proposed site is narrow and without good sight lines, it is currently far too narrow for cars to proceed & be able to pass safely.

All Highways access in the village is problematic. Roads are narrow & winding, & struggle to cope with existing traffic.

The turn from the main A69 into the village is also not fit for purpose & dangerous. There are also two railway bridges on the access roads to Scotby, during the last winter there were 3 occasions when flooding made it impossible to use these roads. If as suggested children are to walk to school from the site then two roads have to be crossed without any controlled crossings.

The school is already oversubscribed and the roads become highly congested at school times. It could already be considered dangerous and adding another big influx of traffic will make this worse. If the suggestion is the additional children walk to and from school then they would have to cross two main roads without any controlled crossing which is totally unacceptable. The highways into the village are already problematic, the roads cannot cope with the existing traffic never mind the additional the additional traffic of up to 90 new homes. The access point out of the Wetheral road is also very narrow and is without good sight lines and a higher volume of traffic coming out of here can only be bad news.

I object to the proposed development due to the extra traffic in the village which is dangerous to pedestrians & drivers & particularly to children going to & from school & crossing 2 roads with no safety measures in place. The access point for the development the road is very narrow & further traffic is a safety issue.

School drop off & pick up are currently very hazardous due to traffic congestion. If as suggested children are to walk to school from the site; two roads need to be crossed & a railway bridge negotiated (extremely narrow & unsuitable for pedestrians if vehicles wish to use the road) without any controlled crossings.

This narrow village road is the main way into Carlisle from the school it is currently difficult if not down right dangerous for emergency vehicles and pedestrians. The possibility of additional 90/180 vehicles from this proposed development is unthinkable.

This new estate, both in construction and use will cause increased noise disturbance to the village. Its location proximal to the village centre means that construction traffic will be obliged to use narrow country roads to access the site. This will cause a significant increase in pollution and traffic along roads, many of which do not have pavements for pedestrians. Once completed, the estate will have up to 90 houses. Given the paucity of public transport in the area, it is likely that most of these residents will have cars. In houses with multiple adults, it is not unreasonable to assume over 100 additional vehicles. This will lead to unsupportable pressure on narrow roads in the area.

90 houses would mean at least 90 vehicles, but most households have 2 cars our roads are not built for this amount of traffic especially when we have flooding under the railway bridges.

The access to the site is on a difficult hill without good site lines and extra traffic generated could well cause safety issues

The Wetheral to Scotby road does not offer a suitable access for this site. The carriageway fronting this proposed development was narrowed to allow for a footway when the Alders Edge development took place. At that time in response to members raising road safety concerns the view offered by the developer to the planning committee was that vehicles would not park on the carriageway. This assertion has been proven to be incorrect. Vehicles are frequently parked during the day and overnight causing difficulties for normal traffic flow. Traffic flows off the proposed development would exacerbate this situation. Please also note that horses, cyclists and walkers frequently exercise on this route.

Proposed Access Strategy Document: Following highway code and Carlisle Council advice there needs to be a 5.5m width in road for up to 20 metres near a T junction.

There are multiple incorrect facts on this document:

- a) Where the proposed T junction is, the road is currently 4.5 metres for at least 20 metres, not 5.5.
- b) The speed limit at that junction is 30mph and extends to the last house on the road towards Wetheral. You have stated that it is national speed limit at this area - that is incorrect. All your calculations are therefore incorrect and invalid as you have based the speed limits on 33.4mph and 37.7mph, when in fact they should be slower.
- c) Your proposed T Junction area is actually on the bend of the road which is the thinnest patch.
- d) A fact you have failed to mention yet I have found on this document is that you are going to cut back all of the vegetation between the field and the road in order to ensure a visibility splay. Therefore increasing visibility of the building site and noise of the building site to the houses directly opposite it. This also means the foul drainage pumping station opposite houses 2 and 3 will have no noise reduction barrier and the station will be highly visible.
- e) What is also not taken into account is that the proposed T Junction is at a start of an incline slope with reduced visibility.

When were the automatic Traffic Count surveys performed? How often? Interesting that they were performed but Gladman yet still don't know the speed limit of the area. Statistics show that on average there are 1.3 cars per household, therefore this would mean that there would be a substantial increase in traffic through the village centre and along Scotby Road to the A69 and nearby M6. This would have a significantly detrimental impact on the village and the quality of life of the residents. In addition, there would be a significant increase in the traffic along Park Road, particularly to and from the school. Traffic is already highly congested during school drop off and pick up times which makes it dangerous, and particularly with the number of cars that park along the road during these times.

There is also widespread concern that housing on this scale would increase already severe traffic issues in the Park Road area at peak school pick-up times.

There may be a hazard created with the increase in road traffic on a relatively narrow road and the situation is compounded by the development at Alders Edge already on that section of road, because there are often cars parked by visitors to these properties.

The narrow roads are already overcrowded.

The Scotby/Wetheral road is not suitable for more traffic. It is a dangerous road with cars going too fast and little space for pedestrians or cyclists. 90 extra houses will add a lot of cars.

My objections to the above proposed new housing development are in the main about the increase in traffic in the centre of Scotby and more importantly on Park Road where there are so many children around the school. Scotby will be soon saturated with new properties in and around the village and no more are needed. The road into Scotby from Wetheral is already very busy with traffic and very narrow leading up to the junction and through the village.

I drive most days through Scotby and Wetheral, and I'm finding the beautiful views that once were there are now being spoiled by more houses. That's not to mention the constant disruption from the lorry's, the constant road closures from the builders, the bad driving from the merchant that deliver supplies which have nearly written my car off twice and the constant mess from all the mud all over the road. I feel sorry for the people that live in Scotby that have to put up with Story homes building on Broomfallen road.

Traffic from the site onto the Scotby/Wetheral road and through the village will be substantially increased.

The parking proposal indicates just one place per property which is significantly less than modern households require and doesn't allow for visitor parking. This will cause noise, pollution and dust at all times of the day and night.

Wetheral Road is already a busy rural road; this additional concentration of traffic and inevitable roadside parking will cause traffic problems and create a safety hazard for pedestrians and other motorists.

Scotby village highway infrastructure is not designed or suitable for the inevitable increase in traffic. Furthermore; the location of both railway lines, existing properties and narrow roads does not allow for realistic expansion

The traffic in Scotby and surrounding areas is already pretty heavy and 90 new homes isn't going to help that. Plus the added pressure on local amenities and the destruction of green land to build this is not acceptable

At present traffic flows through Scotby are extremely high.

Many residents of Wetheral & Cumwhinton, who commute to Carlisle drive through Scotby to avoid 11 sets of traffic lights on the London Road axis.

By driving through Scotby & using the Park Road "rat run" they can emerge on Warwick Road via Botcherby & have only 4 sets of lights to encounter.

More houses mean more traffic along a narrow road where the local Primary School is located.

This proposal would add up to an additional 180 vehicles.

The proposed estate would have its access on the North side adjacent to Alder's Edge.

This road is too narrow as it stands & roadside parked vehicles already inhibit traffic flows along the Wetheral road axis

Scotby is a small village and the extra 90 proposed houses, with all the accompanying extra traffic exiting onto a very narrow road is an accident just waiting to happen. Most households now have at least two cars, plus the exit from the Wetheral Road also joins onto Scotby Road at a very hard to manoeuvre T Junction as the village shop attracts many customers, some of whom are very elderly and there are always pedestrians crossing the road at the junction

I wish to draw your attention to the already existing dangerous road situation which is further compounded by recent developments. These exist in 3 locations in the village. Scotby village to Wetheral The development at Alders edge has already narrowed this road creating a pinch point which causes difficulty when meeting anything larger than a car from the other direction. Also residents of Alders Edge park on the road, in effect reducing it to a single lane road. Additional traffic entering this road from the proposed Gladman application would greatly increase the dangerous aspect of this area. Park Road by the school Already a controversial area with regard to safety, which will be further compounded with the proposed Gladman development. Accidents are a frequent occurrence here due to impatient drivers, and the severity and frequency of these can only increase. Scotby road end and A69 This junction is already a very dangerous area to be driving through. When turning right out of Scotby road, or turning right into Scotby road, or turning right from Stone Eden Nursery School, it is unclear where to position your vehicle to avoid an accident. Sooner probably than later there will be a serious if not fatal accident at this junction. I do hope that you will refuse permission and not add to the already overloaded infrastructure within Scotby

The narrow road between the site and Alders Edge and leading to a difficult T-Junction in the village centre would not be adequate to take the Wetheral commuting traffic and school traffic to Park Road if 90 houses (possibly an extra 180 cars) are added to the equation.

The village has absorbed much development in recent years combined with similar expansion in surrounding villages (also threatened by over development) such that locally generated traffic funnelled through Scotby has increased noticeably and is now near constant at peak times. This increases danger levels locally and the proposed site entrance is positioned close to an already difficult junction

Too much effort is put into new housing, whilst ignoring the associated infrastructure required to support such a development. As a regular user of the Wetheral/Scotby Road the width of road where access to the new housing is anticipated, is far from

adequate. The recent addition of the 40 plus houses at Alders Edge has already resulted in the narrowing the road to accommodate a footpath, and overflow parking to the estate. I believe this presents additional pressures on the existing highway and increased safety concerns. The Highways Authority must also make a serious assessment of the situation before considering a ruling.

The T-junction in the centre of the village is already dangerous and the entrance/exit of this proposed development is almost beside this so another 180 plus cars using this junction is only going to make matters worse. Children are crossing here either walking or cycling to school and also many elderly residents in the village accessing the local post office and shop. Incidentally, this shop has been a lifeline for many during the current pandemic and I feel that local villagers will continue to support it long after the lifting of lockdown restrictions, thus even more foot and vehicular traffic around this junction

There will be a significant impact on the environment, from a large number of wagons driving through the village.

### Flooding/Drainage

During the last winter there were 3 occasions when we could not leave the village underneath either of the railway bridges due to flooding, a number of cars were written off from driving into the flood water.

The Wetheral road is already susceptible to flooding and the increase of properties on this field will increase the flooding risk to the roads and existing properties.

Drainage report indicates site unsuitable for "Infiltration based drainage" Mains drainage is already over capacity and at times of heavy rain flooding of foul water has been reported.

Sewers are at capacity in Scotby

Mains drainage is already over capacity.

Scotby Village urgently needs considerable updates to its infrastructure, the sewage system & run off cannot cope. Pow Maughan Beck is prone to flooding.

At times of heavy rain flooding of foul water has been reported (during the last winter there were 3 occasions when flooding at the railway bridges made it impassable to pedestrians & vehicles)

The proposed site drainage report indicates the site to be unsuitable for "Infiltration based drainage"

There is also the drainage and flooding issue during episodes of not particularly heavy rain the road is often running with water towards the beck the road regularly floods by the bridge over the beck the drains on road often overflow, During the floods of 2015 and again in 2020 the beck came within inches of being overwhelmed with the result that my property and others in Pow Maughan Court would have flooded. The piece of land in question acts as flood area for water if these properties are built with the roads hard standing and other facilities are built our houses will be in even bigger danger of flooding as excess run off of water into the beck would overwhelm it

Please note that land drainage is a definite issue on this site. When Alders Edge was built, I commented to the site supervisor that I was surprised that the house foundations were frequently under water. He advised me not to worry because the vapour barrier would prevent any damp problems arising from standing water under occupied houses. The developers report does recognise that infiltration based drainage is unsuitable for this site and to my knowledge the mains drainage infrastructure will not cope with the additional burden of run off from this site. Risk of flooding from the river Pow Maughan and over capacity in the mains drainage system as the drainage report has highlighted that the site is unsuitable for infiltration based drainage

The Foul Drainage pumping station is going to be situated directly opposite. I will go from having an amazing view of green fields and the Pennines to having a foul

drainage pumping station. I note that Gladman have politely stated that "individual property value is not a material matter in the planning application". Apologies I beg to differ. When part of the planning design is that a foul drainage pumping station will be built directly opposite, I would suggest that it becomes a "material matter".

This will significantly impact on my house value and resale

The proposed estate of 90 houses would be located on rising ground which slopes down to the Wetheral road which is very low lying at this point.

The green field as it stands can easily absorb current rainfall but the vastly increased runoff from such a large development would greatly increase the threat of flooding to the houses in the lower part of Alder's Edge.

A major item of national news on the BBC outlined the greatly increased levels of rainfall facilitated by higher global temperatures.

There is no way of knowing if the proposed "water basins" will be able to contain this.

