

## Eden Planning Committee 4.9.24

Report by Michael Hanley.

1. Earth-banked Slurry Lagoon, Winter Tarn, Newby, Penrith (deferred from the previous meeting for site meeting)

Concerns: stability of the lagoon, not covered (not standard requirement). The applicant has looked at covering options to install biogas capturing equipment (cost: £500k). Site visit two days prior.

J Murray (JM, LD): proposed to accept.

Vote: unanimous in favour.

2. 27 house development at High Heskett. Objection from parish council.

30% will be affordable homes: 8 houses. £46k to go to build footpath into High Heskett.

M Robinson (MR,I): Asked about the drainage scheme.

Planning Officer (PO): There is no objection from United Utilities.

Speaker in favour: Applicant (A): Stated he will answer questions.

JM: Asked about the viability of the social housing contribution.

A: We have no option but to comply.

C Atkinson (CA, C): I am happy to approve.

Vote: Unanimous in favour.

3. Erection of 33 dwellings at High Heskett. Objection: parish council.

Provision of 9 affordable dwellings. 18 dwellings per hectare. Heskett PC objected regarding the drainage, highway safety, lack of social facilities in the village and reduced bus service.

PO: A TRO (traffic regulation order) has been applied for to put double yellow lines on the road.

They will be all bungalows (which is what the council is encouraging). High Heskett lost its pub recently. It is recommended for approval.

L Baker (LB, LD): The drainage arrangements aren't clear.

MR: Asked about Nutrient Neutrality mitigation at Talkin (28 hectares to be transferred from grazing dairy cattle with fertilizer usage to wild flower meadow). Is that land owned by the applicant?

PO: Yes.

Speaker in favour: Sam Greg (SG): Emphasised the need for housing for the elderly, the need for bungalows. Fewer developers want to build bungalows. Discussed the drainage scheme. We propose to plant 330 metres of hedgerow around the estate. The off-site land for Nutrient Neutrality is owned by the applicant.

LB: Asked about the drains.

SG: They will not drain directly into the main drains.

Speaker against: PC Ms Campbell (MC): Our objections still stand. The development will change the rural character of the village. There are no facilities in the village. The site was advised to be for 20 not 33 houses. Discussed the fact that there is likely to be 97 properties built soon in a small village. The council should focus on urban development. We are concerned about the entrance on to the A6 as there has been a number of accidents recently. The sewage pipes are not sufficient for our area.

MR: Asked about retail and other facilities and the GP surgery.

JM: I propose to accept. MR: seconded: it is in the local plan.

CA: I do sympathise with the residents of High Heskett. We should be aware that the character

of a lot of villages has changed.

Vote: unanimous in favour.

4. One dwelling at Petteril Cottage, Greystoke. Objection: parish council.

PO: 0.12 hectares of land. PC main objection is that is not infill within the village. Discussed whether the land can be classified as a garden (part of the curtilage of the main house). If the land has been used as a garden in the recent past it can comply with the status of infill.

Speakers in favour: (a) Applicant: Mr Illingworth: I have owned the land since 1991. We sold the farm house, we live in the nearby two properties. The ecology report refers to the land as a garden. We hope that our daughter will move to the new property. She works as a diabetic nurse (outside Cumbria). I used to teach science at QEGS (Queen Elizabeth Grammar School, Penrith). I am well aware of the problems in the local river Petteril. We will build a sustainable house with solar panels etc. We are long term residents of Greystoke village and are very active in the local community. We are upset that neighbours have objected to it being classified as infill. We will build sympathetically.

(b) Agent, Kate Bell: (Handed around a hand drawn map emphasising the location of the land within the village.) The matter whether it lies within the village is a matter of opinion. The plot lies within the village. Building three houses on the plot would be impossible ( one of the many concerns of the PC). Officers can see there is some screening (from neighbours) but we could provide more. As a young planner at Eden Planning Dept I was to look for harm in any development: there is no harm here.

CA: Can I clarify if the applicant would be happy with a local occupancy clause?

M Lynch (ML, Chief Planning Officer): If it is accepted that the plot is garden, then there is no need for such a clause.

JM: Asked what are "defensible boundaries".

PO: A river or embankment. A hedge or wall are not. On the south side there is no defensible boundary.

ML: If it is within the settlement, it meets the requirement of infill.

MH: I would like to thank Kate Bell for providing the extra map. It looks obvious from this that the plot is infill. Also if the building of this house results in Mr Illingworth's daughter living there and working locally as a diabetic nurse then that would a great addition. A a recently retired GP, I know how difficult it is to attract medical personnel to the area.

LB: Recommended a site visit.

CA: Recommended approval.

