

## Contents Page

<b>Respondent ID</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Page No</b>
106	Ivor Fee.....	1
213	Sarah Lee.....	2
231	Paul Nelson.....	18
272	Anne Gate .....	38
281	Edwin Dinsdale.....	55
282	Michael Armstrong.....	59

From:

Sent: 19 July 2022 20:53

To: Local Plan Consultation

Subject:Gypsy and traveller site comments

Hi,

I wish to object to the proposed installation of a gypsy and traveller site at Sneckyeat as it is totally unsuitable for the following reasons:-

It would be built on a former refuse tip with possible health implications,heavy costs of testing the soil and cost of cleaning up to make safe , all out of council tax.

The drainage is poor ,as land holders adjacent will tell you, with the costs of improving that will entail

The access to the site is very poor, particularly for emergency vehicles .

A listed building is adjacent to the site.

i understand this process could take up to year, and know it is law to provide a site ,but doesn't Copeland not exist after April 2023 and revert to Cumberland,what difference would that make if it is not resolved by then as there is already a site at Carlisle which covers Cumberland's requirement to provide one ?

Kind regards,

### View results

Respondent

16 Anonymous

19:37

Time to complete

### Part A: Your Details

Please provide your details below. This information will be added into our database so we can contact you about the Submission, Examination and Adoption of the Local Plan as well as future Local Plan consultations.

All information in the following table will be used solely for this purpose and no identifying information will be used in any future stages of the Local Plan process. Age and gender data will be used to monitor engagement in the Local Plan consultation process.

If you **do not** wish for your details to be held in our consultation database, please tick here:

If an agent is appointed you must complete details for both parties, but we will use the agent details as our primary contact

1. Do you give permission for your details to be held in our consultation database? \*

- Yes
- No

2. What are your details? (name, organisation (if applicable), address, telephone number and email address) \*

[Redacted] Whitehaven, Cumbria [Redacted]

3. What are your agents details (if applicable) (name, organisation, address, telephone number and email address?)

NA

More options for Resp

4. Gender \*

- Male
- Female
- Prefer not to say

## 5. Age \*

- 18-25
- 26-35
- 36-45
- 46-55
- 56-65
- 66-75
- 76+
- Prefer not to say

## Part B: Your Representation

## 6. To which part of the Consultation Document does this representation relate? \*

If the representation relates to a paragraph within the supporting text, please state the paragraph number in the 'other' box.

- Policy H9: Allocated site for Gypsies and Travellers
- Policy N5: Protection of Water Resources
- Other

## 7. Is the nature of your representation to provide support for or object to the proposal? \*

- Support
- Object

## 8. Do you consider the proposal to be legally compliant? \*

- Yes
- No

## 9. Do you consider the proposal to be sound? \*

- Yes
- No

## 10. Do you consider the proposal to be compliant with the Duty to Co-operate? \*

- Yes
- No

11. Please give details of why you consider the Proposal is not legally compliant, is unsound, fails to comply with the Duty to Co-operate, or if you wish to support it. \*

I don't believe this to be legally compliant or sound as I don't believe due consideration has been given to the fact that this land is believed to be contaminated. It is known locally that planning permission has been refused for allotments to be moved on to this area and this would therefore suggest that the land is unsuitable for development. Knowing this to be the case, I believe the site would not be 'deliverable' within the 5 year time frame which is stated as a requirement for an approved site in the Planning Policy for Travellers sites 2015 Section 10.a) 4 . I believe it to be unfair to have prior knowledge of such an issue and yet allow this site to be put forward as the only suitable site for the development, to allow the developers to pay for the relevant surveys knowing it will not be suitable.

12. Please set out the modification(s) you consider necessary to make the proposal legally compliant and sound, in respect of any legal compliance or soundness matters you have identified at 11 above. \*

**Please note:** In your representation you should provide succinctly all the evidence and supporting information necessary to support your representation and your suggested modification(s). You should not assume that you will have a further opportunity to make submissions. **After this stage, further submissions may only be made if invited by the Inspector, based on the matters and issues he or she identifies for examination.**

Testing should have been done on the land prior to it being put forward in the local plan as the only chosen site. I believe there are other sites which would have been more deliverable, without the issues faced by this land.

13. If your representation is seeking a modification to the Local Plan, do you consider it necessary to participate in the examination hearing sessions? \*

- Yes, I wish to participate in the hearing session(s)
- No, I do not wish to participate in the hearing session(s)

14. If you wish to participate in the hearing session(s), please outline why you consider this to be necessary: \*

na

View results

Respondent

17 Anonymous

28:29

Time to complete

Part A: Your Details

Please provide your details below. This information will be added into our database so we can contact you about the Submission, Examination and Adoption of the Local Plan as well as future Local Plan consultations.

All information in the following table will be used solely for this purpose and no identifying information will be used in any future stages of the Local Plan process. Age and gender data will be used to monitor engagement in the Local Plan consultation process.

If you **do not** wish for your details to be held in our consultation database, please tick here:

If an agent is appointed you must complete details for both parties, but we will use the agent details as our primary contact

1. Do you give permission for your details to be held in our consultation database? \*

- Yes
- No

2. What are your details? (name, organisation (if applicable), address, telephone number and email address) \*

[Redacted] Whitehaven, Cumbria, [Redacted]

3. What are your agents details (if applicable) (name, organisation, address, telephone number and email address?)

NA

More options for Resp

4. Gender \*

- Male
- Female
- Prefer not to say

## 5. Age \*

- 18-25
- 26-35
- 36-45
- 46-55
- 56-65
- 66-75
- 76+
- Prefer not to say

## Part B: Your Representation

## 6. To which part of the Consultation Document does this representation relate? \*

If the representation relates to a paragraph within the supporting text, please state the paragraph number in the 'other' box.

- Policy H9: Allocated site for Gypsies and Travellers
- Policy N5: Protection of Water Resources
- Other

## 7. Is the nature of your representation to provide support for or object to the proposal? \*

- Support
- Object

## 8. Do you consider the proposal to be legally compliant? \*

- Yes
- No

## 9. Do you consider the proposal to be sound? \*

- Yes
- No

## 10. Do you consider the proposal to be compliant with the Duty to Co-operate? \*

- Yes
- No

11. Please give details of why you consider the Proposal is not legally compliant, is unsound, fails to comply with the Duty to Co-operate, or if you wish to support it. \*

I do not believe this site is a reasonable suggestion due to poor drainage at this site. A simple communications mast was erected in the neighbouring field, to the right on the entry from Sneckyeat Road, this caused surface water around the area where the designated entrance would be from Sneckyeat Road. It is also known that run off from the industrial estate ends up in the beck running through the farmers fields below the proposed site. Lastly, my house is a bungalow which is situated below the proposed development site, this year it almost flooded due to heavy rainfall and a blocked drain situated at the bottom of the farmers field adjacent to the pidgeon lofts. My husband cleared this blockage himself to prevent the house flooding as united utilities did not respond to the report for two days. I have grave concerns that the drainage of this site is inadequate and would cause flooding to my property in the future. The strategic policy DS8PU ; Reducing flood risk (pg 52 of the local plan) Section E ) Refers to avoiding development in areas where the existing drainage infrastructure is inadequate; unless appropriate mitigation is provided. I believe there would have been alternative sites more suitable that would not require such costly adjustments to the current drainage infrastructure.

12. Please set out the modification(s) you consider necessary to make the proposal legally compliant and sound, in respect of any legal compliance or soundness matters you have identified at 11 above. \*

**Please note:** In your representation you should provide succinctly all the evidence and supporting information necessary to support your representation and your suggested modification(s). You should not assume that you will have a further opportunity to make submissions. **After this stage, further submissions may only be made if invited by the Inspector, based on the matters and issues he or she identifies for examination.**

I believe the current drainage system would need replaced which would be costly. I don't believe the sustainable drainage systems (SUDS) would be an option due to the contaminated land but you may disagree and this could be an option. A plan would need to be in place to deal with surface water run off caused by the development and how this would be responded to within a reasonable timeframe to prevent damage being caused to the local properties (I believe my neighbour Green Acres would also be at risk).  
If the above would not be an option, Policy DS9PU; Sustainable Drainage has non preferred options 3/4 which could be used, however I'm not sure they would be possible with the poor drainage systems currently in place.

13. If your representation is seeking a modification to the Local Plan, do you consider it necessary to participate in the examination hearing sessions? \*

- Yes, I wish to participate in the hearing session(s)
- No, I do not wish to participate in the hearing session(s)

14. If you wish to participate in the hearing session(s), please outline why you consider this to be necessary: \*

This problem directly affects my home and I may be able to explain better the problems that are caused and the risks posed to us.



View results

Respondent  
18 Anonymous

26:34  
Time to complete

Part A: Your Details

Please provide your details below. This information will be added into our database so we can contact you about the Submission, Examination and Adoption of the Local Plan as well as future Local Plan consultations.

All information in the following table will be used solely for this purpose and no identifying information will be used in any future stages of the Local Plan process. Age and gender data will be used to monitor engagement in the Local Plan consultation process.

If you **do not** wish for your details to be held in our consultation database, please tick here:

If an agent is appointed you must complete details for both parties, but we will use the agent details as our primary contact

1. Do you give permission for your details to be held in our consultation database? \*

- Yes
- No

2. What are your details? (name, organisation (if applicable), address, telephone number and email address) \*

[Redacted] Whitehaven, Cumbria, [Redacted]

3. What are your agents details (if applicable) (name, organisation, address, telephone number and email address?)

NA

More options for Resp

4. Gender \*

- Male
- Female
- Prefer not to say

## 5. Age \*

- 18-25
- 26-35
- 36-45
- 46-55
- 56-65
- 66-75
- 76+
- Prefer not to say

## Part B: Your Representation

## 6. To which part of the Consultation Document does this representation relate? \*

If the representation relates to a paragraph within the supporting text, please state the paragraph number in the 'other' box.

- Policy H9: Allocated site for Gypsies and Travellers
- Policy N5: Protection of Water Resources
- Other

## 7. Is the nature of your representation to provide support for or object to the proposal? \*

- Support
- Object

## 8. Do you consider the proposal to be legally compliant? \*

- Yes
- No

## 9. Do you consider the proposal to be sound? \*

- Yes
- No

## 10. Do you consider the proposal to be compliant with the Duty to Co-operate? \*

- Yes
- No

11. Please give details of why you consider the Proposal is not legally compliant, is unsound, fails to comply with the Duty to Co-operate, or if you wish to support it. \*

I do not believe this site to be legally compliant or sound due to the risk posed by the current structure of the road. As residents travelling from The Cross towards the proposed entrance from Sneckyeat Road below the industrial estate, we are already face with daily near misses from cars exiting the hospital car park or the industrial estate itself. There has previously been a mirror for those exiting the industrial estate which is no longer there. The problem has now been exacerbated by the placement of the car park, which has caused cars to constantly park between the exit for the industrial estate and the the proposed entry/exit to the site. This is extremely dangerous for anyone walking in this direction as there is no pavement for walkers (i personally do not allow my daughter to be taken in her pram this direction as I believe it to be to dangerous). The cars also park right along the double yellow lines towards the Homewood Road junction, this is a daily occurrence and is unchallenged. Cars also park on land right the way to the entrance for the The Cross guesthouse which often results in deliveries being unable to be made as larger vehicles cannot gain access. If you are to change this layout, you will likely cause these drivers to park even further down our private laning causing yet more problems for us. The increase in use of our private laning would also be likely to incur additional costs to us for its maintenance.