The much vaunted Carlisle flood defences constructed after the first major floods of this century proved to be totally inadequate for the second inundation.

### Services/Infrastructure/School

Scotby Village is a rural community served by a small local school which does not have capacity to take additional children from 90 homes aimed at families.

Additional housing without considerable updates to the infrastructure of the village will expedite issues.

The infrastructure of the village is already at breaking point with its current population - schools, road, public transport, utilities.

Scotby school is already a over subscribed school

Erection of another 90 properties in Scotby means that School will be overwhelmed with possible amount of pupils. School is not suitable for so many residents and Scotby has seen 3 major developments already.

School already oversubscribed and traffic already highly congested at school times making it difficult if not dangerous for emergency vehicles and pedestrians.

The size of this development would overwhelm the existing infrastructure and amenities of the village.

The school is also taking on 8-10 less pupils from next year as it's already over capacity.

The school is taking on less pupils from next year as it's already over capacity.

No school places

Scotby is a small village with a primary school that is already oversubscribed, and will be even more so when the current new builds in the village are completed and finally sold.

The school cannot take any more pupils having been extended several times with dangerous levels of traffic on Park Road. 90 houses could mean another 180 cars in the village, please refuse this planning application.

Current services in Scotby such as the school are already over-subscribed. This would result in many primary school age pupils having to travel further from their homes, increasing transport usage, pollution, and decreasing child welfare.

We already have 'building sites' on both sides of the village, how is the school going to cope with the increase of pupils, other village schools have closed, hence Scotby and Cumwhinton are now at capacity, the traffic around these schools is horrendous. The medical practices are also at capacity.

There is insufficient local infrastructure the local school is heavily oversubscribed and already causes traffic congestion and delay during the start and finish of the school day

Scotby School is at capacity and over the years has expanded to meet growth in pupil numbers. It seems unlikely that the school can expand any further

Scotby has grown substantially over the years, with new housing being built, mainly



as infill development. This has to a certain extent been beneficial to the village, helping to sustain the village, shop, pub, etc. This proposed development of 90 units on a greenfield site, on the outskirts of the village, is neither desirable nor needed. Is there sufficient capacity in the local school bearing in mind the additional families who will occupy the properties still under construction?

The school over-subscribed with little scope to expand.

Scotby does not have the infrastructure to accommodate another 90 households - there is not the transport links, the shops or the road network to deal with the additional footfall and traffic this would bring to Scotby

The school is already over-subscribed. I believe that the pupils already at the school would be disadvantaged by over-crowded classrooms if appeals for admission are granted, as I believe they often are. Those families who move in will have the stress of finding an alternative school for their children, dis-advantaging them as it is often more difficult to make local friends. This will also lead to an increase in car journeys, something we should all be trying to reduce.

The local school does not have capacity to take additional children, either does Cumwhinton or Wetherall!

The infrastructure in our village does not have the capacity to accommodate any more buildings, bus, no rail, narrow roads. The traffic coming through the village and by the school would be a danger!

There are already a number of houses under construction in the village and the erection of up to 90 more dwellings would place a further and unacceptable burden on many aspects of Scotby infrastructure

The development will further increase the burden on Council services.

The local primary school is already oversubscribed and could not support additional children that would come from this development

There is no Doctor's surgery in the village. The nearest surgery is in Wetherall or Corby Hill and is run by the Brampton Surgery. This is an extremely busy practice at the moment, without having to look after a possible 180 - 300 extra patients, given that many of these proposed houses will be family houses.

There are already many housing developments in Scotby and surrounding villages, and this major new project would place a great burden on the local infrastructure, for example increased traffic through the village, lack of capacity at Scotby primary school and increased burden on Council services

In a development of the size planned, there is likely to be a lot of children, Scotby School is struggling to cope with the numbers already. It is already very busy in the morning and at going home times, particularly with vehicular traffic, and the pavements are very narrow.

Scotby School is already full to capacity, as are the surrounding village schools.

Where are any future pupils supposed to go to school?

There is no doubt that the size of the proposed development will have a significant adverse impact on Scotby with increased pressure on the local infrastructure, including larger volumes of traffic on rural roads and pressure on the village school

At present Scotby Junior & Infant School has a capacity of 266 pupils & has an actual total of 270.

It has been operating at well over this for years.

At present it has 270 on roll but in 2012 it had 279.

At present there are 480 children aged 0-17 years old in the village but significantly 314 of these are 0-9 years old.

Gladman Land's vague promise of "some financial assistance where needed" does not even begin to address this.

A major development of 90 houses can only greatly increase pressure on the school.

The present population of the village is an estimated 2371 & the 480 children aged 0-17 years old constitute approximately 20% of this.

By the same proportions 90 houses would produce 225 people with 45 being

between the ages of 0-17 years old 30 of which would be in the 0-9 age group. The school could not possibly cope with this & the result would be over large classes in overcrowded conditions, much to the detriment of every child within the school. we just haven't got the facilities to support more families ie: schools, doctors and roads to name but a few.

Scotby School is already oversubscribed and the traffic chaos on Park Road at school times is unacceptable already without the extra traffic this development would cause

I feel this size of development is totally unsuitable for Scotby. There is no room at the village primary school, parents taking their children to and from school already cause an enormous problem with parking on a relatively narrow road. All parking space on Park Road is already taken At school times with many near misses as traffic enters the village from the Carlisle end. This size of development will drastically change the feel and shape of the village

Where are the children going to be educated Scotby school is already at saturation point. The entrance and exiting from the said housing estate onto the Scotby to Wetheral road is extremely narrow and is visually impaired. The beautiful view from the village green over to the Pennine Fells would be gone forever. Therefore the village as we see it now would no longer exist as a true looking village just another housing estate .No way!

This proposed plan would ruin the peaceful character of the village and take from precious farming and wildlife space.

Having grown up in Wetheral and had many friends in Scotby, I believe so many houses on this plot would be a detriment to children growing up in the idyllic area Scotby and Wetheral are overwhelmed with new housing. The infrastructure of services, roads, schools, drainage, shops, parking, medical, traffic and all areas of community support are already stretched beyond the capacity of a small village. There is no way we need 90 more local homes.

The school on Park Road is oversubscribed so where are children to be educated? Also increased traffic along Park Road at school times will only add to the already unacceptable and dangerous levels of congestion

Of paramount importance should be access to suitable schooling. I believe Scotby School cannot continue to be extended on such an add hoc basis, as the village housing stock is increases. I feel the County Council urgently needs to audit available Primary School places in the area. Current and future development either planned or in the pipeline must be considered as a priority when determining the need for school places.

### Open Space \_

A further concern I have is regarding the legal status of the play park and trim trail in the proposed public open space to the south side of the proposed development. The layout of the secondary roads terminating at this public open space appears to me to lend themselves to offering mission creep. By this I mean that once this development is complete and a few years pass could there be an application to develop additional housing on this open space? The legal status of the proposed public open space needs to be made clear.

Design and Access Statement: We already have a more than adequate playing fields and playground in Scotby. Your design is very small and will not be usable for the whole village and barely for the amount of children in a 90 house development This is an application for outline planning permission. That being so, the majority of the submitted documents including the indicative drawing, the Planning Statement, the Affordable Housing Statement and the Landscape and Visual Appraisal contain material that is not especially relevant. A particular example is that the applicant has asserted that a broad swathe of public open space would be created through the centre of the proposed development so as to retain a vista through the site to the

open countryside beyond. There is no commitment to that in an application for outline planning permission. Thus, although the applicant has stated that it has submitted a second application to address the reasons for refusal of the previous application, it has not. In short, this continues to be an application for up to 90 dwellings.

The proposal provides a playground and nature walk neither of which is needed. Scotby has a huge, well run and organised playground and sports area in the centre of the village and many nature trails which are accessible for all.

### Statement of Community Involvement

I would like to add that no communication from the developer to the community has been received.

The last time Gladman made this application, they leafleted nearby residents but refused point blank to meet the community. This time, they have not even bothered to send out leaflet but have submitted a totally misleading "Statement of Community Involvement". Under Government and planning guidelines, engagement with the local community is required. There has been none.

They have not engaged or consulted with the community at all at anytime with either applications & it is offensive for them to intimate that they have.

It is utterly disingenuous for the developer to suggest that there has been community engagement from them. On the contrary, the community has engaged against the developer previously to clearly and publicly oppose a similar application - to my mind nothing has changed in substance from the previous application which was understandably and appropriately declined.

It is standard practice, and indeed the Council's standing advice for people seeking to build a case ahead of a planning application to seek to gather local support by talking to the local community. Last time round Gladman did leaflet drop Scotby but they refused point blank to meet the community. This time Gladman has not even bothered to send out information to residents, yet it has submitted a misleading "statement of community involvement" to the council. The company claims to have "completed a comprehensive programme of community engagement" but clearly there has been nothing of the sort.

Gladman have not, as they suggest in their covering letter submitted with the second application, made any attempt to engage with the community. I have read the Statement of community involvement and all the documentation refers to the original very limited, lazy and inadequate consultation they undertook. The covering letter of this application suggests that they received some favourable comments, examination of App. E fails to show any support whatsoever.

Gladman claim to have consulted with parish councillors and the local MP. The consultation letters were sent out to those persons in mid March when the corona virus pandemic was already the single most important matter to be considered nationwide.

Gladman claim to have gained public opinion in 2018. However, no attempt was made to speak to the people of the village. There appears to have been a meeting with Wetheral Parish Council (no minutes submitted). Again this was performed in 2018 - it is now 2020. There has been NO attempt to engage recently. I refer to Statement of Community Involvement 2.1.4 This is in fact a false statement. In fact it has been a shock to the community to see this has once again been submitted.

On reviewing the letter written on 11th March 2020 to Wetheral Parish Council, it appears to have been sent at a very convenient time around COVID-19 self isolation. It was written and sent on the 11th and Wetheral Parish Council closed due to Coronavirus on 17th March. There is also a Scotby Village Community Hall, no correspondence seems to have been sent there.

Most of all I feel highly aggrieved at the false statements and pure lack of consultation to the public and village members of Scotby. Consultation with Wetheral

Parish Council via a letter 3-5 days before lockdown during a pandemic, is actually insulting

It is said that Gladman have consulted with the local populace, they have not been in contact with me

The applicant has issued a totally misleading statement of community involvement. They have always refused to meet Scotby residents and, during the current pandemic crisis, have not sought or shared any information with residents living near the site or the wider community

There has also been no public consultation or engagement from Gladman regarding this latest proposal and it is clear there is opposition to the plan.

Contrary to the developer's assertion, this revised application has not been the subject of any public consultation with local residents and its submission has come as a complete surprise to everyone

I also note that Gladman have not engaged with any public consultation regarding this 'new' application, which I had understood to be an obligation, even though they have claimed to have done so.

The applicant asserts that it has "completed a comprehensive programme of community engagement" and has "therefore re-engaged with the community prior to the submission of this second application". It has not. Further, the exercise undertaken in respect of the previous application was purely 'box ticking'. Apart from three neutral comments every comment was one of opposition, which the applicant has totally ignored. In respect of this current application the applicant has wrongly asserted that some of the previous comments were supportive in nature. They were not

In the Statement of Community Involvement that the applicant has submitted it has stated that it "has sought to submit a second application that address the reasons refusal". It has not. The new application does nothing to address the reasons for refusal. This is clear from the fact that the Planning Statement submitted in respect of the new application repeats virtually word-for-word the Planning Statement submitted in respect of the previous application

In the Statement of Community Involvement the applicant has stated that it has "completed a comprehensive programme of community engagement" and has "therefore re-engaged with the community prior to the submission of this second application". That is simply not true. Although the Parish Council and a few local councillors may have been written to directly there has been absolutely no engagement with the local community as such. Neither is it true (again so far as I have been able to identify) that the previous consultations produced "some level of support" as the applicant asserts.

In this regard, the applicant has purported to rely upon the community involvement it undertook in relation to the 2018 application (18/1044) notwithstanding that there was no genuine community involvement, such as a public meeting, at that stage and written comments submitted to the applicant were simply ignored.

