



**Local Plan**  
**Housing: Preferred Sites and Policies**  
**Technical Paper**

**Eden District Council**  
**Housing: Preferred Sites and Policies Document**  
**Technical Paper**

**Contents**

Methodology for selection of sites .....	3
How much housing do we need to plan for? .....	3
How much housing has been built or permitted so far? .....	3
What are the future rates of development that we need to achieve? .....	5
Choosing Sites .....	5
How much housing do we need to allocate land for at Penrith? .....	7
How much housing do we need to find land for in the Main Service Centres - Alston, Appleby and Kirkby Stephen? .....	19
Local Service Centres .....	32
How much housing do we need to distribute to the Local Service Centres (LSCs)? .....	32
Annex 1 - Housing completions and allocation figures .....	54
Annex 2 - The Housing Matrix .....	55

## Methodology for Selection of Sites

This paper sets out how we have selected the preferred sites for allocation. It also shows alternative sites, and methods which we are not proposing to use, along with the reasons why we have not selected them.

### How much housing do we need to plan for?

The first stage of looking at how much land needs to be allocated is to look at existing targets for development and against what has already been built or permitted.

### The Housing Target

The adopted Eden District Core Strategy provides the overall housing target over time period 2003/04 to 2024/25. This sets out a figure of 239 dwellings per year, giving a total of 5,258 dwellings over a 22 year period.

This figure was then split to give an indication of the intended amount of development that should come forward in particular areas. Of the 5,258 dwellings:

- 60% should be at Penrith
- 4% should be at Alston
- 9% should be at Appleby
- 7% should be at Kirkby Stephen
- 20% to Local Service Centres
- 0% to 'Other Areas' outside these settlements, where development is limited to only affordable housing to meet local needs.

This gives figures of:

**Table 1: Housing Targets**

Area	Plan Distribution (%)	Plan target 2003/4 - 2024/25	Per year
Penrith	60%	3155	143
Appleby	9%	473	22
Kirkby Stephen	7%	368	17
Alston	4%	210	10
Local Service Centres	20%	1052	48
Other areas	n/a	n/a	n/a
Total Eden District	100%	5258	239

### How much housing has been built or permitted so far?

The base date of the Core Strategy is the year 2003/4, so at the time of writing there have already been nine monitoring years where housing has been built. Our cut off date for monitoring was 31st March 2012.

Since 2003/04 1,207 dwellings have already been completed, or an annual total of 134 per year. This was below the planned rate of 239 per year.

We also know that there are a significant number of sites which already have planning permission, with some already being built. We therefore make an assumption that these sites will come forward and therefore don't need allocating, although we have built in a contingency of 25% for sites under ten units not being completed after grant of permission, to allow for an element on non-delivery. 1,259 houses had planning permission or were under construction at 31 March 2012.

Housing completions and permissions have come forward in the following locations:

**Table 2: Housing Completions and Commitments**

	Target		Completed		Committed for Development			
	Core Strategy Proportion	Plan target	Housing Completions 2003/04 - 2011/12	Left to allocate	Sites under construction	Total extant permissions	Total under construction and with permission	Left to allocate
Penrith (P)	60%	2800	294	2506	327	74	401	2105
Kirkby Stephen (KS)	7%	327	33	294	44	24	68	226
Alston (AL)	4%	187	22	165	33	5	38	127
Appleby (AP)	9%	420	108	312	131	14	146	166
Local Service Centres (LSC)	20%	933	369	564	276	120	396	168
Other Areas (OA)	0%	0	381	-381	116	95	211	0
TOTAL	100%	4666	1207	3459	927	333	1259	2792
A 75% discount rate has been applied to small sites included as commitments to allow for non-implementation.								

## What are the Future Rates of Development that we need to Achieve?

Over the first nine years of the Core Strategy period the pattern of development coming forward in the district has not been in line with the distribution originally envisaged. In particular, the highest level of housing (34.4%) has been coming forward in the 'Other Areas' where policy restricts development to affordable housing need for local needs. This is followed by the Local Service Centres where 26% of new development has been built. Conversely, with the exception of Appleby the larger centres are underperforming, particularly at Penrith. This is likely to be a consequence of market factors - particularly a slow down in larger sites coming forward - and the fact that the Core Strategy has only recently been adopted (March 2010).

Once completions and permissions are accounted we need to find land for at least 2,792 new homes by 2025. In practice we also aim for slightly higher than this figure to allow for an element of under delivery.

## Choosing Sites

The backbone of our technical work has been a comparative assessment of sites against seventeen different planning criteria - known as the housing matrix. All sites were visited and assessed and information collected was then added to the housing matrix. Criteria are weighted so that some criteria count more than others - for example where sites had potential access problems or were prone to flooding this would increase the scoring compared to, for example whether a site had topographical constraints or had tree preservation orders on site. The weighted score allows us to take a view on which may be the better site for allocation.

The matrix was originally developed to appraise sites through the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) and has since been updated to offer a more comprehensive assessment of housing sites. This was developed in house through small workshops with planning officers and consultants who were employed to assist in the assessment of housing sites.

The criteria were:

1. (1a) **Current designation in Local Plan**
2. (1b) **Sequential Test** - Is the site Greenfield / Brownfield; within the settlement; on the edge of the settlement; or detached from the settlement? Are there any existing buildings on site which could be reused? If Greenfield, which agricultural land classification does the land fall under?
3. (1c) **Planning History** - Does the site have any Planning History? Is there known intention to bring this site forward? Is the site available? Are there any different classes of application known - Employment, retail etc
4. (1d) **Affordable Housing Need** - What is the current Housing need for the area?
5. (1e) **Public Consultation** - Has there been any public consultation comments regarding the site (Issues and Options stage, or through the application process)
6. (2a) **Topographical Constraints** - are there any topographic constraints which might affect the density / layout of development? Are there opportunities to use the topography to maximise solar gain from potential housing?

7. (2b) **Utilities** - are there any visible services affecting the site eg pylons/substations? Have we received any comments from service providers on the site? Are there known infrastructure constraints, or deficiencies that may affect the site? Would the site impact upon the local water table, in terms of abstraction and surface run off? In practice without the active input of landowners, developers, infrastructure providers and utility companies it is not possible to complete this information consistently. This criterion will be re-assessed if and when information is provided through responses to this consultation.
8. (2c) **Flood Risk** - does the site comply with the sequential test / exceptions test contained within PPS25? Have we received any comments from the EA?
9. (2d) **Highways Constraints** - are there any visible highways constraints eg Visibility splays, new access required. Have we received any comments from CCC Highways regarding the site? Is the access identifiable? Would the development have any implications on existing road safety?
10. (2e) **Contamination** - are there any known previous contaminative uses or visible signs of contamination?
11. (2f) **Accessibility** to services and public transport - does the site provide easy access to essential services and public transport? How accessible is the site to the centre of the settlement via walking and/or cycling? Are there any Rights of Way that pass through, or next to the site? Facilities - Bus, School, Village Hall, Public House, Shop/Post Office
12. (3a) **Character of Settlement** - the site once developed would be compatible and not discordant with the character and setting of the settlement eg would the site follow historic patterns of development, or be unduly prominent or extend to far into the open countryside (refer to landscape assessment, where available)? Is the site compatible in terms of size for the settlement? Would the site be more suitable for another use, such as employment, retail or recreation? Does the site have any historical significance ( historical land access - Unbuilt frontages)
13. (3b) **Historic Landscape** - Would the development affect a conservation area; listed building; areas of archaeological importance; ancient monuments? Are there any known past uses on the site, determined from historical records?
14. (3c) **Biodiversity** - would the development of the site potentially affect biodiversity located on site - light pollution, displacement, harm to habitat? Are there any features in the surrounding area which may support corridors for biodiversity eg adjacent woodland, river/wetland, agricultural buildings?
15. (3d) **Open Space and Recreational Land** - Would the development of the site affect any amenity open space or informal recreational land. Would there be requirement for additional open spaces (refer to Open Spaces Survey)
16. 3e) **Environmental Designations** - would the development of the site affect the AONB/SAC/SSSI/SPA/Priority Habitats and Species/Local Sites/ NNR's/LNR's?
17. (3f) **Trees** - Are there any TPO's on site or trees/hedgerows/woodlands that should be retained / Ancient Woodland? Are there any trees affecting the access? Are there any trees on site or the boundary which should be retained?

18. (4a) Note any adverse or beneficial environmental conditions / neighbouring land uses which would be experienced by prospective resident's eg road noise; railway lines; air pollution; odour pollution; neighbouring land uses; light pollution

A full template showing the assessment criteria and weightings is included at Annex 2.

It is worth acknowledging at this point the low weighting attributed to public consultation. The low weighting assigned to this criteria is not intended to undermine the value of previous consultation but to reflect the age and validity of the evidence presented. It has been over four years since the public were last consulted on potential housing allocations. In the last four years the planning framework has significantly altered, as Eden District Council have adopted its Core Strategy DPD, which sets a different precedent for development in the district. We would anticipate that as site details are updated through public/stakeholder input, the weightings criteria may also be subject to change.

Alongside this housing matrix, we are then required to put the allocations strategy through a 'sustainability appraisal' to see how it performs against social, economic and environmental criteria. All sites in Penrith, Alston, Appleby and Kirkby Stephen have been put through this appraisal to see how sites perform, and we have used this information to carry out a sustainability 'check' against the results of the comparative assessment to see if the assessment is giving us the right results. For the Local Service centres, we have assessed the centres themselves against each other rather than individual sites to inform our comparative assessment work. We considered that assessing individual sites would offer little insight given the wide geographical spread of villages, as this type of assessment tends to prove the most useful when looking at options within a single settlement.

Finally, whilst technical assessment drives the selection of sites, on occasions there may be issues with sites where an element of judgement is required to select the best sites. Where this is the case this document explains the reasoning and invites comments and feedback.

### **How Much Housing do we need to Allocate Land for at Penrith?**

The 2011 Penrith Masterplan sought to find possible options for up to 2,600 houses, including an element coming from brownfield sites in the urban areas. In arriving at this figure the overall rate of past completions for the district was subtracted from the overall Core Strategy figure and 2,600 is 60% of the remainder. Initial sites for 1,800 were identified, with a further 500 as additional opportunities (bringing us up to 2,300).

The Masterplan was intended to guide the Housing DPD, as it was then known on where urban extensions could be needed. The 'working' figure of 2,300 would always change, because the 2,600 figure was arrived at by discounting housing completions across the whole district rather than just for Penrith. Penrith has underperformed compared to the rest of the district, so the figure should be arguably higher. It also did not take account of sites already in the pipeline i.e. with planning permission. The figure we are now working to is 2,105 new dwellings in addition to those already permitted.

107 sites were identified or submitted for possible inclusion at Penrith. Some were immediately removed from the assessment process.

Some sites were removed as they are either now built, are under construction or have a planning permission:

Town	Site
Penrith	P7 Beaconhill, Fell Lane
Penrith	P9 - Haweswater Road
Penrith	P36 - Land behind Esso Garage, Bridge Lane
Penrith	P37 - Rickerby's, Brunswick Road
Penrith	P63 - Garages to west on Scotland Road
Penrith	P68 - Land at Auction Mart Court
Penrith	P73 - Land CG Ford Site, Friargate
Penrith	P78 - Bowmans, Brunswick Road
Penrith	P80 - CG Ford Site, Old London Road (adjacent Eden Rural Foyer)
Penrith	P81 -Victoria House, Bridge Lane
Penrith	P82 - Workshop at Rowcliffe Lane
Penrith	P83 - Castle Foundry, Castlegate
Penrith	P85 - Co-Op building off West Lane
P87	Bakery / Depot behind Lowther Terrace
P92	Former Zion Chapel, Fell Lane

The following sites fell below the site size threshold of four units used as a minimum for allocation:

Town	Site
Penrith	P84 - Greenfield House, Brunswick Road
Penrith	P88 - Building at Shephers Hill Stricklandgate
Penrith	P89 - Building adjacent to 8 Watson
Penrith	P90 - Garages off Watson Terrace Building
Penrith	P91 - Ferguson's Shop, Brunswick Road

The following sites were removed as the owner does not wish to see them come forward for housing development:

Town	Site
Penrith	P1 - Pennyhill Park
Penrith	P6 - Winters Park
Penrith	P76 - Garages behind Partco, Scotland Road

The following two sites were included in earlier rounds of consultation as they were an undeveloped part of land identified in the National Land User Database. They have been removed from further assessment. This is because the sites had significant planning constraints. They are not considered developable due to form, loss of amenity value and the presence of a tree protected by a tree preservation order on the site.