Back to the safety issue, both the exit from the car park and the industrial estate are sweeping junctions, this means nothing to the drivers who continue to pull out without looking in our direction as they are not expecting cars to come from our direction. The only reason there has not been more accidents is because we assume the drivers will pull out on us and are prepared for it. To increase the amount of traffic doing this and add in another exit will increase the danger to us and the likelihood of there being more accidents. If this was to be used a blind junction, such as the one currently there would be dangerous.

In reference to your local plan (pg34) Methodology 5.4.13 it also does not include a safe walking route with there being no pavement or adequate street lighting. This is a busy area used by dog walkers and as such this would be essential to ensure their safety.

12. Please set out the modification(s) you consider necessary to make the proposal legally compliant and sound, in respect of any legal compliance or soundness matters you have identified at 11 above. \*

**Please note:** In your representation you should provide succinctly all the evidence and supporting information necessary to support your representation and your suggested modification(s). You should not assume that you will have a further opportunity to make submissions. **After this stage, further submissions may only be made if invited by the Inspector, based on the matters and issues he or she identifies for examination.**

The junction would need to be sweeping junction to minimise risk to both drivers and pedestrians.

A pavement would need to be built and better street lighting installed for the safety of pedestrians.

Double yellow lines would need to be put between the industrial estate exit and the proposed entrance/exit and these would actually need to be policed by the council.

I believe an entrance/exit on Homewood Road, as has been considered, would be less costly and a safer option

13. If your representation is seeking a modification to the Local Plan, do you consider it necessary to participate in the examination hearing sessions? \*

- Yes, I wish to participate in the hearing session(s)
- No, I do not wish to participate in the hearing session(s)

14. If you wish to participate in the hearing session(s), please outline why you consider this to be necessary. \*

As a local to the area who already suffers the risks of using the current set up, I could offer a valid opinion on whether any proposed modifications are likely to help the situation.

View results

Respondent  
19 Anonymous

19:02  
Time to complete

Part A: Your Details

Please provide your details below. This information will be added into our database so we can contact you about the Submission, Examination and Adoption of the Local Plan as well as future Local Plan consultations.

All information in the following table will be used solely for this purpose and no identifying information will be used in any future stages of the Local Plan process. Age and gender data will be used to monitor engagement in the Local Plan consultation process.

If you **do not** wish for your details to be held in our consultation database, please tick here:

If an agent is appointed you must complete details for both parties, but we will use the agent details as our primary contact

1. Do you give permission for your details to be held in our consultation database? \*

- Yes
- No

2. What are your details? (name, organisation (if applicable), address, telephone number and email address) \*

[Redacted] Whitehaven, Cumbria, [Redacted]

3. What are your agents details (if applicable) (name, organisation, address, telephone number and email address?)

NA

More options for Resp

4. Gender \*

- Male
- Female
- Prefer not to say

## 5. Age \*

- 18-25
- 26-35
- 36-45
- 46-55
- 56-65
- 66-75
- 76+
- Prefer not to say

## Part B: Your Representation

## 6. To which part of the Consultation Document does this representation relate? \*

If the representation relates to a paragraph within the supporting text, please state the paragraph number in the 'other' box.

- Policy H9: Allocated site for Gypsies and Travellers
- Policy N5: Protection of Water Resources
- Other

## 7. Is the nature of your representation to provide support for or object to the proposal? \*

- Support
- Object

## 8. Do you consider the proposal to be legally compliant? \*

- Yes
- No

## 9. Do you consider the proposal to be sound? \*

- Yes
- No

## 10. Do you consider the proposal to be compliant with the Duty to Co-operate? \*

- Yes
- No

11. Please give details of why you consider the Proposal is not legally compliant, is unsound, fails to comply with the Duty to Co-operate, or if you wish to support it. \*

In the planning policy for Traveller sites 2015 Section 7.a) Pg2 it states there should be particular attention to early and effective communication with settled and traveller communities. Whilst I believe there has been early engagement with the travelling community (they actually suggested this site to the council themselves - this information was given directly to me by the the family themselves - ). There has been no early engagement with the settled community and no public consultation in the early stages, even to give the public an idea of what the site would be and how it would be run. As a result numerous petitions have been created and the local community is in uproar, how is this supposed to foster good relationships. My husband and I have spoken to [REDACTED] As has Councillor [REDACTED] following the Weddicar Parish council meeting, in the early stages of the site selection and requested a consultation but it did not come to fruition.

In the planning policy for Traveller Sites 2015 Section 9 pg 3 says that authorities should be 'working collaboratively with neighbouring and local planning authorities'.

Section 10.c) States LPA should 'consider production or joint development plans that set targets on a cross-authority basis, to provide more flexibility in identifying sites'. I do not believe this has been the case and no joint sites have been considered. Whilst this might not have been the preference of the communities to live in the sites, the failure to provide any sites which are genuinely suitable for to meet the needs of their development suggest that this should have been a consideration as a more suitable site may have been available.

12. Please set out the modification(s) you consider necessary to make the proposal legally compliant and sound, in respect of any legal compliance or soundness matters you have identified at 11 above. \*

**Please note:** In your representation you should provide succinctly all the evidence and supporting information necessary to support your representation and your suggested modification(s). You should not assume that you will have a further opportunity to make submissions. **After this stage, further submissions may only be made if invited by the Inspector, based on the matters and issues he or she identifies for examination.**

The guidance states that no modifications can be suggested for a failure to comply with the duty to co-operate.  
A public consultation should have been held .  
Joint development should have been considered.

13. If your representation is seeking a modification to the Local Plan, do you consider it necessary to participate in the examination hearing sessions? \*

- Yes, I wish to participate in the hearing session(s)
- No, I do not wish to participate in the hearing session(s)

14. If you wish to participate in the hearing session(s), please outline why you consider this to be necessary. \*

NA

View results

Respondent  
20 Anonymous

424:58  
Time to complete

Part A: Your Details

Please provide your details below. This information will be added into our database so we can contact you about the Submission, Examination and Adoption of the Local Plan as well as future Local Plan consultations.

All information in the following table will be used solely for this purpose and no identifying information will be used in any future stages of the Local Plan process. Age and gender data will be used to monitor engagement in the Local Plan consultation process.

If you **do not** wish for your details to be held in our consultation database, please tick here:

If an agent is appointed you must complete details for both parties, but we will use the agent details as our primary contact

1. Do you give permission for your details to be held in our consultation database? \*

- Yes
- No

2. What are your details? (name, organisation (if applicable), address, telephone number and email address) \*

[Redacted text]  
[Redacted text]  
[Redacted text] Whitehaven, Cumbria [Redacted text]

3. What are your agents details (if applicable) (name, organisation, address, telephone number and email address?)

na

More options for Resp

4. Gender \*

- Male
- Female
- Prefer not to say

## 5. Age \*

- 18-25
- 26-35
- 36-45
- 46-55
- 56-65
- 66-75
- 76+
- Prefer not to say

## Part B: Your Representation

## 6. To which part of the Consultation Document does this representation relate? \*

If the representation relates to a paragraph within the supporting text, please state the paragraph number in the 'other' box.

- Policy H9: Allocated site for Gypsies and Travellers
- Policy N5: Protection of Water Resources
- Other

## 7. Is the nature of your representation to provide support for or object to the proposal? \*

- Support
- Object

## 8. Do you consider the proposal to be legally compliant? \*

- Yes
- No

## 9. Do you consider the proposal to be sound? \*

- Yes
- No

## 10. Do you consider the proposal to be compliant with the Duty to Co-operate? \*

- Yes
- No



11. Please give details of why you consider the Proposal is not legally compliant, is unsound, fails to comply with the Duty to Co-operate, or if you wish to support it. \*

I do not believe the proposal for GTW5 is legally compliant or sound or meets the duty to co-operate because I believe the process in which the sites have been selected and deemed as potential opportunities for the settlement is both biased and corrupt. I do not believe that all of the land available to be used in Copeland has been considered and instead, [REDACTED] whose family require the settlement has had to source different pieces of land himself to suggest to Copeland Borough Council, (this information was obtained from [REDACTED] directly). The result of which has been that he has proposed GTW5 and in response, Copeland Borough Council have found some areas of land to put forward as proposals, most if not all of which do not meet the requirements of the settlement site, in order that the site which would indisputably be approved would be GTW5. There were 11 proposed sites, 4 were immediately discounted as too small for the required pitches and 5 due to landscape/character and bio-diversity reasons. I believe the inadequate site suggestions were put forward to ensure the selection of GTW5 as the preferred site.

GTW5 is included on the Open Space Assessment as protected open space (semi/natural green space), surely this means there is a more suitable alternative in order to protect this space. In the local plan it is evident there is a substantial amount of land allocated for housing, opportunity sites and employment sites, as well as other larger areas of green space including 299 pieces mentioned in the Open Space Assessment 2020. I would argue that these may form more adequate settings for the settlement, based on financial, implications, highways concerns (raised in another objection), drainage concerns (raised in another objection) and a query over the land being contaminated, not to mention the fact the land is supposed to be a protected green space.

I understand that Highways and the Lead Flood Authority have been consulted in relation to GTW5 but I query if united utilities have been consulted, this is especially important given the concern over poor drainage in the area. If this has not been done then I believe this would not meet the standards for duty to co-operate. I would also note that it is mentioned in the Local plan 13.7.5 pg 143 that united utilities has been consulted in relation to the housing allocations, I would expect the same to be done for this site or it would also not be defined as deliverable.

I mention that I believe the site selection to be biased and corrupt from the offset, as well as the site having been selected by the family themselves as they stated at Weddicar Parish council meeting, the way in which the sites are written up in the site assessment also lead me to believe this. Here are some things which I believe to be discrepancies;

I have ran out of space to answer this and have continued in box 12 below

12. Please set out the modification(s) you consider necessary to make the proposal legally compliant and sound, in respect of any legal compliance or soundness matters you have identified at 11 above. \*

**Please note:** In your representation you should provide succinctly all the evidence and supporting information necessary to support your representation and your suggested modification(s). You should not assume that you will have a further opportunity to make submissions. **After this stage, further submissions may only be made if invited by the Inspector, based on the matters and issues he or she identifies for examination.**

Impact on heritage assets. GW4 mentions that development in the area may impact the Greenbank Guesthouse to the West which is a Grade II listed building. GW3 is in closer proximity to this guesthouse and yet it has no mention on that site assessment. For GTW5 in the same section it states that there are no heritage assets in the close proximity. This is incorrect. The Cross Guesthouse which is also a Grade II listed building is extremely close to the site and can be seen when standing in the preferred eastern section. The problems mentioned previously in relation to highways and drainage suggest that development on this site is likely to impact the guesthouse.

