

Local Plan Working Group Minutes – 10 June 2014

1. Welcome and Introductions

1.1 Present

Cllr Malcolm Smith (Chair)

Cllr Grattan Bowen

Cllr Michael Holliday

Ruth Atkinson

Gwyn Clark

Paul Fellows

Kayleigh Lancaster

1.2 Apologies

Cllr Andy Connell

Cllr Margaret Clark

Cllr Chris Harrison

Cllr Sheila Orchard

Cllr Michael Slee

1.3 Minutes of the Last Meeting

Agreed as a true record.

1.4 Questions/Feedback from Last Meeting

Cllr Michael Holliday suggested a short PowerPoint presentation for the drop-in events.

Cllr Grattan Bowen queried the highlighted sentence at 1.9 (pg. 3) – GC confirmed the findings were similar to the studies for Morrisons and Booths, studies identified 2 tier shopping.

Cllr Grattan Bowen also noted that the Policy at 1.11 is missing the relevant number.

2. Presentation – Local Plan

PF confirmed that the purpose of today's meeting is to discuss the smaller villages and the proposed land allocations, not the entire plan.

PF confirmed the revised timetable with consultation commencing on 21 July 2014. There is a Member Briefing Session scheduled for 18 June and a Press Briefing on 23 June 2014.

Cllr Malcolm Smith asked whether we will take on board what Members have to say.

RA confirmed that all relevant comments will be considered as part of the consultation.

2.1 Housing Numbers

PF confirmed that we would need to provide 406 dwellings in the Key Hubs across the Plan period with the Smaller Villages and Hamlets contributing 10% of the overall 3600 target.

The 1996 Local Plan had a more flexible approach to housing development than the current Core Strategy policies.

The proposed policy in the new Local Plan will hopefully provide self-build local occupancy housing in some of our smaller villages and hamlets.

2.2 Policy HS2

Overall the policy is supported, RA raised some concern that it may be too restrictive for some of the larger villages i.e. Kirkoswald.

PF identified that one of the issues is how to ensure that the new dwellings are local occupancy and not open market. This policy is most likely to deliver self-build schemes rather than open the floodgates for residential development.

Current Local Occupancy Criteria – Affordable Housing

- 1. A person or household who currently lives in the relevant locality and has done so for a continuous period of at least three years; and/or*
- 2. A person or household who works in the relevant locality and has done so for a continuous period of at least three years; and/or*
- 3. Who has moved away but has strong established and continuous links with the relevant locality by reason of birth or long term immediate family connections; and/or*
- 4. Who has an essential need through age or disability to live close to those who have lived in the relevant locality for at least three years*

The definition of “local” refers to the parish and surrounding parishes in the first instance, and if after a reasonable period of active marketing a purchaser cannot be found the definition would cascade out to include the county. Following a further reasonable period of marketing if no purchaser has been found the property may be sold on the open market.

For the purposes of this policy the local occupancy criteria would be wider and less restrictive and will not include a cascade mechanism.

This policy is encouraging additional housing to meet local need; we have sufficient housing allocations elsewhere to meet our identified need. Essentially this approach is seeking a middle ground, however there is no guarantee that the Inspector will agree to a local occupancy restriction. GC noted that we used to use local occupancy restrictions, but no longer do so after an appeal decision.

Cllr Michael Holliday asked PF to explain Self-Build, PF advised that it is essentially when someone commissions a build project that they themselves intend to live in rather than sell. RA queried what happens when/if they do decide to sell. PF confirmed that the property would be sold at a discount, which is typically 80% for a dwelling with a local occupancy clause.

PF added that if communities find this policy too restrictive there is an opportunity through a Neighbourhood Plan to plan for additional housing development.

Cllr Holliday doesn't think this policy should provide an open door to market led housing development.

2.3 The Housing Sites

The table below outline the number of houses we need to allocate for across the plan period (2014-2032).