That said, as the applicant has sought to rely upon that previous exercise, it is reasonable for me, in similar vein, to rely upon the open letter in the form of a petition that I and others gathered from residents in Scotby opposing the previous application, which was eventually signed by 234 individuals; I still have the signatures if they are required. The applicant's submission of the present application during the period of the current Coronavirus 'lockdown' regime (some would say deliberately and cynically so) has made it impossible to collect signatures in support of a petition on this occasion but there is no reason to think that an equivalent number of residents, if not more, would not sign such a petition in respect of this identical application if it had been possible to make one available. Indeed, this is borne out by the fact that in only a few days over 700 people have signed the online E-petition objecting to the new application

### Other issues raised

The request was rightly dismissed in June 2019, the tactics being taken by this speculative developer are disgraceful. Trying to reapply multiple applications with misleading information attached and no change to submission after the community and council rejected it less than 12 months ago. This only adds to the stress and cost to our community and council at this difficult time. A disgraceful practise, an utterly disgraceful tactic and should be quickly rejected without further harm being caused.

Contrary to the dismissive submissions of the applicant, the land is of archaeological importance

This application appears to simply be a resubmission of the one which was refused last year. One can't help but think that the developer is trying to take advantage of the terrible situation that we are all trying our best to deal with, presented by the pandemic.

I strongly suggest a site visit by the planning committee should be done in conjunction with Scotby residents to discuss the environment and social impact such a proposal has that verifies that these objections are valid.

It is an absolute disgrace that this developer has chosen this time of crisis to re-submit a planning application which was thrown out by Carlisle CC unanimously. There is no need for a further 90 houses to be built in a small village. It is simply greed on the part of the developer, yet again.

One Councillor condemned Gladman's last proposal for Scotby as being "speculation of the most mercenary sort.". Let's hope the Planning Committee once again see this application for exactly what it is.

This development has previously been refused after vociferous opposition from the community.

It is very similar to the last application they put in for 80 houses which was rightly rejected straight away 11-0 in December '19 and all they have changed is an extra 10 houses with a bit of green in the middle?

We have been told that this is agricultural land (not to be built on) so we feel as a community that this Gladman company who has recently changed their name slightly after being unsuccessful last time are just trying their luck, by all accounts they do this with several sites even if rejected.

I am completely appalled that Gladman have submitted this application again especially at this time of major crisis in the country. How could they be so devious?

I objected to this planning application last time as did plenty of other villagers.

Thankfully it was rejected in June 2019 and if the council has any sense it will reject it in 2020.

How low will these developers stoop. Trying to sneak virtually the same application through in a time of national emergency.

The original plan was unanimously defeated and there is no good reason to change such decision.

This is a cynical ploy at the worst of times, for financial gain , nothing more. We totally oppose such scheme and demand it is thrown out again.

These 'land grabbers' should not be allowed to bring their 'bully boy' tactics to bear and I rely on the strong wills of the Cumbrian people to reject this proposal once and for all!

Awful to see a re-attempt to gain planning permission in Scotby once again.

Especially in this climate where Covid-19 is dominating our lives and many are suffering loss. I strongly believe this would negatively impact the village and applying for planning that is widely unwanted by the village will only cause more stress on the community in this trying time. It is disgusting that people are using the distraction of the Coronavirus to make some money.

It is unbelievable that Gladman after unanimous rejection of their previous application 18/1044 (in which they did not even attend the planning meeting or submit an appeal); should have the audacity to once again submit this "new"

proposal.

Gladman are not a local company, let them build on their own doorstep.

It looks as though they are using the lockdown to ride roughshod over objections.

The Council rejected them the last time, let's hope they see sense and do it again.

I hope we can count on Mr John Stevenson again.

If ever we needed proof of underhanded, money grabbing, profiteering tactics this re-application of planning by Gladman at Scotby has to be it.

The timing of this application alone shows the very depths that Gladman are willing to stoop to in a quest to make a quick Buck.

The Country is on its knee's due to the worst Pandemic in 100 years with social distancing a must, which in turn makes knocking doors and interaction between the residents of Scotby all the more difficult.

Because of this the ability of the village residents to come together a cement there appeal is severely compromised.

The fact that Gladman would see this as an opportunity to sneak through another application is nothing short of disgraceful.

I find it disgraceful that Gladman would re-apply for planning permission at Scotby after losing 11 votes to 0 the last time, but doing so under the present desperate and dangerous times the whole of the country is going through is nothing short of unbelievable

Gladman are nothing but a money making machine with no thought at all for the good people of Scotby.

Gladman appear to have deliberately timed the submission of this application to this period of time when the local community and indeed councillors are not able to respond in a well coordinated and informed way.

I trust that the Gladman plea that they have had not had a response to date from the parish councillors is ignored as a cynical tactic on their part.

In this current pandemic climate it is disgraceful how this is being pushed through.

Many of us that live in Scotby and particularly in Alders Edge are emergency workers currently working long hard shifts on the front line during COVID-19. To now have the added stress of potentially bringing home a lethal virus to our families, working during this time when more than half the population are staying at home and having to deal with an influx of workers building an estate opposite where we live whilst trying to work shifts, is actually a disgrace. Have we lost the ability to have any moral compass anymore?.

Noise Assessment Document: At no point has it been noted what the disturbance and noise level will do to the local community and those that live opposite the building works will do to their quality of lives, families and sleep patterns. As previously stated most of us are Emergency workers that do shifts

Gladman are taking advantage of the villagers / whole country undergoing the extreme difficulties of a national pandemic whereby the community is unable to convene meetings or conduct door to door leafleting for discussions with the residents and are trying to get through Planning in a devious manner

To resubmit an application in the present crisis seems to be one of hoping to get through planning as there can be no social contacting , meetings arranged by residents , as well as any communication by Gladman.

Many residents may not be aware of the renewed application and many will still be self isolating

As the proposal is contrary to the Local Plan, I feel the developer has cynically exploited the current Covid pandemic to try and push their application through without proper local consultation.

I am appalled that Gladman are using this time of national crisis as an opportunity to try and push through their plans. A time when it is difficult for local villagers to mount opposition and when Councils and their staff are stretched with trying to cope under the pressure of dealing with the effects of the health crisis

The residents of Scotby have been subjected to the inconveniences of construction

work relentlessly in recent years. We are fed up with noise, filthy roads, road closures, temporary traffic lights and heavy goods traffic. Enough is enough Planning authorities do not take into account the emotional views of people but it has been recognised by the national government that during and after this pandemic which may last for years, essential workers, many of whom live in Scotby and have objected to this proposal, will be traumatised by what they have experienced. Their health and well being should be of paramount importance in the rejection of this proposal by Gladman but in this culture of greed, money seems to be more important than the health and well being of people

4.2 The letter of support raise the following point:  
No objection.

4.3 In addition the local MP John Stevenson has raised the following points:

The reapplication is unhelpful and a distraction from The Garden Village development, which is an exciting project for Carlisle. Developers such as Gladman's should be encouraged to use their resources to plan housing developments within the local plan, which has been consulted on and democratically passed by the council.

## 5. Summary of Consultation Responses

### **Cumbria County Council:**

#### ***Local Highway Authority (LHA) response:***

The outline / revised planning application under consideration is for the erection of 90 dwellings with all matters reserved except for the main vehicular access. The site proposed has a complex planning history whereby in 2018 an outline application (18/1044) was rejected by the planning authority and it should also be noted that the land is not allocated within the Carlisle Local Plan.

As part of the Highways Authority response to the planning application 18/1044 it was stated that although no objections were raised in principal to the development, a secondary emergency vehicle access was to be added. It was also stated that details demonstrating the visibility splays for the emergency vehicle and main accesses were to be submitted for comment to the Highways Authority.

Following on from the initial Highways Authority response to this application dated 26 May 2020 the applicant has been in detailed discussions regarding the Emergency Vehicle Access (EVA)

and visibility splays associated with the proposed access into the development. The applicant submitted revised plans illustrating the location of the 30mph zone and demonstrated that visibility splays of 2.4m x 60m can be achieved for the main access and EVA in accordance with the Cumbria Development Design Guide. The applicant has proposed that an emergency access will share the western footway of the main access into the development from the C1038. The Western footway is proposed to be 3.7m in width and removable bollards are to be present to prevent misuse. This provision in principal is acceptable to the Highways Authority; however the applicant is to confirm that the EVA serves the entirety of the 90 dwellings proposed. It is deemed that this information can be provided at a later stage

of the planning process and secured through the use of an appropriate planning condition which is stated at the end of this response. It is also considered that the details of the internal layout can be appropriately conditioned and should be in line with the Cumbria Development Design Guide. Parking details will also be a requirement of any reserved matters application.

With regards to the Transport Assessment submitted by the applicant; this document was previously commented upon in 2018 as part of the planning application 18/1044 and was found to be acceptable by the Highways Authority. Therefore no further comments are to be made with regards to this document. The applicants Travel Plan is considered to be appropriate and has identified that a s106 contribution for monitoring etc. is likely to be required. Cumbria County Council will therefore be seeking contribution for the following item associated with highways as follows: –

Travel Plan Monitoring - £6600

Therefore to conclude the comments above, the Highways Authority have no objections with regards to the approval of planning permission subject to the conditions stated at the end of this response being applied to any consent you may wish to grant.

**LLFA response:**

As stated previously, the planning application currently under consideration is for access only with all other matters reserved. As such the drainage arrangement are to be conditioned as part of this application to be discharged through a later reserved matters application. However, comment will be made on the Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) and infiltration test results submitted. As stated within the previous response to the planning application 18/1044, although the Environment Agency mapping does not indicate a flood risk from fluvial sources and limited risk

from surface water, it is noted that the FRA identifies water ponding along the north east boundary of the proposed development site. It was concluded that the ponded water is seeping under the track to appear as surface water flow to Pow Maughan (Main River) within the boundary of the Escott House garden. As stated, there may therefore be a blocked outfall from the site across third party land. A second 150mm pipe enters nearby from a different direction, with water flowing. It is considered that further investigation of these culverts should be carried out and potential monitoring of water levels should be undertaken to determine what impact this may have on the development. As part of the FRA the consultant has provided some details regarding a potential surface water drainage scheme. It is noted from the information on the soakaway tests that infiltration is not to be considered as a method of surface water disposal due to poor infiltration rates. The LLFA have reviewed the infiltration test results submitted by the applicant and find it acceptable that infiltration is not a viable method of surface water disposal on this site. As such, and in accordance with the drainage hierarchy stated within the Cumbria Development Design Guide, surface water discharge is to be via an attenuation basin to Pow Maughan. In principle, subject to suitable design this may be an adequate means of surface water disposal. However, it is noted that the discharge pipe from the development site will need to cross 3rd party land and this connection is not included within the red line boundary of



the site plan. Therefore, confirmation that an agreement has been made with the adjoining landowner and a revised red line boundary should be provided prior to planning permission being submitted.

As stated within the Cumbria Development Design Guide, attenuation is to be provided on site to accommodate a 1 in 100 year plus 40% to account for climate change storm event. The applicant at a later stage of the planning process is to submit detailed calculations stating how the drainage network is accommodating this attenuation and also that the discharge rate from the site is controlled through a hydro brake to the green field runoff rate. The green field runoff rate has been calculated within the FRA at 14.2l/s. The LLFA has no objections with regards to this figure being the green field runoff rate and with the total discharge from the site into Pow Maughan being equal to 14.2l/s. It should be noted by the applicant that the attenuation that is to be provided is to be through a series of rain gardens, permeable paving, attenuation ponds and swales. It is the preference of the LLFA that drainage features are not piped but surface features which are easily maintainable and provide additional biodiversity benefits.

Therefore to conclude the Lead Local Flood Authority have no objections in principal with regards to the approval of planning permission as the current application considers the access only.

However, further information is required regarding the drainage network and flood risk on site. As such the conditions stated at the end of this response are to be applied to any consent you may wish to grant.

***Education response:***

As outlined in the County Council's Planning Obligation Policy a population-led model has been used as no dwelling mix has been provided at this stage it estimated to yield 31 children: 18 primary and 13 secondary pupils for the schools.

The site is in the catchment areas of Scotby CE School (0.65 mile) for primary education and Central Academy (2.71 miles) for secondary education. The next nearest primary school to the proposed development is St Cuthbert's Catholic School (2.12 miles) but is not within the statutory walking distance. The next nearest secondary school is Newman Catholic School (2.71 miles) which is currently relocated to another site in Carlisle due to flood damage, and Trinity School (2.98 miles).

Currently there is one development affecting the primary catchment school used for this assessment and there are thirty seven for the secondary schools.

**Primary**

There are 5 spaces available in the catchment school of Scotby CE School. However, after other developments in the area are taken in to consideration there are insufficient spaces to accommodate the pupil yield of 18 from this development. It is considered that taking into account existing loyalty trends the next school that parents are likely to send their children to is

Cumwhinton Primary School, and a scheme has been identified for expansion at the school. This is considered the best solution to provide capacity in the east of Carlisle as this is where the impact will be from developments in Cumwhinton, Scotby and Wetheral will be.