Town	Site
Penrith	P32 & 33 - Macadam Gardens

No sites have been sifted out due to physical constraints eg flooding, impact on Scheduled Ancient Monument etc.

In considering options our preferred option was heavily influenced by the Penrith Masterplan, given that it has provided a considered assessment of development opportunities around the town.

### Option 1 - Masterplan Derived (Preferred Option)

This option, derived from principles in the Penrith masterplan includes a relatively even split of housing to the north and east. Option 1 has been derived through stakeholder involvement as part of the preparation of the masterplan. Full details are included in the area profile document for Penrith.

All of the housing sites in the east are utilised, including a provision for a new school on site P14. Indicative housing numbers for sites E1/E2 have been recommended to reflect lower densities to account for potential landscape impacts.

Development sites to the north have been adjusted to reflect topographical constraints and curtailed to prevent unnecessary urban sprawl. Part of site P23 has also been provisionally set aside as a potential primary school site after discussions with the County Council.

The following sites are part of Option 1:

	Town/Village	Site Ref	Address	Total	Phasing		
					2012-17	2017-22	2022-25
1	Penrith	P2	Gilwilly Road	17			17
2	Penrith	P3	Sand Croft	9	9		
3	Penrith	P4	Beacon Square	3	3		
4	Penrith	P8	Myers Lane, Norfolk Road	32			32

	Town/Village	Site Ref	Address	Total	Phasing		
5	Penrith	P10-14, 52, 67	Carleton Greenfield	554	156	302	96
6	Penrith	P15	Carleton Hill Farm / Veterinary Centre	34		34	
7	Penrith	P16, P26 P53	Carleton Greenfield between sites	300		200	100
8	Penrith	P18, 27, 28	Salkeld Road / Fairhill Greenfield Extension	159		100	59
9	Penrith	P28 (Rest of)	Salkeld Road / Fairhill Greenfield Extension - Field 4	31			31
10	Penrith	P29	Salkeld Road / Fairhill Greenfield Extension - Field 4	96			96
11	Penrith	P30	Salkeld Road / Fairhill Greenfield Extension - Field 5	208			208
12	Penrith	P19-25	Raiselands	150		75	75
13	Penrith	P66, P99	Raiselands N3 & N4.	150			150
14	Penrith	P34	Stampers Depot, Bridge Lane	46			46
15	Penrith	P35	Land off Robinson Street	35	35		
16	Penrith	P38	Land at Friargate	49	49		
17	Penrith	P55 & 56	Land between White Ox Way and Inglewood Road	35			35
18	Penrith	P41, P58, P69-P70, P72, P96-97	White Ox Farm	155		30	125
19	Penrith	P54	Bellevue Farm, Salkeld Road	56			56
20	Penrith	P59	Bakery behind Mostyn Hall, Friargate	11			11
21	Penrith	P60	Gas Works Site, Old London Road	27			27
22	Penrith	P61	Armstrong and Fleming Site	19			19

	Town/Village	Site Ref	Address	Total	Phasing		
23	Penrith	P62	Garages to east on Scotland Road	10		10	
24	Penrith	P64	Depot, Lark Lane	10		10	
25	Penrith	P71	Brent Road Garages	6			6
26	Penrith	P77	Fire Station, Bridge Lane	9		9	
27	Penrith	P86	Garages at Dodding House, William Street	4		4	
28	Penrith	P93	Barn and Yard, Brunswick Road	5		5	
29	Penrith	P94	QEGS Annexe, Ullswater Road	29			29
30	Penrith	P95	TFE Depot, Old London Road	29			29
31	Penrith	P98	Land at Carleton Hall Farm	108			108
32	Penrith	P101	Land at Pategill	6			6
	<b>TOTAL PENRITH</b>			<b>2392</b>			

## Option 2 - Mixed Use Focus

A second option has been built from an alternative scenario in the Penrith masterplan, utilising the site to the west of the M6 (P57) as a mixed use development site. On this basis an option has been suggested which includes three potential development areas to the north, west and east.

Though there is a live application on site E1 (Carleton), this option demonstrates that Eden's targets could be met if the site was undeliverable, though it still utilises the remaining eastern sites. There is still a heavy reliance on sites to the north under this option. Landscape impact and settlement character have influenced this option, removing some of the peripheral sites from the scenario. Provision for a new primary school has been afforded under part of site P23.

The main difference in this option is the potential development of the site to the west of the M6, which contain similar numbers to those in the north and east. This size of the site does not dictate the number of houses, though it is suggested that the site could accommodate significant numbers of housing and suitable employment. Though stakeholder discussions have not taken place regarding school provision, the number of units in this scenario is likely to require a new primary school, in place of the school to the east.

	Town/ Village	Site Ref	Address	Total	Phasing		
					2012-17	2017-22	2022-25
1	Penrith	P2	Gilwilly Road	17			17
2	Penrith	P3	Sand Croft	9	9		
3	Penrith	P4	Beacon Square	3	3		
4	Penrith	P8	Myers Lane, Norfolk Road	32			32
5	Penrith	P15	Carleton Hill Farm / Veterinary Centre	62		62	
6	Penrith	P16, P26, P53	Carleton Greenfield between sites P16 and P26	400		250	150
7	Penrith	P18, 27, 28	Salkeld Road / Fairhill Greenfield Extension - Field 3 Total	212		100	212
8	Penrith	P28 (Rest of)	Salkeld Road / Fairhill Greenfield Extension - Field 4	31			31
9	Penrith	P29	Salkeld Road / Fairhill Greenfield Extension - Field 4	96			96
10	Penrith	P19-25	Raiselands Total	200			200
11	Penrith	P34	Stampers Depot, Bridge Lane	46		46	
12	Penrith	P35	Land off Robinson Street	35		35	
13	Penrith	P38	Land at Friargate	49	49		
14	Penrith	P55, P56	Land between White Ox Way and Inglewood Road	35	35		
15	Penrith	P41, 58, 69, 70, 72, 96,97	White Ox Farm Total	155			155
16	Penrith	P57	Fields adjacent to Mile Lane	750		250	500
17	Penrith	P59	Bakery behind Mostyn Hall, Friargates	11	11		

	<b>Town/ Village</b>	<b>Site Ref</b>	<b>Address</b>	<b>Total</b>	<b>Phasing</b>		
18	Penrith	P60	Gas Works Site, Old London Road	27			27
19	Penrith	P62	Garages to east on Scotland Road	10		10	
20	Penrith	P64	Depot, Lark Lane	10		10	
21	Penrith	P71	Brent Road Garages	6	6		
22	Penrith	P77	Fire Station, Bridge Lane	9		9	
23	Penrith	P86	Garages at Dodding House, William Street	4		4	
24	Penrith	P93	Barn and Yard, Brunswick Road	5		5	
25	Penrith	P94	QEGS Annexe, Ullswater Road	29		29	
26	Penrith	P95	TFE Depot, Old London Road	29		29	
27	Penrith	P98	Land at Carleton Hall Farm	108		108	
28	Penrith	P101	Land at Pategill	5	5		
	<b>TOTAL PENRITH</b>			<b>2354</b>	<b>218</b>	<b>828</b>	<b>1308</b>

### Option 3 - High Density

A further option looked at whether it was possible to build at higher densities on peripheral sites, to minimise land take. In practice, the topography of land around the town limits this option, and, spatially, this option looks very similar to Option 1. On this basis, around two thirds of development is directed towards the east. This increases the density in all sites and affords provision for a new school on site P14.

Sites to the north have been curtailed, according to their impact on landscape quality and character of the settlement. Under this option, sites to the north could still support the development of a new primary school to accommodate levels of new growth.

	Town/ Village	Site Ref	Address	Total	Phasing		
					2012-17	2017-22	2022-25
1	Penrith	P2	Gilwilly Road	17			17
2	Penrith	P3	Sand Croft	9	9		
3	Penrith	P4	Beacon Square	3	3		
4	Penrith	P8	Myers Lane, Norfolk Road	32			32
5	Penrith	P10-14, 52, 67	Carleton Greenfield	713	156	302	255
6	Penrith	P15	Carleton Hill Farm / Veterinary Centre	62		62	
7	Penrith	P16, P26, P53	Carleton Greenfield between sites P16 and P26	400		250	150
8	Penrith	P18, 27, 28	Salkeld Road / Fairhill Greenfield Extension - Field 3 Total	212		100	112
9	Penrith	P28 (Rest of)	Salkeld Road / Fairhill Greenfield Extension - Field 4	31			31
10	Penrith	P29	Salkeld Road / Fairhill Greenfield Extension - Field 4	96			96
11	Penrith	P19-25	Raiselands Total	200			200
12	Penrith	P34	Stampers Depot, Bridge Lane	46		46	
13	Penrith	P35	Land off Robinson Street	35		35	
14	Penrith	P38	Land at Friargate	49	49		
15	Penrith	P55, P56	Land between White Ox Way and Inglewood Road	35	35		
16	Penrith	P41, 58, 69, 70, 72, 96,97	White Ox Farm Total	109		50	59
18	Penrith	P59	Bakery behind Mostyn Hall, Friargates	11	11		

	<b>Town/ Village</b>	<b>Site Ref</b>	<b>Address</b>	<b>Total</b>	<b>Phasing</b>		
19	Penrith	P60	Gas Works Site, Old London Road	27			27
20	Penrith	P62	Garages to east on Scotland Road	10		10	
21	Penrith	P64	Depot, Lark Lane	10		10	
22	Penrith	P71	Brent Road Garages	6	6		
23	Penrith	P77	Fire Station, Bridge Lane	9		9	
24	Penrith	P86	Garages at Dodding House, William Street	4		4	
25	Penrith	P93	Barn and Yard, Brunswick Road	5		5	
26	Penrith	P94	QEGS Annexe, Ullswater Road	29		29	
27	Penrith	P95	TFE Depot, Old London Road	29		29	
28	Penrith	P98	Land at Carleton Hall Farm	144		144	
29	Penrith	P101	Land at Pategill	5	5		
	<b>TOTAL PENRITH</b>			<b>2338</b>	<b>274</b>	<b>1085</b>	<b>979</b>

#### **Option 4 - Northern Expansion**

As an alternative to an eastern focus, this option demonstrates that housing figures could be met through a heavier reliance on sites to the north.

Under this option, two thirds of development is directed to the north of Penrith. Though sites in the east have been included, this option includes only sites in E1 (Carleton) which have been previously approved. This option for the east is somewhat fragmented, though still generates enough critical mass to support a school on an alternative site.

The majority of sites in this option are focussed to the north of the town. As an urban village, this growth option would involve an expansion of a number of services, including new school provision.