	Target	Distribution	Site Allocations	Commitments	To allocate	Annual Requirement	Affordable Housing
Target	3600	100%					
Towns							
Penrith	1800	50%	Yes	391	1409	78	30%
Alston	144	4%	Yes	55	89	5	30%
Appleby	324	9%	Yes	183	141	8	30%
Kirkby Stephen	252	7%	Yes	81	171	10	30%
Total Towns	2520	70%		710	1810	101	
Rural Areas							
Key Hubs	720	20%	Yes	314	406	23	30%
Villages & Hamlets	360	10%	No	405	0	0	Market Enabled/Local Occupancy
Rural Exceptions	0	0%	No	~	0	0	100%
Total Rural	1080	30%		719	406	23	
Total	3600	100%		1429	2216	123	

PF confirmed that the numbers for Penrith have been reduced from 2300 to 1400, with Kirkby Stephen's numbers reduced from 229 to 171. The number for Appleby has increased and the allocations to the Key Hubs have also increased.

Cllr Holliday felt that 406 in the Key Hubs across the plan period seem to be acceptable.

PF added that some Key Hubs will receive no allocations.

Cllr Smith queried whether this number is made up from new applications rather than existing sites – PF confirmed that these would be new applications.

PF advised that the potential allocations are more vague towards the end of the plan period as we are unsure of the market and developer intention.

Penrith

PF confirmed it is our intention to over allocate to Penrith, which may be a risky strategy in terms of delivery but very little has been built in recent years.

Alston

PF advised that any housing will be difficult to deliver in Alston with little developer interest. High Mill is potentially a mixed use site providing both employment and housing with Skelgill providing employment land. The sites in Alston are reasonably uncontroversial

Appleby

PF confirmed that we are unsure of the intention of the creamery site – employment or housing? Cllr Smith suggested that the infrastructure lends itself to an employment site.

PF confirmed that AP11 is relatively straightforward and there is developer interest in this site.

Kirkby Stephen

PF confirmed that the included sites are broadly what were requested by the Town Council. Site KS13 is a longer term site with some uncertainty.

Brough

Sites are self-selected based on planning applications and developer interest.

Greystoke

A site to the north of Howard Park was considered and discounted with LGR3 proposed; it is an obvious site and well within the village.

Hackthorpe

LHA1 is currently being built, LHA3 on the edge of the village is also proposed.

Langwathby

Lots of suggestions and interest Sites LLG1 and LLG2 are existing Local Plan sites. Sites LLG5 and 7 have been suggested as much larger sites but reduced to provide 2 smaller sites.

Cllr Holliday queried what will happen if the Neighbourhood Plan says something else? PF confirmed that the last adopted document takes precedence; there will be the possibility for further consultation with Langwathby residents. Cllr Holliday stated that the Parish Council would prefer the Langwathby Hall site. PF confirmed that we have only just been made aware of this site.

Cllr Holliday noted that the boundary for LLG2 is incorrect and shows an access point which is unavailable, however the site can still be accessed.

GC conformed that an application is under consideration for site at Langwathby Hall, he also advised that an application could be submitted for LLG7. Such an application, in the absence of a Neighbourhood Plan, would be assessed against the Core Strategy.

Nenthead

Identified site is Moredun Garage.

Orton

Orton is a Conservation Area which makes development more difficult.

Plumpton

There is known developer interest in this site.

Ravenstonedale

Allocated site is a small site within the village.

Shap

Shap is a good candidate for development however there has been little interest despite sites being available. Allocations show a large site to the north of the village.

Tebay

Tebay is also a good candidate for development due to its accessibility.

Lazonby and Clifton do not have any proposed allocated sites as they have recently had large housing developments (48 units) approved.

2.4 Gypsy and Traveller Site

PF confirmed that we undertook a 'call for sites' last year and received only one site suggestion. The proposed site is located at Maidenhill which might be contentious but is relatively remote and has potential for 14 pitches.

RA advised that we would be struggling if this site had not been suggested as we need to allocate a site; the Local Plan could fail at examination without a site allocation.

3. Consultation

PF confirmed that meetings are ongoing internally and the branding etc. is developing.

RA advised that interest in Penrith would be addressed by the presence of a banner above King Street and also officer presence and the Food and Farming Festival. It is likely that there will be less drop-in events than previously, however events would be taking place in Penrith, Alston, Appleby and Kirkby Stephen. It is also likely that events will be held in Langwathby and Shap. RA hopes that the 10 week consultation is sufficient time to get the word around.

PF advised that further drop-in events may be held at Tebay, Greystoke or Kirkby Thore.

4. Any Other Business

Cllr Holliday is pleased with the section on Community

Cllr Smith asked if another meeting was necessary, it was agreed that the group would meet again after the consultation.

5. Date of Next Meeting

TBC