Your Reference:
Our Reference: Luke Waterston
Enquiries to: Planning Policy
Direct Dial: 01768 817817
Email: planning.policy@eden.gov.uk
Date: 20 June 2016

Eden District Council
Mansion House, Friargate, Penrith, CA11 7YG
Tel: 01768 817817

Dear Recipients

Eden District Council – Key Hubs meeting – 8 June 2016

1. Welcome and introductions

Luke Waterston – Planning Policy Officer, Eden District Council

Kayleigh Lancaster – Planning Policy Officer, Eden District Council

Stephen Lancaster – Managing Director, Penrith Farmers and Kidd's Plc

Rachel Lightfoot – Planner, Penrith Farmers and Kidd's Plc

Haydn Morris – Sockbridge and Tirril Community, Retired Planner, Artist

Richard Gravil – Sockbridge and Tirril Community

2 Inspectors Letter

Copies of the Inspectors letter were handed out which outlines the concerns/criticisms over the criteria used to designate the Key Hubs and require a reduced list/concise determination/less leeway as many are not well served by public transport links.

It is the intention of the Council to reduce the number of key hubs and produce a discreet list with criteria applied that reflects the Inspector's letter.

General observations and suggestions

- Eden is distinct from other parts of the country in the way that settlements interact with each other. Smaller settlements often function as clusters. (SL)
- The village of Culgaith was given as an example of a typical Eden village that has thrived due to the development of new housing which has allowed the school to remain open and the village to grow. (SL)
- There is a need to look again at the criteria for assessing Key Hubs, assess all villages based on new criteria. (SL)

- A discussion took place on village shops, their size and how they serve surrounding villages/areas.

- Other factors need to be considered other than shop size, such as church, community/village halls which need to be supported and enhanced. (RL)

- There is a need to consider the future viability of the Local Plan to ensure it is deliverable (and ensures a 5 year housing land supply) over the long term and not just in the short term. (RL)

- It was suggested that growth should be proportionate in all villages in Eden. (SL/RL)

- The same percentage of growth should not be applied to all villages in Eden.(HM)

- Local schools need to be supported as some hubs due to be excluded under the new criteria do have a school. (SL/RL)

- Consideration should be given to schools which are succeeding and therefore will support growth and schools which are under performing and may benefit from growth, which may help to keep them open.

- Some village schools are oversubscribed (e.g. Yanwath) and children are bussed in from Penrith. (HM)

- The Inspector's letter does not necessarily say that the hubs currently identified are unsuitable but that there is insufficient evidence to support their inclusion as a Hub. (RL)

- In Eden there are tight 'clusters' of hubs that could possibly be considered as a 'full unit' in respect of development allocation. (RG)

- EDC is proposing a lesser number of Key Hubs; (clarification was sought on the colours used on the map provided):

- Green = Hubs with the existence of key services such as schools, GPs, access to transport

- Yellow = Hubs which fit with the above criteria but are considered too close to other better facilitated hubs/hubs that are more suited to development (Temple Sowerby which is close to Kirkby Thore and Kirkoswald which is close to Lazonby);

- Red = Currently hubs under previous criteria but will no longer be designated under new criteria.

- If development is focussed on a smaller number of hubs then it would make a bigger impact on sustainability and quality of services for the chosen ones. (RG)

- A second ‘tier’ of village hubs should be identified to allow infill/rounding off development, local needs housing etc. to be built where it is needed. (RL)

- A second ‘tier’ of village hubs would dilute the potential sustainability benefits of the remaining Key Hubs. (HM)

- A 5 year land supply is vital to ensure development does not start happening anywhere where it may not be suitable. (RL)

- Current housing stock can be hard to sell and remains unsold for some time so is more development needed in such villages? (RG)

- Villages around Penrith are always attractive to developers due to their proximity to centre and facilities. Other villages much further from the main centre of Penrith are not as popular and they are not as attractive to developers. (SL)

- The Local Plan should support less popular villages for development and encourage them to thrive by allowing them to develop and grow and not just concentrate development in more popular locations. (HM)

- Sites should be considered both in terms of “deliverability” and “develop ability”. (RL)

- We are looking at the hubs with 6/7 services and development will support these. (KL)

- Plumpton, Low Hesket and High Hesket all benefit from good transport service. Plumpton also has a large shop at the garden centre (The Pot Place). Consider including villages with a shop in garden centre as these are increasingly becoming a resource for the community.