Therefore, an education contribution of £292,644 (18 x £16,258) is required. A multiplier of £16,258 has been used which is the £12,051 multiplier identified in the County Council Planning Obligations Policy (2018) index linked using the BCIS All in Tender Price Indexation.

#### Secondary

When considering the effect on pupil numbers from known levels of housing development across Carlisle, it is considered that there will be insufficient places available in Central Academy to accommodate the secondary pupil yield from this development.

The approach to seeking contributions for secondary school provision has been accepted at the recent planning appeal APP/E0915/W/17/3179674: Land at Harker Industrial Estate, CA6 4RF.

Therefore an education contribution of £324,090 (13 x £24,930) is required. A multiplier of £24,930 has been used which is the £18,188 multiplier identified in the County Council Planning Obligations Policy (2018) index linked using the BCIS All in Tender Price Indexation.

#### School Transport

Primary - Taking into account there are no primary school within the statutory walking distance of 2 miles along a safe route a contribution is required.

We have priced for a suitable vehicle based at £140 per day. For primary school, a ten-year contribution is required.

Based on a 190 day school year, the calculation is therefore: £140 x 190 days x 10 years = £266,000

Secondary - Subject to the contribution being provided for secondary school capacity no contribution will be sought for secondary school transport.

#### **Public Rights of Way comments:**

There are no recorded public rights of way in the vicinity of the proposed development area. Therefore, no objections are raised with regards to the proposals from a Public Rights of Way perspective.

#### **Conclusion:**

No objections are raised with regards to the approval of planning permission subject to the following conditions being applied to any consent you may wish to grant:

*The carriageway, footways, footpaths, cycleways etc shall be designed, constructed, drained and lit to a standard suitable for adoption; Ramps shall be provided on each side of every junction to enable wheelchairs, pushchairs etc. to be safely manoeuvred at kerb lines; The development shall not commence until visibility splays providing clear visibility of 60 metres measured 2.4 metres down the centre of the access road and the nearside channel line of the carriageway edge have been provided at the junction of the access road with the county highway and for the emergency vehicular access; Any existing highway fence/wall boundary shall be reduced to a height not exceeding 1.05m above the carriageway level of the adjacent highway; Details of all measures to be taken by the applicant/developer to prevent surface water discharging onto or off the highway; Details showing the provision within the site for the parking, turning and loading and unloading of vehicles visiting the site; Submission of a Travel Plan; A Construction Traffic Management Plan; A surface water drainage scheme; A construction surface water management plan; A condition and capacity survey of the*

*culverted watercourses (or piped drainage system) within the development site*

**Northern Gas Networks:** - No objections

**Wetheral Parish Council:** -

Objection - On 7th June 2019, application 18/1044 by Gladman Development Limited of the land at Rookery Park (South of Alders Edge), for the erection of up to 90 dwellings, open spaces, landscaping and Sustainable Drainage System (SuDS) and vehicle access point from the Scotby to Wetheral Road (outline), was unanimously rejected by the Development Control Committee of Carlisle City Council, confirming the views of the Senior Case Officer, Chris Hardman. An attempt has been made, by means of cosmetic enhancements, to make the second application more palatable. None of these enhancements, however, come close to overriding the reasons for the refusal of permission last year. The reasons being:-

- a. Failure to meet the Criteria 1 & 3 of Policy HO 2 (Windfall Development) of the Carlisle District Local Development Plan 2015 -2030. "The scale of the development would not be appropriate to the scale and character of Scotby".
- b. Failure to adhere to Criteria 8 of Policy SP 2 (Strategic Growth) of the Carlisle District Local Development Plan 2015 – 2030. "The application failed to demonstrate the overriding need for additional housing at this location".
- c. Contrary to Policy GI 1 (Landscape) of the Carlisle District Local Development Plan 2015 - 2030. "The open nature of this landscape would be eroded".

There had been 765 objections via e-mail and some 195 letters of objection, together with objections by Wetheral Parish Council.

This new application 20/0279 by Gladman Development Limited, for the same site and for the erection of up to 90 dwellings, open spaces, landscaping, Sustainable Drainage System (SUDS) and vehicle access point from the Scotby to Wetheral Road (outline), is almost the same apart from a wide tree-lined avenue diagonally across the site from the access point.

"Public open space would be created through the centre of the proposed development maintaining a connection from the Village Green through the site and to the wider countryside beyond". However, the Landscape & Visual Assessment document states:- "The site does provide a connection to the wider countryside, notably with key views from the village green," and that, "The proposed development will alter the character of the site from agricultural land to residential," which the document states will have an ADVERSE effect upon the site.

1. Policy HO 2 (Windfall Development) Criteria 1 & 3 states: "On the edge of settlements it must be well contained within the existing landscape features, physically connected and integrated with the settlement and not lead to unacceptable intrusion into open countryside". This development is not appropriate to Scale, Form, Function & Character of the existing settlement. It does not enhance or maintain the vitality of the rural community. It is not contained within the existing landscape features and does not integrate with the settlement but does lead to an unacceptable intrusion into open countryside.

2. Criterion 8 of Policy SP 2 (Strategic Growth and Distribution) states that development in open countryside will be assessed against the need for it to

be in the specified location. Nowhere does the application succeed in demonstrating an overriding need for additional housing in this location. Scotby has, by any reasonable judgement, undergone its share of residential development since the inception of the current Local Plan.

Windfall Sites Approved:- Alders Edge (45), The Plains (42), Broomfallen Road (12) 6 being Gypsy Pitches, Lambley Bank (9), Parkett Hill (6) and Wellgate (1).

Allocated Sites:- Carlisle District Local Development Plan 2015- 2030 - Meadowbrook (213), Kinmont Rise (28) in the process of being built and Scotby Road/Hill Head (84) house type and layout not yet approved.

Total approximately 400. Further, this Policy states that developments must be of 'an appropriate scale and nature' and 'commensurate with their setting' and must 'enable rural communities to thrive'. It is difficult to see how this development, bringing almost 100 houses and more than 2,000 vehicle movements a week, can be of an appropriate scale. Nor, by putting such additional strain on already overburdened infrastructure – roads, health facilities, drains, schools – can it enable the community to thrive. The local bus service has been stopped due to COVID-19 but may not be reinstated. Scotby Junior School is in the process of reducing the numbers of pupils, for financial reasons, to 7 classes of 30 pupils, e.g. 210 as opposed to 264 currently. A development which severs a valued village green's physical and visual connectivity with the countryside beyond is not commensurate with the setting of the village. By the damage it would do to the sense of community, place and history, it would fail to enable the community to thrive.

3. Policy HE 2. The site lies within an area of high archaeological potential as stated by Historic England. There is not, as stated in the planning application, merely a moderate amount of evidence.

4. Policy HO 1. The application is contrary to this policy in that Carlisle City Council can demonstrate a 5-year supply of deliverable housing, therefore, there is no obligation to consider the development.

5. Policy GI 1 (Landscape) of the Local Plan seeks to ensure that development will be appropriate to its surroundings and suitably accommodated within the landscape, and that landscapes 'will be protected from excessive, harmful or inappropriate development'. Following the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment, this site was specifically excluded from the Local Plan, as the open nature of the landscape would be eroded and harmed by development, contrary to Policy GI 1.

6. Access - The width of the Scotby/Wetheral road at the access is only 5 metres, due to the addition of a footpath on the north side as part of the Alders Edge development. The access is on an incline up to the village centre and in winter conditions is hazardous due to icing. Finally, the proposed access is on a bend with poor visibility and there will be up to 200 vehicle movements each day to and from the development. Visibility could be improved if the access were moved to a safer site further to the east, near Escott House.

This application should be refused as before, as there is little difference to that which was refused in 2019.

**Local Environment, Waste Services:** - As this is an outline only application, I await the detailed reserved matters showing the road layout and access for our waste collection vehicles.

## **Cumbria County Council - (Archaeological Services): -**

The applicant has helpfully commissioned a geophysical survey of the site. The results show a small number of geophysical anomalies of potential archaeological interest on the site. Furthermore, there is the potential for buried archaeological assets of a similar nature to the Iron Age remains in the adjacent field to survive on the site that would not necessarily be identified by the geophysical survey. Also, remains of a small complex of buildings shown on early historic maps and which have disappeared by the mid-19th century may also survive on site. Any assets that do survive are considered to be of local significance and will be disturbed by the construction of the proposed development.

In the event planning consent is granted, the site is subject to further archaeological investigation and recording in advance of development. This work should be commissioned and undertaken at the expense of the developer and can be secured through the inclusion of a condition in any planning consent.

## **Local Environment - Environmental Protection: -**

### **Noise & vibration**

Consideration should be given to limit the permitted hours of work in order to protect any nearby residents from possible statutory noise nuisance, this includes vibration. Any other appropriate noise mitigation measures should be considered, for example, the use of noise attenuation barriers, the storage/unloading of aggregates away from sensitive receptors and the use of white noise reversing alarms, where possible. These measures should aim to minimise the overall noise disturbance during the construction works.

### **Dust**

It is necessary to protect any nearby residents or sensitive receptors from statutory nuisance being caused by dust from the site. Given that the site is located in a residential area it would be advisable to consider all appropriate mitigation measures. Vehicles carrying materials on and off site must be sheeted or otherwise contained, water suppression equipment should be present on site at all times and used when required, wheel wash facilities should be made available for vehicles leaving site and piles of dusty material should be covered or water suppression used.

### **Contamination.**

In the event that contamination is found at any time when carrying out the approved development that was not previously identified it must be reported in writing immediately to the Local Planning Authority. An investigation and risk assessment must be undertaken and where remediation is necessary a remediation scheme must be prepared, which is subject to the approval in writing of the Local Planning Authority. Further guidance can be found on the Carlisle City Council website "Development of Potentially Contaminated Land and Sensitive End Uses – An Essential Guide For Developers."

Site investigations should follow the guidance in *BS10175:2011 (or updated version) "Investigation of Potentially Contaminated Sites.- Code of Practice "*. Following completion of measures identified in the approved remediation scheme a verification report must be prepared, which is subject to the approval in writing of the Local Planning Authority.

**Reason:** To ensure that risks from land contamination to the future users of the land and neighbouring land are minimised, together with those to controlled waters, property and ecological systems, and to ensure that the development can be carried out safely without unacceptable risks to workers, neighbours and other offsite receptors.

**Air Quality and Transport**

Measures that encourage the use of zero-emission modes of transport should be included in the development proposal. The aim is to minimise future impacts on air quality. It is recommended that the developer provides at least one electric vehicle charging point per dwelling, with off street parking. The use of rapid charging points in communal parking areas should also be implemented. This recommendation is supported by the following:

**Institute of Air Quality Management (IAQM)**

The provision of charging points is in line with current IAQM 'Land-Use Planning & Development Control: Planning for Air Quality' guidance (2017).

Section 5 states:

"The provision of at least 1 Electric Vehicle (EV) "fast charge" point per 10 residential dwellings and/or 1000m<sup>2</sup> of commercial floorspace. Where on-site parking is provided for residential dwellings, EV charging points for each parking space should be made".

**The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)**

This was updated in February 2019 and concisely sets out national policies and principles on land use planning. Paragraph 105 states:

"If setting local parking standards for residential and non-residential development, policies should take into account: ...e) the need to ensure an adequate provision of spaces for charging plug-in and other ultra-low emission vehicles".

Paragraph 103 of the NPPF states:

".... Significant development should be focused on locations which are or can be made sustainable, through limiting the need to travel and offering a genuine choice of transport modes. This can help to reduce congestion and emissions and improve air quality and public health...".

**The Carlisle District Local Plan 2015-2030**

Carlisle City Council (CCC) adopted the Carlisle District Local Plan 2015-2030 in November 2016

Policy IP2 - Transport and Development:

*"Sustainable Vehicle Technology: Developers will be encouraged to include sustainable vehicle technology such as electric vehicle charging points within proposals".*

Paragraph 6.13 states: *".... consideration should be afforded to increasing electric charging provision wherever appropriate and possible".*

Policy CM5 – Environment and Amenity Protection:

*"The Council will only support development which would not lead to an adverse impact on the environment or health or amenity of future or existing occupiers".*

**Natural England - relating to protected species, biodiversity &**

**landscape:** - Natural England has no comments to make on this application.

Natural England has not assessed this application for impacts on protected species. Natural England has published Standing Advice which you can use

to assess impacts on protected species or you may wish to consult your own ecology services for advice.

