



**COPELAND BOROUGH COUNCIL  
DELEGATED PLANNING DECISION**

1.	<b>Reference No:</b>	4/21/2163/0B1
2.	<b>Proposed Development:</b>	VARIATION IN DESIGN - VARIATION OF CONDITION 2 OF PLANNING APPROVAL 4/20/2180/0B1 - ERECTION OF A THREE STOREY BUILDING FOR USE AS A COASTAL ACTIVITY CENTRE COMPRISING CHANGING AND SHOWER FACILITIES, CLASS ROOM, A FLEXIBLE MULTI USE SPACE FOR HIRE, OFFICE SPACE AND HOSTEL ACCOMMODATION; THE ERECTION OF A DETACHED BUILDING FOR USE AS STORAGE; THE ERECTION OF A DETACHED BUILDING FOR USE AS A WORKSHOP/RETAIL UNIT; THE CONSTRUCTION OF A NEW SLIPWAY
3.	<b>Location:</b>	WELLINGTON CAR PARK, WEST STRAND, WHITEHAVEN
4.	<b>Parish:</b>	Whitehaven
5.	<b>Constraints:</b>	Ancient Monument - Ancient Monument, ASC;Adverts - ASC;Adverts, Conservation Area - Conservation Area, Flood Area - Flood Zone 2, Flood Area - Flood Zone 3, Listed Building - Listed Building, Coal - Standing Advice - Data Subject To Change
6.	<b>Publicity Representations &amp;Policy</b>	See Report.
7.	<b>Report:</b>  <b>Site and Location:</b>  <p>The Application Site comprises the property known as Wellington Car Park, West Strand, Whitehaven.</p> <p>The Site extends to 0.33 hectares of land that currently comprises a vehicle parking area; access road; landscaped area; part of a pedestrian footway connecting West Strand to the West Pier; and, part of the Whitehaven Outer Harbour.</p> <p>The Site occupies a prominent location within the Whitehaven Harbour with views of the Site experienced from a number of the key historic viewpoints within the harbour area itself, which is an important public open space and major tourist attraction and beyond.</p>	

The Site is located within the defined Whitehaven Town Centre.

The Site is located in the Whitehaven Town Centre Conservation Area, comprises part of the setting of a number of listed buildings/structures and non-designated heritage assets and includes part of the Whitehaven Old Fort scheduled monument. The Old Quay and Old Quay Lighthouse scheduled monument is located to the north of the Site.

The Site is primarily located within Flood Zone 1; however, elements of the northern portion of the Site are located in Flood Zone 2 and Flood Zone 3.

**Recent Planning Application History:**

4/19/2016/0F1 – Erection of a three storey building for use as a coastal activity centre comprising toilet, changing and shower facilities, class room, a flexible multi use space for hire, office space and hostel accommodation; the erection of a detached building for use as storage; the erection of a detached building for use as a workshop/retail unit; the construction of a new slipway – Approved.

4/20/2149/DOC – Approval of details reserved by Planning Condition 5 – Slipway. Approved.

4/20/2180/0B1 - Variation of conditions 3, 4, 6, 7, 9 (change of wording) of approved planning permission 4/19/2016/0F1 – Approved.

**Proposal:**

This application seeks the following:

- Minor material amendment application to vary Condition 2 (compliance with approved drawings and documents) of planning permission 4/20/2180/0B1; and,
- The effective approval of the requirements of Condition 4, Condition 6 and Condition 9 imposed on Application Ref: 4/20/2180/0B1.

It is proposed to increase the overall size of the building footprint and floor area.

*Ground Floor*

Revisions are proposed to the changing rooms and drying room; a commercial kitchen has been incorporated; and, an external terrace is proposed.

*First Floor*

6no. additional hostel accommodation rooms are proposed in place of the classrooms previously approved. The classroom spaces are now to be operated from the flexible spaces within the building

to provide operational efficiencies and maximise the useable space. A kitchenette is proposed to the Mezzanine Gallery in place of the kitchen. The semi-external corridor has been removed to create enlarged facilities and direct, unobstructed views across the harbour.

#### *Second Floor*

The external terraces fronting each accommodation room have been removed to provide enlarged facilities and direct, unobstructed views over the harbour. 11no. hostel accommodation rooms are now proposed.

#### *Exterior*

The exterior has been adapted to provide a weather tight skin.

This window layout has been adapted to ensure all accommodation has a suitable view with adequate levels of daylighting and to response to the changes to the layout.

The previously proposed mesh has been replaced by bronze tinted glazing, clear glazing and opaque spandrel panels to match the tone and finish of the cladding system.

Details of the external finishes including the proposed doors have been provided.

A detailed scheme of illumination has been submitted.

A detailed scheme of drainage was initially submitted and subsequently withdrawn.

Revisions were initially proposed to the approved retail unit and equipment storage compound; however, these were subsequently withdrawn.