GTW4 - This is the largest area suggested for the settlement site, whilst most of it is densely wooded and this is the main reason given for its' none suitability due to the impact on biodiversity and landscape/character. It does have sections of land which I believe would be big enough to house the 12 pitches, yet these areas are not mentioned. These areas are behind Derwentwater Road and Borrowdale Road. Another issue arising from this site is the fact that on the Local Plan, this area of Greenspace includes some green space in between the cemetery and businesses on Meadow Road and also a very sparsely wooded area at the junction for Meadow Road and Low Road. The impact on these areas are not likely to be the same as the densely wooded areas referred to on the site assessment. I would query why these potentially suitable areas have been let off the site assessment but included on the Local Plan, if not deliberately to make the site seem less suitable.

GTW3 is also a wooded area as is GTW4 yet this does not seem to pose concern and has not been a reason to discount the site as it was for GTW4.

GTE1 is a site at Egremont which has been partly discounted due to being a flood risk. [REDACTED] as posted on Facebook to say that Egremont has received 12million pounds to build flood defences in Egremont and the work is due to finish imminently. Have these not work and the area should still be classed as a flood risk or have they not be taken in to consideration for some reason?

In the assessment of site GTW5, it mentions the impact on biodiversity to be 'some individual trees and scrub', it also mentions the most eastern part of the site to be the preferred area for the settlement. This is actually the most likely place on the site to have an impact on biodiversity, as well as the area which would form an entrance/exit from Homewood Road. If we are trying to avoid the impact to biodiversity why would this particular area of the site be favoured?

The PPTS 2015

(4b) to ensure that local planning authorities, working collaboratively, develop fair and effective strategies to meet need through the identification of land for sites.

I will be submitting a freedom of information to find out the exact process that was adopted in order to identify the suggested 11 sites to ensure the above has been adhered to this in keeping with the Duty to co-operate. The quality of the suggested sites leads me to believe this might not be the case.

PPTS 2015

Plan Making

Local Planning authorities should in producing their local plan;

a) identify and update annually a supply of specific deliverable sites sufficient to provide 5 years' worth of sites against their locally set targets.

They define that; to be considered deliverable, sites should be available now, offer a suitable location for development and be achievable with a realistic prospect that development will be delivered on the site within 5 years. Sites with planning permission should be considered deliverable until planning permission expires, unless there is clear evidence that schemes will not be implemented within 5 years, for example they will not be viable, there is no longer a demand for the type of units or sites.

I don't believe this site has current planning permission to ensure it is deliverable

13. If your representation is seeking a modification to the Local Plan, do you consider it necessary to participate in the examination hearing sessions? \*

- Yes, I wish to participate in the hearing session(s)
- No, I do not wish to participate in the hearing session(s)

14. If you wish to participate in the hearing session(s), please outline why you consider this to be necessary: \*

na





*Proud of our past. Energised for our future.*

# Copeland Local Plan 2021- 2038

## Publication Draft: Gypsy and Traveller Site Consultation Response Form

### For internal use:

Resp. No. ....

Rep. No. ....

Date Rec. ....

This Representation Form provides the opportunity to comment on each potential, alternative Gypsy and Traveller site allocation currently being considered for inclusion within the Publication Draft of the Copeland Local Plan. The consultation documents can be viewed at:

<https://www.copeland.gov.uk/content/gypsy-and-traveller-site-allocation-consultation>. This consultation is a requirement under the Town and County Planning (Local Planning) Regulations 2012 Regulation 19. Please complete one form per representation/site.

The Publication Draft represents the Council's final draft of the Local Plan that we wish to submit to the Secretary of State for Public Examination by a Planning Inspector. Completed forms will be sent to the Planning Inspectorate for their consideration through the Examination in Public process.

Comments **not** submitted on the standard response form will only be considered at the Inspector's discretion.

It should be noted that representations will be made available to the Planning Inspectorate and to the Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State to conduct the Examination. Representations will be also be 'made available' in line with the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012 (Regulations 20, 22 and 35). This includes publication on the Council's website.

### Privacy Notice

A copy of the Council's privacy statement can be viewed at

[https://www.copeland.gov.uk/sites/default/files/attachments/privacy\\_notice1.pdf](https://www.copeland.gov.uk/sites/default/files/attachments/privacy_notice1.pdf). Further information is also available by contacting the council's Data Protection Officer at [info@copland.gov.uk](mailto:info@copland.gov.uk) or by calling 01946 598300 and asking to speak to the Data Protection Officer.

Please complete a separate sheet for each representation you wish to make and return this form **no later than 4.30pm on Tuesday 3<sup>rd</sup> May 2022** to:

Strategic Planning  
Copeland Borough Council  
Market Hall  
Market Place  
Whitehaven  
CA28 7JG

Or email: [localplanconsultation@copeland.gov.uk](mailto:localplanconsultation@copeland.gov.uk)

## Part B: Your Representation

1. To which part of the Consultation Document does this representation relate?

Paragraph  Policy  Site Ref.   
 H10PU?

2. Is the nature of your representation to provide support for or to object to the Proposal/Allocation?

Support  Object

3. Do you consider the Proposal/Allocation is legally compliant? (Please tick as appropriate)

Yes  No

4. Do you consider the Proposal/Allocation is sound? (Please tick as appropriate)

Yes  No

5. Do you consider the Proposal/Allocation complies with the Duty to Co-operate? (Please tick as appropriate)

Yes  No

6. Please give details of why you consider the Proposal/Allocation is not legally compliant, is unsound, fails to comply with the Duty to Co-operate, or if you wish to support it.

I don't believe this to be legally compliant or sound as I don't believe consideration has been given to the below point and I don't believe it would be achievable within your 'desirable' 5 year timeframe, as stated is required for phase 1 of the settlement. It is known locally that the area is a contaminated site and planning permission has previously been refused for allotment/s.

The policy DS10PU: Soils, Contamination and Land Stability (pg 54/55) <sup>of the local plan</sup> states it is the developers responsibility to provide the information at the time of the application. 'The full implementation of approved remediation measures will normally be required, prior to the commencement of, or the occupation of the proposed development of any phase.' I don't believe this has been considered in relation to site GTWS.

As stated in Planning Policy for Traveller Sites 20 Section 10-a) 4 pg 3.

(Continue on a separate sheet / expand box if necessary)

7. Please set out the modification(s) you consider necessary to make the proposal/allocation legally compliant and sound, in respect of any legal compliance or soundness matters you have identified at 6 above.

You would need to make a plan to remediate the contamination issues and have all of the remediation measures implemented prior to the commencement of any phase of development. I don't believe this is achievable within 5 years and thus the site is not deliverable..

(Continue on a separate sheet /expand box if necessary)

**Please note:** In your representation you should provide succinctly all the evidence and supporting information necessary to support your representation and your suggested modification(s). You should not assume that you will have a further opportunity to make submissions. **After this stage, further submissions may only be made if invited by the Inspector, based on the matters and issues he or she identifies for examination.**

8. If your representation is seeking a modification to the plan, do you consider it necessary to participate in the Examination hearing session(s)?

Yes, I wish to participate in the hearing session(s)

No, I do not wish to participate in the hearing session(s)

9. If you wish to participate in the hearing session(s), please outline why you consider this to be necessary:

Signature:



Date:

27/4/22

Please use a separate form for each site you wish to comment on and return this form **no later than 4.30pm on Tuesday 3<sup>rd</sup> May 2022**. We are unable to consider any responses received after this date.

**Thank you for completing this form**



*Proud of our past. Energised for our future.*

# Copeland Local Plan 2021- 2038

## Publication Draft: Gypsy and Traveller Site Consultation Response Form

### For internal use:

Resp. No. ....

Rep. No. ....

Date Rec. ....

This Representation Form provides the opportunity to comment on each potential, alternative Gypsy and Traveller site allocation currently being considered for inclusion within the Publication Draft of the Copeland Local Plan. The consultation documents can be viewed at:

<https://www.copeland.gov.uk/content/gypsy-and-traveller-site-allocation-consultation>. This consultation is a requirement under the Town and County Planning (Local Planning) Regulations 2012 Regulation 19. Please complete one form per representation/site.

The Publication Draft represents the Council's final draft of the Local Plan that we wish to submit to the Secretary of State for Public Examination by a Planning Inspector. Completed forms will be sent to the Planning Inspectorate for their consideration through the Examination in Public process.

Comments **not** submitted on the standard response form will only be considered at the Inspector's discretion.

It should be noted that representations will be made available to the Planning Inspectorate and to the Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State to conduct the Examination. Representations will be also be 'made available' in line with the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012 (Regulations 20, 22 and 35). This includes publication on the Council's website.

### Privacy Notice

A copy of the Council's privacy statement can be viewed at [https://www.copeland.gov.uk/sites/default/files/attachments/privacy\\_notice1.pdf](https://www.copeland.gov.uk/sites/default/files/attachments/privacy_notice1.pdf). Further information is also available by contacting the council's Data Protection Officer at [info@copland.gov.uk](mailto:info@copland.gov.uk) or by calling 01946 598300 and asking to speak to the Data Protection Officer.

Please complete a separate sheet for each representation you wish to make and return this form **no later than 4.30pm on Tuesday 3<sup>rd</sup> May 2022** to:

Strategic Planning  
Copeland Borough Council  
Market Hall  
Market Place  
Whitehaven  
CA28 7JG

Or email: [localplanconsultation@copeland.gov.uk](mailto:localplanconsultation@copeland.gov.uk)

**Part B: Your Representation**

1. To which part of the Consultation Document does this representation relate?

Paragraph  Policy  Site Ref.   
*H10PU?*

2. Is the nature of your representation to provide support for or to object to the Proposal/Allocation?

Support  Object

3. Do you consider the Proposal/Allocation is legally compliant? (Please tick as appropriate)

Yes  No

4. Do you consider the Proposal/Allocation is sound? (Please tick as appropriate)

Yes  No

5. Do you consider the Proposal/Allocation complies with the Duty to Co-operate? (Please tick as appropriate)

Yes  No

6. Please give details of why you consider the Proposal/Allocation is not legally compliant, is unsound, fails to comply with the Duty to Co-operate, or if you wish to support it.

I do not believe site GTWS is a reasonable suggestion for the settlement due to poor drainage at the site. A simple communications mast was erected at the site which caused surface water where the designated entrance on sneekyeat Rd is. It is also known that run off from the industrial estate ends up in the beck running through the farmers fields. Lastly, my house is a bungalow situated below the proposed site, this year my house nearly flooded, due to blocked drains in heavy rain. My husband rang united utilities who came 2 days after the report. My husband had to clear the drain himself. I believe this settlement would cause my house to flood because of poor drainage.

Ref- Strategic policy DS8PU: Reducing flood risk (pg 52 of local plan) section e) Avoiding development in areas where the existing drainage infrastructure is inadequate: unless appropriate mitigation is provided.

