

Copeland Local Plan 2021-2038

Statement of Common Ground between Copeland Borough Council and Friends of the Lake District

Introduction

This Statement of Common Ground has been prepared jointly between Copeland Borough Council (CBC) and Friends of the Lake District (FLD). FLD are the only independent charity and membership organisation dedicated to protecting and enhancing the landscapes of the Lake District National Park and Cumbria. They represent CPRE- The Countryside Charity in Cumbria and are, in effect, their Cumbria branch.

The purpose of a Statement of Common Ground is to set out the confirmed agreements and disagreements with regard to strategic cross- boundary issues surrounding the Copeland Local Plan. This is the result of early, meaningful and continuous engagement between the Local Planning Authority, statutory consultees and key stakeholders in the Local Plan process.

The statement is intended to assist the Inspectors during the examination of the Copeland Local Plan to show where effective co-operation and agreement on key issues has taken place. For more information on how Copeland Borough Council has engaged with key stakeholders throughout the Local Plan preparation process, please see the Duty to Co-operate statement and previous Consultation Statements, produced at every stage of the Local Plan process, which set out how responses to consultations have been addressed.

Appendix A provides a full breakdown of FLD's response to the Copeland Local Plan Publication Draft consultation and CBC's response to this. This approach has been agreed by the two organisations.

Copeland Borough Council and Friends of the Lake District agree the following:

1. Consultation and engagement has been undertaken in accordance with the Statement of Community Involvement and has provided adequate opportunity for FLD to get involved with the development of the Plan at each key stage.
2. National Parks have the highest status of protection in relation to landscape and scenic beauty.
3. There are two statutory purposes for National Parks in England and Wales:
 - Conserve and enhance the natural beauty, wildlife and cultural heritage;
 - Promote opportunities for the understanding and enjoyment of the special qualities of national parks by the public.
4. Copeland Borough Council has a statutory duty to have regard to the purpose of the Lake District National Park designation in decision making. This includes when considering development proposals that are situated outside National Park boundaries, but that might have an impact on their setting or

protection. Development within the setting should be sensitively located and designed to avoid or minimise adverse impacts on designated areas.

5. Natural England is currently considering a proposal to extend the Lake District National Park southwards towards Millom. Whilst little weight can be given to the proposal at this stage, Copeland Borough Council have taken into consideration the independent landscape analysis and boundary recommendations report that supports the proposal when producing their Landscape Character Assessment to support the Copeland Local Plan. It has also considered the Lake District National Park Landscape Character Assessment, which was produced in 2008 and revised in 2018 and 2021.
6. It is vital that the St Bees and Whitehaven Heritage Coast is protected and enhanced through the Copeland Local Plan. Whilst the extended Heritage Coast has not yet formally been defined by Natural England, the extension and proposed defined area was approved by CBC on 9th April 2019 and an amended Heritage Coast boundary is currently being produced. It is hoped that a formal designation will have taken place prior to the adoption of the Local Plan.
7. It is important that Copeland's Dark Skies are protected and that light pollution is minimised through Local Plan policy. CBC and FLD are currently working together to produce a Dark Skies Technical Advice Note alongside the other Cumbrian Local Authorities.

Signed on behalf of Copeland Borough Council

Name and Position: Chris Hoban, Strategic Planning Manager

Signature: 

Date: 28/07/2022

Signed on behalf of Friends of the Lake District

Name and Position: Lorayne Wall, Planning Officer

Signature: 

Date: 05/08/2022

Appendix A: CBC response to FLD Publication Draft Comments

Please note that whilst CBC can put forward suggested main and minor modifications to policies and sites in the Local Plan Publication Draft at the time it is submitted to the Planning Inspectorate, these may or may not be taken forward by the Inspector. If they are taken forward, they will be subject to a public consultation during the Examination in Public.

Key: Proposed additional wording in bold, proposed deletion in ~~strike through~~, notes in *italics*

Policy/Paragraph/ allocation ref	FLD Comment	CBC Response
2.9	<p>We consider that wording amendments would make the plan more effective and fully reflective of national policy and legislation.</p> <p>A sentence should be added here and /or in section 15.13 to highlight the Council’s statutory duty to conserve and enhance the setting of the Lake District National Park, to qualify the point in Table 1 about having no planning jurisdiction for the Park itself. The statutory duty does not apply only to the National Park Authorities (see Paragraph: 039 Reference ID: 8-039-20190721 of the NPPG).</p>	<p><i>Modifications proposed:</i></p> <p><i>Table 1, row 2, column 3:</i></p> <p>This comes under planning remit of the Lake District National Park Authority, and therefore planning matters are out of Copeland Borough Council’s control. The Council does however have a statutory duty to conserve and enhance the setting of the Lake District National Park.</p> <p><i>Additional wording added to paragraph 15.13.1, third sentence:</i></p> <p>The Council has a statutory duty to conserve and enhance the setting of the Lake District National Park. It is therefore important that full...</p>

<p>3.3</p>	<p>We consider that wording amendments would make the plan more effective and fully reflective of national policy</p> <p>Population growth objective should focus on achieving a balanced population not specifically or actively seeking to grow it, which will ultimately result in yet more need / demand for housing and infrastructure development. This could include measures such as ensuring training and good quality, sustainable job opportunities to enable younger people to stay living in the area, including reducing the need to leave to access training, education, jobs, housing and leisure activities.</p> <p>Protecting and Enhancing Biodiversity objective - we suggest the following wording amendments:</p> <p>Protect and enhance the rich biodiversity and geodiversity both within and outside of the borough's many nationally and internationally designated sites, ensuring that existing habitats are extended, and effectively connected by effective wildlife corridors, the new habitats are created and that lost habitats are restored, all in ways that secure biodiversity net gain and defend against ecological collapse</p> <p>Landscape and built heritage objective - we suggest the following wording amendments:</p> <p>Conserve and enhance all landscapes and built heritage within the borough, including attaching</p>	<p><i>Population growth objective: The Council does want to reverse population decline, however in order to support economic growth, it wants to attract working age people in particular.</i></p> <p><i>Modification proposed (Communities Objective 5):</i></p> <p>Increase the borough's population to support economic growth by reducing out migration (particularly of working age people), attracting new, permanent residents and improving life expectancy</p> <p><i>Modification proposed: Protecting and Enhancing Biodiversity objective (Copelands Places, Objective 5): Wording amended as suggested:</i></p> <p>Protect and enhance the rich biodiversity and geodiversity both within and outside of the borough's many nationally and internationally designated sites, ensuring that existing habitats are extended and effectively connected by effective wildlife corridors, that new habitats are created and that lost habitats are restored, all in ways that secure biodiversity net gain and defend against ecological collapse</p> <p><i>Modification proposed: Landscape and Built Heritage Objective (Copelands Places objective 3): Wording amended as suggested:</i></p>
------------	---	---

	<p>great weight to the conservation and enhancement of the setting of the Lake District National Park, World Heritage Sites and the St Bees Head and Whitehaven Heritage Coast, in addition to the many other places and buildings of historical, cultural and archaeological importance and their settings.</p> <p>Transport objective - we suggest the following wording amendments:</p> <p>Encourage development that Enables sustainable, active and low impact travel, improving access to key services and employment opportunities as well as the leisure opportunities of the coast and Lakeland fringe. Develop and maintain safe, efficient, high quality, modern and integrated transport networks with good internal links and connections to key routes, including the West Coast Main Line via both Carlisle and Barrow, and the M6 via both the A66 and A590.</p>	<p>Conserve and enhance all landscapes and built heritage within the borough, including attaching great weight to the conservation and enhancement of the setting of the Lake District National Park, World Heritage Sites and the St Bees Head and Whitehaven Heritage Coast, in addition to the many other places and buildings of historical, cultural and archaeological importance and their settings</p> <p><i>Modification proposed: Transport Objective (Copelands connectivity objective 2): Wording amended as suggested:</i></p> <p>Encourage development that Enables sustainable, active and low impact travel, improving access to key services and employment opportunities...</p>
7.4	<p>We consider that wording amendments would make the plan more effective and fully reflective of national policy</p> <p>7.4.1 - climate change should be identified as a driver for change</p> <p>Section 7.4 generally - There is a need to make the link throughout this section between economic development and addressing climate change, mitigation and adaptation and addressing other environmental issues including ecological collapse. The connectivity between these issues, and thus the scope for each to influence the other cannot be underestimated – proposals for economic growth and new jobs/training opportunities should have clear mutually beneficial links to addressing environmental issues if relevant objectives and targets are to be achieved and future-proofed. This must include supply chains and measures to create a more circular economy.</p>	<p><i>Modification proposed:</i></p> <p><i>Additional bulletpoint added to list at 7.4.1:</i></p> <p>Recognition of the severity of climate change, the creation of Copeland’s Climate Change Panel and the opportunities available for new renewable technologies in the borough</p> <p><i>General comments on 7.4 noted, however the Local Plan should be read as a whole and policies relating to climate change and ecology would be relevant to proposals for economic development.</i></p>

<p>12.1</p>	<p>Omission/textual correction</p> <p>Reference to the Borough's World Heritage Sites should be made on the Tourism Headlines page.</p> <p>'Scafell Pike' should also be corrected to read 'Safell Pike'.</p>	<p><i>Modification proposed:</i></p> <p><i>12.1 Strength Column, first sentence amended to say:</i></p> <p>Two thirds of Copeland is situated within the Lake District National Park World Heritage Site, the most visited park in the UK.</p> <p><i>Modification proposed:</i></p> <p><i>Additional Strength added: Location for part of the Hadrian's Wall World Heritage Site</i></p> <p><i>Modification proposed: Spelling of Scafell Pike amended</i></p>
<p>13.1-13.10</p>	<p>We consider that greater emphasis on genuine need would make the plan more effective and fully reflective of national policy, certain plan objectives and sustainable development goals</p> <p>Para. 13. 1</p> <p>Concern at reference 'Opportunity to direct more development to more rural villages'. We understand the need to ensure communities remain viable but this must be guided by environmental capacity and factors such as transport sustainability. Deliberately directing more development towards rural areas should not be a strategy aim.</p> <p>Para. 13.2.2</p>	<p><i>Modification proposed: Para 13.1 (Headlines: Opportunities): Opportunity to direct more an appropriate scale of additional development to more rural villages</i></p> <p><i>Modification proposed: Para 13.2.2:</i></p>

	<p>In line with our comment about population at para. 3.3, this paragraph should also be amended to refer to seeking a more balanced population not specifically or actively seeking to grow it, which will ultimately result in yet more need / demand for housing and infrastructure development.</p> <p>Para. 13.10.9</p> <p>We note that average household size in the area, based on the population and housing stock figures given in the Plan, is 2.03. This suggests a limited need for larger houses and should translate to an approach that prioritises smaller homes to meet the genuine needs of the area. It is therefore concerning that this paragraph encourages ‘executive homes’ and ‘higher-end, larger’ homes to ‘appeal to’ the highly-paid. New housing should be delivered to meet genuine need.</p>	<p><i>The Council is actively seeking to reverse the trend of population decline and particularly wants to attract working age people to support economic growth. No change required, particularly as changes have been made to para 3.3 to explain this further.</i></p> <p><i>Modification proposed: Paragraph 13.10.9</i> <i>The SHMA recommends a suitable housing mix and Policy H7 requires developers to consider the SHMA and other evidence when designing proposals. No change required.</i></p>
15.2.1-15.2.2	<p>We consider that wording amendments would make the plan more effective and fully reflective of national policy and legislation, certain plan objectives and sustainable development goals</p> <p>Para 15.2.1– We suggest clarification is provided that this list is not exhaustive and that reference is made to include provision of food, water, air to breathe and soil ‘health and production’</p> <p>Paras. 15.3.10 and 15.3.11 should be expanded to cover Priority Species and Habitats, including reference to the Council’s duty to these under the NERC Act and also to cover Network Expansion and Enhancement Zones, Restorable Habitats etc that have been identified by Natural England and which will form inform the Local Nature Recovery Strategy. This should be complemented by references in relevant policies and site profile documents</p>	<p><i>Modification proposed: Para 15.2.1: It supports life on earth and provides the following multiple benefits, including the following:...</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Important for soil health and production • Provision of food, water, air to breathe <p><i>Modification proposed: 15.3.10 additional text:</i></p> <p>The Cumbria Biodiversity Action Plan 2001 identifies protected species within the borough, many of which may be found on sites which are not protected habitats. These Priority species are those identified as being the</p>

	<p>and consideration of these species and habitats when applying the biodiversity hierarchy to new proposals, selecting sites for development, considering settlement boundary extensions and when considering how proposals meet requirements for biodiversity net gain.</p> <p>Para. 15.5.2 - expand reference to indirect effects to include disturbance through human activity, noise and lighting</p> <p>Para. 15.13 - Add 'and it's setting' to the end of the first sentence.</p>	<p>most threatened and requiring conservation action. The Council has a duty under the Natural Environment and Rural Communities (NERC) Act 2006 to conserve biodiversity when exercising its functions. The Action Plan contains...</p> <p><i>Modification proposed: Additional paragraph after 15.9.3</i></p> <p>The Pilot LNRS has been informed by Natural England's National Habitat Network Maps¹. These identify Existing Habitats and Network Expansion and Enhancement Zones. The LNRS Map should be considered by developers at the earliest stage when determining the best location for off-site biodiversity net gain (see Policy N3PU). Focus should be on those areas identified for habitat management, enhancement, restoration and creation.</p> <p><i>Where there are crossovers this will also be identified in the Biodiversity Technical Paper.</i></p> <p><i>Modification proposed: Additional wording added to 15.5.2:</i></p> <p>Development can result in a direct loss of habitats and disturbance to species but can also have indirect effects through increasing pollution (including noise and light pollution), disturbance through human activity and accelerating the effects of climate change.</p>
--	--	--

¹ https://magic.defra.gov.uk/Metadata_for_magic/Habitat%20Network%20Mapping%20Guidance.pdf

	<p>A sentence should be added here and /or in para. 2.9 to highlight the Council’s statutory duty to conserve and enhance the setting of the Lake District National Park, to qualify the point in Table 1 about having no planning jurisdiction for the Park itself. The statutory duty does not apply only to the National Park Authorities (see Paragraph: 039 Reference ID: 8-039-20190721 of the NPPG).</p> <p>15.13.7 - Here or in footnote 100 it would be worth briefly explaining why the LDNPA LCA may be relevant i.e. In areas where the LDNPA landscape types extend beyond the LDNP boundary and into the Copeland Plan area.</p> <p>15.15.4 – indicate that this list is not exhaustive – all type of vegetation/green spaces have some GI function, however small, e.g. for biodiversity, providing oxygen to breathe or intercepting rainfall. Green corridors – hedgerows, old railway routes, river corridors etc. are all green corridors.</p>	<p><i>No need to add “and its setting” to end of first sentence as the sentence says including and is therefore not exhaustive.</i></p> <p><i>Modification proposed: additional text proposed in paragraph 15.13.1:</i></p> <p>The Council has a statutory duty to conserve and enhance the setting of the Lake District National Park. It is therefore important that full...</p> <p><i>Modification proposed: Footnote 100 amended:</i></p> <p>For example, where the proposal due to the scale of landscape types some may extend beyond the LDNP boundary and into the Copeland Local Plan area and/or may affect the setting of the Lake District National Park.</p> <p><i>Modification proposed: Paragraph 15.15.4:</i></p> <p>...types of green infrastructure within the borough as listed below (please note there are also other forms of GI and this list is not exhaustive):</p>
16.3	<p>We consider that additions to Figure 11 would better reflect the supporting text and the range of heritage assets Copeland has, including those with the highest significance and level of protection but which are currently missing from the diagram entitled ‘Copeland’s Heritage Assets’.</p> <p>The supporting text and Policies Map will require minor updating to reflect these changes.</p> <p>We understand that it would be very challenging to identify other heritage assets such as individual listed buildings but the LDNP World Heritage Site,</p>	<p><i>Modification proposed: amendments proposed to Figure 11: the LDNP World Heritage Site, Frontiers of the Roman Empire World Heritage Site and the St. Bee’s and Whitehaven Heritage Coast to be added to Figure 11 and Proposals Map.</i></p>

	<p>Frontiers of the Roman Empire World Heritage Site and the St. Bee’s and Whitehaven Heritage Coast should be identified on Figure 11.</p> <p>Accordingly, para. 16.3.2 will require amending to read as follows:</p> <p>“Copeland contains a wealth of heritage assets, including the Lake District National Park World Heritage Site (this lies outside the Plan area but adjoining the Plan area adjoins it and contains its setting), elements of Hadrian’s Wall Frontiers of the Roman Empire World Heritage Site, the St. Bee’s and Whitehaven Heritage Coast, 483 listed buildings, 120 scheduled ancient monuments (SAMs) and 8 conservation areas.</p> <p>Heritage assets are identified on the Proposals Map, with WHSs, the Heritage Coast, Conservation Areas and SAMs also shown in Figure 11 below”.</p> <p>The policies map should also reflect these designations – currently the Heritage Coast is shown but not the WHSs.</p>	<p><i>Modifications proposed: Paragraph 16.3.2 as suggested:</i></p> <p>Copeland contains a wealth of heritage assets, including the Lake District National Park World Heritage Site (this lies outside the Plan area but adjoining the Plan area adjoins it and contains its setting), elements of Hadrian’s Wall Frontiers of the Roman Empire World Heritage Site, Whitehaven and St Bees Heritage Coast, 483 Listed Buildings, 120 scheduled ancient monuments (SAMs) and 8 Conservation Areas.</p> <p>Heritage assets are identified on the Proposals Map, with WHSs, the Heritage Coast, Conservation Areas and SAMs also shown in Figure 11 below.</p> <p><i>See comment above re Proposals Map.</i></p>
17.1	<p>We consider that wording amendments and additions are needed for factual accuracy and to better reflect national policy and plan objectives.</p> <p>Strengths – reference to a rail link to Carlisle airport should be removed. There is no rail link to it and in any event, it has ceased operation as a public airport.</p> <p>17.1 - more could be added here about walking routes, including reference to the England Coast path</p>	<p><i>Modification proposed: amendment to strenths</i></p> <p>Copeland has a 7 day rail service along the coastline, as well as regular indirect train links to airports at Carlisle, Manchester and Newcastle</p> <p><i>17.1 No change – already mentions pedestrian and cycle links and these are explained further in the chapter</i></p>

<p>BE6PU</p>	<p>We consider that wording amendments would make the plan more effective and fully reflective of the stated plan objectives and national policy</p> <p>iv) – replace ‘considered’ with ‘demonstrably’ in order to make the policy effective and in line with policies for the protection of dark skies elsewhere in the plan</p>	<p><i>Modification proposed to criterion iv: Where illumination is proposed it is considered demonstrably necessary and is sensitively designed...</i></p>
<p>CC1PU</p>	<p>We consider that wording amendments would make the plan more effective and fully reflective of national policy</p> <p>Lighting should be added to the final bullet of this policy</p>	<p><i>This Policy now forms part of DS2PU</i></p> <p><i>Lighting considered under DS5PU which applies to all developments. No change therefore necessary.</i></p>
<p>CO5PU</p>	<p>We consider that wording amendments are necessary for clarity and syntax.</p> <p>We understand the intention behind d) ‘vehicles that facilitate car sharing’ but in order to include car sharing within the hierarchy, this would need rewording and qualifying in order to make sense as any vehicle with more than one seat could ‘facilitate’ sharing. In addition, it is only when the sharing is actually happening that any priority in the hierarchy should be engaged. That said, it is not clear how a development could promote car sharing, and, more specifically, how it could promote or manage the relative priority of car sharing within the hierarchy, other than perhaps through a Travel Plan and/or having dedicated car share lanes/parking spaces accompanied by a monitoring system for enforcement, which could be very land-hungry and difficult to implement and enforce.</p> <p>One option might be to remove car sharing as a separate category in the hierarchy on the basis that it would be difficult for any development or planning mechanism to effectively prioritise, monitor and enforce it (in the same way as it would if any level of priority was sought for electric vehicles).</p>	<p><i>Modification proposed: Criterion d to be deleted. Some larger developments may want to include car share options within a Travel Plan and this is already considered in Policy CO4PU.</i></p>

DS2PU	<p>We consider that wording amendments would make the plan more effective and fully reflective of national policy and legislation</p> <p>We welcome the re-positioning of the climate change policy within the document to reflect its importance and the fact it underpins the whole plan. However, whilst we recognise that there is as yet no requirement in the NPPF to meet net zero carbon by any given year or to include specific climate change measures in local plans, meeting net zero carbon by 2050 is a legal requirement and requires concerted action now, regardless of any lack of reference to it in the NPPF.</p> <p>If net zero carbon is to be achieved across the Borough by 2037, rather than just having a reduced footprint, new developments will have to have a net zero carbon footprint, alongside measures to make existing development also net zero, otherwise the overall carbon footprint will simply grow more slowly.</p> <p>As such, we remain of the view that ‘encouraging’ developers to consider relevant measures is not strong enough and will leave the policy ineffective in terms of delivering net zero carbon in line with either the Cumbrian or national target.</p>	<p><i>The Council would like to be stronger on this issue through the Local Plan, however there is no requirement in the NPPF to include such policies within Local Plans and requiring all development to have a net zero carbon footprint would have a significant impact on development viability. Therefore the Council feel that the best means of addressing the issue is through revised building regulations etc, requirements at a national level and negotiation/encouragement at a local level.</i></p>
DS4PU	<p>We consider that wording amendments would make the plan more effective</p> <p>DS4PU part 2) bullet 4 – suggest ‘are dependent on’ rather than ‘require’. This will help to ensure a genuine need for that location rather than just a desire/convenience on behalf of the applicant.</p>	<p><i>Modification proposed:</i></p> <p>Appropriate rural developments such as agricultural, forestry, farm diversification or tourism proposals which are dependent on require such a location</p>
DS6PU	<p>We very much welcome the addition of a reference to dark skies within the Design and Development Standards Policy. However, we consider that wording amendments would make the plan more effective and fully reflective of national policy</p> <p>We very much welcome the reference to light pollution and dark skies in the policy and supporting text. We suggest the policy text be strengthened and</p>	<p><i>Modification proposed:</i></p> <p>Uses appropriate levels and types of external lighting that does not create light pollution and helps maintain dark skies in line with up to date dark skies guidance</p>

	made more effective by amending it to say “Uses appropriate levels and types of external lighting that does not create light pollution and helps maintain dark skies in line with up to date dark skies guidance ”	
H1PU	<p>We consider that greater emphasis on genuine need, in addition to the welcome commitment to bringing empty homes back into use and making more efficient use of the existing stock, would make the plan more effective and fully reflective of national policy, certain plan objectives and sustainable development goals</p> <p>An important piece of evidence is not fully taken into account in the overall approach to housing.</p> <p>We note that average household size in the area based on the population and housing stock figures given in the Plan is 2.03. This suggests a very limited need for larger houses and should translate to an approach that strongly prioritises smaller homes to meet the genuine needs of the area and make more efficient use of resources, as well as providing evidence to justify subdivision where appropriate opportunities arise, including when bringing empty homes back into re-use.</p> <p>H1PU – The housing strategy should seek to meet genuine local need not ‘aspirations’. We welcome the aim to bring the 1000 empty homes back into use and renew and improve the existing stock – empty homes and existing buildings, including subdivisions, where appropriate should be the priority. This must be seen in the context of the standard method identifying a need for only 11 homes per year, the existing average household size, the existing levels of empty homes and opportunities for brownfield sites, existing buildings and subdivision to create new homes, along with the climate and ecological emergencies. In this context it is increasingly difficult to justify significant greenfield development for new homes (especially open market/non-affordable housing). Notwithstanding the above, we welcome the reduced figure compared to that set out in the Core Strategy. Population and housing stock figures suggest very few new-build houses are genuinely</p>	<i>The housing requirement and required housing mix is supported by appropriate evidence. No change proposed.</i>

	<p><i>needed.</i> More efficient use of existing stock is required and the approach should not just be about the amount of new housing built but about ensuring that the quantity, type, size, tenure, affordability and location of homes meets genuine needs and is delivered in a way that also complements other objectives including those relating to climate change and biodiversity.</p>	
H5PU	<p>For some sites, certain factors still need to be taken into account in their site profiles and in determining their suitability for development.</p> <p>HSU1 – Trig pillar should be referenced in the site profile for this site and incorporated as a feature in the development, rather than being destroyed or removed as these have cultural heritage and recreational value – see https://www.ordnancesurvey.co.uk/newsroom/blog/a-history-of-the-trig-pillar</p> <p>Sites that directly affect priority habitat such as HMI2 and HDI1 are inappropriate for development. This factor should be recorded on relevant sites' site profiles.</p> <p>Where sites affect Network Enhancement and Expansion Zones relating to the Local Nature Recovery Network/Strategy, this should be identified on their site profiles.</p> <p>HDH2 – unclear how this site will define the village edge as claimed as it is not on the edge of the village but is an open space within it, which contributes to its character</p>	<p><i>Modification proposed:</i></p> <p><i>Wording added to site profile (Local Plan Appendix F) re Trig Point:</i></p> <p>The site contains a Trig Pillar which should be retained as a cultural feature where possible. For further information see https://www.ordnancesurvey.co.uk/newsroom/blog/a-history-of-the-trig-pillar</p> <p><i>Where a site is located within an area of priority habitat, or is affected by a Network Enhancement and Expansion Zone this will be identified in the Biodiversity Technical Paper. All housing sites have undergone a site specific ecology assessment that also identifies mitigation required to allow development to commence – the summary is included within the Site Profiles document.</i></p>

		<i>Disagree with this comment. The site is on the edge of the village and the Settlement Landscape Character Assessment identified an opportunity to better define the edge. No change proposed.</i>
H7PU	<p>We consider that wording amendments would make the plan more effective and fully reflective of national policy and legislation</p> <p>Specific reference should be made to local landscape character and natural and cultural heritage assets. The phrase ‘consideration should be given’ should be more positively worded in order to be effective, for example ‘development proposals should clearly demonstrate that’ the size etc. are appropriate to the site. Again, the focus should be on genuine need rather than desires and aspirations.</p>	<i>No change proposed – H7 appears strong enough as worded</i>
H8PU	<p>We very much support efforts to help address empty homes and welcome the references to this in policies H8PU and H11PU and in the supporting text – this should be a high priority for the Borough.</p>	<i>Support welcomed.</i>
H13PU	<p>We welcome the policy but amendments to the text would make it more effective and more aligned with plan objectives and sustainable development goals</p>	<i>No change required – 13.15.1 and the policy title make it clear that the policy does not just relate to HMOs. The majority of the supporting text does relate to HMOs as these developments are most likely to cause adverse effects.</i>
H18PU	<p>We consider that wording amendments would make the plan more effective and fully reflective of certain plan objectives</p> <p>Bullet a – there is a need to clarify what will constitute ‘close to’, we suggest: “the replacement dwelling is to be sited on, or should closely reflect, the footprint of the existing dwelling to be replaced, unless there are clear and demonstrable reasons why an alternative siting or footprint will deliver a more appropriate scheme”</p>	<p><i>Modification proposed (Slightly different wording proposed to criterion a than suggested):</i></p> <p>the replacement dwelling is to be sited on, or close directly adjacent to the footprint of the existing dwelling to be replaced, unless there are clear and demonstrable reasons why an alternative siting or footprint will deliver a more appropriate scheme.</p>