<b>Consultee:</b>	<b>Nature of Response:</b>
Town Council	No objections
Cumbria County Council – Highways and LLFA	14 <sup>th</sup> May 2021 <b>Highways</b> As your authority is aware the carriageways and footways within this location are private, they do not form part of the public highway. The Highway Authority has no objection to the proposed development subject to previous conditions being included in any notice of consent you may grant. Your authority should consider the below points when considering approval of the application: <i>Carriageways</i>

		<p>The carriageway width has been reduced from circa 5m to 4m in the area of the development to introduce increased footway space, while it is understood the aim is to reduce speeds and accommodate pedestrians this reduction may lead to vehicle conflict when entering and leaving the car park area during peak times and also for large service vehicles when maneuvering in and around the car park entrance.</p> <p>Has the applicant considered creating a shared surface in this area? This would serve to reduce speeds but still allow sufficient space for vehicles to access and egress the parking area without the need for a carriageway reduction down to 4m.</p> <p>West Strand is the only access route West Pier, New Old Quay and Wellington South Beach, has access to these areas been considered? If there is a need for future maintenance in the above areas can larger vehicles be managed during these works?</p> <p>Pedestrian crossing points have not been detailed within the proposed site plan, your authority should seek to ensure these are included as part of the proposed design.</p> <p><i>Refuse Collection</i></p> <p>In regard to refuse collection, the applicant needs to demonstrate how a refuse vehicle will manoeuvre and turn within the development, it is likely that refuse bins will be the large 4 wheeled industrial types, these generally have a maximum distance of 10m over which they can be moved by refuse operatives, also given the close proximity of parking bay 10 where will refuse be collected from?</p> <p>I would advise your authority seeks clarification on the above and request a tracking diagram for a 6 wheeled HGV refuse wagon which is commonly used in this district, should it be required to reverse and manoeuvre within the car parking area.</p> <p><i>Parking Provision</i></p> <p>Concerns have been raised in regard to parking spaces provided as part of the development, however considering the close location to the town centre, good transport links and various local parking facilities there is no concern from the Highway Authority.</p> <p>Also as the area is private it is within the right of the applicant to designate nearby parking to be used by the new development should they wish, a point your authority may wish to consider when approving the application.</p> <p>Parking provision for cycles is well accommodated for, again given the nature of the development and its location within short distance of designated cycle routes it raises no concerns for the highway authority.</p>	
--	--	--	--

		<p><b>LLFA</b></p> <p>In relation to the submitted documents for planning condition 9, further information is required before this condition can be discharged:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li><input type="checkbox"/> Micro drainage calculations need to be provided demonstrating the system does not flood during a 1 in 30yr +40% Climate change event, if the system floods during a 1 in 100yr +40%</li></ul> <p>CC event this exceedance should be held within the site or channelled along a route that will not cause flooding to the development, exceedance routes should be detailed on a plan, as above Climate change is to be set at 40% CV levels to 1.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li><input type="checkbox"/> Treatment of the surface water before discharge needs to be considered in line with NPPF, further details of this are required.</li></ul> <p>The above condition requires to remain in place until the above information has been submitted for review.</p> <p>The LLFA has no objections to the proposed amendments subject to previous conditions being included in notice of consent you may grant.</p> <p>13<sup>th</sup> July 2021</p> <p><b>Highways</b></p> <p>The proposed site plan details parking and layout changes and includes a tracking diagram for a refuse wagon.</p> <p>I would note that in laying out the tracking diagram the refuse wagon is demonstrated to drive up to the bin store, which is unlikely to occur as it will hinder the loading of bins and require the driver to reverse back out and onto the highway, it is likely the driver would look to reverse into place.</p> <p>The wagon is demonstrated to enter and leave without issue but it is a minor point worth noting.</p> <p>The highway authority has no objections to proposed development subject to previous conditions being included in any notice of consent you may grant.</p> <p><b>LLFA</b></p> <p>Noted in the covering letter, details requested by the LLFA in regard to surface water discharge are requested to be reserved by condition, the LLFA has no objection to this request and a suitable condition has been detailed below.</p> <p>The LLFA has no objections to the proposed development subject to the following condition being included in any notice of consent you</p>	
--	--	--	--

		<p>may grant:</p> <p><b>1. Condition</b> - Full details of the surface water drainage system (incorporating SUDs features as far as practicable) and a maintenance schedule (identifying the responsible parties) shall be submitted to the Local Planning Authority for approval prior to development being commenced.</p> <p>Any approved works shall be implemented prior to the development being completed and shall be maintained thereafter in accordance with the schedule.</p> <p><b>Reason:</b> To promote sustainable development, secure proper drainage and to manage the risk of flooding and pollution. To ensure the surface water system continues to function as designed and that flood risk is not increased within the site or elsewhere.</p>	
	<p>Cumbria County Council – Historic Environment Officer</p>	<p>27<sup>th</sup> April 2021</p> <p><i>I confirm that I have no objection to the proposed variation. The construction of the proposed development however, has the potential to disturb buried archaeological assets related to 18<sup>th</sup> and early 19<sup>th</sup> century buildings that once stood on the quay and the proposed landscaping within the scheduled monument of Whitehaven Old Fort may reveal the buried remains of the fort.</i></p> <p>I therefore recommend that, in the event planning consent is granted, the construction ground works should be subject to a programme of archaeological recording. This recording should be carried out during the development (a watching brief) and should be commissioned and undertaken at the expense of the developer. This work can be secured through the inclusion of a condition in any planning consent and I suggest the following form of words:</p> <p><i>Prior to the commencement of development, a written scheme of archaeological investigation must be submitted by the applicant and approved by the Local Planning Authority. Once approved, the scheme shall be implemented in full with an archaeological watching brief being undertaken by a qualified archaeologist. Within two months of the completion of the development, a digital copy of the archaeological report shall be furnished to the Local Planning Authority.</i></p> <p><i>Reasons: To afford reasonable opportunity for an examination to be made to determine the existence of any remains of archaeological</i></p>	