	Town/ Village	Site Ref	Address	Total	Phasing		
					2012-17	2017-22	2022-25
1	Penrith	P2	Gilwilly Road	17			17
2	Penrith	P3	Sand Croft	9	9		
3	Penrith	P4	Beacon Square	3	3		
4	Penrith	P8	Myers Lane, Norfolk Road	32			32
5	Penrith	P10	Carleton Greenfield	103	103		
6	Penrith	P52	Carleton Greenfield	16	16		
7	Penrith	P67	Carleton Greenfield	56	56		
8	Penrith	P15	Carleton Hill Farm / Veterinary Centre	34		34	
9	Penrith	P16, P26, P53	Carleton Greenfield between sites P16 and P26	300		100	200
10	Penrith	P18, 27, 28	Salkeld Road / Fairhill Greenfield Extension - Field 3 Total	159	100	59	
11	Penrith	P28 (Rest of)	Salkeld Road / Fairhill Greenfield Extension - Field 4	31			31
12	Penrith	P30	Salkeld Road / Fairhill Greenfield	208			208
13	Penrith	P31	Salkeld Road / Fairhill Greenfield	106			106
14	Penrith	P42	Inglewood Road Greenfield extension	47			47
15	Penrith	P43	Inglewood Road Greenfield extension	94			94
16	Penrith	P45	Inglewood Road Greenfield extension	66			66
17	Penrith	P46	Inglewood Road Greenfield extension	65			65
18	Penrith	P19-25	Raiselands Total	175			175
19	Penrith	P66, 99	Raiselands N3 & N4	175			175

	Town/ Village	Site Ref	Address	Total	Phasing		
20	Penrith	P34	Stampers Depot, Bridge Lane	46		46	
21	Penrith	P35	Land off Robinson Street	35		35	
22	Penrith	P38	Land at Friargate	49	49		
23	Penrith	P54	Bellvue Farm, Salkeld Road	84			84
24	Penrith	P55, P56	Land between White Ox Way and Inglewood Road	35	35		
25	Penrith	P41, 58, 69, 70, 72, 96,97	White Ox Farm Total	155			155
26	Penrith	P59	Bakery behind Mostyn Hall, Friargate	11	11		
27	Penrith	P60	Gas Works Site, Old London Road	27			27
28	Penrith	P62	Garages to east on Scotland Road	10		10	
29	Penrith	P64	Depot, Lark Lane	10		10	
30	Penrith	P71	Brent Road Garages	6	6		
31	Penrith	P77	Fire Station, Bridge Lane	9		9	
32	Penrith	P86	Garages at Dodding House, William Street	4		4	
33	Penrith	P93	Barn and Yard, Brunswick Road	5		5	
34	Penrith	P94	QEGS Annexe, Ullswater Road	29		29	
35	Penrith	P95	TFE Depot, Old London Road	29		29	
36	Penrith	P98	Land at Carleton Hall Farm	108		108	
37	Penrith	P101	Land at Pategill	5	5		
	<b>TOTAL PENRITH</b>			<b>2353</b>	<b>393</b>	<b>478</b>	<b>1482</b>

## Option 5 - Sustainability Derived Option

This option is a composite of previous options which seeks to focus development based upon sustainability considerations. In this option, around half of development would be directed to the east, whilst the north and west would be split to similar levels. Growth in the east of the town would be identical to that proposed in Option 1 and as such would generate enough critical mass to support new services, including a primary school.

In this option, expansion to the north of the town has been limited to round off existing development and minimise the impacts upon landscape quality. Though significant numbers have been suggested, this may not be enough to support new services in this area.

Akin to option 2, this scenario promotes a mixed use development to the west of the town, though due to development elsewhere is less reliant on the same scale of development. Though the numbers of units on this site are reduced, it is possible that it could still support new services including a primary school.

	Town/ Village	Site Ref	Address	Total	Phasing		
					2012-17	2017-22	2022-25
1	Penrith	P2	Gilwilly Road	17			17
2	Penrith	P3	Sand Croft	9	9		
3	Penrith	P4	Beacon Square	3	3		
4	Penrith	P8	Myers Lane, Norfolk Road	32			32
5	Penrith	P10-14, P52, 67	Carleton Greenfield	554	156	302	96
6	Penrith	P15	Carleton Hill Farm / Veterinary Centre	34		34	
7	Penrith	P16, P26, P53	Carleton Greenfield between sites P16 and P26	300		200	100
8	Penrith	P18, 27, 28	Salkeld Road / Fairhill Greenfield Extension - Field 3 Total	159	100	59	
9	Penrith	P19-25	Raiselands Total	175			175
10	Penrith	P34	Stampers Depot, Bridge Lane	46		46	
11	Penrith	P35	Land off Robinson Street	35		35	
12	Penrith	P38	Land at Friargate	49	49		

	Town/ Village	Site Ref	Address	Total	Phasing		
13	Penrith	P55, P56	Land between White Ox Way and Inglewood Road	35	35		
14	Penrith	P41, 58, 69, 70, 72, 96,97	White Ox Farm Total	74			74
15	Penrith	P57	Fields adjacent Mile Lane	500			500
16	Penrith	P59	Bakery behind Mostyn Hall, Friargates	11	11		
17	Penrith	P60	Gas Works Site, Old London Road	27			27
18	Penrith	P61	Armstrong and Fleming Site	19			19
19	Penrith	P62	Garages to east on Scotland Road	10		10	
20	Penrith	P64	Depot, Lark Lane	10		10	
21	Penrith	P71	Brent Road Garages	6	6		
22	Penrith	P77	Fire Station, Bridge Lane	9		9	
23	Penrith	P86	Garages at Dodding House, William Street	4		4	
24	Penrith	P93	Barn and Yard, Brunswick Road	5		5	
25	Penrith	P94	QEGS Annexe, Ullswater Road	29		29	
26	Penrith	P95	TFE Depot, Old London Road	29		29	
27	Penrith	P98	Land at Carleton Hall Farm	108		108	
28	Penrith	P101	Land at Pategill	5	5		
	<b>TOTAL PENRITH</b>			<b>2,275</b>	<b>374</b>	<b>880</b>	<b>1,040</b>

**How much housing do we need to find land for in the Main Service Centres - Alston, Appleby and Kirkby Stephen?**

Completions and permissions in the three towns have been as follows:

**Table 3: Housing Targets, Completions and Commitments, Main Service Centres**

	Target		Completed		Committed for development			
	Core Strategy Proportion	Plan target	Housing Completions 2003/04 - 2011/12	Left to allocate	Sites under construction	Total extant permissions	Total under construction and with permission	Left to allocate
Kirkby Stephen (KS)	7%	327	33	294	44	24	68	226
Alston (AL)	4%	187	22	165	33	5	38	127
Appleby (AP)	9%	420	108	312	131	14	146	166

Applying Core Strategy targets and then removing completions and permissions since 2003/4 this leaves a need to find land for 226 houses in Kirby Stephen, 127 in Alston and 166 in Appleby. In the case of Appleby a recent planning permission granted this year for 142 homes at Back Lane (AP5) also needs to be factored in, leaving 24 homes to allocate land for in the town.

51 sites were identified or submitted for assessment across the three towns - 11 in Alston, 18 in Appleby and 22 in Kirkby Stephen.

Six sites were removed from the process at this stage as they already had permission, were under construction or complete. The houses within these sites will have already been counted against targets when we calculated what needed to be built from 2012/13 onwards, so the sites need removing to avoid double counting. They are:

	Town	Site	Case Reference
1	Alston	AL2 - Former Gasworks site	Approved in July 2008 for 11 houses. Case Reference 04/0610
2	Alston	AL5 - Raise Bank	Historical permission for 12 residential units (Case reference 09/1090), new revised application under consideration.
3	Appleby	AP1 - Colby lane	Permission granted and the site is developed - Case reference 07/0962
4	Kirkby Stephen	KS1 - Nateby Road	Permission granted for 60 new dwellings, Case Reference 10/0794, under construction
5	Kirkby Stephen	KS8 - Field north east of Victoria buildings	Current permission for nine dwellings, under construction (Case reference 09/0003)
6	Kirkby Stephen	KS12 - Littlefairs Yard No. 2, Faraday Road	Outline and reserve permission for 5 units 07/0785 and 11/0192

Note: Site AP5 (Back Lane, Appleby) is retained at this stage as it received permission in late 2012, so will have not been factored in to targets yet.

Next, we sieve out any sites which fall below our threshold of four units which we use as the minimum amount for allocating sites. This threshold represents the minimum sized site on which an element of on site affordable housing will be sought, and is applied so that smaller sites do not pass through the time consuming assessment process. Exclusion at this stage does not necessarily imply that these sites would not be granted permission if bought forward, rather it means that they are not part of the allocations strategy needed to meet targets.

	Town	Site
1	Appleby	AP3 - Site opposite old dairy
2	Appleby	AP15 - Land at Shaws Wiend, Boroughgate
3	Kirkby Stephen	KS16 - Land at South Road

Next, we remove any sites we consider to have a 'showstopper' constraint which would prevent its development, as there is no value in carrying out any further assessment. The constraints are:

**Sites in Flood Zone 3b.** Government guidance classifies land according to the probability of it flooding, and the Council is expected to take this into account when allocating land. It has commissioned and completed a detailed Strategic Flood Risk Assessment. This informs a sequential approach to determining the suitability of land for development in areas at risk of flooding, steering new development to areas at the lowest possible risk of flooding (Zone 1). Where there are no reasonably available sites within Zone 1, consideration of available sites in Flood Zone 2 (Medium Probability) should be made, where sites ultimately shown to be developable through site based Flood Risk Assessment. Only where there are no reasonably available sites in Flood Zones 1 or 2 will consideration be given to the suitability of sites in Flood Zone 3a (High Probability). Where sites are allocated an 'exceptions test' will be applied to demonstrate that the sustainability benefits of allocation are such that allocation is necessary.

Where sites fall within Zone 3b (flood plain) this has been treated as a 'showstopper' constraint and sites have been removed from consideration at an early stage.

	Town	Sites
1	Kirkby Stephen	KS14 - Land adjacent Eden Nursery. A significant proportion of the site is in Flood Zone 3b (Functional Floodplain) with some areas in Flood Zone 3a (high probability).

### **Sites which may affect Scheduled Ancient Monuments and Sites which are in Historic Park and Gardens**

No sites have been put forward in these areas.

This leaves 41 sites for assessment.

## Alston

Town	Site	Site (ha)	Number	Weighted scoring	Notes
Alston	AL1 - Jollybeard Lane	1.32	40	78	Identified as a suitable site in the SHLAA. Local plan site.
Alston	AL3 - The Scrap Yard, Station Road	0.55	17	69	Identified as a suitable site in the SHLAA
Alston	AL4 - Bruntley meadows	0.72	22	78	Identified as a suitable site in the SHLAA
Alston	AL6 - The Wardway	2.14	64	69	Identified as a suitable site in the SHLAA
Alston	AL7 - Raise Bank North	0.29	9	64	Dependent on the development of AL5 (Raise Bank) which has permission for 12 Units
Alston	AL8 - Tyne Café and garage building	0.35	11	77	Discounted due to size in the SHLAA
Alston	AL9 - Raise Bank West	0.24	7	68	Discounted due to size in the SHLAA
Alston	AL10 - Station Road Garage	0.31	9	65	Discounted due to size in the SHLAA
Alston	AL11 - Land South of Primary School	1.01	10	72	Identified as a suitable site in the SHLAA. Number based on SHLAA estimate due to topography
<b>TOTAL</b>			<b>188</b>		

(Target: 127)

### Headlines:

- No sites in Alston were considered unsuitable in the SHLAA
- On assessment, none of the proposed sites in Alston performed particularly badly, nor did they prove the least desirable when subject to sustainability assessment
- Sites AL8 and AL3 proved the most sustainable

- Sites AL3, 8 and 10 are brownfield sites, although all are in use as a scrapyard and garages respectively, and there is currently no indication as to whether they will be available for development
- Site AL1 and AL6 are allocated sites in the 1996 Local Plan
- Around a third of site AL10 lies in floodzone 3a
- All sites are within the North Pennines Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty

### **Option 1 (preferred option) - Prioritising brownfield sites plus next smallest sites**

Site	Phases (years)		
	0 to 5	6 to 10	11 to 15
AL3 - The Scrap Yard, Station Road			17
AL8 - Tyne Café and garage building		11	
AL10 - Station Road Garage		9	
AL1 - Jollybeard Lane	40		
AL4 - Bruntley Meadows	22		
AL11 - Land South of the Primary School			10
AL9 - Raise Bank West			7
AL7- Raise Bank North			9
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>62</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>43</b>

Total allocations: 125 against a target of 127.