	<p>We would also suggest an additional clause requiring the replacement dwelling to closely reflect the existing dwelling in size and scale as per the Beach Bungalow policy (and as indicated in the Issues and Options document)– consideration could be given to stipulating a maximum percentage increase in floorspace.</p> <p>The policy requirement limiting extensions to a certain percentage increase in size compared to the original property appears to have been removed. This policy helped to address an important issue relating to overdevelopment, cumulative impacts and the impacts of increased scale and should be reinstated.</p> <p>Clarification is needed as to whether figures presented in this section and elsewhere in the document relate to the whole Borough or just the Plan area.</p>	<p><i>Modification proposed to criterion b:</i></p> <p>The erection of a replacement dwellings outside of identified settlement boundaries will be permitted where:</p> <p>...b) the replacement dwelling (including any curtilage development) should be no larger in scale, size or massing that the existing dwelling to be replaced and curtilage development is of a scale, form and its design must be appropriate to the location...</p> <p><i>Amendments made to para 13.2.2 – figures updated and “the borough” changed to “Copeland”.</i></p>
N1PU	<p>This policy is welcomed but we consider that wording amendments/additional elements would make the plan more effective and fully reflective of national policy and legislation and certain plan objectives</p> <p>The ‘avoidance’ step should include an assessment of the genuine need for the development and consideration of alternative, less sensitive sites.</p>	<p><i>This is set out in paragraph 15.3.3. An assessment of genuine need doesn’t apply at this stage of the process. No change proposed.</i></p>
N2	<p>This policy is welcomed but we consider that wording amendments/additional elements would make the plan more effective and fully reflective of national policy and legislation and certain plan objectives</p> <p>We suggest including a presumption against development that compromises areas identified as part of the Local Nature Recovery Network i.e. NE’s</p>	

	<p>identified Network Enhancement Zones 1 & 2 and Network Expansion Zones. These should also be referenced as key components of Local Nature Recovery Networks/Strategies.</p> <p>We also suggest a rewording of the first paragraph of the policy as the plan has no jurisdiction over networks that extend beyond the borough's boundaries and as such, this part of the wording is ineffective. We suggest that the first paragraph of the policy is re-written as follows: "The Council will support the identification, implementation, protection and enhancement of Local Nature Recovery Networks".</p>	<p><i>Modification proposed: Additional paragraph at 15.9.4:</i></p> <p>The Pilot LNRS has been informed by Natural England's National Habitat Network Maps². These identify Existing Habitats and Network Expansion and Enhancement Zones. The LNRS Map should be considered by developers at the earliest stage when determining the best location for off-site biodiversity net gain (see Policy N3PU). Focus should be on those areas identified for habitat management, enhancement, restoration and creation.</p> <p><i>Including a presumption against development in these areas would not conform with the NPPF.</i></p> <p><i>Suggested modification as recommended:</i></p> <p>The Council will support the identification, and implementation, protection and enhancement of Local Nature Recovery Networks that extend beyond the borough's boundaries and provide...</p>
N6	<p>We consider that wording amendments/additional elements would make the plan more effective and fully reflective of national policy and legislation and certain plan objectives</p> <p>c) – 'impact on its setting' should be amended to read 'impact on their settings' in order to make it clear that the importance of setting relates to both the LDNP and the Heritage Coast, not just the latter.</p>	<p><i>Modification proposed to criterion c:</i></p> <p>Ensuring development proposals demonstrate that their location, scale, design and materials will conserve and where possible enhance the natural beauty, wildlife and cultural heritage of the Lake District National Park and Heritage Coast where proposals could impact on its their setting...</p>

² https://magic.defra.gov.uk/Metadata_for_magic/Habitat%20Network%20Mapping%20Guidance.pdf