Natural England and the Forestry Commission have also published standing advice on ancient woodland and veteran trees which you can use to assess any impacts on ancient woodland.

The lack of comment from Natural England does not imply that there are no impacts on the natural environment, but only that the application is not likely to result in significant impacts on statutory designated nature conservation sites or landscapes. It is for the local planning authority to determine whether or not this application is consistent with national and local policies on the natural environment.

**Planning - Access Officer:** - I would advise the trim trail/ nature track is of a suitably firm and level surface for wheelchair users and the ambulant disabled to access. There are no objections to the above application at this time.

**Cumbria Constabulary - North Area Community Safety Unit (formerly Crime Prevention):** -

Item 4.4.20 of the submitted Planning Statement refers to Policy CM 4 of the Local Plan, but states that crime prevention issues will be addressed at Reserved Matters stage. The comments in the published Design and Access Statement (Design and Safety: Creating Safer Places) are also noted. Of particular interest are the intentions to enhance natural surveillance of streets and open spaces, avoidance of blank walls and the incorporation of windows in corner elevations and gables.

In the event of this application receiving consent and an application relating to reserved matters being submitted, I shall particularly wish to establish how the design shall address definition of public and private space, car parking, lighting schemes and the protection of buildings against forced entry.

**Council for Protection of Rural England/Friends of the Lake District:** -

Friends of the Lake District (FLD) welcomes the opportunity to comment on the above application. We are the only charity wholly dedicated to protecting the landscape and natural environment of Cumbria and the Lake District.

FLD objected to an earlier iteration of this proposal (18/1044). Whilst we recognise that some amendments have been made to the application, including the proposal to route the main road through the site such that a visual corridor across the site will be created, **our objections, which largely related to the principle of development, still stand.** I have attached our response to 18/1044, which should be taken into account and taken as part of our response to 20/0279 along with the following further comments.

The previous application was refused unanimously by Carlisle City Council's Planning Committee and all three of the strongly-stated reasons for refusal apply equally to this application.

The Officer's report, with which the Committee unanimously agreed, concluded that the field is *"integral to linking the village directly to the surrounding countryside and significant views out of the settlement"* and that it would be *"difficult to justify describing the site as being well-contained within existing landscape features"*. It also made clear that permitting the application would:

- constitute “a departure from the Plan-led approach” (para. 6.22);
- be “significant in terms of scale” (para. 6.22);
- “put significant pressure on the community” (para. 6.23);
- be “an unacceptable intrusion into the countryside” (para. 6.25).

These factors all led the Officer and the committee to unanimously conclude that the proposal was contrary to Local Plan policy and to state the reasons for refusal. The reasons for refusal and these statements in the Officer’s report relate to the principle and scale of development at this site and are not matters that can be addressed through the amendments put forward in this new application.

The reasons for refusal were:

- Conflict with Carlisle Local Plan Policy HO2 (Windfall Housing Development) on the grounds that the proposed development would not be appropriate to the scale and character of Scotby and is in an area perceived as open countryside and not well contained or integrated into the village
- Conflict with Criterion 8 of Carlisle Local Plan Policy SP2 (Strategic Growth and Distribution) due to a failure to demonstrate an overriding need for the additional housing in this location
- Conflict with Carlisle Local Plan Policy GI1 (Landscape) on grounds that the development would erode the characteristics of and be harmful to this landscape type and due to the fact that this site was specifically excluded from the Local Plan on landscape grounds having been thoroughly assessed for landscape impact in its own right and against other alternatives.

Furthermore, the Officer’s report (para. 6.31) highlighted that whilst the Council does have a 5-year supply of housing land, even if it did not, this would not allow for permitting otherwise unsustainable or inappropriate development. This point is supported by evidence detailed in a recent letter from the Sussex branch of the Campaign to Protect Rural England (CPRE) to Chichester District Council. The letter, dated 5th May 2020, sought to draw the Council’s attention to “recent court cases which emphasise the primacy of the plan-led system, even in the face of a lack of a 5-year supply of housing land”. In doing so, it stated:

*“...in March of this year, Mr Justice Holgate dismissed land promoter Gladman Developments’ bid to overturn two appeal decisions blocking plans to build 240 homes in the Essex district of Uttlesford and another 120 near Corby in Northamptonshire. Given shortfalls in both authorities’ five-year supply, the claimants argued that this rendered the most important relevant development plan policies out of date and the “tilted balance” in favour of sustainable development set out in paragraph 11(d) of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) should therefore have been decisive in determining the appeals (DCS Numbers 200-008-785 and 200-008-716). Holgate’s verdict was grounded in the legal principle, set out in section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, that decisions on planning applications are governed by the development plan “read as a whole, unless other material considerations indicate otherwise”. He ruled that NPPF policies, including the tilted balance, do not have the same “force of statute” and “have to be understood in the context of the development plan-led system”. “The NPPF cannot and does not purport to displace or distort the primacy given by the presumption in section 38(6) to the statutory development plan,” he concluded.*



*This decision makes it clear that a lack of five-year supply does not reduce the weight of policies. Applicants will now need to argue why plan policies should be given reduced weight in the tilted balance. In short, the lack of a five-year housing land supply should not ‘open the door’ to inappropriate and speculative development”.*

As such, even if the Council’s position regarding housing land were to have changed since the previous decision, leaving it without a 5-year supply, this would and should not result in a different decision now, given the firmly established conflicts with Local Plan policy.

In addition to the above and in supplementing our earlier comments, we also wish to highlight that:

- Regarding our point about overdevelopment and in relation to the 2013-2020 delivery figures set out in SP2, we do recognise that there is a separate figure for 2020-2030 that indicates further development. However, the plan will be up for review before 2030 and policy SP2 itself makes clear that the figure for 2020-2030 must be adjusted to account for under- or over-delivery in the 2013-2020 period. The requirement to recalibrate the figures in the second phase to account for previous under or over delivery would serve no purpose if the delivery figures planned for were not, at the very least, meant to be indicative and/or if the prospect of excessive under- or over-delivery was considered to be of no consequence.
- Over-development of a settlement does not relate only to strain on its infrastructure capacity but also to the capacity of the environment to accommodate development and change, including change to the area’s character and to the settlement’s character.
- Whilst Scotby has some services and facilities, people living there have to travel to Carlisle for higher level services, this will include children travelling for school given the evidence that the local primary does not have capacity for the additional pupils that expected as a result of the proposed development and that they will need to travel to school elsewhere. This therefore also brings into question the sustainability of locating large numbers of new houses in the village as it will not reduce the need to travel.

On grounds of the above, in conjunction with our earlier comments, which should be taken as part of our response, **this application should be refused.**

#### **United Utilities: -**

##### ***Drainage***

In accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and the National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG), the site should be drained on a separate system with foul water draining to the public sewer and surface water draining in the most sustainable way. Following our review of the submitted Flood Risk Assessment, ref: 6259/R2 revision B dated April 2020, proposing surface water discharging into the local watercourse, Pow Maughan, we can confirm we have no objection to the proposed development in principle. Should planning permission be granted, we would request a drainage condition is attached to any subsequent Decision Notice.

Please note, United Utilities are not responsible for advising on rates of discharge to the local watercourse system. This is a matter for discussion with the Lead Local Flood Authority and / or the Environment Agency (if the watercourse is classified as main river).

If the applicant intends to offer wastewater assets forward for adoption by United Utilities, the proposed detailed design will be subject to a technical appraisal by an Adoptions Engineer as we need to be sure that the proposal meets the requirements of Sewers for Adoption and United Utilities' Asset Standards. The detailed layout should be prepared with consideration of what is necessary to secure a development to an adoptable standard. This is important as drainage design can be a key determining factor of site levels and layout. The proposed design should give consideration to long term operability and give United Utilities a cost effective proposal for the life of the assets. Therefore, should this application be approved and the applicant wishes to progress a Section 104 agreement, we strongly recommend that no construction commences until the detailed drainage design, submitted as part of the Section 104 agreement, has been assessed and accepted in writing by United Utilities. Any work carried out prior to the technical assessment being approved is done entirely at the developer's own risk and could be subject to change.

### ***Management and Maintenance of Sustainable Drainage Systems***

Without effective management and maintenance, sustainable drainage systems can fail or become ineffective. As a provider of wastewater services, we believe we have a duty to advise the Local Planning Authority of this potential risk to ensure the longevity of the surface water drainage system and the service it provides to people. We also wish to minimise the risk of a sustainable drainage system having a detrimental impact on the public sewer network should the two systems interact. We therefore recommend the Local Planning Authority include a condition in their Decision Notice regarding a management and maintenance regime for any sustainable drainage system that is included as part of the proposed development. We recommend the Local Planning Authority consults with the Lead Local Flood Authority regarding the exact wording of any condition.

Please note United Utilities cannot provide comment on the management and maintenance of an asset that is owned by a third party management and maintenance company. We would not be involved in the discharge of the management and maintenance condition in these circumstances.

### ***Water Supply***

Our water mains may need extending to serve any development on this site and the applicant may be required to pay a contribution.

It is the applicant's responsibility to demonstrate the exact relationship between any United Utilities' assets and the proposed development. We recommend the developer contacts United Utilities for advice on identifying the exact location of the water main.

If the applicant intends to obtain a water supply from United Utilities for the proposed development, we strongly recommend they engage with us at the earliest opportunity. If reinforcement of the water network is required to meet the demand, this could be a significant project and the design and construction period should be accounted for.

### ***United Utilities' Property, Assets and Infrastructure***

The applicant should be aware of water mains in the vicinity of the proposed development site. Whilst this infrastructure is located outside the applicant's proposed red line boundary, the applicant must comply with our '*Standard Conditions for Works Adjacent to Pipelines*'. We provide this information to support the applicant in identifying the potential impacts from all construction

activities on United Utilities infrastructure and to identify mitigation measures to protect and prevent any damage to this infrastructure both during and after construction. This includes advice regarding landscaping in the vicinity of pipelines.

It is the applicant's responsibility to investigate the possibility of any United Utilities' assets potentially impacted by their proposals and to demonstrate the exact relationship between any United Utilities' assets and the proposed development.

## **6. Officer's Report**

### **Assessment**

- 6.1 Section 70(2) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990/ Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 requires that proposals be determined in accordance with the development plan, unless material considerations indicate otherwise.
- 6.2 The relevant planning policies against which the application is required to be assessed are Policies SP1, SP2, SP6, SP8, SP9, HO1, HO2, HO4, IP1, IP2, IP3, IP4, IP5, IP6, IP8, CC3, CC4, CC5, CM2, CM4, CM5, GI1, GI3, GI4 and GI6 of The Carlisle District Local Plan 2015-2030 and the council's Supplementary Planning Documents (SPD) "Achieving Well Design Housing" and "Trees and Development" are also material planning considerations.
- 6.3 The requirements of the public sector equality duty under Section 149 of the Equality Act 2010; and the "Guidelines for Public Transport In Developments" (1999) and "Reducing Mobility Handicaps" (1991) both prepared by the Chartered Institution of Highways & Transport CIHT) are also material considerations. Section 149(1) of the Equality Act 2010 establishes a duty to have due regard to three identified needs in the delivery of public services and the exercise of public powers, namely:
  - a) to eliminate discrimination, harassment, victimisation etc;
  - b) advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it; and
  - c) foster good relations between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it.
- 6.4 The relevant protected characteristics include age, gender, disability and race.
- 6.5 At a national level, other material considerations include the National Planning Policy Framework, February 2019 (the Framework/NPPF), Planning Practice Guidance (April 2014 as updated), the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010 (as amended), and the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act (2006).
- 6.6 The NPPF identifies 3 objectives for the planning system to perform under sustainable development, namely, an economic role, a social role and an environmental role.

6.7 Paragraph 11 of the NPPF highlights the presumption in favour of sustainable development. For decision-taking this means approving development proposals that accord with the development plan; or where there are no relevant development plan policies or the policies are out of date, grant permission unless:

- the policies of the Framework that protect areas or assets of particular importance provides a clear reason for refusing the development; or
- any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits when assessed against the policies in the Framework taken as a whole.

6.8 Section 40 of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act (2006) states that every public authority must have regard to the purpose of conserving biodiversity. Local planning authorities must also have regard to the requirements of the EC Habitats Directive (92/43/EEC) when determining a planning application as prescribed by regulation 3 (4) of the Conservation (Natural Habitats, &c.) Regulations 1994 (as amended), and Article 16 of the Habitats Directive before planning permission is granted. This is reflected in paragraph 175 of The NPPF that if significant harm to biodiversity resulting from a development cannot be avoided, adequately mitigated or as a last resort, compensated for, then planning permission should be refused.

6.9 The proposal raises the following planning issues:

### **1. The Principle Of Development**

6.10 Paragraph 12 of the NPPF states:

*“The presumption in favour of sustainable development does not change the status of the development plan as a starting point for decision making..... Local Planning Authorities may take decisions that depart from an up-to-date development plan, but only if material considerations in a particular case indicate that the plan should not be followed.”*

6.11 Carlisle District Local Plan 2015-30 was adopted by the City Council on the 8<sup>th</sup> November 2016 and whilst there have been two updates of the National Planning Policy Framework since that time it remains an up-to-date Development Plan for the purposes of making planning decisions.

6.12 Policy SP1 (Sustainable Development) follows the principles established in the NPPF and forms the basis for which sustainable development is then interpreted through the Local Plan policies.

6.13 Policy SP2 (Strategic Growth and Distribution), states that sufficient land will be identified to accommodate 9,606 net new homes between 2013 and 2030 including a minimum annualised average of:

- 478 net new homes between 2013 and 2020; and
- 626 net new homes between 2020 and 2030 (adjusted to have regard to delivery in the 2013-2020 period).

It goes on to state that approximately 70% of the growth will be focussed on

the urban area of Carlisle, with approximately 30% in the rural area. Specific sites have been identified within the Plan, alongside an allowance for windfall developments, to accommodate the majority of growth required. Strategic Policy SP2 (8) states that within the open countryside development will be assessed against the need to be in the location specified.

- 6.14 The site of this application is not an allocated site for residential development under Policy HO1 in the local plan. It is however worth noting that other sites have been allocated within the village of Scotby to help deliver the Local Plan targets above namely:  
R15 – Land north of Hill Head, east of Scotby Road (indicative yield 90)  
R16 – Land at Broomfallen Road (currently under construction)
- 6.15 In determining which sites to bring forward to allocations within the Local Plan an exercise was undertaken known as the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA). This process considered a number of sites throughout the district in order to formulate a deliverable Local Plan strategy by assessing the potential constraints to development and impacts on infrastructure. This assessment led to a number of sites being allocated for housing alongside the significant strategy to development south of Carlisle in what is now referred to as the St Cuthbert's Garden Village area.
- 6.16 Specifically in relation to this proposed site the SHLAA process considered a larger area under reference SC14 – Land at Townhead Farm. The December 2014 update of the assessment determined that the site should be discounted due to the unacceptable landscape impact and the site was therefore not allocated. The non-allocation of a site in a Local Plan does not prevent applications from being made on that site and each application has to be treated on its merits. It provides a contextual reference and as the site is not allocated it now falls to consideration under separate policy in the Local Plan namely, HO2 (Windfall Housing Development).
- 6.17 Policy HO2 states that:  
*“New housing development on sites other than those allocated will be acceptable within or on the edge of Carlisle, Brampton, Longtown and villages within the rural area provided that the development will not prejudice the delivery of the spatial strategy of the Local Plan and:*  
1 *the scale and design of the proposed development is appropriate to the scale, form, function and character of the existing settlement;*  
2 *the scale and nature of the development will enhance or maintain the vitality of the rural community within the settlement where the housing is proposed;*  
3 *on the edge of settlements the site is well contained within existing landscape features, is physically connected, and integrates with, the settlement, and does not lead to an unacceptable intrusion into open countryside;*  
4 *in the rural area there are either services in the village where the housing is being proposed, or there is good access to one or more villages with services, or to the larger settlements of Carlisle, Brampton or Longtown; and*  
5 *the proposal is compliant with adjacent land users.*

*Within rural settlements applicants will be expected to demonstrate how the proposed development will enhance or maintain the vitality of rural communities.*

*Applicants will be expected to work closely with those directly affected by their proposals to evolve designs that take account of the views of the community.”*

- 6.18 With regards to Policy HO2, the location of the site on the edge of Scotby conforms to the general intent of the policy however it must conform to the overall spatial strategy and satisfy the criteria within the policy.
- 6.19 In terms of the spatial strategy, Policy HO1 makes provision for allocations of housing development within Scotby. Members will be aware that Site R15 had a previous planning application which was deferred by Development Control Committee and has subsequently been withdrawn by the applicant. Site R16 has planning permission and work has commenced on site. It is therefore early in the plan process and the release of this site may prejudice the delivery of Site R15 but would not prejudice the delivery of Site R16. The spatial strategy of the plan did however allow for windfall sites to come forward with an overall allowance in the region of 100 dwellings per annum. This application is less than the envisaged windfall level for the district however other sites have also come forward in recent years within Scotby and other villages in the parish, providing further windfall permissions. Many of the objectors to the application raise concerns that with the other applications, Scotby has had more than its fair share of housing and the subsequent impacts on infrastructure.
- 6.20 In reviewing that position and the impact on the spatial strategy, a large site coming forward may have a significant impact but it is unlikely to be sufficient to prejudice the overall spatial strategy of the plan provided that the development is limited. Policy HO2 does not have a limit on the scale of individual or cumulative windfall sites however in the case of Scotby and some other settlements surrounding Carlisle it is clear to see that the pressure for development puts an uneven strain on infrastructure.

*1 the scale and design of the proposed development is appropriate to the scale, form, function and character of the existing settlement;*

- 6.21 Scotby is a linear village which historically grew up around the two railway lines and has expanded both northwards towards the A69 and south along Broomfallen Road. This site expands the historic central part of Scotby extending the village eastwards. The scale of the expansion is contained and mirrors that of the frontage for the Alders Edge development however such a large scale expansion into a field can be considered to be counter to the natural linear evolution of the settlement.
- 6.22 Criterion 1 of the policy is concerned with the scale and design of the proposed development being appropriate to the scale, form, function and character of the existing settlement. Whilst HO2 does not prescribe a size threshold for windfall, the addition of up to 90 dwellings is significant in terms of scale for this central section of the village. In addition, a windfall

development of this size is in essence a departure from the 'Plan led' approach, and undermines confidence in the Local Plan as being the document which gives the public and developers certainty about what development is going to happen and where. Indeed, national guidance states that the Local Plan should make clear what is intended to happen in the area over the life of the plan, where and when this will occur, and how it will be delivered.

*2 the scale and nature of the development will enhance or maintain the vitality of the rural community within the settlement where the housing is proposed;*

- 6.23 The scale of this application is similar to allocation of site R15 and therefore it could be argued that the scale of such a site has an established context for the village. It should be noted, however, that this application is additional to those existing allocations for housing and therefore will increase the village by a further 90 houses. This scale combined with other developments in the village is considered to be out-of-scale with the settlement and will put significant pressure on the rural community it seeks to integrate with. For services such as a village shop, any increase in housing would help to maintain the viability and it is therefore difficult to determine that such development would be detrimental to the community it serves. In this instance, however, it is clear that there is no additional capacity at the primary school. The other housing sites and allocations already progressing will put pressure on the local school but have been accepted as part of the Local Plan process and measures are in place to deal with the infrastructure. Members will also be aware that there have been a number of developments at Cumwhinton which impact on services in the parish including the other school within parish boundaries. The overall catchment, including from development on allocated sites on the edge of Carlisle, means that this further application will not enhance or maintain the vitality of the village but add to existing pressures.

*3 on the edge of settlements the site is well contained within existing landscape features, is physically connected, and integrates with, the settlement, and does not lead to an unacceptable intrusion into open countryside;*

- 6.24 This application site is on the edge of Scotby but well related by being close to the centre of the village. The site is part of a larger field and the proposal therefore includes landscaping which would contain the development. It is physically connected by its siting on the Wetheral-Scotby road opposite the recent Alders Edge development and a short walk to local services. Many objectors consider that the location of this proposal, close to the area used as the village green removes one of the only opportunities to link directly to the surrounding countryside from within the centre of the village. The agricultural field is integral to linking the village directly to the surrounding countryside and significant views out of the settlement.
- 6.25 For sites on the edge of villages, criterion 3 of the policy requires that sites are well contained within existing landscape features, physically connected to

and integrate with the settlement, and do not lead to an unacceptable intrusion into the open countryside. The perception of the site is, as outlined above, that of open countryside, and there are no landscape features which would lead to the site being described as integrating with the village. The open views across the site to the North Pennines also make it difficult to justify describing the site as being well contained within existing landscape features. The agent has sought to address this concern by proposing an indicative layout that would allow for a swathe of green landscape through the centre of the site to link directly towards the views to neighbouring fields. This is discussed further in the Landscape section of this report however the development of this site would nevertheless result in housing extending either side of this swathe and poses an unacceptable intrusion into the countryside.

*4 in the rural area there are either services in the village where the housing is being proposed, or there is good access to one or more villages with services, or to the larger settlements of Carlisle, Brampton or Longtown; and*

- 6.26 Scotby has a number of services including a school, a church, a village hall and a shop. This level of services would suggest that there are sufficient services where the housing is proposed. Concerns have been raised regarding the ability of those services to accommodate the development, particularly in relation to the primary school. This latter point is discussed further in the Education section of this report. Scotby is also close to Carlisle and therefore a higher level of services can be accessed. In principle this criterion of the policy can be achieved subject to details regarding education provision.

*5 the proposal is compliant with adjacent land users*

- 6.27 Adjacent land uses are residential in nature or open countryside. Whilst further details of design and layout will be required, the ability to site residential development adjacent to those other uses does not compromise the occupiers of that land. Concerns have been raised regarding property prices and individual views however these are not planning matters as long as the distances with the Council's SPD can be achieved. Concerns have also been raised about the impact of the development on traffic particularly in relation to the Wetheral-Scotby road and the parking of vehicles in relation to Alders Edge development. This latter point is discussed further in the highways/ access section of this report.

*Within rural settlements applicants will be expected to demonstrate how the proposed development will enhance or maintain the vitality of rural communities.*

- 6.28 This has been considered in paragraph 6.23 above.

*Applicants will be expected to work closely with those directly affected by their proposals to evolve designs that take account of the views of the community."*



- 6.29 Prior to the application being submitted the agents had carried out a re-consultation with local residents and attempted to engage with the Parish Council since their initial application. The response of local people has remained opposed to this development and therefore it has not been possible to fully engage in this process. The responses to consultation on this application have also indicated strong opposition to the development with little, if any, constructive responses as to how the design of the development may evolve. There have also been very few comments on the proposed change to the framework plan as people are opposed to the principle of development. This part of Policy HO2 should however not be used as a reason for refusing this application due to the endeavours of the applicants to engage prior to an application being submitted.
- 6.30 The application site is located in a sustainable location where there are a range of services accessible from the site however the development of this site will put pressure on existing services/ infrastructure and the form and scale of such a proposal will not enhance the settlement with which it seeks to integrate.
- 6.31 The applicant refers in their planning statement to the potential for the Council not to be able to provide a five-year supply of housing given that the supply is not significantly higher than 5 years. The Council maintains that it does have a sufficient supply of housing coming forward and therefore this application should be considered on its own merits. Measures are also being taken to continue to deliver the plan strategy with further consultation ongoing at the time of preparing this report, in relation to the St Cuthbert's Garden Village broad location for growth. Nevertheless, even if it were to be proven that there was not a five year supply of housing this does not provide for granting permission on sites that are considered to be unsustainable due to their impacts.
- 6.32 In the context of Policy HO2, the principle of housing on this site is deemed not to be acceptable and permission should be refused.

## **2. The Layout, Scale, Appearance And Landscaping**

- 6.33 Policies seek to ensure the development is appropriate in terms of quality to that of the surrounding area and that development proposals incorporate high standards of design including siting, scale, use of materials and landscaping which respect and, where possible, enhance the distinctive character of street scape and landscape. This theme is identified in Policy SP6 of the local plan which requires that development proposals should also harmonise with the surrounding buildings respecting their form in relation to height, scale and massing and make use of appropriate materials and detailing. Development of this site could have a significant impact on the character of the area unless it is sympathetically designed.
- 6.34 This application is an Outline application with all matters reserved except access. The application is accompanied by a design and access statement as well as an indicative masterplan. Both these documents indicate the potential layout of housing and the design influences which could be

incorporated at the reserved matters stage. As all these matters are reserved for a later application the requirements to comply with policies could be conditioned to ensure that the final scheme would be of a high quality and integrate well with the local context.