Vote: Unanimous in favour.

5. Garage extension, Bongate Cross, Appleby.

3.4 x 5.2 metres. Height: 5.7 metres (if less than 4 metres then planning permission is not required).

Objection Highways Dept: loss of parking space.

N McCall (NMC, LD): Are neighbours objecting?

PO: No.

JM: They could use the garage as a store as most people do.

Speaker in support: Applicant: My neighbour is in full support. I will be able to store things in the garage loft. I will park my car in the garage.

JM: Proposed to accept the officer's recommendation for approval.

Vote: Unanimous in favour.

6. Change of use: Methodist Chapel to dwelling. Kirkby Thore.

Objections: PC and Highways.

PO: Application in 2022 was refused (Nutrient Neutrality). Windows have been altered, now opaque lower parts. Highways: parking.

Speaker against: Ms McKeown: Talked about rubbish thrown out of the property. Discussed lots of Airbnbs in the area. There is no provision for parking. Each renting of an Airbnb brings two cars. This will not be a private house.

LB: Discussed Nutrient Neutrality and its mitigation by planting trees in an adjacent plot. This plot is of archaeological interest.

MR: Asked about the parking.

PO: Provision of two parking spaces and a mirror opposite the exit is acceptable (the land opposite is owned by the applicant).

MR: Asked about Airbnb.

ML: Discussed whether this is relevant.

G Simpkins (GS, Chair, LD): That is not within our remit.

PO: There have been several refusals before, to do with appearance mainly of the windows.

GS: I propose we accept.

Vote: Unanimous in favour.

7. Extension of Bell's Bakery, Lazonby.

Objection: Parish Council : Increased noise, increased pollution, impact on wildlife, increased HGV traffic, drainage and water run off.

Phase 1: Storage building, 66 x 38 m, 10 m high.

Speakers in support: Tim Conder (TM, Managing Director of Bell's): We are a 100% family owned business. We have received the Queens Award for innovation. We supply all the major UK supermarkets and export as far as Australia. The application is because we need increased storage in site. We now employ 359 people. We have supported local causes. We have extended invitations to the parish council and residents to discuss the application but no one took us up. We recently invested in solar panels. We will be able to maintain our business in a lean and efficient way.

Daniel Addis,(DA, agent): The application is supported by the local plan. There aren't any other local businesses. Local businesses should be supported. The application will reduce the number of vehicles coming and going from the factory. As for the objection letters, all the concerns have been met. The benefits are clear. If the application is refused the company will have to reassess the suitability of the current site.

Speaker against: Miss Ruffly (representing residents): Increased noise, increased light pollution and water flow are concerns. The scale of the site is also a concern: three and a half hectares.

PC representative: None of us are against Bells, it was said there would be a loss of jobs, that wouldn't happen. Mr Conder is discounting local residents. There is noise at night, fan blowers cooling down cakes. This development will be closer to us. The noise is in the early hours of the morning (from lorry drivers). Rain on metal makes more noise.

MR: Asked whether Lazonby Neighbourhood Plan was in force.

PO: Yes it is.

CA: There is a significant slope in the field. I wouldn't like to see them go from the village. They have to future-proof themselves. With the number of jobs at risk, I would support this.

JM: I think we need to support a very successful local business.

Vote: Unanimous in favour.

8. Two storey extension to Pear Tree House, Melmerby.

Objection: Modern designs and building materials not in harmony with other nearby buildings.

MR: It backs on to village green.

Speakers in support: Agent: Discussed the objections. Melmerby PC have supported this application. Several local people have supported the application. We have accommodated the concerns of the planning department. The neighbouring houses did not receive notification of the application.

Applicant: M Walfert: I am originally from Newcastle. My house (in Melmerby) is too small (with a growing family). We applied to extend our current home but this was rejected. We plan to enlarge this property and swap the house for our current home. We have changed the materials. 10 of our close neighbours have written in support. We are moved by the support of Melmerby PC and our neighbours. We will be forced to move from Melmerby if this application is refused. We lived there for many years and don't want to do this.

Rita Mark (Mr Walpert's mother-in-law): I was born in that house. My daughter has outgrown their home.

ML: We did publicise the application. No formal submission of the amended plan has come to the department. If this plan had been discussed with the pre-application service, a lot of this might have been avoided.

JM: I don't want to say no to this application.

GS: I propose we defer it to the next meeting so that the materials can be sorted.

CA: We should make a decision.

MR: We are the people on the ground.

CA: The development is not overlooking neighbours and it isn't out of character and there is a local need.

ML: Discussed having a condition.

MH: Could this be new materials as discussed by the applicant.

ML: That would mean deferral.

Vote: Unanimous in favour of application.