- Clarification on the ‘100 dwellings’ threshold was sought. (RG)

- This was a starting point from which to assess the hubs as generally the settlements which have more than 100 dwellings have more facilities. (KL)

- Concern expressed over ‘in-fill’ development and what is considered suitable. Infill generally refers to development to fill small gaps within otherwise built up areas of an existing settlement. Planning Officers would determine the suitability of proposals for infill and “rounding off”. (RG/LW) • It is vital to get the list of village hubs correct in order that the 5 year land supply is satisfied and stop development in unsuitable areas.

- A brief discussion on development figures and on the Land Availability Assessment took place. The LAA was not a full analysis of all available housing sites in the Key Hubs, as the decision had already been taken prior to its publication, not to allocate housing sites in the Key Hubs. The Council would not wish to rely solely upon this evidence source to allocate suitable sites for housing development within the Local Plan. Further work would need to be undertaken to allocate specific sites.

3. Telephone conversation with Dan Mitchell (Barton Willmore)

Dan Mitchell, representing Barton Willmore, was unable to attend the meeting in person. Therefore a telephone discussion was held between Luke and Dan to discuss the meeting and the Key Hubs methodology. The key points of this discussion are set out below:

- The original criteria for identifying Key Hubs were set too low, and this led to disparity in the types of settlement identified. (DW) www.eden.gov.uk 4

- An amended set of criteria for identifying Key Hubs will be produced. (LW)

- The basic settlement hierarchy is supported. (DW)

- The Role of the Key Hubs is currently unclear and their role within the policy should be refined. (DW)

- More weight should be given in the assessment to the importance of public transport. (DW)

- Consideration should be given to designating Key Hubs in two stages. Firstly those Key Hubs which perform strongly in terms of existing infrastructure, facilities and public transport should be considered and then those settlements that would benefit from additional development should be considered. (DW)

- Greystoke should be included as a Key Hub. (DW)

- The Council will allocate a number of units per Key Hub. (LW)

- The Council should consider allocating sites rather than simply numbers of units, in the Key Hubs. This would give developers more certainty. (DW)

- The Council should make it clear that the numbers of units identified for each settlement/ Key Hub is a minimum rather than a maximum figure. (DW)

- Questions were asked as to the timetable and approach to the next set of hearings and if any public consultation would take place before the hearings commenced. (DW)

- It was suggested that the Council should carry out public consultation before submitting any additional information to the Inspector. (DW)

- LW indicated that the current understanding is that the hearings will commence on the 19th of July as planned. Then depending on the outcome of the hearings and the inspector's advice, the council may carry out a focused consultation on modifications to the Local Plan. (LW)

- Given the amount of additional work that is being done by the Council on Key Hubs and the OAN Barton Willmore will require time to review and respond to any changes prior to the hearing. (DW)

4. Next steps

- A paper will be produced which will explain the reasoning behind the selection of each Key Hub. It will include explanation of how a criteria based approach applies to each settlement as well as considering all other factors which have influenced the Council's decision to include particular settlements as Key Hubs.

- Development numbers will be allocated to each Key Hub. www.eden.gov.uk 5

- A report will be presented to the Council's Executive on the 5 July 2016. This report will consider the Council's revised approach to Key Hubs. Hearings reconvene on 19th July.

- It is envisaged that the revised assessment of the Key Hubs will form part of the main modifications consultation later in the year.

Yours sincerely

Luke Waterston

Planning Officer

Planning Policy

Eden District Council