### **Explanation:**

Firstly, we prioritised the three brownfield sites in the town. However, because we don't currently know when or if they will come forward for development they have been placed in the second phase. Secondly, we chose the three best scoring sites as marked in the weightings matrix. The exception to this was site AL6 (The Wardway) as this is a larger site furthest from the facilities in town.

### **Possible Alternative Options**

#### **Option 2 - The best scoring sites**

Allocating the best scoring sites would mean the following sites would be selected:

Site	Phases (years)		
	0 to 5	6 to 10	11 to 15
AL1 - Jollybeard Lane	40		
AL4 - Bruntley meadows	22		
AL11 - Land South of Primary School			10
AL6 - The Wardway			64
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>62</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>74</b>

Total allocations: 136 against a target of 127.

Although sites AL8 and AL3 scored higher than AL6 in this list the sites combined would not be of sufficient size to help meet targets if site AL6 was removed. They have therefore been excluded from this option.

### Option 3 - Concentrated development on the least number of (larger) sites

Allocating the largest sites would mean the the following sites would be selected:

Site	Phases (years)		
	0 to 5	6 to 10	11 to 15
AL1 - Jollybeard Lane	40		
AL4 - Bruntley Meadows	22		
AL6 - The Wardway			64
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>62</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>64</b>

Total allocations: 126 against a target of 127.

In practice the only difference between Options 2 and 3 is the inclusion of site AL11 in Option 2.

### Option 4 - Concentrated development on smallest sites

An option allocating the smallest sites possible was also investigated. This yielded the same sites as the preferred option.

#### Appleby

Town	Site	Site (ha)	Number	Weighted scoring	Notes
Appleby	AP2 - Drawbridge Lane	0.64	19	81	
Appleby	AP4 - Site adjacent to Appleby Cemetery	0.76	23	77	Identified as a suitable site in the SHLAA.
Appleby	AP5 - Back Lane	4.55	142	70	Granted permission for 142 dwellings, November 2012 (Case reference 09/1090). Identified as a suitable site in the SHLAA.
Appleby	AP6 - Cross Croft	4.18	125	77	Identified as a suitable site in the SHLAA.
Appleby	AP7- Bank's Nursery	1.02	31	73	Identified as a suitable site in the SHLAA.

Town	Site	Site (ha)	Number	Weighted scoring	Notes
Appleby	AP8 - Old Dairy Site, Drawbriggs Lane	1.96	59	77	Identified as a suitable site in the SHLAA.
Appleby	AP9 - Land Adjacent to Castlebank Lodge	0.94	28	66	
Appleby	AP10 - Land to the South of Station Road	4.02	121	71	Identified as a suitable site in the SHLAA.
Appleby	AP11 - Fields at the Coal Yard, Station Road	3.44	103	73	Identified as a suitable site in the SHLAA.
Appleby	AP12 - Field adjacent Barrowmoor Road, Colby Lane	4.43	133	75	Identified as unsuitable in the SHLAA.
Appleby	AP13 - Field adjacent Margaret's Way junction, Colby Lane	1.60	48	69	Identified as unsuitable in the SHLAA.
Appleby	AP14 - Field behind Rampkin Pastrures, Colby Lane	3.69	111	66	Identified as a suitable site in the SHLAA.
Appleby	AP16 - Land behind Cross Croft	5.06	152	67	Identified as a suitable site in the SHLAA.
Appleby	AP17 - Land adjacent to the A66	2.54	76	66	
Appleby	AP18 - Land at Battlebarrow	2.46	74	66	
<b>TOTAL</b>			<b>1,249</b>		

(Target: 166 - 24 after permission at AP5 is taken into account)

#### Headlines:

- Site AP5 (Back Lane, Appleby received a planning permission for 132 dwellings after March 31st 2012 and therefore needs to be factored into the target for Appleby and allocated. This leaves a target of 34 dwellings to find land for, which points to a need to find an additional single site.

- Sites AP12 and AP13 were considered unsuitable in the SHLAA - AP12 because the site is poorly related to the centre of Appleby and AP13 because of the sites steep gradient and intrusion into the open countryside.
- On assessment, sites AP13, 14, 16, 17 and 18 scored the lowest against the housing matrix. Site AP2 performed the best but overlaps with AP8.
- Sites AP2 and AP4 proved the most sustainable when assessed, sites AP6, AP12, AP16 and AP17 performed the least well.
- Sites AP2, 7 and 8 are brownfield sites.
- Sites AP5 and AL7 are allocated sites in the 1996 Local Plan

### **Option 1 (preferred option) - Permitted development plus prioritising best performing sites**

Site	Phases (years)		
	0 to 5	6 to 10	11 to 15
AP11 (Part) - Fields at the Coal Yard, Station Road			24
<b>TOTAL</b>			<b>24</b>

Site AP5 has permission for development. To find additional housing land, we looked at three brownfield sites possibly available for development in Appleby - AP2, AP7 and AP8. AP2 and AP8 score for highly when assessed against the housing matrix. However AP2, although brownfield is a small sloping site with mature trees. New development would also potentially overlook housing opposite on Drawbriggs Lane. Although site AP8 is brownfield it remains in employment use and the potential for housing development therefore remains uncertain. There is also no indication that the landowner wishes to bring forward site AP7 so this has not been selected as preferred option at this stage.

Site AP4 is the next best performing site. However, it is adjacent to the cemetery and would potentially prevent any expansion of the cemetery in the long term. The next best performing site is AP12, but this was considered one of the least sustainable sites when appraised. This leaves us with part of site AP11 as the best option.

Total allocations: 24 against a target of 24.

### **Option 2 - Alternative brownfield site**

Site	Phases (years)		
	0 to 5	6 to 10	11 to 15
AP8 (part)			24
<b>TOTAL</b>			<b>24</b>

Our alternative would be site AP8, currently ruled out as there is no indication that it is currently available for development. The site would be considered if employment uses terminated and the land came forward for development.

Total allocations: 24 against a target of 24.

### Option 3 - Alternative Greenfield Site

Site	Phases (years)		
	0 to 5	6 to 10	11 to 15
AP7			24
<b>TOTAL</b>			<b>24</b>

This next option is included as an alternative to Site AP11, should the landowner wish to bring the site forward for development.

Total allocations: 24 against a target of 24.

#### Explanation:

### Option 4 - Further Alternative Greenfield Site

Site	Phases (years)		
	0 to 5	6 to 10	11 to 15
AP10 (Part)			24
<b>TOTAL</b>			<b>24</b>

The best performing greenfield site under the housing matrix after Site AP11 is AP10. It is therefore included as a fourth option.

Total allocations: 24 against a target of 24.

### Kirkby Stephen

Town	Site	Site (ha)	Number	Weighted scoring	Notes
Kirkby Stephen	KS2 - Hobson's Lane	1.54	46	82	
Kirkby Stephen	KS3 - South Road/Whitehouse Farm	1.80	54	86	Identified as an unsuitable site in the SHLAA.
Kirkby Stephen	KS4 - Croglam Lane	0.24	4	75	Recreational space since 2004. Discounted due to size in the SHLAA.
Kirkby Stephen	KS5 - Land adjacent Mountain Rescue Post, Christian Head	0.74	22	80	Discounted from the SHLAA as poorly related, beyond the settlement boundary.
Kirkby Stephen	KS6 - Green field, Christian Head	0.74	22	78	Discounted from the SHLAA as poorly related, beyond the settlement boundary.
Kirkby Stephen	KS7 - Mark Johns Motors	0.18	5	73	Discounted due to size in the SHLAA

Town	Site	Site (ha)	Number	Weighted scoring	Notes
Kirkby Stephen	KS9 - Field adjacent The Crescent, Nateby Road	0.95	20	72	Identified as suitable in the SHLAA but topography restricts sites.
Kirkby Stephen	KS10 - Land off Bollam Lane	0.28	8	76	Discounted due to size in the SHLAA
Kirkby Stephen	KS11 - Land adjacent Park Terrace, South Road	1.02	31	74	Suitable in the SHLAA providing access issues can be overcome.
Kirkby Stephen	KS13 - Land to the west of Faraday Road	4.09	96	77	Identified as suitable in the SHLAA. Part of the site is a County Wildlife site
Kirkby Stephen	KS15 - Land adjacent Croglam Lane	2.80	84	75	Identified as suitable in the SHLAA
Kirkby Stephen	KS17 - Land behind Park Terrace	0.75	23	77	Identified as suitable in the SHLAA
Kirkby Stephen	KS18 - Land adjacent Croglam Park	1.18	35	77	Identified as suitable in the SHLAA in the long term
Kirkby Stephen	KS19 - Land behind the Crescent, Nateby Road	0.28	8	73	Discounted due to size in the SHLAA. Access via a narrow road which the landowner does not want to see developed.
Kirkby Stephen	KS20 - South Road/Whitehouse Road (extension of KS3)	0.63	19	70	Discounted from the SHLAA as poorly related to the settlement, and beyond the settlement boundary.
Kirkby Stephen	KS21 - Land at Edensyde	0.51	15	60	Discounted from the SHLAA as awkwardly shaped and proximity to the floodplain. Possible flooding issues
Kirkby Stephen	KS22 - Land at Mellbecks	5.48	164	73	Outline Live application for 24 units on part of the site (12/0984)
			<b>656</b>		

(Target: 226)

### Headlines:

- Sites KS3, 5 and 6 and KS20 and KS21 were considered unsuitable in the SHLAA
- Site KS5 was put forward as an alternative to KS2, and covers a part of the same site.
- Site KS19 currently is inaccessible as the landowner of the access does not wish to put it forward for development
- On assessment, Sites KS2, KS6, KS13, and KS17 performed the best.
- Sites KS4, 5, 6 and 10 proved the most sustainable when assessed. Sites KS18 and 21 performed the least well.
- Sites KS18 and 21 performed less well in the sustainability appraisal exercise
- Site KS22 has an outline application for 24 units on part of the site.

### Option 1 (preferred option) - Dispersed development, prioritising Brownfield development

Site	Phases (years)		
	0 to 5	6 to 10	11 to 15
KS7 - Mark Johns Motors			5
KS2/5 - Hobson's Lane/Land adjacent Mountain Rescue Post, Christian Head			46
KS13 - Land to the west of Faraday Road (part)			52
KS17 - Land behind Park Terrace			23
KS4 - Croglam Lane			4
KS15 - Land adjacent Croglam Lane (part)			52
KS9 - Field adjacent The Crescent, Nateby Road			20
KS22 - Land at Melbecks (part)			24
<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>0</b>	<b>226</b>

Total allocations: 226 against a target of 226.

### Explanation

To the north of Kirkby Stephen site KS7 is allocated as it is a brownfield site. KS2 and 5 are then allocated as the best performing options. To the south of the settlement, site KS4 is allocated, which is well connected to the development of site KS15. Not all of KS15 would be needed to meet targets, and as it's proposed the site follows the building line from Garth Grove to Croglam Lane. To the west of the settlement it is proposed part of site KS13 is allocated. It is felt the site in its entirety is of too large scale to be allocated. To the east of the settlement it is proposed site KS9 is allocated, and the western area of site KS22. KS22 in its entirety scored relatively poorly through the technical exercise due to scale and topography, however it is felt development of the western area is acceptable in principle. KS3 and 6 are not included as they were considered unsuitable in the SHLAA. KS18 is

excluded as it performed less well under sustainability appraisal. KS19 is excluded due to access issues. KS10 is not included as it is considered to be not well related to the development pattern of the town.