(Continue on a separate sheet / expand box if necessary)

See example map for more details.

7. Please set out the modification(s) you consider necessary to make the proposal/allocation legally compliant and sound, in respect of any legal compliance or soundness matters you have identified at 6 above.

You could consider replacing the inadequate drainage system, however I believe this would be costly.  
I don't believe sustainable drainage systems (SUDS) would be an option due to the contaminated land.  
Where could you direct the surface water? If the drainage system is inadequate, it would have to be your non preferred options 3/4 of your Policy DS9PU: Sustainable drainage. However, I'm not sure this would even be possible due to the poor drainage system currently in place.

(Continue on a separate sheet /expand box if necessary)

**Please note:** In your representation you should provide succinctly all the evidence and supporting information necessary to support your representation and your suggested modification(s). You should not assume that you will have a further opportunity to make submissions. **After this stage, further submissions may only be made if invited by the Inspector, based on the matters and issues he or she identifies for examination.**

8. If your representation is seeking a modification to the plan, do you consider it necessary to participate in the Examination hearing session(s)?

Yes, I wish to participate in the hearing session(s)

No, I do not wish to participate in the hearing session(s)

9. If you wish to participate in the hearing session(s), please outline why you consider this to be necessary:

I have previous knowledge of the area and problems having grown up here for two decades. I have now moved back to the area in the last few years and my house would be at direct risk of flooding if this issue is not addressed correctly.

Signature:

Date:

Please use a separate form for each site you wish to comment on and return this form no later than 4.30pm on Tuesday 3<sup>rd</sup> May 2022. We are unable to consider any responses received after this date.

**Thank you for completing this form**





*Proud of our past. Energised for our future.*

# Copeland Local Plan 2021- 2038

## Publication Draft: Gypsy and Traveller Site Consultation Response Form

### For internal use:

Resp. No.	.....
Rep. No.	.....
Date Rec.	.....

This Representation Form provides the opportunity to comment on each potential, alternative Gypsy and Traveller site allocation currently being considered for inclusion within the Publication Draft of the Copeland Local Plan. The consultation documents can be viewed at:

<https://www.copeland.gov.uk/content/gypsy-and-traveller-site-allocation-consultation>. This consultation is a requirement under the Town and County Planning (Local Planning) Regulations 2012 Regulation 19. Please complete one form per representation/site.

The Publication Draft represents the Council's final draft of the Local Plan that we wish to submit to the Secretary of State for Public Examination by a Planning Inspector. Completed forms will be sent to the Planning Inspectorate for their consideration through the Examination in Public process.

Comments **not** submitted on the standard response form will only be considered at the Inspector's discretion.

It should be noted that representations will be made available to the Planning Inspectorate and to the Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State to conduct the Examination. Representations will be also be 'made available' in line with the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012 (Regulations 20, 22 and 35). This includes publication on the Council's website.

### Privacy Notice

A copy of the Council's privacy statement can be viewed at [https://www.copeland.gov.uk/sites/default/files/attachments/privacy\\_notice1.pdf](https://www.copeland.gov.uk/sites/default/files/attachments/privacy_notice1.pdf). Further information is also available by contacting the council's Data Protection Officer at [info@copland.gov.uk](mailto:info@copland.gov.uk) or by calling 01946 598300 and asking to speak to the Data Protection Officer.

Please complete a separate sheet for each representation you wish to make and return this form **no later than 4.30pm on Tuesday 3<sup>rd</sup> May 2022** to:

Strategic Planning  
Copeland Borough Council  
Market Hall  
Market Place  
Whitehaven  
CA28 7JG

Or email: [localplanconsultation@copeland.gov.uk](mailto:localplanconsultation@copeland.gov.uk)

## Part B: Your Representation

1. To which part of the Consultation Document does this representation relate?

Paragraph  Policy  Site Ref.   
H10PU?

2. Is the nature of your representation to provide support for or to object to the Proposal/Allocation?

Support  Object

3. Do you consider the Proposal/Allocation is legally compliant? (Please tick as appropriate)

Yes  No

4. Do you consider the Proposal/Allocation is sound? (Please tick as appropriate)

Yes  No

5. Do you consider the Proposal/Allocation complies with the Duty to Co-operate? (Please tick as appropriate)

Yes  No

6. Please give details of why you consider the Proposal/Allocation is not legally compliant, is unsound, fails to comply with the Duty to Co-operate, or if you wish to support it.

I do not believe the option ATWS for the settlement to be legally compliant or sound due to the risk posed by the current structure of the road. As residents travelling from The Cross towards the proposed entrance/exit of site and the industrial estate, we have already had a number of near misses with cars exiting the industrial estate or turning in or out of the hospital car park. This has been even more of an issue since the car park was built and cars started parking on the road around your proposed entrance/exit on Summeryeat Rd. Even with the sweeping junctions the cars struggle to see us and often don't even look, not considering cars will be coming from our direction. Additional traffic from our direction i.e. from the site would increase the problem. In reference to your local plan (pg 34) Methodology 5.4.13 it also does not include a safe walking route as there is no continuous pavement or adequate street lighting.

This is a busy area used by dog walkers. (Continue on a separate sheet / expand box if necessary)

6. This entrance/exit also leads on to a private road with public access on foot. The use this entrance/exit would inevitably lead to increased use of this road which is maintained at a cost to myself and other local residents.

7. Please set out the modification(s) you consider necessary to make the proposal/allocation legally compliant and sound, in respect of any legal compliance or soundness matters you have identified at 6 above.

The junction could not be a blind junction and would need to be sweeping like the others.

A pavement would need to be built between your proposed entrance/exit and the industrial estate + better street lighting put in.

Double yellow lines would need to be next to the pavement to prevent the current parking issue. (The yellow lines in this area are always parked on and never monitored).

The double yellow lines in the area would actually have to be policed by the council.

- Homewood road entrance/exit (Continue on a separate sheet / expand box if necessary) would be better with the back area blocked off.

**Please note:** In your representation you should provide succinctly all the evidence and supporting information necessary to support your representation and your suggested modification(s). You should not assume that you will have a further opportunity to make submissions. **After this stage, further submissions may only be made if invited by the Inspector, based on the matters and issues he or she identifies for examination.**

8. If your representation is seeking a modification to the plan, do you consider it necessary to participate in the Examination hearing session(s)?

Yes, I wish to participate in the hearing session(s)

No, I do not wish to participate in the hearing session(s)

9. If you wish to participate in the hearing session(s), please outline why you consider this to be necessary:

I have already suffered many near misses with drivers from the car park and the industrial estate. I also refuse to allow my mother to walk my daughter in that direction because of how dangerous the parked cars/junctions are with a prism. This would directly impact me and my family and I could provide you with useful input for consideration.

Signature:

[Redacted Signature]

Date:

27/4/22

Please use a separate form for each site you wish to comment on and return this form no later than 4.30pm on Tuesday 3<sup>rd</sup> May 2022. We are unable to consider any responses received after this date.

*Thank you for completing this form*



*Proud of our past. Energised for our future.*

# Copeland Local Plan 2021- 2038

## Publication Draft: Gypsy and Traveller Site Consultation Response Form

### For internal use:

Resp. No. ....

Rep. No. ....

Date Rec. ....

This Representation Form provides the opportunity to comment on each potential, alternative Gypsy and Traveller site allocation currently being considered for inclusion within the Publication Draft of the Copeland Local Plan. The consultation documents can be viewed at:

<https://www.copeland.gov.uk/content/gypsy-and-traveller-site-allocation-consultation>. This consultation is a requirement under the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) Regulations 2012 Regulation 19. Please complete one form per representation/site.

The Publication Draft represents the Council's final draft of the Local Plan that we wish to submit to the Secretary of State for Public Examination by a Planning Inspector. Completed forms will be sent to the Planning Inspectorate for their consideration through the Examination in Public process.

Comments **not** submitted on the standard response form will only be considered at the Inspector's discretion.

It should be noted that representations will be made available to the Planning Inspectorate and to the Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State to conduct the Examination. Representations will be also be 'made available' in line with the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012 (Regulations 20, 22 and 35). This includes publication on the Council's website.

### Privacy Notice

A copy of the Council's privacy statement can be viewed at

[https://www.copeland.gov.uk/sites/default/files/attachments/privacy\\_notice1.pdf](https://www.copeland.gov.uk/sites/default/files/attachments/privacy_notice1.pdf). Further information is also available by contacting the council's Data Protection Officer at [info@copeland.gov.uk](mailto:info@copeland.gov.uk) or by calling 01946 598300 and asking to speak to the Data Protection Officer.

Please complete a separate sheet for each representation you wish to make and return this form **no later than 4.30pm on Tuesday 3<sup>rd</sup> May 2022** to:

Strategic Planning  
Copeland Borough Council  
Market Hall  
Market Place  
Whitehaven  
CA28 7JG

Or email: [localplanconsultation@copeland.gov.uk](mailto:localplanconsultation@copeland.gov.uk)

## Part B: Your Representation

1. To which part of the Consultation Document does this representation relate?

Paragraph

Policy

H9PU

Site Ref.

ATWS.

2. Is the nature of your representation to provide support for or to object to the Proposal/Allocation?

Support

Object

3. Do you consider the Proposal/Allocation is legally compliant? (Please tick as appropriate)

Yes

No

4. Do you consider the Proposal/Allocation is sound? (Please tick as appropriate)

Yes

No

5. Do you consider the Proposal/Allocation complies with the Duty to Co-operate? (Please tick as appropriate)

Yes

No

6. Please give details of why you consider the Proposal/Allocation is not legally compliant, is unsound, fails to comply with the Duty to Co-operate, or if you wish to support it.

In the Planning Policy for Traveller Sites 2015 Section 7.a) pg2 states particular attention to early and effective communication with settled and traveller communities. There has been no early engagement with the settled community and no public consultation where questions could be asked. Both myself and my husband have requested this via [redacted] as has Councillor [redacted] on our behalf and the behalf of residents who attended Weddicar Parish council meeting.

In the Planning Policy for Traveller Sites 2015, Section 9 pg3 it says local planning authorities should be 'working collaboratively with neighbouring local planning authorities.

Section 10.c) states LPA should 'consider production or joint development plans that set targets on a cross-authority basis, to provide more flexibility in identifying sites'. I do not believe this has been done and it therefore doesn't meet the duty to co-operate.

(Continue on a separate sheet /expand box if necessary)

7. Please set out the modification(s) you consider necessary to make the proposal/allocation legally compliant and sound, in respect of any legal compliance or soundness matters you have identified at 6 above.

The guidance states that no modifications can be suggested for a failure to comply with the duty to co-operate.  
A public consultation should have been held.  
Joint development should have been considered.

(Continue on a separate sheet /expand box if necessary)

**Please note:** In your representation you should provide succinctly all the evidence and supporting information necessary to support your representation and your suggested modification(s). You should not assume that you will have a further opportunity to make submissions. **After this stage, further submissions may only be made if invited by the Inspector, based on the matters and issues he or she identifies for examination.**

8. If your representation is seeking a modification to the plan, do you consider it necessary to participate in the Examination hearing session(s)?

Yes, I wish to participate in the hearing session(s)

No, I do not wish to participate in the hearing session(s)

9. If you wish to participate in the hearing session(s), please outline why you consider this to be necessary:

Signature:

Date:

27/4/22

Please use a separate form for each site you wish to comment on and return this form **no later than 4.30pm on Tuesday 3<sup>rd</sup> May 2022**. We are unable to consider any responses received after this date.

*Thank you for completing this form*



*Proud of our past. Energised for our future.*

# Copeland Local Plan 2021- 2038

## Publication Draft: Gypsy and Traveller Site Consultation Response Form

### For internal use:

Resp. No. ....

Rep. No. ....

Date Rec. ....

This Representation Form provides the opportunity to comment on each potential, alternative Gypsy and Traveller site allocation currently being considered for inclusion within the Publication Draft of the Copeland Local Plan. The consultation documents can be viewed at:

<https://www.copeland.gov.uk/content/gypsy-and-traveller-site-allocation-consultation>. This consultation is a requirement under the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) Regulations 2012 Regulation 19. Please complete one form per representation/site.

The Publication Draft represents the Council's final draft of the Local Plan that we wish to submit to the Secretary of State for Public Examination by a Planning Inspector. Completed forms will be sent to the Planning Inspectorate for their consideration through the Examination in Public process.

Comments **not** submitted on the standard response form will only be considered at the Inspector's discretion.

It should be noted that representations will be made available to the Planning Inspectorate and to the Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State to conduct the Examination. Representations will also be 'made available' in line with the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012 (Regulations 20, 22 and 35). This includes publication on the Council's website.

### Privacy Notice

A copy of the Council's privacy statement can be viewed at [https://www.copeland.gov.uk/sites/default/files/attachments/privacy\\_notice1.pdf](https://www.copeland.gov.uk/sites/default/files/attachments/privacy_notice1.pdf). Further information is also available by contacting the council's Data Protection Officer at [info@copland.gov.uk](mailto:info@copland.gov.uk) or by calling 01946 598300 and asking to speak to the Data Protection Officer.

Please complete a separate sheet for each representation you wish to make and return this form **no later than 4.30pm on Tuesday 3<sup>rd</sup> May 2022** to:

Strategic Planning  
Copeland Borough Council  
Market Hall  
Market Place  
Whitehaven  
CA28 7JG

Or email: [localplanconsultation@copeland.gov.uk](mailto:localplanconsultation@copeland.gov.uk)



**Part B: Your Representation**

1. To which part of the Consultation Document does this representation relate?

Paragraph  Policy  Site Ref.

2. Is the nature of your representation to provide support for or to object to the Proposal/Allocation?

Support  Object

3. Do you consider the Proposal/Allocation is legally compliant? (Please tick as appropriate)

Yes  No

4. Do you consider the Proposal/Allocation is sound? (Please tick as appropriate)

Yes  No

5. Do you consider the Proposal/Allocation complies with the Duty to Co-operate? (Please tick as appropriate)

Yes  No

6. Please give details of why you consider the Proposal/Allocation is not legally compliant, is unsound, fails to comply with the Duty to Co-operate, or if you wish to support it.

*Please see attached typed document.*

(Continue on a separate sheet /expand box if necessary)

- 6. I do not believe the proposal for GTW5 is legally compliant or sound or meets the duty to co-operate because I believe the process in which the sites have been selected and deemed as potential opportunities for the settlement is both biased and corrupt. I do not believe that all of the land available to be used in Copeland has been considered and instead, [redacted] whose family require the settlement has had to source different pieces of land himself to suggest to Copeland Borough Council, (this information was obtained from [redacted] directly). The result of which has been that he has proposed GTW5 and in response, Copeland Borough Council have found some areas of land to put forward as proposals, most if not all of which do not meet the requirements of the settlement site, in order that the site which would indisputably be approved would be GTW5. There were 11 proposed sites, 4 were immediately discounted as too small for the required pitches and 5 due to landscape/character and bio-diversity reasons. I believe the inadequate site suggestions were put forward to ensure the selection of GTW5 as the preferred site.

GTW5 is included on the Open Space Assessment as protected open space (semi/natural green space), surely this means there is a more suitable alternative in order to protect this space. In the local plan it is evident there is a substantial amount of land allocated for housing, opportunity sites and employment sites, as well as other larger areas of green space including 299 pieces mentioned in the Open Space Assessment 2020. I would argue that these may form more adequate settings for the settlement, based on financial, implications, highways concerns (raised in another objection), drainage concerns (raised in another objection) and a query over the land being contaminated, not to mention the fact the land is supposed to be a protected green space.

I have spoken with [redacted] and will be requesting specifically which areas of land listed in the Local Plan appendices are owned by Copeland Borough council, as this is not defined as part of the plan. I understand that all land owned by CBC has been considered however, i find it hard to believe that there was no land any further south than Egremont which could have been suitable. In obtaining the information of the land owned by CBC I hope to see if this is true. Having spoken with [redacted] he has said that they would most definitely consider land South of Egremont if it would provide a suitable settlement site.

I understand that Highways and the Lead Flood Authority have been consulted in relation to GTW5 but I query if united utilities have been consulted, this is especially important given the concern over poor drainage in the area. If this has not been done then I believe this would not meet the standards for duty to co-operate. I would also note that is is mentioned in the Local plan 13.7.5 pg 143 that united utilities has been consulted in relation to the housing allocations, I would expect the same to be done for this site or it would also not be defined as deliverable.

I mention that I believe the site selection to be biased and corrupt from the offset, as well as the site having been selected by the family themselves as they stated at Weddicar Parish council meeting, the way in which the sites are written up in the site assessment also lead me to believe this. Here are some things which I believe to be discrepancies;

- Impact on heritage assets. GW4 mentions that development in the area may impact the Greenbank Guesthouse to the West which is a Grade II listed building. GW3 is in closer proximity to this guesthouse and yet it has no mention on that site assessment. For GTW5 in the same section it states that there are no heritage assets in the close proximity. This is incorrect, The Cross Guesthouse which is also a Grade II listed building is extremely close to the site and can be seen when standing in the preferred eastern section. The problems mentioned previously in relation to highways and drainage suggest that development on this site is likely to impact the guesthouse.
- GTW4 - This is the largest area suggested for the settlement site, whilst most of it is densely wooded and this is the main reason given for its' none suitability due to the impact on biodiversity and landscape/character. It does have sections of land which I believe would be big enough to house the 12 pitches, yet these areas are not mentioned. These areas are behind Derwentwater Road and Borrowdale Road. Another issue arising from this site is the fact that on the Local Plan, this area of Greenspace includes some green space in between the cemetery and businesses on Meadow Road and also a very sparsely wooded area at the junction for Meadow Road and Low Road. The impact on these areas are not likely to be the same as the densely wooded areas referred to on the site assessment. I would query why these potentially suitable areas have been let off the site assessment but included on the Local Plan, if not deliberately to make the site seem less suitable.
- GTW3 is also a wooded area as is GTW4 yet this does not seem to pose concern and has not been a reason to discount the site as it was for GTW4.
- GTE1 is a site at Egremont which has been partly discounted due to being a flood risk. [REDACTED] has posted on Facebook to say that Egremont has received 12million pounds to build flood defences in Egremont and the work is due to finish imminently. Have these not work and the area should still be classed as a flood risk or have they not be taken in to consideration for some reason?

In the assessment of site GTW5, it mentions the impact on biodiversity to be 'some individual trees and scrub', it also mentions the most eastern part of the site to be the preferred area for the settlement. This is actually the most likely place on the site to have an impact on biodiversity, as well as the area which would form an entrance/exit from Homewood Road. If we are trying to avoid the impact to biodiversity why would this particular area of the site be favoured?

The PPTS 2015

(4b) to ensure that local planning authorities, working collaboratively, develop fair and effective strategies to meet need through the identification of land for sites.

I will be submitting a freedom of information to find out the exact process that was adopted in order to identify the suggested 11 sites to ensure the above has been adhered to this in keeping

with the Duty to co-operate. The quality of the suggested sites leads me to believe this might not be the case.

PPTS 2015

Plan Making

11. Local Planning authorities should in producing their local plan;
12. a) identify and update annually a supply of specific deliverable sites sufficient to provide 5 years' worth of sites against their locally set targets.

They define that; to be considered deliverable, sites should be available now, offer a suitable location for development and be achievable with a realistic prospect that development will be delivered on the site within 5 years. Sites with planning permission should be considered deliverable until planning permission expires, unless there is clear evidence that schemes will not be implemented within 5 years, for example they will not be viable, there is no longer a demand for the type of units or sites.

- I have mentioned in other objections and also above that the land on GTW5 is locally known to be a contaminated site for which permission for allotment/s has previously been refused. For this reason I feel doubtful there is any current planning permission on the site or that any future permission should be granted. (I will check this by submitting a freedom of information to acquire information on previous planning proposals and responses on this site). I have also submitted objections based not the drainage and likely flooding that would be caused by development on this site and questioned if United utilities have been consulted. As well as the inadequate and unsafe road structure on the Sneckyeat Road access. For these reasons I don't believe the duty to co-operate has been met. I do not believe GTW5 to be a sound suggestion for the site under the points of it being justified or effective. I don't believe other reasonable alternatives have been considered. I also don't believe it to be a deliverable site over the suggested 5 year period.

I also believe the Rural Exceptions Policy H15PU Local Plan pg 167 should be considered if it has not been and it is reasonable in these circumstances due to the considered cost of the development of GTW5 considering the potential drainage/highways issues and the likely cost to fix such problems.

7. Please set out the modification(s) you consider necessary to make the proposal/allocation legally compliant and sound, in respect of any legal compliance or soundness matters you have identified at 6 above.

Please see attached typed document.

(Continue on a separate sheet /expand box if necessary)

**Please note:** In your representation you should provide succinctly all the evidence and supporting information necessary to support your representation and your suggested modification(s). You should not assume that you will have a further opportunity to make submissions. **After this stage, further submissions may only be made if invited by the Inspector, based on the matters and issues he or she identifies for examination.**

8. If your representation is seeking a modification to the plan, do you consider it necessary to participate in the Examination hearing session(s)?

Yes, I wish to participate in the hearing session(s)

No, I do not wish to participate in the hearing session(s)

9. If you wish to participate in the hearing session(s), please outline why you consider this to be necessary:

Signature: 

Date: 29/4/22

Please use a separate form for each site you wish to comment on and return this form no later than 4.30pm on Tuesday 3<sup>rd</sup> May 2022. We are unable to consider any responses received after this date.

Thank you for completing this form

7. Could you put more emphasis on your Empty Homes Policy and allow some of your housing allocation to be used as potential sites for the settlement? This would still assist in achieving your housing objectives but would mean there are more adequate options for the settlement site put forward.

I would like to note that the 2014 based household projections for England suggest CBC need to be building an average of 8.4 houses per annum. In the last decade the lowest number of houses built was 98 between 2020/202, this is at least 10% more than required. Whilst I appreciate it is part of the plan to prevent further population loss in the area to increase the housing, I would suggest that equal if not more importance should be placed upon the need to provide a site for the gypsy/traveller settlement site and as such we should be satisfied that that we are far exceeding the minimum required house builds and consider some of the land from housing allocation to be used. Alternatively, land from opportunity sites or employment sites could also be used where appropriate.

As an example (without the requested relevant documents showing if these are all council owned) some suggestions from the Local Plan would be;  
Employment sites - ES7, ES8, ES14, Opportunity sites OWH05, OWH08, OM10, OCL01 and housing allocations HM11, HM12, HAR, HD1, HSE2 and HSE3 to name a few. (Taken from the Local plan Appendices)

Give consideration to the use of the Rural exception policy due to the potential costs of the development of GTW5 and the lack of affordable land which meets the gypsy/traveller needs for a settlement site. This could potentially identify more suitable options for the settlement.



*Proud of our past. Energised for our future.*

# Copeland Local Plan 2021- 2038

## Publication Draft: Gypsy and Traveller Site Consultation Response Form

### For internal use:

Resp. No. ....

Rep. No. ....

Date Rec. ....

This Representation Form provides the opportunity to comment on each potential, alternative Gypsy and Traveller site allocation currently being considered for inclusion within the Publication Draft of the Copeland Local Plan. The consultation documents can be viewed at:

<https://www.copeland.gov.uk/content/gypsy-and-traveller-site-allocation-consultation>. This consultation is a requirement under the Town and County Planning (Local Planning) Regulations 2012 Regulation 19. Please complete one form per representation/site.

The Publication Draft represents the Council's final draft of the Local Plan that we wish to submit to the Secretary of State for Public Examination by a Planning Inspector. Completed forms will be sent to the Planning Inspectorate for their consideration through the Examination in Public process.

Comments **not** submitted on the standard response form will only be considered at the Inspector's discretion.

It should be noted that representations will be made available to the Planning Inspectorate and to the Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State to conduct the Examination. Representations will be also be 'made available' in line with the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012 (Regulations 20, 22 and 35). This includes publication on the Council's website.

### Privacy Notice

A copy of the Council's privacy statement can be viewed at

[https://www.copeland.gov.uk/sites/default/files/attachments/privacy\\_notice1.pdf](https://www.copeland.gov.uk/sites/default/files/attachments/privacy_notice1.pdf). Further information is also available by contacting the council's Data Protection Officer at [info@copland.gov.uk](mailto:info@copland.gov.uk) or by calling 01946 598300 and asking to speak to the Data Protection Officer.

Please complete a separate sheet for each representation you wish to make and return this form **no later than 4.30pm on Tuesday 3<sup>rd</sup> May 2022** to:

Strategic Planning  
Copeland Borough Council  
Market Hall  
Market Place  
Whitehaven  
CA28 7JG

Or email: [localplanconsultation@copeland.gov.uk](mailto:localplanconsultation@copeland.gov.uk)

## Part B: Your Representation

1. To which part of the Consultation Document does this representation relate?

Paragraph  Policy  Site Ref.   
H10PU?

2. Is the nature of your representation to provide support for or to object to the Proposal/Allocation?

Support  Object

3. Do you consider the Proposal/Allocation is legally compliant? (Please tick as appropriate)

Yes  No

4. Do you consider the Proposal/Allocation is sound? (Please tick as appropriate)

Yes  No

5. Do you consider the Proposal/Allocation complies with the Duty to Co-operate? (Please tick as appropriate)

Yes  No

6. Please give details of why you consider the Proposal/Allocation is not legally compliant, is unsound, fails to comply with the Duty to Co-operate, or if you wish to support it.

I do not believe site GTWS is a reasonable suggestion for the settlement due to poor drainage at the site. A simple communications mast was erected at the site which caused surface water where the designated entrance on Sneekyeat Rd is. It is also known that run off from the industrial estate ends up in the beck running through the farmers fields. Lastly, my house is a bungalow situated below the proposed site, this year my house nearly flooded, due to blocked drains in heavy rain. My husband rang united utilities who came 2 days after the report. My husband had to clear the drain himself. I believe this settlement would cause my house to flood because of poor drainage.

Ref- Strategic policy DS8PU: Reducing flood risk (pg 52 of local plan) section e) Avoiding development in areas where the existing drainage infrastructure is inadequate: unless appropriate mitigation is provided.

(Continue on a separate sheet / expand box if necessary)

See example map for more details.



7. Please set out the modification(s) you consider necessary to make the proposal/allocation legally compliant and sound, in respect of any legal compliance or soundness matters you have identified at 6 above.

You could consider replacing the inadequate drainage system, however I believe this would be costly.  
I don't believe sustainable drainage systems (SUDS) would be an option due to the contaminated land.  
Where could you direct the surface water? If the drainage system is inadequate, it would have to be your non preferred options 3/4 of your Policy DS9PU: Sustainable drainage. However, I'm not sure this would even be possible due to the poor drainage system currently in place.

(Continue on a separate sheet /expand box if necessary)

**Please note:** In your representation you should provide succinctly all the evidence and supporting information necessary to support your representation and your suggested modification(s). You should not assume that you will have a further opportunity to make submissions. **After this stage, further submissions may only be made if invited by the Inspector, based on the matters and issues he or she identifies for examination.**

8. If your representation is seeking a modification to the plan, do you consider it necessary to participate in the Examination hearing session(s)?

Yes, I wish to participate in the hearing session(s)

No, I do not wish to participate in the hearing session(s)

9. If you wish to participate in the hearing session(s), please outline why you consider this to be necessary:

I have previous knowledge of the area and problems having grown up here for two decades. I have now moved back to the area in the last few years and my house would be at direct risk of flooding if this issue is not addressed correctly.

Signature:

Date:

Please use a separate form for each site you wish to comment on and return this form no later than 4.30pm on Tuesday 3<sup>rd</sup> May 2022. We are unable to consider any responses received after this date.

**Thank you for completing this form**



*Proud of our past. Energised for our future.*

# Copeland Local Plan 2021- 2038

## Publication Draft: Gypsy and Traveller Site Consultation Response Form

### For internal use:

Resp. No.	.....
Rep. No.	.....
Date Rec.	.....

This Representation Form provides the opportunity to comment on each potential, alternative Gypsy and Traveller site allocation currently being considered for inclusion within the Publication Draft of the Copeland Local Plan. The consultation documents can be viewed at:

<https://www.copeland.gov.uk/content/gypsy-and-traveller-site-allocation-consultation>. This consultation is a requirement under the Town and County Planning (Local Planning) Regulations 2012 Regulation 19. Please complete one form per representation/site.

The Publication Draft represents the Council's final draft of the Local Plan that we wish to submit to the Secretary of State for Public Examination by a Planning Inspector. Completed forms will be sent to the Planning Inspectorate for their consideration through the Examination in Public process.

Comments **not** submitted on the standard response form will only be considered at the Inspector's discretion.

It should be noted that representations will be made available to the Planning Inspectorate and to the Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State to conduct the Examination. Representations will be also be 'made available' in line with the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012 (Regulations 20, 22 and 35). This includes publication on the Council's website.

### Privacy Notice

A copy of the Council's privacy statement can be viewed at [https://www.copeland.gov.uk/sites/default/files/attachments/privacy\\_notice1.pdf](https://www.copeland.gov.uk/sites/default/files/attachments/privacy_notice1.pdf). Further information is also available by contacting the council's Data Protection Officer at [info@copland.gov.uk](mailto:info@copland.gov.uk) or by calling 01946 598300 and asking to speak to the Data Protection Officer.

Please complete a separate sheet for each representation you wish to make and return this form **no later than 4.30pm on Tuesday 3<sup>rd</sup> May 2022** to:

Strategic Planning  
Copeland Borough Council  
Market Hall  
Market Place  
Whitehaven  
CA28 7JG

Or email: [localplanconsultation@copeland.gov.uk](mailto:localplanconsultation@copeland.gov.uk)

## Part B: Your Representation

1. To which part of the Consultation Document does this representation relate?

Paragraph  Policy  Site Ref.   
H10PU?

2. Is the nature of your representation to provide support for or to object to the Proposal/Allocation?

Support  Object

3. Do you consider the Proposal/Allocation is legally compliant? (Please tick as appropriate)

Yes  No

4. Do you consider the Proposal/Allocation is sound? (Please tick as appropriate)

Yes  No

5. Do you consider the Proposal/Allocation complies with the Duty to Co-operate? (Please tick as appropriate)

Yes  No

6. Please give details of why you consider the Proposal/Allocation is not legally compliant, is unsound, fails to comply with the Duty to Co-operate, or if you wish to support it.

I do not believe the option ATWS for the settlement to be legally compliant or sound due to the risk posed by the current structure of the road. As residents travelling from The Cross towards the proposed entrance/exit of site and the industrial estate, we have already had a number of near misses with cars exiting the industrial estate or turning in or out of the hospital car park. This has been even more of an issue since the car park was built and cars started parking on the road around your proposed entrance/exit on Summeryeat Rd. Even with the sweeping junctions the cars struggle to see us and often don't even look, not considering cars will be coming from our direction. Additional traffic from our direction i.e. from the site would increase the problem. In reference to your local plan (pg 34) Methodology 5.4.13 it also does not include a safe walking route as there is no continuous pavement or adequate street lighting.

This is a busy area used by dog walkers. (Continue on a separate sheet / expand box if necessary)

6. This entrance/exit also leads on to a private road with public access on foot. The use this entrance/exit would inevitably lead to increased use of this road which is maintained at a cost to myself and other local residents.

7. Please set out the modification(s) you consider necessary to make the proposal/allocation legally compliant and sound, in respect of any legal compliance or soundness matters you have identified at 6 above.

The junction could not be a blind junction and would need to be sweeping like the others.  
A pavement would need to be built between your proposed entrance/exit and the industrial estate + better street lighting put in.  
Double yellow lines would need to be next to the pavement to prevent the current parking issue. (The yellow lines in this area are always parked on and never monitored).  
The double yellow lines in the area would actually have to be policed by the council.

- Homewood road entrance/exit (Continue on a separate sheet /expand box if necessary)  
would be better with the back area blocked off.

**Please note:** In your representation you should provide succinctly all the evidence and supporting information necessary to support your representation and your suggested modification(s). You should not assume that you will have a further opportunity to make submissions. **After this stage, further submissions may only be made if invited by the Inspector, based on the matters and issues he or she identifies for examination.**

8. If your representation is seeking a modification to the plan, do you consider it necessary to participate in the Examination hearing session(s)?

Yes, I wish to participate in the hearing session(s)

No, I do not wish to participate in the hearing session(s)

9. If you wish to participate in the hearing session(s), please outline why you consider this to be necessary:

I have already suffered many near misses with drivers from the car park and the industrial estate. I also refuse to allow my mother to walk my daughter in that direction because of how dangerous the parked cars/junctions are with a prism. This would directly impact me and my family and I could provide you with useful input for consideration.

