

# **Allerdale Local Plan (Part 2) Sites Allocations**

## **Hearing Session – Day 5 (PM)**

Wednesday 22 May 2019 at 14:00

Venue: Council Offices Allerdale House Workington CA14 3YJ

### **Agenda**

Please note:

- Participants are encouraged to familiarise themselves with the Hearing Statements (and any additional evidence) produced by the Council and other parties in respect of the matters addressed at this session. These are available on the Examination website.
- Reference to questions refer to those posed by the Inspector in the Matters, Issues and Questions already circulated and on the Examination website, unless otherwise stated.
- Participants, including the Council, named in [square brackets] may be invited to open the item concerned, but this is optional.

#### **1. Inspector's Introduction**

#### **2. Matter 7: Wind Energy**

#### **Issue 7: Whether the proposed approach towards wind energy is justified, effective and consistent with national policy and the ALPP1?**

Q77. Is the approach of defining the areas suitable for wind energy development set out in the Wind Energy Topic Paper (Ref TP7) soundly based? [Cllr N. Cockburn]

Q78. Are the potentially suitable areas justified, effective and consistent with national policy and Policy S19 of the ALPP1? Are there any significant factors that indicate that these areas should not have been designated? [Cllr N. Cockburn]

Q79. What is the justification for having sensitivity zones whether proposals for wind energy development will be restricted to small scale turbines? Is it clear to decision makers, developers and the local communities what types of development will be acceptable and where? Are these zones justified and effective in accordance with the recommendations of the HRA and other evidence based work? [Allerdale BC]

Q80. The Appropriate Assessment in relation to Policy SA50 recommends that the sensitivity zones shown on the Wind Energy Inset Policy Map as only suitable for small-scale turbines should be amended to include the ecological sensitive designated nature conservation sites including the

ecological designations along the Allerdale coastline and inland<sup>1</sup>. In response to the Inspector's Initial Questions<sup>2</sup> the Council advised that the current policy approach of assessing wind energy development through project level Habitat Regulation Assessment and Appropriate Assessment would continue in line with the provisions of Policy S19 of the ALPP1. Does this approach provide a robust policy framework to ensure that any proposal for wind energy is appropriately assessed in relation to ecologically sensitive designated nature conservation sites and achieves the necessary mitigation? [Allerdale BC]

Q81. Is the suggested Main Modification MM41 justified? Is this necessary in the interests of soundness? [Cllr N. Cockburn]

**Additional Question:**

AQ1. Are any additional Main Modifications proposed in relation to Issue 7? [Allerdale BC]

**3. Matter 8: Natural Environment**

**Issue 8: Whether the proposed approach towards natural environment is justified, effective and consistent with national policy and the ALPP1?**

**Issue 8a: Amenity Green Space (Policy SA51)**

Q82. Is the basis for assessing, selecting and rejecting Amenity Green Space objective, consistent and justified by robust evidence? [Mrs H. Wood]

Q83. Is the Council policy to designate and protect amenity green space in lower tiers of the settlement hierarchy only, justified and consistent with national policy and the ALPP1? [Allerdale BC]

**Additional Question:**

AQ2. Are any Main Modifications proposed in relation to Issue 8a? [Allerdale BC]

**Issue 8b: Green Infrastructure (Policy SA52)**

Q84. Is the approach to the protection and enhancement of Green Infrastructure network in Policy SA52 effective and justified? Is the identification of the Green Infrastructure network on the Policies Map appropriate? Is the policy likely to result in conflicts with other aims of the Plan and national policy considerations and if so does the policy need to be modified so as to minimise such conflicts? [Port Derwent Properties]

Q85. Are the suggested Main Modifications MM42, MM43, MM44 and MM45 justified? Are they necessary in the interests of soundness? [Port Derwent Properties]

---

<sup>1</sup> Habitats Regulations Assessment of the Local Plan Site Allocations: WYG Environmental Planning Transport Ltd (September 2018) para. 7.2.3

<sup>2</sup> Document Ref INSP.01

**Additional Question:**

AQ3. Are any additional Main Modifications proposed in relation to Issue 8b?  
[Allerdale BC]

**Issue 8c: Green Gaps (Policy SA53)**

Q86. What is the justification for 'green gaps' between Kirkbampton and Thurstonfield and Prospect and Oughterside? [Allerdale BC]

Q87. How were the green gaps identified on the Policies Map and what process was followed? What evidence-based documents were used to inform this process? [Allerdale BC]

Q88. Are the green gaps justified, effective and consistent with national policy? Are there any significant factors that indicate that these areas should not have been designated? [Allerdale BC]

**Additional Question:**

AQ4. Are any Main Modifications proposed in relation to Issue 8c? [Allerdale BC]

**4. Other Issues and outstanding matters**

**5. Close**

Participants

Issue 7:

*Allerdale Borough Council*

*122 Allerdale Borough Council (Cllr N. Cockburn)*

*494 Allerdale Borough Council (Cllr M. Fitzgerald)*

Issue 8a:

*Allerdale Borough Council*

*496 Mrs H. Wood*

Issue 8b:

*Allerdale Borough Council*

*512 Port Derwent Properties (Peter Shannon/Graham Hale, WYG)*

Issue 8c:

