

Response on behalf of the Leconfield Estate to the Allerdale Local Plan (Part 2) Sites Allocations Examination.

Inspector's Matters, Issues and Questions for Examination

Matter 2: General Approach to Development and Settlement Boundaries

Issue 2a: Is the general approach to development in the Local Plan justified, effective and consistent with national policy?

Q13. Is the Council's approach to the development and safeguarding identified sites on the Policies Maps in Policy SA1 justified? Is the presumption in favour of renewing lapsed consents for major committed developments consistent with national policy?

As the Local Plan is being examined against the 2012 National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), it is vital to highlight that, in terms of identifying 'deliverable' sites, Footnote 11 of the 2012 NPPF needs to be considered which states that "To be considered deliverable, sites should be available now, offer a suitable location for development now, and be achievable with a realistic prospect that housing will be delivered on the site within five years and in particular that development of the site is viable. Sites with planning permission should be considered deliverable until permission expires, unless there is clear evidence that schemes will not be implemented within five years, for example they will not be viable, there is no longer a demand for the type of units or sites have long term phasing plans." [emphasised by us]. Therefore, sites with expired planning permissions should not be considered deliverable as part of the Local Plan.

Based on Footnote 11, expired permissions for major developments are likely to have limited realistic prospects that housing will be delivered on the site within five years. We therefore consider the Council's approach to the development and safeguarding identified sites on the Policies Maps in Policy SA1 to be unjustified.

As planning permissions for major sites have lapsed or could lapse, there could be significant implications with the Council's five year housing land supply throughout the plan period. We therefore suggest that additional development sites are identified / allocated as part of the Local Plan to address this concern.

With regard to additional site allocations, our comments are as follows.

The only proposed development in Cockermouth is either already subject to planning permission or under construction. There are no proposed allocations to address future need. As such, if extant permissions expire then this Key Service Centre (second tier of the settlement hierarchy), which is a focus for new development in the Local Plan, will not meet the identified housing need throughout

the Plan period. We therefore suggest that further housing allocations are identified in Cockermouth as part of the Local Plan to address this concern.

Cockermouth has a high market demand and additional Housing Sites will ensure that deliverable sites are available in sought after areas all the way through the Plan period and beyond. Land supply is important to the successful delivery of the planned growth and strategy.

As set out in our comments to the Pre-Submission consultation document, our client owns land in Cockermouth. Our client's land could accommodate the following housing numbers based on an average developable area of 80% of the gross site size at a density of 30 dwelling per hectare:

· 1/COC/007/R – Land south of Wyndham Caravan Park – 10.0 hectares = 240 dwellings ·
1/COC/008/R - Land north of Wyndham Caravan Park – 0.86 hectares = 20 dwellings · 1/COC/009/R –
Land south of Castlegate Drive – 5 .0 hectares = 120 dwellings · 1/COC/010/R – Land adjacent
Wyndham Lodge – 1.3 hectares = 30 dwellings

We therefore propose and support the allocation of these sites for housing development as part of the Local Plan (Part 2) Sites document.

However, if the Council is to proceed with the existing approach then this will need careful monitoring to ensure that sufficient deliverable sites are available to provide five years' worth of housing against

Response on behalf of the Leconfield Estate to the Allerdale Local Plan (Part 2) Sites Allocations Examination.

Inspector's Matters, Issues and Questions for Examination

their housing requirements, plus the appropriate buffer to provide a realistic prospect of achieving the planned supply and to ensure choice and competition in the market for land.

Q14. Are the suggested Main Modifications MM2, MM3, MM5 and MM7 justified? Are they necessary in the interests of soundness?

If planning permission has expired or, a site has not been built out, then there is usually implications with regard to viability and therefore deliverability. As such, with regard to the suggested Main Modifications MM2 and MM3, we support the proposed removal of the final paragraph of Policy SA1 and paragraph 47 of the supporting text which aims to provide greater flexibility when considering the renewal of current housing commitments and thereby ensure the plan is more effective.

However, with regard to Main Modifications MM5 and MM7, it is considered that lapsed housing permissions should not contribute to the deliverable housing land supply as the permission has lapsed for a reason. As set out in Footnote 11 of the 2012 NPPF, to be considered deliverable, sites should be available and viable now with a realistic prospect that housing will be delivered on the site within five years. Sites with planning permission should be considered deliverable until permission expires. As MM5 is associated with expired / lapsed consents, we do not support the inclusion of this Main Modification.