Signature:



Date:

27/4/22

Please use a separate form for each site you wish to comment on and return this form no later than 4.30pm on Tuesday 3<sup>rd</sup> May 2022. We are unable to consider any responses received after this date.

*Thank you for completing this form*



*Proud of our past. Energised for our future.*

# Copeland Local Plan 2021- 2038

## Publication Draft: Gypsy and Traveller Site Consultation Response Form

### For internal use:

Resp. No. ....

Rep. No. ....

Date Rec. ....

This Representation Form provides the opportunity to comment on each potential, alternative Gypsy and Traveller site allocation currently being considered for inclusion within the Publication Draft of the Copeland Local Plan. The consultation documents can be viewed at:

<https://www.copeland.gov.uk/content/gypsy-and-traveller-site-allocation-consultation>. This consultation is a requirement under the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) Regulations 2012 Regulation 19. Please complete one form per representation/site.

The Publication Draft represents the Council's final draft of the Local Plan that we wish to submit to the Secretary of State for Public Examination by a Planning Inspector. Completed forms will be sent to the Planning Inspectorate for their consideration through the Examination in Public process.

Comments **not** submitted on the standard response form will only be considered at the Inspector's discretion.

It should be noted that representations will be made available to the Planning Inspectorate and to the Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State to conduct the Examination. Representations will be also be 'made available' in line with the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012 (Regulations 20, 22 and 35). This includes publication on the Council's website.

### Privacy Notice

A copy of the Council's privacy statement can be viewed at

[https://www.copeland.gov.uk/sites/default/files/attachments/privacy\\_notice1.pdf](https://www.copeland.gov.uk/sites/default/files/attachments/privacy_notice1.pdf). Further information is also available by contacting the council's Data Protection Officer at [info@copland.gov.uk](mailto:info@copland.gov.uk) or by calling 01946 598300 and asking to speak to the Data Protection Officer.

Please complete a separate sheet for each representation you wish to make and return this form **no later than 4.30pm on Tuesday 3<sup>rd</sup> May 2022** to:

Strategic Planning  
Copeland Borough Council  
Market Hall  
Market Place  
Whitehaven  
CA28 7JG

Or email: [localplanconsultation@copeland.gov.uk](mailto:localplanconsultation@copeland.gov.uk)

## Part B: Your Representation

1. To which part of the Consultation Document does this representation relate?

Paragraph  Policy  Site Ref.

2. Is the nature of your representation to provide support for or to object to the Proposal/Allocation?

Support  Object

3. Do you consider the Proposal/Allocation is legally compliant? (Please tick as appropriate)

Yes  No

4. Do you consider the Proposal/Allocation is sound? (Please tick as appropriate)

Yes  No

5. Do you consider the Proposal/Allocation complies with the Duty to Co-operate? (Please tick as appropriate)

Yes  No

6. Please give details of why you consider the Proposal/Allocation is not legally compliant, is unsound, fails to comply with the Duty to Co-operate, or if you wish to support it.

In the Planning Policy for Traveller Sites 2015 Section 7.a) pg2 states particular attention to early and effective communication with settled and traveller communities. There has been no early engagement with the settled community and no public consultation where questions could be asked. Both myself and my husband have requested this via [redacted] as has Councillor [redacted] on our behalf and the behalf of residents who attended Weddicar Parish council meeting.

In the Planning Policy for Traveller Sites 2015, Section 9 pg3 it says local planning authorities should be 'working collaboratively with neighbouring local planning authorities.

Section 10.c) states LPA should 'consider production or joint development plans that set targets on a cross-authority basis, to provide more flexibility in identifying sites'. I do not believe this has been done and it therefore doesn't meet the duty to co-operate.

(Continue on a separate sheet /expand box if necessary)

7. Please set out the modification(s) you consider necessary to make the proposal/allocation legally compliant and sound, in respect of any legal compliance or soundness matters you have identified at 6 above.

The guidance states that no modifications can be suggested for a failure to comply with the duty to co-operate.  
A public consultation should have been held.  
Joint development should have been considered.

(Continue on a separate sheet /expand box if necessary)

**Please note:** In your representation you should provide succinctly all the evidence and supporting information necessary to support your representation and your suggested modification(s). You should not assume that you will have a further opportunity to make submissions. **After this stage, further submissions may only be made if invited by the Inspector, based on the matters and issues he or she identifies for examination.**

8. If your representation is seeking a modification to the plan, do you consider it necessary to participate in the Examination hearing session(s)?

Yes, I wish to participate in the hearing session(s)

No, I do not wish to participate in the hearing session(s)

9. If you wish to participate in the hearing session(s), please outline why you consider this to be necessary:

Signature:

Date:

27/4/22

Please use a separate form for each site you wish to comment on and return this form **no later than 4.30pm on Tuesday 3<sup>rd</sup> May 2022**. We are unable to consider any responses received after this date.

*Thank you for completing this form*





*Proud of our past. Energised for our future.*

# Copeland Local Plan 2021- 2038

## Publication Draft: Gypsy and Traveller Site Consultation Response Form

### For internal use:

Resp. No. ....

Rep. No. ....

Date Rec. ....

This Representation Form provides the opportunity to comment on each potential, alternative Gypsy and Traveller site allocation currently being considered for inclusion within the Publication Draft of the Copeland Local Plan. The consultation documents can be viewed at:

<https://www.copeland.gov.uk/content/gypsy-and-traveller-site-allocation-consultation>. This consultation is a requirement under the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) Regulations 2012 Regulation 19. Please complete one form per representation/site.

The Publication Draft represents the Council's final draft of the Local Plan that we wish to submit to the Secretary of State for Public Examination by a Planning Inspector. Completed forms will be sent to the Planning Inspectorate for their consideration through the Examination in Public process.

Comments **not** submitted on the standard response form will only be considered at the Inspector's discretion.

It should be noted that representations will be made available to the Planning Inspectorate and to the Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State to conduct the Examination. Representations will also be 'made available' in line with the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012 (Regulations 20, 22 and 35). This includes publication on the Council's website.

### Privacy Notice

A copy of the Council's privacy statement can be viewed at [https://www.copeland.gov.uk/sites/default/files/attachments/privacy\\_notice1.pdf](https://www.copeland.gov.uk/sites/default/files/attachments/privacy_notice1.pdf). Further information is also available by contacting the council's Data Protection Officer at [info@copland.gov.uk](mailto:info@copland.gov.uk) or by calling 01946 598300 and asking to speak to the Data Protection Officer.

Please complete a separate sheet for each representation you wish to make and return this form **no later than 4.30pm on Tuesday 3<sup>rd</sup> May 2022** to:

Strategic Planning  
Copeland Borough Council  
Market Hall  
Market Place  
Whitehaven  
CA28 7JG

Or email: [localplanconsultation@copeland.gov.uk](mailto:localplanconsultation@copeland.gov.uk)

**Part B: Your Representation**

1. To which part of the Consultation Document does this representation relate?

Paragraph  Policy  Site Ref.

2. Is the nature of your representation to provide support for or to object to the Proposal/Allocation?

Support  Object

3. Do you consider the Proposal/Allocation is legally compliant? (Please tick as appropriate)

Yes  No

4. Do you consider the Proposal/Allocation is sound? (Please tick as appropriate)

Yes  No

5. Do you consider the Proposal/Allocation complies with the Duty to Co-operate? (Please tick as appropriate)

Yes  No

6. Please give details of why you consider the Proposal/Allocation is not legally compliant, is unsound, fails to comply with the Duty to Co-operate, or if you wish to support it.

*Please see attached typed document.*

(Continue on a separate sheet /expand box if necessary)

- 6. I do not believe the proposal for GTW5 is legally compliant or sound or meets the duty to co-operate because I believe the process in which the sites have been selected and deemed as potential opportunities for the settlement is both biased and corrupt. I do not believe that all of the land available to be used in Copeland has been considered and instead [REDACTED] whose family require the settlement has had to source different pieces of land himself to suggest to Copeland Borough Council, (this information was obtained from [REDACTED] directly). The result of which has been that he has proposed GTW5 and in response, Copeland Borough Council have found some areas of land to put forward as proposals, most if not all of which do not meet the requirements of the settlement site, in order that the site which would indisputably be approved would be GTW5. There were 11 proposed sites, 4 were immediately discounted as too small for the required pitches and 5 due to landscape/character and bio-diversity reasons. I believe the inadequate site suggestions were put forward to ensure the selection of GTW5 as the preferred site.

GTW5 is included on the Open Space Assessment as protected open space (semi/natural green space), surely this means there is a more suitable alternative in order to protect this space. In the local plan it is evident there is a substantial amount of land allocated for housing, opportunity sites and employment sites, as well as other larger areas of green space including 299 pieces mentioned in the Open Space Assessment 2020. I would argue that these may form more adequate settings for the settlement, based on financial, implications, highways concerns (raised in another objection), drainage concerns (raised in another objection) and a query over the land being contaminated, not to mention the fact the land is supposed to be a protected green space.

I have spoken with [REDACTED] and will be requesting specifically which areas of land listed in the Local Plan appendices are owned by Copeland Borough council, as this is not defined as part of the plan. I understand that all land owned by CBC has been considered however, i find it hard to believe that there was no land any further south than Egremont which could have been suitable. In obtaining the information of the land owned by CBC I hope to see if this is true. Having spoken with [REDACTED] he has said that they would most definitely consider land South of Egremont if it would provide a suitable settlement site.

I understand that Highways and the Lead Flood Authority have been consulted in relation to GTW5 but I query if united utilities have been consulted, this is especially important given the concern over poor drainage in the area. If this has not been done then I believe this would not meet the standards for duty to co-operate. I would also note that is is mentioned in the Local plan 13.7.5 pg 143 that united utilities has been consulted in relation to the housing allocations, I would expect the same to be done for this site or it would also not be defined as deliverable.

I mention that I believe the site selection to be biased and corrupt from the offset, as well as the site having been selected by the family themselves as they stated at Weddicar Parish council meeting, the way in which the sites are written up in the site assessment also lead me to believe this. Here are some things which I believe to be discrepancies;

- Impact on heritage assets. GW4 mentions that development in the area may impact the Greenbank Guesthouse to the West which is a Grade II listed building. GW3 is in closer proximity to this guesthouse and yet it has no mention on that site assessment. For GTW5 in the same section it states that there are no heritage assets in the close proximity. This is incorrect, The Cross Guesthouse which is also a Grade II listed building is extremely close to the site and can be seen when standing in the preferred eastern section. The problems mentioned previously in relation to highways and drainage suggest that development on this site is likely to impact the guesthouse.
- GTW4 - This is the largest area suggested for the settlement site, whilst most of it is densely wooded and this is the main reason given for its' none suitability due to the impact on biodiversity and landscape/character. It does have sections of land which I believe would be big enough to house the 12 pitches, yet these areas are not mentioned. These areas are behind Derwentwater Road and Borrowdale Road. Another issue arising from this site is the fact that on the Local Plan, this area of Greenspace includes some green space in between the cemetery and businesses on Meadow Road and also a very sparsely wooded area at the junction for Meadow Road and Low Road. The impact on these areas are not likely to be the same as the densely wooded areas referred to on the site assessment. I would query why these potentially suitable areas have been let off the site assessment but included on the Local Plan, if not deliberately to make the site seem less suitable.
- GTW3 is also a wooded area as is GTW4 yet this does not seem to pose concern and has not been a reason to discount the site as it was for GTW4.
- GTE1 is a site at Egremont which has been partly discounted due to being a flood risk. [REDACTED] has posted on Facebook to say that Egremont has received 12million pounds to build flood defences in Egremont and the work is due to finish imminently. Have these not work and the area should still be classed as a flood risk or have they not be taken in to consideration for some reason?