		<p><i>interest within the site and for the investigation and recording of such remains.</i></p> <p>2<sup>nd</sup> July 2021</p> <p>Thank you for consulting me on additional information submitted for the above application.</p> <p>Comments I made in a letter to you dated 27 April 2021 are still considered appropriate.</p> <p>I recommend that, in the event planning consent is granted, the construction ground works should be subject to a programme of archaeological recording. This recording should be carried out during the development (a watching brief) and should be commissioned and undertaken at the expense of the developer. This work can be secured through the inclusion of a condition in any planning consent and I suggest the following form of words:</p> <p><i>Prior to the commencement of development, a written scheme of archaeological investigation must be submitted by the applicant and approved by the Local Planning Authority. Once approved, the scheme shall be implemented in full with an archaeological watching brief being undertaken by a qualified archaeologist. Within two months of the completion of the development, a digital copy of the archaeological report shall be furnished to the Local Planning Authority.</i></p> <p><i>Reasons: To afford reasonable opportunity for an examination to be made to determine the existence of any remains of archaeological interest within the site and for the investigation and recording of such remains.</i></p> <p>17<sup>th</sup> August 2021</p> <p>The submitted WSI for an archaeological watching brief is adequate. So, the wording of the archaeological condition that I previously recommended can be altered in light of this. I suggest:</p> <p><i>An archaeological watching brief should be undertaken during the construction of the permitted development, by a qualified archaeologist and in accordance with the submitted written scheme of archaeological investigation entitled 'Specifications for a Programme of Watching Brief Investigation, The Edge, Whitehaven', dated 8<sup>th</sup> June</i></p>	
--	--	---	--

		<p><i>2021. Within two months of the completion of the development, a digital copy of the archaeological report shall be furnished to the Local Planning Authority.</i></p> <p><i>Reasons: To afford reasonable opportunity for an examination to be made to determine the existence of any remains of archaeological interest within the site and for the investigation and recording of such remains.</i></p>	
	Natural England	<p>4<sup>th</sup> May 2021</p> <p>Natural England currently has no comment to make on the variation of condition 2.</p> <p>Should the proposal be amended in a way which significantly affects its impact on the natural environment then, in accordance with Section 4 of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006, Natural England should be consulted again. Before sending us any further consultations regarding this development, please assess whether the changes proposed will materially affect any of the advice we have previously offered. If they are unlikely to do so, please do not re-consult us.</p> <p>7<sup>th</sup> July 2021</p> <p>Natural England currently has no comment to make on the additional information for this variation of condition 2.</p> <p>Should the proposal be amended in a way which significantly affects its impact on the natural environment then, in accordance with Section 4 of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006, Natural England should be consulted again. Before sending us any further consultations regarding this development, please assess whether the changes proposed will materially affect any of the advice we have previously offered. If they are unlikely to do so, please do not re-consult us.</p>	
	Copeland Borough Council – Conservation Officer	<p>19<sup>th</sup> May 2021</p> <p>Request to vary Condition 2:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>I am surprised by the extent of the proposed changes here. One might expect small changes to several parts of the scheme or</li> </ul>	



		<p>large changes in one particular area, but the scheme appears extensively revised from when it was approved.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The internal layout changes to the main building have justification, and the removal of the semi-external corridor is understandable in practical terms. This necessarily entails the removal of the mesh façade elements, which contributed to the appearance of a single, monolithic exterior (when closed). This job has now been taken on by a bronze tinted glazing, the aim of which is to visually blend the windows with the façade, preserving the appearance of a monolithic envelope.</li> <li>• The external detailing of the window reveals has been quite substantially altered, and now conveys a flatter appearance.</li> <li>• The landward long elevation (SW) has been notably revised downward in aspiration. From featuring a stone finish that reinforced the design concept and vision, and attractive recessed windows with chamfered reveals to add some highlight and dynamism, it's now texturally flat, metal and largely windowless. The number of openings has been reduced from approximately 40 to approximately 15, leaving this more vertical elevation less welcoming.</li> <li>• The façade materiality has been rationalised and now appears to be entirely seamed zinc wherever it's not openings, apart from a small square of sandstone. This undermines the concept work outlined in the 2019 design and access statement, whereby the artistic vision for the building was a lump of hewn red sandstone. The building now appears only rather loosely connected to this vision and is likely to read less as a lump of stone punctured by well-detailed openings as a metal shell with flush glazing. How successful this will be is not completely clear just from elevation drawings.</li> <li>• The compound to the rear has been reordered and now no longer appears to retain any dedicated canoe and kayak storage, which is a shame. This also leaves the arches unused. I was under the impression that part of this building's purpose was to provide a base for small vessels, so this is unexpected.</li> <li>• The shop unit, which was shaped and specified to be a small complementary structure to the main building, has received a total redesign, now being a shed. While there is clearly some justification to this, they no longer relate to one another or read as a co-designed pair. It is likely that understanding how these structures will fit together and be viewed in context will enable any advice to address the present uncertainty. This</li> </ul>	
--	--	---	--

		<p>similarly applies to the proposed cycle/refuse store.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• In the compound itself, previously, the use of the arches, the design of the retail unit, and the presence of the boat store structure combined to convey a fully-realised scheme of interlocking parts. There seems a risk now of the compound appearing more like a car park with some shipping containers in it. The presence of the two structures (retail unit and cycle/refuse store) are of assistance as they provide some form to work with, but the remainder of the space seems a touch unresolved from the site plan.</li></ul> <p>Summary:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• As there are wide-ranging changes proposed to the design, it is important that we fully understand the impact. I do not at this stage have complete confidence that I understand how the revised scheme will look compared with the approved version. A series of eye-level visualisations comparing both the approved and the revised schemes from various points around the harbour will be of great (and necessary) assistance.</li><li>• Regarding the request to remove the requirement to re-impose several conditions, I think it would be best to understand the proposed design changes fully first before I could form an opinion on the external windows/doors, lighting and surface water details (as relevant).</li></ul> <p>13<sup>th</sup> July 2021</p> <p>Request to vary Condition 2: Following an earlier consultation response, dated 19/05/21, in which I requested a series of eye-level visualisations, updated information has been received and provides clarification. The scope of the VoC now relates to the detail revisions to the main building itself. Although somewhat simplified, the visualisations are helpful in demonstrating the expected impact.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The seaward long elevation is clearly different from the approved design of 2019 in the sense that the glazing is now integrated into its appearance rather than concealed through either tinted coatings or a hinged mesh system.</li><li>• The key question here is whether this departs too far from the “hewn stone” concept that initially inspired the highly sculptural form, resulting in a scheme that is unacceptably watered-down.</li></ul>	
--	--	--	--

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Given the identified difficulties introduced by the mesh screen system, it appears there is reasonable justification for altering the approach.</li> <li>In sculptural terms, I find the revised proposal is still successful at both articulating the concept and existing as an object within its surroundings. The justification of being able to take better advantage of views from inside is an added benefit.</li> <li>On the landward long elevation, the change from sandstone with chamfered window reveals is in some senses a pity, however the slight articulation of the façade and its unification materially with the rest reinforces the sculptural concept.</li> </ul> <p>In summary:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The design has lost character in some areas but gained it in others. I view the revised proposal as cohesive and of a good architectural quality. I would view the impact on the surrounding heritage assets as neutral, in comparison with the previous scheme.</li> <li>I would request clarification on the railings to be installed in the immediate vicinity of the doors to the building on the seaward side. The glass and stainless steel design doesn't perhaps compliment the building as well as it might. Is it proposed that this design is the final one?</li> </ul> <p>6<sup>th</sup> August 2021</p> <p>Request to vary Condition 2:</p> <p>Following earlier consultations, I requested clarification on the railings to be installed in the immediate vicinity of the doors to the building on the seaward side. The glass and stainless steel design doesn't perhaps compliment the building as well as it might. Is it proposed that this design is the final one?</p> <p>Additional justification has been provided for the use of the specified glass balustrade, and I find this convincing.</p>	
	Copeland Borough Council – Flood and Coastal Defence Engineer	<p>11<sup>th</sup> May 2021</p> <p>No comments to make on this application.</p> <p>5<sup>th</sup> July 2021</p>	

		No comments on the amended plans for this development.	
	Environment Agency	<p>29<sup>th</sup> April 2021</p> <p>No objection to the proposed amendments as submitted.</p> <p>5<sup>th</sup> July 2021</p> <p>No objection to the proposed amendments as submitted.</p>	
	Whitehaven Heritage Action Group	No comments received.	
	Cumbria Police	No comments received.	
	United Utilities	No comments received.	
	Historic England	<p>20<sup>th</sup> May 2021</p> <p>The application is for the variation of Condition 2 of planning approval 4/20/2180/0B1, in order to permit changes to the approved design of the proposed development. The majority of the changes relate to the interior and exterior design of the proposed coastal activity centre itself, although there are also changes proposed to the layout of the remainder of the development site. Study of of the revised Proposed Site Plan 2452 (00)102 submitted with the application suggests that only one of the proposed changes has the potential to impact upon the Whitehaven Old Fort scheduled monument or its setting. This is the proposed erection of a secure refuse and cycle store (identified oin the drawing as P19) just outside the south east corner of the scheduled monument.</p> <p>The proposed secure store would be of lightweight steel-framed construction, finished with corrugated black metal cladding. Its design, and its position to the south of the proposed coastal activity centre, suggest that it would have little impact on the setting of the upstanding remains of Whitehaven Old Fort, or on the public understanding and appreciation of them. Historic England therefore has no objection to the variation of condition 2 of planning approval 4/20/2180/0B1.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>Historic England has no objection to the application on heritage grounds.</p> <p>16<sup>th</sup> July 2021</p>	

		<p>The application is for the further variation of Condition 2 of planning approval 4/20/2180/0B1, in order to permit changes to the approved design of the proposed development. The majority of the changes relate to the interior and exterior design of the proposed coastal activity centre itself. Study of the amended proposed site plan L(00)102 Rev 04 suggests that the latest amendments will have no impact upon the scheduled Whitehaven Old Fort or its setting, or upon archaeology surviving within the wider application site, beyond that previously identified. Historic England therefore does not wish to add to the comments made in our letter of 20 May 2021.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>Historic England has no objection to the application on heritage grounds.</p>	
	Copeland Borough Council - Environmental Protection	No comments received.	
	Copeland Disability Forum	<p>28<sup>th</sup> April 2021</p> <p>Re the planning variation below and proposed changes to the original planning application.</p> <p>From the plans submitted it appears all access for people with disabilities has been maintained and there is the provision of accessible bedrooms in the new proposal. So, provided the access for people with disabilities has not been reduced in any way with these proposals Copeland Disability Forum would have no objections to this application.</p> <p>6<sup>th</sup> July 2021</p> <p>Having satisfied ourselves that there is no material reduction in accessibility for people with disabilities with the proposed alterations to the planning application CDF support this application.</p>	
	Copeland Borough Council – Design Advisor	<p>20<sup>th</sup> May 2021</p> <p><b><u>Summary</u></b></p> <p>Two issues emerge from the submission:</p> <p>1. Design: the scheme has not just developed the earlier concept into</p>	

		<p>detail, bringing it into sharper focus, but has introduced an array of changes to all its aspects, presumably as a result of rethinking, functionality, buildability or cost. The cumulative impact combines fundamental changes (aspects of the current scheme differ completely from the original) with development changes (a clear design progression from outline to detail). Hence, the submission raises new questions rather than satisfying existing conditions;</p> <p>2. Procedural: the logic of changes to improve buildability and operation is appreciated, but in planning terms, as the scheme differs significantly from that previously submitted, the ability to consider it as a variation, or as satisfying conditions, is a critical factor in how the submission is to be considered. However, the planning criteria upon which basis conditional approval to the earlier scheme was granted almost certainly still apply – that this scheme has the potential also of securing consent based on the same criteria, but the presumption of consent cannot be assumed as a variation to the approved scheme, or discharge of conditions, when the design changes are so comprehensive.</p> <p>The key words in the introduction of the covering letter are ‘minor material amendment’. However, as it takes three pages to summarise the changes to the design, the proposed changes are numerous and comprehensive, affecting most aspects of the design and the development’s impact upon its setting. As such, those changes cannot be considered to be minor, or limited to the removal of conditions of detail.</p> <p>In the two years since submission of the original application, the applicant has transformed a concept design with changes ‘made to make the scheme deliverable and improve its functionality and robustness in relation to the coastal environment.’ It was noted in 2019 that such transformations are the test of a concept – that it can be worked up in detail and built without a compromising loss of character or quality, and go on to become a positive contribution to the setting through its robustness in its material resilience to and aesthetic assimilation into the coastal environment. Though the original concept remains recognisable, the extent of change to the form and detail, and even to the concept itself, appears to go beyond the reasonable scope of variations and discharge of conditions of an existing planning application.</p> <p>This is undoubtedly a close relative of the earlier scheme, but it is not the same as the earlier scheme.</p> <p><b><u>Detailed Commentary</u></b></p>	
--	--	---	--

		<p><i>Concept</i></p> <p>On page 16 of the Design &amp; Access Statement, as the scene-setter of Section 3.8 on Public Realm Strategy, is the 'small red sandstone sculpture, commissioned to illustrate the architectural concept, [which] provided the project team with an engaging, tangible focus for the development of the proposals. The ability to physically hold the idea and imagine how it could interact with the landscape forged a connection to the concept.' On page 20 the rationale evolved into 'The "Pebble Option" developed as a response to the immediate environment, where large rocks are thrown upon the outer piers of the harbour by the sea. This concept represents the erosion undertaken by these natural forms as their edges are knocked off and gradually smoothed as they are carried by the sea. This concept has developed into the current design.' It was described as a 'hewn block'.</p> <p>However, the envelope is now predominantly metal without any remaining vestige of the extensive defining red sandstone 'pebble', other than the shallow plinth. By definition, design development and compliance with minor conditions presupposes the original concept is unchanged, but here, whilst the form profile is recognisably similar, the fundamental move from stone to metal suggest the applicant's team has abandoned the validity of the sandstone 'pebble' concept. Such a change of heart and its consequences needs to be explained and justified to enable appropriate planning consideration.</p> <p><i>Main building</i></p> <p>In comparing this scheme with that previously submitted, design development of the internal accommodation from concept to functionality, and presumably buildability, has created consequential changes for form (the building is bigger) and external detail, and the way the building functions in relation to the site. As can sometimes be the case when working up a striking concept into a functional, durable building, there has been a loss of some sculptural purity, such as the increased number of external doors, and an unfortunate freestanding rainwater pipe column right in the middle of the entrance terrace area, but also possible gains if the purity of the concept's faceted modelling becomes reality.</p> <p>The above raises the issue of accessibility: though doors 01B/02B are identified as the main entrance lobby, is that really the entrance most people will use from that side when all of the site facilities are on the other side? And what about wheelchair access: at first glance the raised balustraded 'terrace' leading to the main entrance would have a ramp, but it does not, even though the level difference is only three steps from the adjacent footpath (though Section CC shows four). Does</p>	
--	--	---	--

		<p>that mean there is implied discrimination that wheelchair or less ambulant users cannot use the main entrance but must use what the submission refers to as the 'rear elevation' entrance..? If there is an event in the multi-space room with doors 8A opened onto the terrace for users, must wheelchair or less ambulant users leave by returning to the lobby and hallway and exiting by door 2A (which in Section CC also exits 600mm above ground level, but no ramp or steps are shown in the section or on the plan)?</p> <p>The omission of mesh screening from the entire north east elevation, and sheltered balconies and terrace that were behind it, to be replaced by an increase in internal floor area accommodation, is a substantial change that cannot be assessed for impact from the information provided. Operationally, the logic of the proposed development changes is appreciated but in planning terms the changes in appearance, floor area and use could be beyond the scope of a variation to the original.</p> <p>Fenestration has changed from being 'punctured' into (and therefore reinforcing the sense of) the pebble's solidity, to a veneer of flush surfaces where glazing, panelling and ventilation louvres are framed within each faceted plane. This should create a simplified modelling of the whole, so that each facet is almost a smooth unbroken plane; that could be a positive characteristic, perhaps now more akin to a cut gemstone profile, nevertheless a significant departure from the previous 'sculpted pebble' in concept, legibility and setting.</p> <p>The building is a pavilion, free-standing in an open setting, so all aspects are important. The covering letter describes the south west elevation as 'the rear façade', which should be strongly discouraged as it could give rise to that elevation receiving less investment and attention than the north east elevation.</p> <p>The two 'gables' have changed – they have been remodelled; though they have a semblance to the original, they are not the same as the original.</p> <p><i>Materiality</i></p> <p>The pebble concept was expressed as red sandstone and copper. The new scheme has replaced copper with zinc cladding, which is not explained or illustrated for the implications of the change upon visual impact: is there a change in colour, reflectivity, weathering, maintenance, texture, construction detailing?</p> <p>It was a concern with the earlier scheme that the faceted form and metal surfaces will reflect sunlight, which could be dazzling, but there is still nothing included in the supporting information using CGI to illustrate impact at different times from different viewpoints.</p>	
--	--	--	--



		<p>The change in fenestration to flush surface from recessed extends to the second floor where the roof plan shows windows, louvres and panels on the north east elevation are inclined upwards, increasing their exposure and weathering, increasing performance expectations (but accelerating degradation of frames, gaskets and seals?)</p> <p>Some windows are described as 'silicon jointed (capless)', which could enhance the appearance of smooth faceted surfaces (the 'weathertight skin' referred to in the application), but which suggests a contradiction between aesthetics and durable performance in a prevailing hostile climate.</p> <p>As in the earlier scheme, the unusual design relies much more on joints and junctions than conventional construction and remain the most critical test of aesthetics and performance everywhere. in this scheme the number of roof planes has increased from six to seven, compounding the potential risk if both the detailing and construction do not achieve, and keep achieving, the highest performance standards. There are now more places where multiple planes converge at single points.</p> <p>The earlier scheme referred to recessed joints, which would emphasise the overall surface plane of each facet, not the junctions between components; the new scheme specifies standing seams, which reverses the visual attention onto the joints, breaking up the plane into its constituent panels – a profound change in how the concept purity seems now to have been compromised. Despite concerns about the earlier scheme, and now these concerns about reconciling the neat alluring aesthetics of the concept with the practical rigour of performance, there is still insufficient information to establish if the reality can match the vision.</p> <p><i>Condition 4 (windows and doors)</i></p> <p>Windows: General comments about fenestration in the context of the building envelope are included in the other sections.</p> <p>The submitted window schedule is a typology without indicative illustrative profiles, detailing or framing to enable assessment against the condition in the planning condition, the purpose of which is to ensure correct understanding of the visual impact close-to and in context. The schedule assists as an overview but not sufficiently to determine whether the condition can be satisfied; some typical scale details and photographs of relevant examples elsewhere are required, especially to illustrate the variations between glazing types and panels. Understanding and reassurance are critical for the silicone jointed ('capless') glazing units and 'slanted' units, especially at level 2 where units are inclined upwards (Section BB, room 2.03) and presumably</p>	
--	--	---	--

		<p>therefore more vulnerable in performance and in creating reflections. Doors: the introduction of a draught lobby for the main entrance is wise. Presumably the likelihood of the external doors at opposite ends of corridor G being open simultaneously is low. Of the eight (previously four) external doors, six are 'frameless' (including the main entrance) or 'sliding stacking panels'. The main entrance door 01B has no framing to its side glazed panels, which suggests it is not draught-stripped and therefore capable of being air tight under pressure. The schedule shows this door has an overhead closer – presumably automatic for accessible entry and exit, but hopefully sensors will not be able to activate both lobby doors 01B and 02B (which is much wider than 01B – why?) simultaneously.</p> <p>All of this seems to be a...bold decision in such an exposed location; detailing and example photographs would help establish if confidence in the performance of these is well placed, and therefore if in planning terms, the doors as proposed are the doors that will be installed and continue to be used.</p> <p><i>Condition 6 (external lighting)</i></p> <p>The information provided refers to the utility luminaires for general illumination of the site (fitting types but not illustrations in use), and colour-changing feature lighting of the building (CGI illustrations) – but only on the north east or 'rear elevation' as the application refer to it. Is the feature lighting only to this elevation? If so, what is the reason? If on both or all elevations (it is a pavilion), why not show that?</p> <p>The colour display could be very enhancing but again, information is fragmented so there is no possibility of gaining an overall impression of combined utility and display lighting to see if one clashes with or dilutes the other, and what the cumulative visual impact is when seen across the harbour from the town or other key viewpoints.</p> <p>Seeing the aggregated physical impact of lamp posts, bollards and barriers would be helpful to avoid cluttering the setting of the building conveyed in the concept images.</p> <p>Concern has been expressed whether sunlight reflections on the main building will cause glare. Though unlikely, it is possible that the lighting scheme could cause reflected glare if from the utility or projected feature lighting – but it is not possible to tell.</p> <p>Given the above, it is difficult to see how the planning authority has enough information to be able to consider that Condition 6 has been met satisfactorily.</p> <p><i>Ancillary buildings and site</i></p> <p>The most significant impact change is the retail unit. Taking the analogy of the 'pebble', the original unit design was like a 'chip off the</p>	
--	--	---	--