**Option 2 - Prioritising brownfield sites, followed by best performing sites, dispersed option**

Site	Phases (years)		
	0 to 5	6 to 10	11 to 15
KS7 - Mark Johns Motors			5
KS2/5 - Hobson's Lane/Land adjacent Mountain Rescue Post, Christian Head			46
KS13 - Land to the west of Faraday Road			96
KS17 - Land behind Park Terrace			23
KS4 - Croglam Lane			4
KS15 - Land adjacent Croglam Lane (part)			52
<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>0</b>	<b>226</b>

Total allocations: 226 against a target of 226.

**Explanation**

Site KS7 is allocated as it is a brownfield site. KS3 and 6 are not included as they were considered unsuitable in the SHLAA. KS2 and 5 are then allocated as the best performing options, followed by KS13, 17, 10 and 4 and 15 are then proposed for allocation, although not all of KS15 would be needed to meet targets. KS15 and 4 are also adjacent to each other. KS18 is excluded as it performed less well under sustainability appraisal. KS19 is excluded due to access issues. KS10 is not included as it is considered to be not well related to the development pattern of the town.

**Option 3 - Concentrated Development**

Site	Phases (years)		
	0 to 5	6 to 10	11 to 15
KS13 - Land to the west of Faraday Road			96
KS2/5 - Hobson's Lane/Land adjacent Mountain Rescue Post, Christian Head			46
KS15 - Land adjacent Croglam Lane (part)			84
KS4 - Croglam Lane			4
<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>0</b>	<b>230</b>

Total allocations: 226 against a target of 226.

This option focuses development onto three larger sites, with KS15 allocated for more development than in Option 1.

#### Option 4 - Smaller sites

Site	Phases (years)		
	0 to 5	6 to 10	11 to 15
KS4 - Croglam Lane			4
KS10 - Land off Bollam Lane			8
KS9 - Field adjacent The Crescent, Nateby Road			20
KS17 - Land behind Park Terrace			23
KS11 - Land adjacent Park Terrace, South Road			31
KS2/5 - Hobson's Lane/Land adjacent Mountain Rescue Post, Christian Head			46
KS13 - Land to the west of Faraday Road			96
<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>0</b>	<b>228</b>

Total allocations: 228 against a target of 226.

## Local Service Centres

### How much housing do we need to distribute to the Local Service Centres (LSCs)?

The Eden District Council Core Strategy distributes 20% of new housing in the district between 2003 and 2025 - or 933 dwellings. Removing housing already built from this figure (369 dwellings) and those already committed for development (396 dwellings) land allocations for 168 dwellings need to be identified. No additional buffer for under delivery has been applied as it is anticipated that past rates of development and potential windfall development will come forward in sufficient quantity to mitigate any potential under delivery.

There are 38 villages with sufficient services to warrant status as a Local Service Centre. If we were to distribute evenly to all of them an additional 4 to 5 houses would be allocated to each.

### Choosing Sites

275 sites were identified or submitted for assessment outside Penrith, Alston, Appleby and Kirkby Stephen.

We began by removing sites from the assessment process where they are outside the Local Service Centres, including villages where the review detailed in the main consultation document has resulted in some villages losing their LSC designation. This is because current Core Strategy policy is for new housing development to be focussed in the main, key and local service centres. The following sites have therefore been excluded:

Village	Sites	Source
Ainstable	LAI1, LAI2, LAI3	These sites were not included in previous rounds of consultation but were identified as Ainstable is currently a Local Service Centre.
Blencarn	LBC1, 2, 3, 4	LBC1,2 & 3 were identified in the Alternative sites document. LBC4 was identified by the District Council
Brackenber	LBK1,2	LBK1 & 2 were identified in the Alternative sites document.
Brough Sowerby	LBS1	The Alternative Sites Document
Crosby Garrett	LSCG1, 2	These sites were not included in previous rounds of consultation but were identified as Crosby Garrett is currently a Local Service Centre.
Cliburn	LCB1, 2	Alternative Sites consultation
Dale, nr. Ruckcroft	LDL1	LDL1 was identified in the Alternative Sites consultation.
Duften	LDUF1, 2, 3, 4, 5	LDUF1 was identified in the Alternative Sites consultation, LDUF 2-5 were identified by EDC as Duften is currently a Local Service Centre.

Village	Sites	Source
Eamont Bridge	LEB1, 2, 3	Alternative Sites consultation
Flusco	LFL1	Alternative Sites consultation
Garrigill	LGA1, 2, 3	These sites were
Great Ormside	LGO1, 2	These sites were not included in previous rounds of consultation but were identified as Great Ormside is currently a Local Service Centre.
Great Salkeld	LGSA1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8	LGSA1 was identified in the Alternative Sites consultation. LGSA 2-8 were not included in previous rounds of consultation.
Great Strickland	LGST1, 2, 3	LGST 1 & 2 were identified in the Alternative Sites consultation. LGST3 was not included in previous rounds of consultation.
Highbank Hill, near Kirkoswald	RHBH1	This site was not previously identified.
Hunsonby	LHS1	LHS1 was identified in the Alternative Sites consultation.
Hwith, nr Ravenstonedale	LHW1	LHW1 was identified in the Alternative Sites consultation.
Knock	LKN1, 2, 3	These sites were not included in previous rounds of consultation but were identified as Knock is currently a Local Service Centre.
Lamonby	LLB1	This site was not included in previous rounds of consultation.
Little Salkeld	LLSA1, 2, 3, 4, 5	LLSA1 was identified in the Alternative sites consultation. LLSA2-5 were not included in previous rounds of consultation but were identified as Little Salkeld is currently a Local Service Centre.
Low Hesket	LLH1	This site was not included in previous rounds of consultation
Mallerstang	LML1	This site was included in the Alternative Sites consultation.
Nateby	LNA1, 2, 3	LNA1 was identified in the Alternative Sites consultation. LNA2 & 3 were not included in previous rounds of consultation but were identified as Nateby is currently a Local Service Centre.
Newbiggin (Ainstable)	RNNA1	This site was included in the Alternative Sites Consultation.

Village	Sites	Source
Newbiggin (Dacre)	RNN1, 2, 3, 4, 5	These sites were included in the Alternative Sites Consultation.
Newbeggin on Lune	RNNL1, 2	These sites were included in the Alternative Sites Consultation.
Plumpton Head	LPL1	This site was included in the Issues and Options consultation.
Ruckcroft	RDF1	This site was not previously identified.
Sandford	RSF1	This site was included in the Alternative Sites consultation.
Skirwith	RSK11	This site was not previously identified.
Soulby	LSO1, 2, 3, 4, 5	These sites were not included in previous rounds of consultation but were identified as Soulby is currently a Local Service Centre.
Southwaite	RSW1	This site was included in the Issues and Options consultation.
Stagstones	RSS1	This site was included in the Alternative Sites consultation.
Winskill	LWIN1, 2, 3	These sites were not previously identified.
Winton	LWT1	This site was included in the Alternative Sites consultation.
Woodside, Whinfell Farm & Ash Hill Farm, Temple Sowerby	RWH1, 2, 3	These sites were not previously identified.

This leaves 192 sites. The next step is to take out sites which have received planning permission, were under construction, or were completed by 31 March 2012. 31 March 2012 applies because this is the end date for the last full monitoring year, so it has been used as a cut off point when establishing new housing targets. If sites are not excluded they would be double counted. Where sites have received a planning permission after this date they have been included in this assessment at this stage and acknowledged as having permission - for example Site LBO2 - land at The Larches, Bolton and LME3 - Land at Village Hall; Rectory Dell, Melmerby.

	Village	Site	Case Reference
1	Armathwaite	LAR4	Permission granted February 2012, implemented consent (09/0876)
2	Bolton	LBO10	Permission granted April 2010 (10/0069)
3	Bolton	LBO11	Permission granted August 2009, under construction (09/0521)
4	Brough	LBR3	Outline permission for 48 units granted on appeal in 2009. Appeal reference APP/HO928/A/09/2107203

	Village	Site	Case Reference
5	Clifton	LCF1	Approved August 2011 (10/0987)
6	Crosby Ravensworth	LCR1	Approved (08/0767)
7	Culgaith	LCU4	Approved March 2010 (09/0881)
8	High Hesket	LHH1	Approved October 2009 (09/0279)
9	Orton	LOR2	Approved, (12/0619)
10	Renwick	RRN1	Approved (10/0616)
11	Shap	LSH4	Approved December 2009 (09/0568) and December 2008 (08/0869)
12	Stainton	LST1	Approved for one dwelling (08/0830) which appears to remove access to the site

Note part of sites LBR4 (Brough), LSKE1 (Skelton) LTS1 (Temple Sowerby) and LWA3 (Warcop) were granted consent (11/0607, 09/1007, 10/0977, 11/1126 & 08/0444) but not for the whole site. They therefore remain in the process.

Sites of less than four dwellings are then removed. It is considered that it is not practical to allocate sites below this threshold, which is the number above which it is Council policy to require an element of affordable housing. Sites have therefore been removed and no further assessment is carried out.

Village	Sites
Armathwaite	LAR2
Bolton	LBO3, 4, 5, 8, 9
Brough	LBR5 & 6
Gamblesby	LGAM2
Kings Meaburn	LKM1
Lazonby	LLZ1, 8, 9, 10
Long Marton	LLM1
Maulds Meaburn	LMM1, 3, 4
Melmerby	LME3
Morland	LMO4
Orton	LOR3
Shap	LSH2, 3, 10
Stainton	LST2
Tebay	LTE3, 4
Temple Sowerby	LTS3
Warcop	LWA5, 7 & 8
<b>Total</b>	<b>31</b>

In cases where a site is above this threshold when a density multiplier of 30 dwellings per hectare is applied but has had a planning permission for less than four houses granted since 31 March 2012 it has been included, but with the number of houses subject to the grant of permission.

The next step was to remove any sites we considered to have 'showstopper' constraints to development which cannot be overcome. These constraints are:

**Sites in Flood Zone 3b.** Government guidance classifies land according to the probability of it flooding, and the Council is expected to take this into account when allocating land. It has commissioned and completed a detailed Strategic Flood Risk Assessment. This informs a sequential approach to determining the suitability of land for development in areas at risk of flooding, steering new development to areas at the lowest possible risk of flooding (Zone 1). Where there are no reasonably available sites within Zone 1, consideration of available sites in Flood Zone 2 (Medium Probability) should be made, where sites ultimately shown to be developable through site based Flood Risk Assessment. Only where there are no reasonably available sites in Flood Zones 1 or 2 will consideration be given to the suitability of sites in Flood Zone 3a (High Probability). Where sites are allocated an 'exceptions test' will be applied to demonstrate that the sustainability benefits of allocation are such that allocation is necessary.

Where sites fall within Zone 3b (flood plain) this has been treated as a 'showstopper' constraint and sites have been removed from consideration at an early stage. Sites LLZ11, LNE2, LOR1 & LOR4 have been excluded on this basis all or most of the sites are classified as Zones 3a or b. Where sites do have areas with a probability of flooding within them but where there remains a developable area these have been left in the assessment and flooding issues considered as part of site appraisal.