In the assessment of site GTW5, it mentions the impact on biodiversity to be 'some individual trees and scrub', it also mentions the most eastern part of the site to be the preferred area for the settlement. This is actually the most likely place on the site to have an impact on biodiversity, as well as the area which would form an entrance/exit from Homewood Road. If we are trying to avoid the impact to biodiversity why would this particular area of the site be favoured?

The PPTS 2015

(4b) to ensure that local planning authorities, working collaboratively, develop fair and effective strategies to meet need through the identification of land for sites.

I will be submitting a freedom of information to find out the exact process that was adopted in order to identify the suggested 11 sites to ensure the above has been adhered to this in keeping

with the Duty to co-operate. The quality of the suggested sites leads me to believe this might not be the case.

PPTS 2015

Plan Making

11. Local Planning authorities should in producing their local plan;
12. a) identify and update annually a supply of specific deliverable sites sufficient to provide 5 years' worth of sites against their locally set targets.

They define that; to be considered deliverable, sites should be available now, offer a suitable location for development and be achievable with a realistic prospect that development will be delivered on the site within 5 years. Sites with planning permission should be considered deliverable until planning permission expires, unless there is clear evidence that schemes will not be implemented within 5 years, for example they will not be viable, there is no longer a demand for the type of units or sites.

- I have mentioned in other objections and also above that the land on GTW5 is locally known to be a contaminated site for which permission for allotment/s has previously been refused. For this reason I feel doubtful there is any current planning permission on the site or that any future permission should be granted. (I will check this by submitting a freedom of information to acquire information on previous planning proposals and responses on this site). I have also submitted objections based not the drainage and likely flooding that would be caused by development on this site and questioned if United utilities have been consulted. As well as the inadequate and unsafe road structure on the Sneckyeat Road access. For these reasons I don't believe the duty to co-operate has been met. I do not believe GTW5 to be a sound suggestion for the site under the points of it being justified or effective. I don't believe other reasonable alternatives have been considered. I also don't believe it to be a deliverable site over the suggested 5 year period.

I also believe the Rural Exceptions Policy H15PU Local Plan pg 167 should be considered if it has not been and it is reasonable in these circumstances due to the considered cost of the development of GTW5 considering the potential drainage/highways issues and the likely cost to fix such problems.

7. Please set out the modification(s) you consider necessary to make the proposal/allocation legally compliant and sound, in respect of any legal compliance or soundness matters you have identified at 6 above.

Please see attached typed document.

(Continue on a separate sheet /expand box if necessary)

**Please note:** In your representation you should provide succinctly all the evidence and supporting information necessary to support your representation and your suggested modification(s). You should not assume that you will have a further opportunity to make submissions. **After this stage, further submissions may only be made if invited by the Inspector, based on the matters and issues he or she identifies for examination.**

8. If your representation is seeking a modification to the plan, do you consider it necessary to participate in the Examination hearing session(s)?

Yes, I wish to participate in the hearing session(s)

No, I do not wish to participate in the hearing session(s)

9. If you wish to participate in the hearing session(s), please outline why you consider this to be necessary:

Signature:

Date:

Please use a separate form for each site you wish to comment on and return this form **no later than 4.30pm on Tuesday 3<sup>rd</sup> May 2022**. We are unable to consider any responses received after this date.

*Thank you for completing this form*

7. Could you put more emphasis on your Empty Homes Policy and allow some of your housing allocation to be used as potential sites for the settlement? This would still assist in achieving your housing objectives but would mean there are more adequate options for the settlement site put forward.

I would like to note that the 2014 based household projections for England suggest CBC need to be building an average of 8.4 houses per annum. In the last decade the lowest number of houses built was 98 between 2020/202, this is at least 10% more than required. Whilst I appreciate it is part of the plan to prevent further population loss in the area to increase the housing, I would suggest that equal if not more importance should be placed upon the need to provide a site for the gypsy/traveller settlement site and as such we should be satisfied that that we are far exceeding the minimum required house builds and consider some of the land from housing allocation to be used. Alternatively, land from opportunity sites or employment sites could also be used where appropriate.

As an example (without the requested relevant documents showing if these are all council owned) some suggestions from the Local Plan would be;  
Employment sites - ES7, ES8, ES14, Opportunity sites OWH05, OWH08, OM10, OCL01 and housing allocations HM11, HM12, HAR, HD1, HSE2 and HSE3 to name a few. (Taken from the Local plan Appendices)

Give consideration to the use of the Rural exception policy due to the potential costs of the development of GTW5 and the lack of affordable land which meets the gypsy/traveller needs for a settlement site. This could potentially identify more suitable options for the settlement.

Sent: 22 August 2022 17:43

To: Local Plan Consultation

Subject: Objection against Sneckyeat Gypsy & Traveller Site

Grounds for objection against Sneckyeat Gypsy and Traveller site.

On any project Safety must be paramount! The hazards that have been identified on the proposed Sneckyeat Gypsy & Traveller site demonstrate that the site is unsafe and should not be developed these include...

#### Methane Gas

One disregarded cigarette could result in disaster for a traveller family. Copeland Borough Council openly admitted that previous tests on the old land fill site had discovered methane gas. This hazard cannot be ignored and the impact to human life could be devastating!

#### Subsidence

To go ahead with a development that could subside could cost life's! Land fill sites are prone to land slips and subsidence. Assessments must be done to ensure the land is safe. Without these assessments how can any project be given permission!

#### Contaminated Soil

Heavy metal content within soil can be extremely dangerous to human beings and in particular babies and young children. A member of the allotment community confirmed at a public meeting dated 18th August 2022 at Cumbria Sports Academy that samples of the soil was taken over 10 years ago and the results determined that the soil was contaminated with heavy metals.

#### Asbestos

At the time the land fill site was receiving waste no provisions were but in place about specialist waste streams.



How can anybody say for definite that asbestos doesn't exist within the proposed gypsy traveller site?

any excavation work could result in asbestos particles being blown around built up areas like Sneckyeat, Rutland, Richmond and Summer Grove.

A great number of schools are located within a short distance of the proposed gypsy traveller site and this could result in young people and residents of all ages being contaminated with asbestos. A resident at a public meeting dated 18th August 2022 confirmed that the old pre-fab houses at Sneckyeat had been dumped at the land fill site that is proposed to house the Gypsy & Traveller site. The pre-fab houses were full of asbestos, this could mean tons of unregistered asbestos present at the proposed Gypsy & Traveller site.

#### Chemical Waste

Residents at the public meeting dated 18th August 2022 reported to the meeting that the old chemical works at Marchon would dump chemical waste at the proposed Gypsy & Traveller site. This was an eye witness report of chemical waste from Marchon being dumped on the site in metal barrels and metal containers. How can a site that contains chemical waste be used for a Gypsy & Traveller site?

All the hazards mentioned are strongly linked to land fill site developments.

For a local authority To allow people to live in these types of conditions is barbaric!

For the reasons given I believe the proposed Sneckyeat Gypsy & Traveller site is not safe! And I am formally objecting against the project going ahead.

Yours Sincerely

Sent: 22 August 2022 15:55  
To: Elected Mayor; Local Plan Consultation  
Cc:  
Subject: Consultation Extension

Dear Mike

The campaign group against the proposed Gypsy & Traveller site for Sneckyeat held a meeting dated Thursday 18th August with the business community of Sneckyeat and community groups to discuss concerns relating to the Gypsy & Traveller site and Copeland Borough Council's ongoing consultation.

Within a discussion, a proposal came from the floor for the current Copeland Borough Council consultation to be extended.

This proposal was seconded and a vote was taken which fully supported the proposal that had been submitted.

The Grounds for the Request for the Gypsy & Traveller site Consultation to be extended are...

- \* A great number of residents and businesses did not know that a consultation was currently taking place.
- \* A great number of residents and businesses were of the opinion, that they had played a part in the first consultation, which involved the proposed Greenbank & Sneckyeat sites and that was the end of the process. The fact that the two consultations were so close together created confusion among the stakeholders.
- \* Residents & Businesses along with community groups would like direct meeting's with Mike Starkie the Elected Mayor of Copeland, Copeland Borough Council officers and the Copeland Borough Council executive committee.
- \* Residents & Businesses along with community groups would like to hold meetings with their Copeland Borough Councillors to directly discuss concerns they have about the Gypsy & Traveller site planned for Sneckyeat.
- \* Stakeholders did feel intimidated by the Gypsy & Traveller community and feared retribution if

they publicly objected to the Gypsy & Traveller site. The campaign group believe the process should include a more face to face approach with residents and businesses which would allow their concerns to be submitted anonymously.

\* The campaign group also believe Copeland Borough Council as the Gypsy & Traveller site consultation owner should do more for the local community groups which include the allotment groups, Cumbria Sports Academy, Sneckyeat Pigeon followers and the Richmond pensioner group. Members of these groups are elderly and are very limited when it comes to online engagement. Copeland Borough Council as the consultation holder needs to do more around engagement with these key community stakeholders.

For Copeland Borough to push out a post on the Copeland Borough Council website about the ongoing Gypsy & Traveller site consultation is quite simple just not good enough!

The only public meetings that have taken place about this consultation are in-house Copeland Borough Council meetings.

Despite being given up to ten days' notice, Copeland Borough Council did not send any representatives to the public meeting that was organised for 18th August. THIS IS TOTALLY UNACCEPTABLE!

Copeland Borough Council are the consultation owners and as such they should be bending over backwards to get the views of the general public.

For the reasons given and on behalf of the campaign against the Gypsy & Traveller site, I am formally requesting for the current Gypsy & Traveller site Sneckyeat consultation to be extended. I am also requesting for the Copeland executive to meet up with members of the campaign group to discuss terms of reference for the proposed time extension.

Yours Sincerely

From:

Sent: 17 August 2022 14:37

To: Local Plan Consultation

Subject:Gypsy Traveller site Sneakeyat.

I am writing to object to the current proposal of building a gypsy traveller site at Sneakeyat. This is due to the close proximity to the residential area, everywhere I have seen travellers leave a site.

[REDACTED]

Kind regards,

Sent from my iPhone