		<p>block', with asymmetric roof and other scaled-down characteristics as a single story 'fragment'. Now the unit is a two story conventional dual-pitched shed with roof signage poorly substituting for architectural modelling; it's not from the lexicon of architecture, but the only way to describe the signage is 'naff'. It sums up a deep disappointment that undermines all of the persuasive arguments for breaking the mould of convention on this site; it speaks of a loss of faith. More than that, the substantial increase in scale destroys the pavilion status of the main building for the shed will dominate the foreground and setting when viewed from any angle from south east to west. Is this purely down to cost? Not only the form but the materials (corrugated steel) have lost almost every vestige of 'family' association with the main building. Unfortunately the shed is a pastiche, neither having the authenticity of an historic working original or the appeal of the earlier 'fragment'. Please revert to Plan A. Another disappointment is that the arches are no longer to be in daily use for kayaks, or indeed seemingly, used at all, which inevitably is a portend of risk that they'll fall into disrepair by just being ignominiously fenced off. What a missed opportunity when the narrative is about a future for this post-industrial site.</p> <p>In the move downmarket for the site, it seems shipping containers have multiplied and taken centre-stage instead of the <i>raison d'être</i> ('<u>activity centre</u>'?!) of the toppers. The colour and liveliness of a boatyard has become a bleak compound and car park.</p> <p>Accessibility: are there kerbs at either end of the Crossing Strip P2 which connects the south west entrance to the car park? Or around the 'island' next to the cycle store? How does someone get from disabled bays 18 &amp; 19 into the building?</p> <p><i>Context of conservation area/listed buildings/scheduled monument</i></p> <p>Immediate context: The existing memorial next to the retail unit retained in the original scheme is now missing; is that to be moved or demolished or has it simply been missed off the drawing? In the heritage statement ( pages 22 and 52/xix ), the monument to the mining disaster was to be retained out of respect for the site's history.</p> <p>Scheduled monument: 2452_l00102_-_proposed_site_plan_02.pdf states works to the monument are subject to a separate application so are not commented upon here.</p> <p>Conservation area: many of the principles of development of this site have been established and justified for the project to have been able to progress this far. However, comments in March 2019 about insufficient information for the planning authority to be able to undertake its responsibilities, especially for the conservation area,</p>	
--	--	---	--

		<p>remain, and are now exacerbated because the scheme has changed so much but those changes cannot be compared to equivalent references for the earlier submission. Other than close-up images and ‘shy’ glimpses from afar in the Design and Access Statement, and Heritage Statement, the scheme cannot be assessed adequately for impact; too many assumptions would be required, and for such a bold intervention in the town, harbour and conservation area, it is unreasonable to expect the planning authority to make such assumptions.</p> <p>16<sup>th</sup> July 2021</p> <p><b><u>Summary</u></b></p> <p>The scheme as now presented is the closest deliverable iteration yet to the original concept – a scheme which, through scrutiny and design testing, has emerged more coherent in the expression of function through form and materials. It remains surprising how coy the team is to show the building from important vantage points in the town; the addition of some nearby views is helpful but the harbour is part of the town, not its neighbour, and recognition of that relationship in terms of the history of the community (the conservation area) and the life of its community would have been welcome and, in conservation planning terms, normal practice.</p> <p>The revised scheme appears to have taken on board much of the feedback on the last version. Concerns were expressed about some practicalities but these notes are comments on a planning application, not building regulations; the points have been made and it is for the team to determine if those concerns are relevant and have been addressed.</p> <p>In one or two places the information currently available seems to be a hybrid of previous visuals and updates. This is picked up in the notes below.</p> <p><b><u>Detailed Commentary</u></b></p> <p><i>Concept</i></p> <p>Though materiality and to a degree colour have changed, the concept of a ‘hewn block’ is once again discernible as a simple single moulded form – the pebble cast onto the quay. Much of what diluted that simplicity, such as the balconies and an array of different panels, has now gone. What could be described as the fussiness of a palette of so many materials, textures and panel shapes has settled down to enable the form to dominate as originally presented. In doing so, the adoption of metal throughout now makes sense in a way that sandstone could</p>	
--	--	--	--

		<p>never achieve as a moulded single material – it would always have required a ‘lid’ roof and therefore had the conventional appearance of a box; metal was probably always going to be the only route to a three-dimensional enclosure. In planning terms, the aberration of recent designs has given way to fulfilment of the original vision.</p> <p><i>Main building</i></p> <p>It has been emphasised before that the building is a pavilion, free-standing in an open setting, so all aspects are important. It is heartening therefore that the narrative has changed (no longer is there mention of the ‘rear façade’) and the design now is much more holistic and in a way, orientation-neutral as a form, though still having an essential operational axis.</p> <p>The updated drawings indicate that the isolated column on the terrace leading to the main entrance has been removed, but the visuals still show it. The assumption is that the plan is later and the column has been removed, which makes considerable aesthetic and practical sense.</p> <p><i>Materiality</i></p> <p>The use of VMZinc Pigmento Red cladding offers a breakthrough in being durable, light-fast, can be installed at all angles and is true to the original concept, accepting the concession about stone noted above. The standing seams should not be so pronounced as to shift the overall impression from form to fabrication. Similarly, mention of reduced junctions will help aesthetically and in performance.</p> <p>Having arrived at the solution of an all-encompassing envelope in one predominant material, the detail with the plinth becomes the main (and most visible to public and users) junction to perform well and look well resolved. Detail D40 of Section A-A – drawing D(21)107 – is not typical (not that there are necessarily ‘typical’ details in this building): this is an overhang; the more vertical alignment instances are where the visual test and of performance will be scrutinised on a daily basis. In particular, D40 does not address and therefore cannot reassure on the problem of runoff, not just in torrential rain (substantial splashback? ground gutters?) but given the hard landscaping and proximity of pedestrians, the frequency of inconvenience in normal rain. Will there be additional splashing from higher level horizontal seams and projections? The detail drawings do not show any horizontal junctions where this might apply. In addition to impact (perhaps literally) on passers-by, runoff will find out the weak points such as joints in cappings and panel junctions. Some streaking is inevitable, but maintenance and in-time repairs should ensure streaking does not become disfiguring staining.</p>	
--	--	--	--