	Village	Sites
1	Lazonby	LLZ11. The site is in floodzone 3a. Whilst this does not preclude it from development a sequential test must be applied to see if other sites can be used in preference. This site would fail this test within this process.
2	Nenthead	LNE2. The site is in floodzone 3a. Whilst this does not preclude it from development a sequential test must be applied to see if other sites can be used in preference. This site would fail this test within this process.
3	Orton	LOR1. The site is in floodzone 3a. Whilst this does not preclude it from development a sequential test must be applied to see if other sites can be used in preference. This site would fail this test within this process.
4	Orton	LOR4. The majority of the site is in floodzone 3a. Whilst this does not preclude it from development a sequential test must be applied to see if other sites can be used in preference. This site would fail this test within this process.
5	Warcop	LWA2. The site is within flood zones 2 and 3b. Floodzone 3b is the functional floodplain and any development must be subject to an exceptions and sequential test. This site would fail this test within this process.

**Sites which may affect Scheduled Ancient Monuments.** Scheduling is the process through which nationally important sites and monuments are given legal protection. Development affecting a Scheduled Ancient Monument or its setting should be avoided.

	Village	Sites
1	Kings Meaburn	LKM3, 4, 5. The sites are part of the King's Meaburn medieval open field system and Bessygarth Well Schedule Ancient Monument.
2	Kirkby Thore	LKT4, 9. The sites are within the Kirkby Thore Roman Fort and associated scheduled ancient monument.

**Sites which are in Historic Park & Gardens.** There are six registered historic parks and gardens in the district: Appleby Castle, Image Garden Rheghed, Askham Hall, Hutton in the Forest, Dalemian and Lowther Castle. No sites have been put forward in these areas.

**Sites within area designated for their nature conservation importance under European and national law.** Sites within Special Protection Areas, Special Areas for conservation and 'RAMSAR' sites would be excluded. No sites have been put forward in these areas.

This leaves 139 sites which have been assessed for suitability.

Some sites have already been identified as unsuitable in the District Council's Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (March 2009). Table 3 and Appendix 1 set out the reasons why. They have therefore been excluded from further assessment.

	Village	Site	Reason for Assessment of Unsuitability
1	Armathwaite	LAR1	Unsuitable in isolation due to proximity of railway line and inadequate access.
2	Bolton	LBO6	Unsuitable as Amenity Open Space and topographic issues make development unviable.
3	Culgaith	LCU2	Unsuitable due to topography, and sequentially less preferable.
4	Culgaith	LCU5	Excluded as too large, poorly related and extends beyond the settlement boundary.
5	Kirkby Thore	LKT3	Unsuitable as poorly related to the settlement
6	Kirkby Thore	LKT5	Excluded due to flooding issues, presence of an ancient monument, inadequate access and being poorly related to the settlement.
7	Langwathby	LLG4	Unsuitable as poorly related to the settlement.
8	Langwathby	LLG6	Unsuitable as poorly related to the settlement and would set a negative precedent.
9	Lazonby	LLZ5	Unsuitable as poorly related to the settlement.

	Village	Site	Reason for Assessment of Unsuitability
10	Lazonby	LLZ7	Unsuitable as back land development out of character.
11	Lazonby	LLZ12	Excluded as it is a playing field.
12	Long Marton	LLM3	Removed as poorly related to the physical settlement .boundary
13	Long Marton	LLM4	Removed as poorly related to the physical settlement boundary.
14	Morland	LMO3	Excluded as some of the site is in floodzone and relates poorly to the settlement.
15	Morland	LMO5	Excluded as some of the site is in floodzone and relates poorly to the settlement.
16	Ousby	LOU1	Unsuitable as poorly related to the settlement.
17	Shap	LSH6	Excluded as amenity open space and extends beyond the physical settlement boundary.
18	Shap	LSH7	Excluded as amenity open space and extends beyond the physical settlement boundary.
19	Shap	LSH8	Unsuitable as poorly related to the settlement.
20	Shap	LSH9	Excluded as some of the site is in floodzone and relates poorly to the settlement.
21	Sockbridge and Tirril	LT11	Unsuitable as a restrictive covenant prevents development.
22	Stainton	LST3	Unsuitable due to topographical issues and effect on residential amenity.
23	Stainton	LST5	Excluded due to lack of access and unacceptable development in the countryside.
24	Stainton	LST6	Excluded as poorly related and extends beyond the settlement boundary.
25	Stainton	LST7	Excluded as poorly related and extends beyond the settlement boundary.
26	Tebay	LTE5	Excluded on scale and amenity grounds.
27	Tebay	LTE6	Excluded as Amenity Open Space and adjacent to allotments.
28	Warcop	LWA6	Excluded due to scale and being poorly related to the existing built form.
29	Yanwath	LYA1	Unsuitable as poorly related to the settlement.

This leaves 110 potential sites. Note: Site LTE7 (Former Railway Sidings, Tebay) was assessed as unsuitable but part of the site has subsequently received a planning permission for 16 dwellings subject to the signing of a Section 106 agreement so is retained in the Assessment.

## Possible Options for Allocating New Sites

First, we need to take account of a site which has received permission for development since 31 March 2012:

Village	Site	Case Reference	Number of Dwellings
Bolton	LBO2 - Land adjacent to The Larches	11/0793, granted on appeal 2012	5
<b>Total</b>			<b>5</b>

(note: sites still awaiting Section 106 agreements are not included. Site LME3 at Melmerby has also received a permission for three units but falls below the threshold for inclusion)

Next, we have reviewed any proposed Local Service Centre additional sites identified in the new five year land supply calculations to see if they remain suitable, achievable and deliverable. A schedule of the revised five year land supply schedule is available separately. The following sites have been identified in the five year land supply and are above four units in size:

	Village	Site	Number of dwellings	Weighting Score	Notes
1	Armathwaite	LAR3 - Land behind Armathwaite School	20	83	Capacity of the site reduced by 50%. Availability and achievability confirmed by agent/land/owner.
2	Kings Meaburn	LKM2 - Land adjacent Prospect House	13	82	Known developer interest, previous application for development.
3	Langwathby	LLG1 - Meadow Court	4	79	Small area of site still undeveloped. Local Plan site. Remainder of the site considered suitable for minor development.
4	Langwathby	LLG2 - Townhead	13	75	Availability and achievability confirmed by agent/land/owner. Local Plan allocation.
5	Morland	LMO2 - Land behind Mothercroft	15	80	Live application with the Council (12/0018), awaiting Section 106 sign off.
5	Tebay	LTE7 (part) - Former Railway Cuttings	16	73	Live application with the Council for half of the site (08/0103), awaiting Section 106 sign off.

	Village	Site	Number of dwellings	Weighting Score	Notes
6	Temple Sowerby	LTS1 - Land to the rear of Linden Farm	9	83	Section 106 is due to be signed off.
7	Warcop	LWA3 - Eden Gate Farm	12	84	Suitable in principle. Live application (11/0145) for 12 units.
	<b>Total</b>		<b>102</b>		

If we were to assume these sites were to come forward this would leave a need to find land for an additional 61 houses from 99 sites (Target of 168 - 5 completions - 102 in the five year land supply = 61).

### Assessing Sites

100 sites have been assessed for their suitability against 15 different weighted planning criteria and were scored accordingly. Across the district sites scored between 55 and 91. The sites in the five year land supply were checked against these criteria to see if any did not perform well as should be considered for exclusion. All sites attracted high scores (see table above) and are proposed for allocation.

We then have numerous ways of selecting villages and sites. For example:

- We could focus development on the largest villages only.
- We could focus development to a small number of larger sites in particular villages.
- We could focus new development to the villages we identify as the most sustainable.
- We could focus development in sites with the most services.

### Preferred Option for Selecting Sites

Our preferred option (small scale balanced distribution across the most sustainable Local Service Centres) is to apply a number of filters to sift sites and then apply the weightings to select the best of those sifted sites. For the preferred option the filters are:

	Filter	Reasoning
1	Sites must be in the most sustainable settlements. We have carried out a comparative sustainability assessment of each village, and each has been given a mark of 1 to 5. Details are included in the separate sustainability assessment. It is proposed that at this stage only sites in villages scoring 1, 2 or 3 are considered for new allocations.	Selected sites will be in the most sustainable villages. Comparative assessment also aids compliance with legal requirements to carry out strategic environmental assessment.

2	Sites should not add more than 10% of new development to the existing housing stock.	To ensure that new development is proportionate to the settlement and character and form is protected. By using this filter it means that small scale housing is distributed across the Local Service Centres rather than being focussed on one area.
3	The village does not already have an existing permission for housing development or the site is identified in the five year land supply.	This is to ensure a more even distribution of new development across the district.
4	Only one allocation per village. Where more than one potential allocation is identified for one village the higher scoring is chosen.	This is to ensure a more even distribution of new development across the district.

The following sites fall within these criteria (sorted against weighted scores):

	Village	Site	Number of dwellings	Percentage of existing dwelling stock	Weighting Score
1	Lazonby	LLZ3	22	6.25	80
2	Hackthorpe	LHA1	6	4.95	77
3	Kirkby Thore	LKT1	22	7.36	75
4	Lazonby	LLZ13	6	1.70	73
5	Kirkoswald	LKO1	15	8.15	72
6	Greystoke	LGR2	11	4.23	71
7	Nenthead	LNE1	6	4.23	70
8	Long Marton	LLM6	15	8.24	69
9	Greystoke	LGR1	4	1.54	69
10	Kirkoswald	LKO2	10	5.43	67
11	Plumpton	LPL4	14	8.19	64
12	Plumpton	LPL3	9	5.26	59
	<b>Total</b>		<b>140</b>		

Some sites do fall within the criteria set out above but have been excluded because of their planning history or other factors:

- Site LGR2 (Greystoke) was refused outline permission for two units in 2012 and is considered unsuitable for development
- Site LPL3 (Plumpton) is excluded as there is a site in the same village with a higher score
- Site LLZ13 (Lazonby) is excluded as there is a site in the same village with a higher score
- Site LLM6 (Long Marton) is allocated as amenity open space in the 1996 Local Plan
- Site LKT6 (Kirkby Thore) has been excluded due to potential disturbance from the neighbouring farm
- Site LKT8 (Kirkby Thore) - Land off Piper Lane, Field behind Rectory Farm, Kirkby Thore passes through this filter but has been excluded access would be needed through site LKT 6 or 7 which are not proposed for development

This leaves:

	Village	Site	Number of dwellings	Weighting Score	Notes
1	Lazonby	LLZ3	22	80	Identified as suitable in the SHLAA
2	Hackthorpe	LHA1	6	77	Excluded from the SHLAA due to size
3	Kirkoswald	LKO1	15	72	
4	Kirkby Thore	LKT1	22	75	
5	Greystoke	LGR1	4	71	
6	Nenthead	LNE1	6	70	Identified as suitable in the SHLAA
7	Kirkoswald	LKO2	10	67	Identified as suitable in the SHLAA
8	Plumpton	LPL4	14	64	Identified as suitable in the SHLAA
	<b>Total</b>		<b>65</b>		

The following sites are therefore proposed therefore be allocated:

	Village	Site	Number of dwellings
1	Armathwaite	LAR3 - Land behind Armathwaite School	20
2	Bolton	LBO2 - Land adjacent to The Larches	5
3	Hackthorpe	LHA1 - Pattinson Close	6
4	Kings Meaburn	LKM2 - Land adjacent Prospect House	13
5	Kirkby Thore	LKT1 - Land near Primary School	22
6	Kirkoswald	LKO1 - Former Butchers Shop and Field	15
7	Langwathby	LLG1 - Meadow Court	4
8	Langwathby	LLG2 -Townhead	13
9	Lazonby	LLZ3 - Rosebank Farm	22
10	Morland	LMO2 - Land behind Mothercroft	15
11	Tebay	LTE7 (part) - Former Railway Cuttings	16
12	Temple Sowerby	LTS1 - Land to the rear of Linden Farm	9
13	Warcop	LWA3 - Eden Gate Farm	12
	<b>Total</b>		<b>172</b>

These sites give a total of 172 houses, against a target of 168.