### **3. Impact On Landscape**

- 6.35 The application is accompanied by a Design and Access Statement which incorporates a section regarding landscape character and a response to the context of the landscape in evolving the development framework plan for the site.
- 6.36 It is noted that the landscape around Scotby is not within a designated landscape nevertheless the local landscape is important in determining whether or not development proposals can be assimilated into existing areas particularly where these seek to develop around the edge of settlements. Many concerns have been raised by the public in connection to this site and the context of the SHLAA when the site was discounted for development due to the impact on the landscape. Members of the public also noted that there are clear views across this site towards the North Pennines AONB.
- 6.37 It is therefore important to consider this context when assessing the potential landscape impact of this development. In the adopted Local Plan Policy GI1 – Landscapes - seeks to value all landscapes for their intrinsic character and protect them from excessive, harmful or inappropriate development. The core principle of the policy is that all landscapes matter, not just those that form part of national designations. The policy requires proposals for development to be assessed against the criteria presented within the Cumbria Landscape Character Guidance and Toolkit with regard to the particular area's key characteristics, local distinctiveness and capacity for change. The site lies within landscape sub type 5b, low farmland. The key characteristics include:
- Undulating and rolling topography;
  - Patchy areas of woodland;
  - Large rectangular fields;
  - Hedges, hedgerow trees and fences bound fields and criss-cross up and over the rolling landscape.
- 6.38 Sensitive characteristics or features include the traditional feel of villages being sensitive to unsympathetic village expansion, whilst the character is described as large scale and open, with wide and long-distance views to the fells.
- 6.39 Whilst Policy GI1 does not mean that development which incurs changes to landscapes should be resisted; rather that new development should be appropriate to its surroundings and be suitably accommodated within the landscape.
- 6.40 This site lies outside the build edge of the settlement of Scotby, although it is physically connected to it along its western and northern boundaries. When viewing the site from the T junction of the road to Wetheral with the main road

through Scotby, there are wide views across the whole site to the trees around the Pow Maughan beck and beyond as far as the North Pennines AONB. This is typical of landscape sub-type 5b. The roadside hedge reinforces the sense of leaving the village and moving into the open countryside. This open aspect is also visible from along the Scotby Road, across the small green area and through the gaps between and around the properties named as Holly Bush and Greenside.

- 6.41 The impact on the local landscape was identified as a reason to refuse the earlier application on this site. The agent has redesigned the proposed development framework to take account of this reason and propose a scheme which they consider addresses those concerns. The Development Framework Plan proposes a green swathe of land which would remain open across the centre of the site which would be visible and in a direct line from the bench on the green open space in the centre of the village. The submitted Landscape and Visual Assessment considers that the enhanced green infrastructure provided on the site enhances Scotby's connectivity to the wider countryside. The landscape enhancements would offset the loss of agricultural land. Whilst this provides connectivity to the surrounding landscape, the open nature of this site means that the housing development either side of the open space would still have a visual impact and impose in the general foreground on views of the surrounding area.
- 6.42 The proposed access which forms part of this proposal would also mean that from the view of the observer in the village the green swathe would have the main access road for the development along one side with its attendant street lighting (as it would have to be an adopted highway) and combined with housing, present a harder development edge than the current open nature of the site enclosing one side of the space. Whilst the use of a visual link to the surrounding countryside may work in some instances, development of the scale proposed on this site would still erode this open nature, and be harmful to the landscape, contrary to Policy GI1 and it is considered that the application should be refused on this basis.

#### **4. Whether The Proposal Would Adversely Affect The Amenity Of The Occupiers Of Neighbouring Properties**

- 6.43 When considering proposals for development it is important to consider the impacts that any development may have on existing occupiers of neighbouring properties. Planning does not protect the right to a view, it does however ensure that privacy remains important.
- 6.44 The city council's SPD "Achieving Well Designed Housing", on the matter of privacy, states that:

*"Where a development faces or backs onto existing development, in order to respect privacy within rooms a minimum distance of 21 metres should usually be allowed between primary facing windows (and 12 metres between any wall of the building and a primary window). However, if a site is an infill, and there is a clear building line that the infill should respect, these distances need not strictly apply. (para. 5.44) While it is important to protect the privacy of*

*existing and future residents, the creation of varied development, including mews style streets, or areas where greater enclosure is desired, may require variations in the application of minimum distances." (para. 5.45)*

- 6.45 Moreover, criterion 7 of Policy SP6 of the local plan requires that proposals ensure that there is no adverse effect on residential amenity or result in unacceptable conditions for future users and occupiers of the development.
- 6.46 As such, it is considered that the main issues revolve around the impacts on the occupiers of the proposed dwellings as well as the existing neighbours concerning not only potential losses in privacy but also such matters as whether any element would be oppressive; cause losses in daylight/visible sky; and/or cause overshadowing/losses in sunlight.
- 6.47 This application is in outline form with matters relating to layout and scale reserved for a future application. These will primarily impact on neighbouring properties and therefore at this stage, providing that conditions are used to ensure compliance with the relevant policies there would be no conflict in relation to residential amenity.

## **5. Highway Issues and Accessibility**

- 6.48 It should be noted that although this application is Outline with some matters reserved, access is not a reserved matter and therefore approving this application will also approve the proposed access arrangement for the site. The land currently has a farm access gate at the north western corner of the site on the Wetheral-Scotby road.
- 6.49 The application submitted a transport assessment (TA) and travel plan as part of the application. It is proposed to continue to provide access to the main road through the development at the north western corner of the site with footways and visibility splays being able to be provided from land within the ownership of the applicant. The access road will be 5.5m wide with a 2m footway either side. This complies with the required highway standards. The main road will form the highest element of a hierarchy of road provision within the site.
- 6.50 The County Council as highway authority considered the proposed access and initially raised concerns due to the lack of provision of an emergency access. Following further discussions with the applicant, the highway authority has considered that any such requirement, which will be dependent upon the detailed layout and numbers of dwellings confirmed at a Reserved Matters stage, can be dealt with by way of planning conditions.
- 6.51 The highway authority therefore recommends that a number of conditions should be attached to any permission if granted (covering standard of highway works, visibility splays, sub-base construction, lowering of kerbs, travel plan monitoring, construction management plan, emergency vehicle access and a contribution of £6,600 towards travel plan monitoring).
- 6.52 In accordance with Paragraph 109 of the NPPF the development will not have

a “severe” impact or result in an unacceptable impact on highway safety and should not therefore be refused on transport grounds.

## **6. Flood Risk And Foul and Surface Water Drainage**

- 6.53 The submitted Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) concludes that there is low risk of flooding from fluvial sources with a probability of 1 in 1000 in any one year (<0.1%). The proposed development is classified as ‘more vulnerable’ and is located within Flood Zone 1, therefore, the development is suitable within this flood zone in accordance with the NPPF. There are no water bodies or watercourse systems which present a source of risk to the development with the site being elevated above the adjacent watercourse, Pow Maughan.
- 6.54 Ground conditions will not be suitable for surface water infiltration based drainage. It is therefore proposed to connect surface water drainage to Pow Maughan to the north east. The proposed piped drainage system will be designed to contain flows from a minimum of 1:30 year event and will discharge into an attenuation basin located within the north east boundary of the site via a flow control structure.
- 6.55 The overall drainage system will be put forwards for adoption via a Section 104 agreement with United Utilities. United Utilities has not raised any objections subject to the imposition of conditions on detailed drainage. They have noted that they have some assets in the area however any potential conflicts could be resolved at the detailed layout stage.
- 6.56 The County Council as Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA) note that from the information on soakaway tests, infiltration is not to be considered as a method of surface water disposal due to poor infiltration rates. Surface water discharge is to be via an attenuation basin to Pow Maughan. In principle, subject to suitable design this may be an adequate means of surface water disposal. However, it is noted that the discharge pipe will need to cross 3rd party land and this connection is not included within the red line boundary of the site plan. Therefore, confirmation that an agreement has been made with the adjoining landowner and a revised red line boundary should be provided prior to planning permission being granted.
- 6.57 The LLFA further comments that it has no objection to the greenfield runoff rate and total discharge from the site into Pow Maughan Beck being equal to 14.2l/s. It should also be noted that this would be provided by a series of rain gardens, permeable paving, attenuation ponds and swales. The preference of the LLFA is for surface features which are easily maintainable and provide additional biodiversity benefits.
- 6.58 The County Council (LLFA) has updated their response and whilst some information is still required relating to third party land, drainage network and flood risk on site, they suggest conditions should be imposed should permission be granted (surface water drainage scheme, construction surface water management plan, capacity survey of culverted watercourses).

## **7. Archaeology**

- 6.59 The applicant has submitted an archaeology and built heritage assessment as part of the planning application. The report concludes that overall there is a moderate amount of evidence for earlier prehistoric activity in the wider study area, including the cropmarks of a Neolithic cursus-like feature and Bronze Age ring ditches. A Bronze Age cemetery was also recorded to the north of the site. There is no recorded evidence of earlier prehistoric activity within or in close proximity to the site, and the potential for unrecorded remains of this date is considered to be low.
- 6.60 Numerous cropmarks of potential Iron Age or Roman date have been recorded in the study area, and although the overall spread of cropmarks suggest that the activity was focused away from the site, a couple of linear cropmarks potentially extend in a northern direction towards the site. Other cropmarks have been identified in the study area which have been interpreted as Iron Age and Romano-British date, including roundhouses and a temporary camp. The potential for unrecorded remains of Iron Age or Roman date within the southeastern area of the site is considered to be moderate, although there is no current evidence to suggest such remains are of a significance to preclude development. The potential for significant unrecorded remains of Iron Age or Roman date within the remainder of the site is considered to be low. There is no evidence for medieval settlement features or finds within the site, and there is scarce evidence for finds and features of medieval date within the study area, aside from the Anglo-Saxon coin hoard. A potential field system within the site of probably medieval date was identified during an aerial photograph review of the site. Ridge and furrow earthworks of possible medieval date are recorded on the LiDAR imagery within the site, in a broadly north-east to south-west orientation. The potential for remains of archaeological significance of medieval date within the site is considered to be moderate, although there is no current evidence to suggest that such remains are of a significance to preclude development.
- 6.61 The land within the site was utilised at the time of the Tithe Apportionment Map of 1842 as a mixture of arable land, meadow, waste land and orchard. The former fields of the site were then consolidated as an area of parkland associated with Rookery Park during the latter half of the 19th century, before again reverting to agricultural land in the early to mid-20th century, which has continued into the 21st century. A former building within the site, illustrated on the Tithe Map and described as *Croft and Tan Yard*, was demolished in the late 19th century. Any potential below-ground remains of this building are not considered to be of heritage interest.
- 6.62 Numerous buildings and railways were constructed in the post-medieval to modern landscape at Scotby. The potential for significant post-medieval and modern archaeological remains within the site is considered to be low. The report also considers the setting of heritage assets and concludes that for the listed buildings within Scotby there is either less than substantial or no harm to the setting of those assets and the proposal would result in minor harm to the setting of the non-designated Acorn Grove.
- 6.63 The County Council's Historic Environment Officer noted that the applicant

has commissioned a geophysical survey of the site. The results show a small number of geophysical anomalies of potential archaeological interest on the site. Furthermore, there is the potential for buried archaeological assets of a similar nature to the Iron Age remains in the adjacent field to survive on the site that would not necessarily be identified by the geophysical survey. Also, remains of a small complex of buildings shown on early historic maps and which have disappeared by the mid-19th century may also survive on site. Any assets that do survive are considered to be of local significance and will be disturbed by the construction of the proposed development.

- 6.64 He recommends that the site is subject to further archaeological investigation and recording in advance of development. This work should be commissioned and undertaken at the expense of the developer and can be secured through the inclusion of a condition in any planning consent.
- 6.65 On that basis, archaeological matters can be dealt with by way of a planning condition should the application be approved.