	<p>We recommend that ‘Consideration must be given to’ should be amended to read ‘Development proposals must be informed by’ and that ‘at the earliest stage’ should be amended to read ‘from the earliest stage’.</p> <p>The link should also be made to footnote 100/LDNP LCA in the final sentence of this policy.</p>	<p><i>Modification proposed:</i></p> <p>Consideration must be given to Development proposals must be informed by the Council’s Landscape Character Assessment, Settlement Landscape Character Assessment, and the Cumbria Landscape Character Guidance and Toolkit and where appropriate, the Lake District National Park Landscape Character Assessment at from the earliest stage</p> <p><i>Suggested modification as recommended.</i></p>
N7	<p>We very much welcome and support the changes to reflect the Heritage Coast extension and the dedicated Heritage Coast policy.</p>	<p><i>Support welcomed</i></p>
N10	<p>Whilst the primary purpose of green wedges may be about settlement separation and landscape, the wider green infrastructure functions they have are also important and should be protected in order to complement policy N9PU and to be fully reflective of national policy and certain plan objectives.</p> <p>As such, we consider that wording amendments/additional elements would make the plan more effective.</p> <p>Add ‘the green infrastructure functionality and’ to second bullet after ‘where...’ to read:</p> <p>“where the green infrastructure functionality and the special characteristics and quality of the landscape are conserved and enhanced”.</p>	<p><i>Modification proposed:</i></p> <p>Where its functionality and the special characteristics and quality...</p>
N13	<p>We welcome this policy but consider that wording amendments/additional elements would make the plan more effective and fully reflective of national</p>	<p><i>No change proposed re deletion of appropriate from 2nd sentence – it may not always be appropriate to</i></p>

	<p>policy. The changes will better support biodiversity protection and biodiversity net gain requirements as well as being beneficial in relation to other objectives including air quality and public health and well-being.</p> <p>We recommend removing references to ‘where possible and appropriate’ and ‘where possible’, which creates an unnecessary loophole.</p> <p>The word ‘additional’ should be added after the word ‘incorporate’ and under 2) ‘where possible’ should be replaced with ‘unless demonstrably inappropriate or unviable. Off-site provision will then be required’.</p>	<p><i>incorporate new tree or hedge planting eg on a small site.</i></p> <p><i>Modification proposed (slightly different wording to that suggested):</i></p> <p>Replacement trees should be planted on site and with native species should be used where possible. Where this is inappropriate or unviable, off site provision and alternative species will then be required.</p>
R5	<p>We consider that wording amendments would make the plan more effective and fully reflective of the stated plan objectives, national policy and sustainable development goals</p> <p>Consideration of shared uses/combining services and facilities in order to bolster viability should also be listed as a criteria in relation to the loss of services and facilities.</p>	<p><i>Modification proposed:</i></p> <p>a) Its continued use as a village shop, post office or public house is no longer feasible, having had regard to appropriate marketing (over twelve months and at a price which reflects its use, condition and local market values), the demand for the use of the site or premises, its usability and the identification of a future occupier. Applicants must demonstrate that full consideration has been given any opportunities available to retain the existing use as part of a shared/combined service in order to improve viability.</p>

<p>SC5</p>	<p>We consider that wording amendments would make the plan more effective and fully reflective of the stated plan objectives, national policy and sustainable development goals</p> <p>We suggest including a criterion requiring that ‘shared facilities / co-location have been considered as an option to improve viability’</p>	<p><i>Modification proposed:</i></p> <p>a) Its continued use as a community or cultural facility is no longer feasible, having had regard to appropriate marketing that has been undertaken. Evidence should be provided to show that the building premises/site has been marketed over a 12 month period through recognised agents and inline platforms appropriate to the nature of the facility at a price which reflects its use, condition and local market values}, the demand for the use of the site or premises, and its usability and the identification of a potential future occupier. Applicants must demonstrate that full consideration has been given any opportunities available to retain the existing use as part of a shared/combined service in order to improve viability.</p>
<p>General</p>	<p>We very much welcome overall extent and quality of coverage of landscape character and the setting of important landscape and heritage assets in the Plan.</p> <p>References to ‘net zero by 2030’ have been replaced by ‘net zero carbon by 2037’ in most cases. Whilst this is helpful clarification, for consistency, all instances should be changed. Another option would be, at the first reference to ‘net zero by 2037’, to include a footnote to make clear that it is net zero carbon that is being referred to in such references throughout the document.</p> <p>We welcome removal of Crook Field and Land South of Derwentwater Close, Millom and HSB2 in St Bee’s from consideration</p>	<p><i>Support welcomed</i></p> <p><i>Modifications proposed throughout</i></p> <p><i>Support welcomed</i></p>