Pros	Cons
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A balanced approach between small scale distribution to more settlements and allocation of medium sized sites</li> <li>• Favours the more sustainable settlements</li> <li>• Is mostly based on five year land supply information, meaning sites should be readily available</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Focuses new housing to larger villages only, meaning need may not be met elsewhere</li> </ul>

## Possible Alternative Options

### Option 2 - Balanced distribution across the most sustainable Local Service Centres, without applying the 5 year land supply filter

This option, is the same as the first, but sites are not automatically included if they are in our five year land supply. In addition, the size threshold has been widened to 15% of existing stock as a filter of 10% does not yield sufficient sites to meet targets, and it allows us to explore an option that yields fewer, bigger sites. We have also chosen this option for testing and consultation because although the five year land supply sites are our estimate of the sites that are likely to come forward we would like your views on any alternatives that you may feel are preferable. The filter is therefore as follows:

	Filter	Reasoning
1	Sites must be in the most sustainable settlements. We have carried out a comparative sustainability assessment of each village, and each has been given a mark of 1 to 5. Details are included in the separate sustainability assessment. It is proposed that at this stage only sites in villages scoring 1, 2 or 3 are considered for new allocations.	Selected sites will be in the most sustainable villages. Comparative assessment also aids compliance with legal requirements to carry out strategic environmental assessment.
2	Sites should not add more than 20% of new development to the existing housing stock.	To ensure that new development is proportionate to the settlement and character and form is protected. By using this filter it means that small scale housing is distributed across the Local Service Centres rather than being focussed on one area.
3	The village does not already have an existing permission for housing development.	This is to ensure a more even distribution of new development across the district.
4	Only one allocation per village. Where more than one potential allocation is identified for one village the higher scoring is chosen.	This is to ensure a more even distribution of new development across the district.

This filter yields the following sites (sorted against weighted scores):

	Village	Site	Number of dwellings	Percentage of existing dwelling stock	Weighting Score
1	Temple Sowerby	LTS1	9	5.17	83
2	Lazonby	LLZ3	22	6.25	80
3	Greystoke	LGR3	30	11.54	80
4	Long Marton	LLM2	33	18.13	80
5	Langwathby	LLG1	4	0.506	79
6	Lazonby	LLZ2	63	17.90	79
7	Temple Sowerby	LTS4	6	3.45	78
8	Hackthorpe	LHA1	6	4.95	77
9	Temple Sowerby	LTS2	16	9.20	77
10	Tebay	LTE1	9	4.07	76
11	Tebay	LTE2	38	17.19	76
12	Kirkby Thore	LKT6	13	0.355	76
13	Kirkby Thore	LKT1	22	7.21	75
14	Kirkby Thore	LKT7	48	15.74	75
15	Langwathby	LLG2	13	0.506	75
16	Kirkby Thore	LKT2	24	7.87	74
17	Hackthorpe	LHA3	20	19.80	74
18	Hackthorpe	LHA4	14	13.86	74
19	Langwathby	LLG3	52	19.26	74
20	Lazonby	LLZ4	39	11.08	74
21	Lazonby	LLZ13	6	1.70	73
22	Tebay	LTE7	16	7.24	73
23	Hackthorpe	LHA2	12	11.88	72
24	Kirkoswald	LKO1	15	8.15	72
25	Temple Sowerby	LTS5	6	3.45	72
26	Sockbridge and Tirrill	LTI2	19	10.33	71
27	Greystoke	LGR2	11	4.23	71
28	Nenthead	LNE1	6	4.23	70
29	Temple Sowerby	LTS6	5	2.87	70

	Village	Site	Number of dwellings	Percentage of existing dwelling stock	Weighting Score
30	Greystoke	LGR1	4	1.54	69
31	Long Marton	LLM6	15	8.24	69
32	Kirkoswald	LKO2	10	5.43	67
33	Lazonby	LLZ6	44	12.50	64
34	Plumpton	LPL4	14	8.19	64
35	Sockbridge and Tirrill	LT13	29	15.76	63
36	Plumpton	LPL3	9	5.26	59
	<b>Total</b>		<b>702</b>		

An additional site LKT8 - Land off Piper Lane, Field behind Rectory Farm, Kirkby Thore passes through this filter but has been excluded access would be needed through site LKT 6 or 7 which are not proposed for development. The site was flagged as unsuitable in the SHLAA for this reason but was left in the assessment process.

Where more than one allocation has been proposed in a village the highest scoring site is retained. If sites have identical scores the smaller site is selected.

	Village	Site	Number of dwellings	Percentage of existing dwelling stock	Weighting Score
1	Temple Sowerby	LTS1	9	5.17	83
2	Lazonby	LLZ3	22	6.25	80
3	Greystoke	LGR3	30	11.54	80
4	Long Marton	LLM2	33	18.13	80
5	Langwathby	LLG1	4	0.506	79
6	Hackthorpe	LHA1	6	4.95	77
7	Tebay	LTE1	9	4.07	76
8	Kirkby Thore	LKT6	13	0.355	76
9	Kirkoswald	LKO1	15	8.15	72
10	Sockbridge and Tirrill	LT12	19	10.33	71
11	Nenthead	LNE1	6	4.23	70
12	Plumpton	LPL4	14	8.19	64
	<b>Total</b>		<b>180</b>		

The following sites would therefore be allocated under this option:

	Village	Site	Number of dwellings
1	Temple Sowerby	LTS1 - Linden Farm	9
2	Lazonby	LLZ3 - Rosebank Farm	22
3	Greystoke	LGR3 - Land behind Ashburn Croft	30
4	Long Marton	LLM2 - Land at Nursery, Long Marton	33
5	Langwathby	LLG1 - Meadow Court	4
6	Hackthorpe	LHA1 - Pattinson Close	6
7	Tebay	LTE1 - Highfield behind School House	9
8	Kirkby Thore	LKT6 - Rectory Farm	22
9	Kirkoswald	LKO1 - Former Butchers Shop and Field	15
10	Sockbridge and Tirrill	LT12 - Land South of Ladybeck	19
11	Nenthead	LNE1 - Moredum Garage	6
	<b>Total</b>		<b>175</b>

Pros	Cons
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Focuses development into larger sites than Option 1, which helps meet local affordable housing need in that village</li> <li>• Favours the more sustainable settlements</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Focuses new housing to larger villages only, meaning need may not be met elsewhere</li> <li>• Does not take into account five year land supply information, including schemes where the Council has granted permission subject to the signing of a Section 106 agreement.</li> </ul>

### Option 3 - The optimum number of smaller sites to the most amount of villages

With this option we try to allocate as many sites as possible to as many villages as possible, on the basis that this may help distribute housing around the district and meet local need. The only filters applied are to remove any allocations in villages scoring lowest in the sustainability appraisal (a scoring of five) or scoring less than 60 under the weighting score. The smallest sites are then selected until to overall target is met.

	Filter	Reasoning
1	Sites must not be in the least sustainable settlements - a scoring of 5 against the sustainability assessment.	Selected sites not be in the least sustainable villages
2	Sites must not score less than 60 in the weightings matrix	This is to ensure that sites than performed badly against our planning criteria assessment are filtered out.

The following sites result from these filters:

	Village	Site	Size	Number
1	Greystoke	LGR1 - Land adjacent to Fair View	0.14	4
2	Ravenstonedale	LRA3 - Land adjacent Little Close	0.12	4
3	Culgaith	LCU6 - Land adjacent Loaning Head Courtyard	0.166	5
4	Hackthorpe	LHA1 - Pattinson Close	0.154	5
5	Milburn	LMI3 - Land adjacent North Gate	0.161	5
6	Temple Sowerby	LTS6 - Land adjacent Eden House	0.181	5
7	Warcop	LWA1 - Martindale View	0.158	5
8	Lazonby	LLZ13 - North Bank, Lazonby	0.198	6
9	Milburn	LMI2 - Land adjacent North Cross Fell View	0.207	6
10	Nenthead	LNE1 - Moredum Garage	0.202	6
11	Temple Sowerby	LTS4 - Land at Chapel Street	0.216	6
12	Temple Sowerby	LTS5 - Land adjacent Smithy House	0.188	6
13	Armathwaite	LAR5 - Land at Coal Bank	0.222	7
14	Ivegill	LIV1 - Land adjacent The Grange	0.242	7
15	Orton	LOR6 - Land adjacent Coombe Leigh	0.232	7
16	Ravenstonedale	LRA1- Land behind Stonethwaite House	0.242	7
17	Shap	LSH1 - West Lane	0.273	8
18	Shap	LSH11 - Land off Church Street	0.255	8
19	High Hesket	LHH4 - Land north of Stonecroft Gardens	0.286	9
20	Melmerby	LME1- Fell Foot Yard Area	0.292	9
21	Morland	LMO1 - Hilltop (Halmshaws Garage)	0.304	9

	Village	Site	Size	Number
22	Tebay	LTE1 - Highfield (behind School House - part))	0.59	9
23	Yanwath	LYA3 - Land West of Oakfields	0.312	9
24	Bolton	LBO1 - Land behind Applegarth and Croft House	0.34	10
25	Kirkoswald	LKO2 - Land at Coach House	0.349	10
	<b>Total</b>			<b>172</b>

Pros	Cons
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Easy to understand</li> <li>• Goes some way to meeting the needs of all villages</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Mechanical</li> <li>• Does not take account of existing sites in the five year land supply</li> <li>• Means larger developers may have less development opportunities, reducing supply</li> <li>• Takes less account of sustainability and planning considerations.</li> <li>• May reduce affordable housing opportunities generated by larger sites.</li> </ul>

#### Option 4 - Concentrated development in particular villages

This option is designed to test the implications of concentrating new housing into four or five particular villages. The filters applied are as follows:

	Filter	Reasoning
1	Sites must be capable of accommodating at least 20 or more houses.	This is to ensure that development is concentrated to particular sites rather than dispersed across the district.
2	Sites must be in the most sustainable settlements. We have carried out a comparative sustainability assessment of each village, and each has been given a mark of 1 to 5. Details are included in the separate sustainability assessment. It is proposed that at this stage only sites in villages scoring 1 or 2 are considered for new allocations.	Selected sites will be in the most sustainable villages. Comparative assessment also aids compliance with legal requirements to carry out strategic environmental assessment.
3	Sites should not add more than 20% of new development to the existing housing stock.	To ensure that new development is proportionate to the settlement and character and form is protected.

	Filter	Reasoning
4	Only one allocation per village. Where more than one potential allocation is identified for one village the higher scoring is chosen.	This is to ensure a more even distribution of new development across the district.
5	The site must score at least 70 against our weighted planning criteria assessment.	This is to make sure that selected sites perform well when looked at against various planning criteria.

The following sites result from these criteria:

	Village	Site	Number of dwellings	Percentage of existing dwelling stock	Weighting Score
1	Greystoke	LGR3	30	11.54	80
2	Lazonby	LLZ2	63	17.90	79
3	Tebay	LTE2	38	17.19	76
4	Kirkby Thore	LKT1	22	7.21	75
5	Kirkby Thore	LKT7	48	15.74	75
6	Kirkby Thore	LKT2	24	7.87	74
7	Langwathby	LLG3	52	19.26	74
	<b>Total</b>		<b>277</b>		

Removing the two lower performing sites at Kirkby Thore and ranking the sites by size would mean that the following sites would be allocated (LKT1 at Kirkby Thore is also removed as it is not needed to meet targets):

	Village	Site	Number of dwellings	Percentage of existing dwelling stock	Weighting Score
1	Lazonby	LLZ2	63	17.90	79
2	Langwathby	LLG3	52	19.26	74
3	Tebay	LTE2	38	17.19	76
4	Greystoke	LGR3	30	11.54	80
	<b>Total</b>		<b>183</b>		

## Rejected Methods for Allocating Sites

### Rejected option 1 - By level and location of affordable housing need

Parish level housing needs surveys were carried out in 2009/10 by Cumbria Housing Trust. We investigated whether it was possible to distribute new housing according to affordable housing need. This proved difficult in practice. The difficulty with this methodology is that several settlements may fall within a single Parish. It is possible to apportion need based on a proportion of need being distributed to villages according to their relative numbers of dwellings, although this risks skewing results - the table below uses this methodology. The amount of need may also not correspond with the size of settlement or availability of sites.