## **8. Affordable Housing, Education And Recreational Provision**

- 6.66 On the matter of planning obligations, Policy IP8 of the local plan makes clear that new development will be expected to provide infrastructure improvements which are directly related to and necessary to make the development acceptable.
- 6.67 In relation to affordable housing, the council's Housing Development Officer has confirmed that a 30% affordable housing contribution would be required in accordance with Policy HO4 of the local plan. The applicant has confirmed that the proposed housing will comply with the policy albeit that the details of such provision are reserved for a later application. The submitted Affordable Housing Statement identifies that 27 units of affordable housing would be provided where there is a significant affordable housing need and significant weight should be given to this matter. It is acknowledged that the proposed development has the ability to provide policy compliant affordable housing but this needs to be balanced against other planning policy provisions to ensure the development is sustainable. However, it would be essential that should the application be approved, a legal agreement (S106) is drawn up to ensure that provision.
- 6.68 Policy CM2 (Educational Needs) explains that to assist in the delivery of additional school places, where required, to meet the needs of development, contributions will be sought. In terms of primary school provision, Cumbria County Council has advised that there are limited places available in the catchment of Scotby Primary School which is therefore effectively full and that an education contribution of £292,644 is required to provide capacity which is likely to be at Cumwhinton school where capacity can be provided to mitigate the impact of the proposed development.
- 6.69 In terms of secondary school provision, Cumbria County Council has advised that it is considered that there will be insufficient places available in Central Academy to accommodate the secondary pupil yield from this development,

therefore an education contribution of £324,090 is required to mitigate the impact of the development.

- 6.70 In terms of school transport provision, subject to the above contribution being provided, there are no primary schools within the statutory walking distance of 2 miles along a safe route a contribution is required of £266,000. No contribution is sought in relation to secondary school transport.
- 6.71 These contributions towards education would have to be provided by S106 agreement should the application be approved.
- 6.72 Policy GI4 states that new housing developments of more than 20 dwellings will be required to include informal space for play and general recreational or amenity use on site according to the size of the proposal. On smaller housing sites, where on site provision is not appropriate the developer may be required to make commuted payments towards the upgrade of open space provision in the locality, especially if a deficit has been identified.
- 6.73 The applicant proposes a new play area and trim trail/ nature track as part of this development alongside a number of landscape enhancements. These areas will all require provision and maintenance and further details will be required as part of a Reserved Matters application. Whilst acceptable in principle they will require a S106 legal agreement to put in place the necessary measures to make them acceptable and continue through to reserved matters stage.

## **9. The Effect Of The Proposed On Nature Conservation Interests**

- 6.74 When considering whether the proposal safeguards the biodiversity and ecology of the area, it is recognised that Local Planning Authorities must have regard to the requirements of the EC Habitats Directive (92/43/EEC) when determining a planning application as prescribed by regulation 3 (4) of the Conservation (Natural Habitats, &c.) Regulations 1994 (as amended), and Article 16 of the Habitats Directive before planning permission is granted. Article 16 of the Directive indicates that if there is reasonable likelihood of a European protected species being present then derogation may be sought when there is no satisfactory alternative and that the proposal will not harm the favourable conservation of the protected species and their habitat. In this case, the proposal relates to the development of residential dwellings on greenfield land. As such, it is inevitable that there will be some impact upon local wildlife.
- 6.75 The authority should consider securing measures to enhance the biodiversity of a site from the applicant, if it is minded to grant permission for an application in accordance with paragraph 118 of the NPPF. This is reflected in Section 40 of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act (2006) which states that every public authority must have regard to the purpose of conserving biodiversity.
- 6.76 Policy GI3 of the local plan seeks to ensure the protection and, where possible, enhancement of biodiversity assets across the District. These



policies are consistent with Section 15 of the Framework.

6.77 The Ecological Assessment provided the following summary:

- It is unlikely that the proposals will result in any significant impacts to sites designated for their nature conservation interest.
- The site is of limited botanical and ecological value, owing to the predominance of poor semi improved grassland and marshy grassland for which any loss can be more than compensated for by the creation of species-rich grassland.
- The hedgerow bordering the site qualifies as a Habitat of Principal Importance of value at a local scale and whilst there will be some loss for the access construction this would be compensated for by the provision of greenspace within the site.
- Badgers, reptiles and great crested newts were not recorded and were considered not to be a constraint to development.
- Red squirrel may be present adjacent to the site. The proposed woodland belts and landscape buffer planting will provide foraging and commuting opportunities for this species which are not currently available.
- Bat activity surveys were undertaken in spring, summer and autumn 2018 comprising static bat detectors and transect surveys. Overall the bat activity was concentrated along the boundaries and adjacent off-site gardens. It is expected that the newly created greenspace outlined in the proposals will enhance the site's suitability for bats.
- The report identifies a number of potential ecological enhancements

6.78 Based on this information, the Assessment includes the following enhancements:

- *The site is currently of limited botanical and ecological value, owing to the predominance of poor semi-improved grassland and marshy grassland (mainly soft rush), with some tall ruderal (mainly nettles) also present.*
- *The proposed Green Infrastructure, woodland belt planting, and provision of a SUDS attenuation basin will result in greater biodiversity on site than is currently present and provide enhanced foraging, commuting and breeding opportunities for various groups of species, including bats, red squirrels, and birds.*
- *In line with the NPPF (2018), it is recommended that the development of the site results in a gain in value for wildlife by incorporating biodiversity in and around the development via the use of ecological enhancement measures. In addition to the recommendations with respect to individual species and habitats outlined above, opportunities exist within the scheme for general biodiversity enhancements to be undertaken. The following are recommended for this specific site:*
  - *Areas of informal grassland should seek to use a herb-rich mix suitable for the local area, with any more formal areas using a flowering lawn mix as an alternative to a standard rye grass mix. New habitat creation proposals should aim to increase the diversity of habitats present and provide structural diversity, with scrub, woodland and grassland areas. Any garden planting proposed at the outset should also use native species of value to wildlife. Suitable small tree species for inclusion in garden planting schemes include field maple, silver birch and holly. All informal areas of planting should use native*

*species and be subject to sympathetic management and a management plan to promote their conservation value.*

- Soft landscaping using native and ecologically valuable species would enhance the site, avoid using non-native species with overly complex flower structure or those of an invasive nature such as cotoneasters.*
- An ecological management plan should be devised and adhered to for all retained and created habitats in order for them to maintain existing value and/or realise enhanced value, making sure that management is appropriate and ongoing for the life of the development.*
- Creating dark corridors along retained boundary features will be important to maintain and enhance value for bats as sources for invertebrate prey and commuting and dispersal routes through the landscape. Care should be taken to avoid artificially lighting these habitats or any newly planted hedgerows.*
- Small gaps could be left under or in the corners of garden fences to permit access for wildlife such as hedgehog;*
- A variety of types of bat and bird boxes could be installed on new buildings adjacent to retained and created open space and on retained trees to increase availability of roosting and nesting sites.*
- Deadwood piles could be created in areas of retained open space to provide a habitat niche for amphibians and small mammals as well as deadwood for invertebrates such as saproxylic beetles; and*
- Sustainable drainage should be designed to provide optimal habitat for wildlife as well as serving drainage functions, for example attenuation and storage ponds designed to hold water all year round and to have edge habitat with marginal vegetation.*

6.79 In response, Natural England has not raised any objections. Although a number of local residents have referred to wildlife species being present, the detailed survey work has evaluated a range of species. On the basis of the foregoing, it is considered that the proposal is consistent with Policy GI3 of the local plan subject to the imposition of conditions that include a requirement to provide the identified enhancements as identified above.

## **10. Other Matters**

6.80 With regard to waste disposal, on the basis that the detailed layout is yet to be provided Waste Services have not objected at this stage.

6.81 Some members of the public have raised concerns about the impact on residential values however these are not a planning matter and cannot be taken into account when considering planning applications.

6.82 The timing of the application during the lockdown period of the Covid-19 pandemic was raised by some objectors. It should however be noted that the planning system was one of the services which had to continue during these difficult times and whilst the Government made provisions to deal with some of the challenges to the development industry for additional measures to be implemented, they did not stop the planning application or determination process and the agent was not prevented from submitting their application during the pandemic which had to be duly considered.

## Conclusion

- 6.83 This is an outline application to establish the principle of development. Access is included at this stage however appearance, landscaping, layout and scale are reserved for a later application.
- 6.84 Policy HO2 seeks to ensure that the scale and design of any windfall development is appropriate to the scale, form, function and character of the existing settlement. Following the Officer's assessment of the submitted application against the Local Plan and any other material considerations, the current application site represents an intrusion into the open countryside contrary to Policy HO2 of the Local Plan and is out of character with the form of Scotby village. The proposed development therefore conflicts with the principle of windfall development as defined by the Local Plan. As this conflicts with the principle of windfall development and intrudes into open countryside Policy SP8 requires justification for the proposal however despite the reference to the need to provide affordable housing, no overriding need has been demonstrated to indicate why this development should take place in this location. This is contrary to Strategic Policy SP8 of the Local Plan. Furthermore, development proposed in this location has a negative impact on the open nature of the local landscape character and whilst proposals have been amended to try to address the visual impact and integration with the surrounding landscape, it remains contrary to Policy GI1 of the Local Plan.
- 6.85 On other matters such as highways, access, drainage, biodiversity, archaeology, affordable housing, education and recreation, any outstanding policy concerns can be dealt with through planning conditions or through the provisions within a S106 legal agreement to make them acceptable.
- 6.86 When considering the planning balance of the issues above, there are fundamental concerns about the principle of development which override the detailed elements that can be dealt with through reserved matters and therefore the recommendation is to refuse the application.

## 7. Planning History

- 7.1 Planning application 18/1044 for the erection of up to 90no. dwellings, public open space, landscaping and sustainable drainage system (suds) and vehicular access point from the Scotby to Wetheral road (outline) was refused permission on the 7th June 2019.

## 8. Recommendation: Refuse Permission

1. **Reason:** Policy HO2 (Windfall Housing Development) of the Carlisle District Local Plan 2015-2030 seeks to ensure that the scale and design of the proposed development is appropriate to the scale, form, function and character of the existing settlement. The scale of the proposed development would not be

appropriate to the scale and character of Scotby. At present the majority of housing is located in a linear form and this development would extend the historic core to the east. In addition, the policy seeks to ensure that sites are well contained within existing landscape features, physically connected to and integrate with the settlement, and does not lead to an unacceptable intrusion into the open countryside. The perception of this site is one of open countryside and not well contained or integrated into the village. The proposal would, therefore, be contrary to Criteria 1, and 3 of Policy HO2 (Windfall Housing Development) of the Carlisle District Local Plan 2015-2030.

2. **Reason:** Criterion 8 of Policy SP2 (Strategic Growth and Distribution) states that within the open countryside development will be assessed against the need to be in the location specified. The applicant has failed to demonstrate an overriding need for the additional housing to be sited in this location.
  3. **Reason:** The application site has been considered throughout the Local Plan process, including the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment process, from the inception of the Local Plan. It has been considered against alternative sites and against the Sustainability Appraisal principles. This culminated in the site being omitted from the Local Plan. The site was specifically excluded due to its landscape impact. Policy GI1 of the Local Plan seeks to ensure that development should be appropriate to its surroundings and suitably accommodated within the landscape. When viewing the site from the central section of the village the landscape is typical of the Landscape Character Guidance sub-type 5b. The open nature of this landscape would be eroded by the development and would be harmful contrary to Policy GI1 (Landscape) of Carlisle District Local Plan 2015-2030.
-





This drawing is the property of FPCR Environment and Design Ltd and is issued on the condition it is not reproduced, retained or disclosed to any unauthorised person, either wholly or in part without written consent of FPCR Environment and Design Ltd.

Ordnance Survey Mastermap - Crown Copyright. All rights reserved. Licence Number: 100019960 (Centremapsplc.com)

Site Boundary 5.41Ha

Existing Development

Existing Hedgerow/Treebelt

Existing Trees

Pow Maughan (River)

Existing Public Right of Way

Proposed Residential Development: 2.64Ha  
(Up to 90 dwellings at an average of 34dph)

Proposed Site Access

Indicative Main Street

Indicative Secondary Roads and Lanes

Indicative SuDS Attenuation Basin Location

Proposed Footpaths

Proposed Trim Trail/Nature Track

Proposed Childrens Play Area

Proposed woodland belts and  
Landscape buffer planting

Proposed Green Infrastructure (c2.7Ha)  
includes: natural & semi natural green  
space, tree planting, wood copse, grove,  
amenity green space, provision for children  
and young people and SuDS basins

Pumping Station - Indicative Location

N



K:\9209\9227\LANDS\Plans\9227-L-031 Development Framework Plan.indd

Gladman  
Rookery Park  
Scotby, Carlisle

# DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK

1:2,500@A3

20th March 2020 MST / J.J

8227-L-03 - 1

1:2,500@A3  
 20th March 2020  
 MST / J.J  
 8227-L-03 - 1  
 1:2,500@A3  
 20th March 2020  
 MST / J.J

fpcr