The following table shows levels of stated housing need using this method:

	Village/Town	Dwellings (town/village)	Affordable housing need (village)
1	Shap	570	16
2	Langwathby	270	14
3	Crosby Ravensworth	78	13
4	Maulds Meaburn	62	10
5	Ravenstonedale	66	10
6	Skelton	136	10
7	Culgaith	207	9
8	Stainton	368	9
9	Gamblesby	75	7
10	Plumpton	171	6
11	Croglin	36	6
12	Kirkby Thore	305	6
13	Lazonby	352	6
14	Sockbridge and Tirril	184	6
15	Tebay	221	6
16	Armathwaite	150	6
17	Bolton	166	5
18	Milburn	58	5
19	Morland	166	5
20	Warcop	142	5
21	Kirkoswald	184	5
22	High Hesket	114	4

	Village/Town	Dwellings (town/village)	Affordable housing need (village)
23	Temple Sowerby	174	4
24	Calthwaite	90	3
25	Brough & Church Brough	306	3
26	Clifton	182	3
27	Nenthead	142	3
28	Greystoke	260	2
29	Hackthorpe	101	2
30	Orton	143	2
31	Renwick	53	2
32	Ivegill	40	1
33	Kings Meaburn	35	1
34	Long Marton	182	1
35	Melmerby	94	1
36	Great Asby	168	0
37	Ousby	45	0
38	Yanwath	52	0

Pros	Cons
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Distributes to where need is greatest</li> <li>• Distributes to larger settlements which are likely to have more services and available land</li> <li>• Easily understood</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Favours larger settlements and does not allocate to smaller villages which may have housing needs</li> <li>• Does not increase demand for existing or new facilities elsewhere</li> <li>• Based on a survey response which means non-responses may skew figures.</li> </ul>

## Option 7 - By Available Brownfield Land

The following proposed sites are on brown field land, which could be used as a mechanism for allocation:

LSC	Site	Number	Notes
Lazonby	LLZ13	5	
Orton	LOR1	5	
Warcop	LWA3	12	
Yanwath	LYA1	8	Landowners do not want to see the site developed
Brough	LBR4	17	(part)
Crosby Ravensworth	LCR2	6	(part)
Kings Meaburn	LKM2	12	(part)
Kirkby Thore	LKT6	10	Farmstead
Kirkoswald	LKO1	14	(part)
Lazonby	LLZ2	63	
Long Marton	LLM2	33	
Morland	LMO1	21	
Nenthead	LNE1	6	(part)
Nenthead	LNE2	6	
Plumpton	LPL4	14	
Shap	LSH12	65	(part)
Tebay	LTE7	41	Live app for 16 dwellings 08/0103
Temple Sowerby	LTS1	16	Permission for nine units in phase 1

The presence of brownfield land is one of the factors that is included in the housing matrix so it is, to an extent, taken into account. It has, however not been used as the primary means of allocation as the amount available may not fit in with targets, and may skew distribution to smaller areas, to areas with the least amount of services or to land that may have some other value eg for wildlife use.

Pros	Cons
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Protects Greenfield land elsewhere and re-uses land</li> <li>Easily understood</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Does not necessarily distribute to areas of demand or those with the best services</li> <li>The land may be in use</li> <li>The land may have other value eg wildlife</li> </ul>

## Annex 1 - Housing Completions and Allocation Figures

	Target		Completed		Committed for development			
	Core Strategy Proportion	Plan target	Housing Completions 2003/04 - 2011/12	Left to allocate	Sites under construction	Total extant permissions	Total under construction and with permission	Left to allocate
Penrith (P)	60%	2800	294	2506	327	74	401	2105
Kirkby Stephen (KS)	7%	327	33	294	44	24	68	226
Alston (AL)	4%	187	22	165	33	5	38	127
Appleby (AP)	9%	420	108	312	131	14	146	166
Local Service Centres (LSC)	20%	933	369	564	276	120	396	168
Other Areas (OA)	0%	0	381	-381	116	95	211	0
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>4666</b>	<b>1207</b>	<b>3459</b>	<b>927</b>	<b>333</b>	<b>1259</b>	<b>2792</b>
A 75% discount rate has been applied to small sites included as commitments to allow for non-implementation.								

## Annex 2 - The Housing Matrix

Each site (where not sifted out for the reasons explained in this report) was scored against the following matrix, and a single value was assigned accordingly:

Suitability For Housing	Notes/ Comments	Scoring (5=High, 1=Low)	Issue Weighting
<b>1. Planning Policy Restrictions</b>			
(1a) <b>Current designation in Local Plan</b>		3. Identified within the SHLAA or allocated as housing in Local Plan	2
		2. No designation	
		1. Allocated as employment, Schedule Ancient Monument or other allocations in Local Plan	
(1b) <b>Sequential Test</b> - Is the site greenfield / brownfield; within the settlement; on the edge of the settlement; or detached from the settlement? Are there any existing buildings on site which could be reused? If Greenfield, which agricultural land classification does the land fall under?		5. Brownfield site with buildings suitable for conversion	4
		4. Brownfield site with buildings not suitable for conversion	
		3. Agricultural buildings / farmsteads	
		2. Greenfield sites with agricultural classification 3 - 4	
		1. Greenfield sites with agricultural classification 1 - 2	
(1c) <b>Planning History</b> - Does the site have any Planning History? Is there known intention to bring this site forward? Is the site available? Are there any different classes of application known - Employment, retail etc		5. Site has approved planning application covering >60% of site area.	3
		4. Site has live residential planning application covering >60% of site. Site suitable in principle.	
		3. No application, but known interest to bring site forward	
		2. Land owner unknown	
		1. Land owner currently not willing to bring site forward.	

(1d) <b>Affordable Housing Need</b> - What is the current Housing need for the area? (Refer to SHMA, or if available CRHT Parish Surveys).		N/A	N/A
(1e) <b>Public Consultation</b> - Has there been any public consultation comments regarding the site (Issues & Options stage, or through the application process)		5. Generally strong public consensus to see site developed	2
		4. General support for the site	
		3. No strong opinions of site	
		2. Generally has objections towards the site	
		1. Generally Strong objections towards development of site	
		0. No consultations undertaken	

2. Physical Problems or Limitations			
(2a) <b>Topographical Constraints</b> - are there any topographic constraints which might affect the density / layout of development? Are there opportunities to use the topography to maximise solar gain from potential housing?		3. Whole of site level	3
		2. Potential issues with levels	
		1. Steeply sloping not developable for housing allocation	
(2b) <b>Utilities</b> - are there any visible services affecting the site eg pylons/substations? Have we received any comments from service providers on the site? Are there known infrastructure constraints, or deficiencies that may affect the site? Would the site impact upon the local water table, in terms of abstraction and surface run off?		3. Services on or adjacent to the site and current foul system has capacity	4
		2. Potential issues with services or capacity of system	
		1. No visible services on or adjacent to the site and the system has no capacity	

(2c) <b>Flood Risk</b> - does the site comply with the sequential test / exceptions test contained within PPS25? Have we received any comments from the EA?		4. Site not in flood zones 2 or 3 with no nearby bodies of water	5
		3. Site not in flood zones 2 or 3 but bodies of water within 8m	
		2. Part of site within flood zones 2 or 3	
		1. Site in flood zones 2 or 3 and near bodies of water	
(2d) <b>Highways Constraints</b> - are there any visible highways constraints eg Visibility splays, new access required. Have we received any comments from CCC Highways regarding the site? Is the access identifiable? Would the development have any implications on existing road safety?		5. Well defined access served by good quality wide road. Clear visibility	5
		4. Access defined, however some issues need to be addressed	
		3. Alternative accesses evident	
		2. No discernable access	
		1. No discernable access, development would prompt calming measures. Unsuitable adjacent roads for walking/cycling	
(2e) <b>Contamination</b> - are there any known previous contaminative uses or visible signs of contamination? List any visible indicators on site, though main assessments to be undertaken by contamination officer.		3. No known contamination and none evident on site	4
		2. Potential contamination linked to current / past use of site	
		1. Known contamination on the site	
(2f) <b>Accessibility</b> to services and public transport - does the site provide easy access to essential services and public transport? How accessible is the site to the centre of the settlement via walking and/or cycling? Are there any Rights of Way that pass through, or next to the site? Facilities - Bus, School, Village Hall, Public House, Shop/Post Office		5. All 5 facilities within village	4
		4. 4 of the facilities	
		3. 3 of the facilities	
		2. 1 - 2 of the facilities	
		1. no facilities	

3. Potential Impacts			
(3a) <b>Character of Settlement</b> - the site once developed would be compatible and not discordant with the character and setting of the settlement eg would the site follow historic patterns of development, or be unduly prominent or extend to far into the open countryside (refer to landscape assessment, where available)? Is the site compatible in terms of size for the settlement? Would the site be more suitable for another use, such as employment, retail or recreation? Does the site have any historical significance (historical land access - Unbuilt frontages)		4. Within village and respects village form	4
		3. Within village but alters form	
		2. Extends the village	
		1. Outside village within open countryside or suitable for alternative use	
(3b) <b>Historic Landscape</b> - Would the development affect a conservation area; listed building; areas of archaeological importance; ancient monuments? Are there any known past uses on the site, determined from historical records?		4. Site not in or within 250m of Conservation Area, Schedule Ancient Monument or Listed Building	4
		3. Site in or within 250m of a conservation area	
		2. Potentially affects listed building or Schedule Ancient Monument within 250m	
		1. Listed buildings on site or site on Schedule Ancient Monument	
(3c) <b>Biodiversity</b> - would the development of the site potentially affect biodiversity located on site - light pollution, displacement, harm to habitat? Are there any features in the surrounding area which may support corridors for biodiversity eg Adjacent woodland, river/wetland, agricultural buildings?		3. No biodiversity issues	4
		2. Potential biodiversity issues	
		1. Within or adjacent a designated area	

(3d) <b>Open Space and Recreational Land</b> - Would the development of the site affect any amenity open space or informal recreational land. Would there be requirement for additional open spaces (refer to Open Spaces Survey)		3. No need for additional open space	4
		2. Need identified but site not suitable to satisfy need	
		1. Need identified and site is suitable to satisfy need	
(3e) <b>Environmental Designations</b> - would the development of the site affect the AONB/SAC/SSSI/SPA/Priority Habitats and Species/Local Sites/ NNR's/LNR's?		3. Not in or within 250m of an environmental designation	4
		2. Within 250m of an environmental designation	
		1. Within an environmental designation	
(3f) <b>Trees</b> - Are there any TPO's on site or trees/hedgerows/woodlands that should be retained / Ancient Woodland? Are there any trees affecting the access? Are there any trees on site or the boundary which should be retained? NB - Please refer to Rob's note on trees.		3. Not within 200m of an ancient woodland or within 15m of a Tree Preservation Order or significant trees	4
		2. Within 200m of an Ancient Woodland or within 15m of a TPO tree	
		1. Within an Ancient Woodland or TPO on site and/ or has significant trees on the site	
4. Environmental Conditions			
(4a) Note any adverse or beneficial environmental conditions / neighbouring land uses which would be experienced by prospective resident's eg <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>road noise</li><li>railway lines</li><li>air pollution</li><li>odour pollution</li><li>neighbouring land uses</li><li>light pollution</li></ul>		5. No issues on the site	3
		4. One issue affects the site	
		3. Two issues affects the site	
		2. Three issues affects the site	
		1. Four of more issues affects the site	