		<p>The note on extended warranties is welcome.</p> <p>Reflection was a concern; the matt finish of the VMZinc Pigmento Red cladding should address that.</p> <p><i>Windows and doors</i></p> <p>The return to recessed windows now has a clear purpose to emphasise, by giving depth, the solidity of the modelling. It gains greater relevance because the first and second floor fenestration has shaped edges to fit the moulded facets: the concept model was to break with convention; the fenestration on the upper floors does too: by following the facet edges, the fenestration and form complement each other.</p> <p>It is slightly bizarre therefore, with so much reconciliation in the design, that window W1.07 on the first floor of the south east elevation – drawing 2452_L(02)102 South East + North West Elevations – is the only one to have a sloping head without any obvious logical justification.</p> <p>Reference to ‘bronzed printed glazing’ in some panels helps to reinforce the perception of a single envelope.</p> <p>There is no new information on doors. Previously expressed queries and concerns remain.</p> <p><i>External lighting</i></p> <p>The document ‘The Edge External Lighting Information - Response to Planning Queries June 21’ describes the intended function of utility and feature lighting, and the avoidance of conflicting effects. There is a written response but no new images, so the presumption is that the installations are unchanged.</p> <p><i>Context of conservation area/listed buildings/scheduled monument</i></p> <p>Conservation area: see note above about providing the planning authority with sufficient information to assess the impact of change on the character of the conservation area.</p> <p>8<sup>th</sup> August 2021</p> <p>These notes are a response to the letter dated 30 July 2021 from Northmill Associates and refer to the numbering in that letter.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The letter refers to Proposed View 1 on page 90 of the Heritage Statement. The point was raised about illustrating more effectively the visual relationship of the building with the town because this illustration is of only limited value, partly because the building is almost reduced to being a silhouette behind the forest of masts and rigging, and partly because the resolution of the image is low and grainy. Absence of a better impression may not adversely</li> </ol>	
--	--	--	--

		<p>affect consideration of the application, but provision of a better illustration would have been helpful.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2. Whilst it is understandable why the column is to be retained for structural reasons, this scheme set its own objective of measuring success against the 'pebble', and that all design aspects should strengthen and not detract from that simple, single concept. Therefore, retention of the column compromises the purity of the concept – the column is alien to the illusion of the moulded form, but it is there because the building cannot stand up without it. The point was also made that the location of the column is a regrettable impediment to free movement. It really would be aesthetically and operationally such a benefit to solve the problem without a column. It will always be the 'yes, but' point where people feel the design could not quite realise the concept.</li> <li>3. The detail of D80 is noted. As said previously, this is not an assessment of compliance with building regulations but of design within the planning context, which nevertheless does include consideration of performance and the impact (literally or visually) on the public. The risk remains that water streaming down the continuous sheet surfaces will arrive at detail D60 and onto the plinth at some speed without the benefit of it being captured by conventional downpipes or ground gutters.</li> <li>4. The removal of window W1.07 is noted. It makes sense.</li> <li>5. The manufacturer's drawings are almost impossible to relate to their application on this building as most are unannotated. It is understood that all detailing of doors is within the proprietary system and therefore aesthetics and performance are determined by that.</li> </ol>	
	<b>Neighbour Responses:</b>		
	<p>The application has been advertised by way of a planning application site notice, press notice and neighbour notification letters issued to 3no. interested parties.</p> <p>Written representations in objection have been received from 2no. parties.</p> <p>The material planning issues raised comprise the following:</p> <p>The proposed use of shipping containers for storage does not fit the character of the area or the proposed development.</p> <p>The proposed retail building is not in keeping with comparable buildings in Cumbria. The</p>		

	<p>proposed black sheet cladding will not fit with the character of the area.</p> <p>It is unclear where the existing statue is to be relocated.</p> <p>No space will exist for fishermen to park when fishing from West Pier.</p> <p>It is not clear if the proposed car park will be accessible for non-users of the development.</p> <p>Why are so many bedrooms proposed when this is intended for use by local people?</p> <p>Will access to the beach be maintained during construction?</p> <p>What impact will the construction have on ecology?</p> <p>It would appear that there has been a change of mind and potentially a change of use for this structure since it was presented to the Planning Committee. Statements on building occupancy and the acceptance by the Agent at the Planning Meeting “that the Ground Floor could become flooded during winter storms “ appears to very different from what is now being proposed.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>*Removal of the Corridor - stated in the Covering Letter that this is “realisation of the impact of coastal weather”.</li> <li>*Siting of a Commercial Kitchen and Plant Room on the Ground Floor.</li> <li>* Increased number of Hotel Rooms.</li> <li>* Classrooms removed to make way for Hotel Accommodation.</li> <li>* Roads adapted to increase pavements.</li> <li>*Arches fenced off as Canoe and Kayak storage no longer required.</li> <li>* Secure boat storage no longer required.</li> <li>* Access to New Slipway with no clear road access - Cannon Balls strategically positioned</li> <li>*Building footprint increased so it is now very close to Scheduled Monument - list Entry No 1020460.</li> <li>* Position of a Refuse and Cycle Store close to the buried part of the Schedule Monument.</li> <li>* No clear vehicular access route to the Refuse Store for Bin collections.</li> <li>* No clear turning space for Refuse Vehicle or other Service Vehicles.</li> <li>* Refuse Store, Cycle storage and Retail unit constructed from Corrugated Iron to blend in with traditional Boat Sheds and Boat Houses as stated in the Covering Letter is absurd in my 60 years of living around the harbour there has never been any Traditional Boat Sheds constructed in this manner.</li> <li>*The use of Corrugated Iron will not be very sustainable in this coastal environment, it</li> </ul>	
--	---	--



	<p>will require constant maintenance and will not compliment the “Blend of modern materials intended to be “Eye Catching” as stated in the Covering letter.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* Slipway Design and positioning is very different from that discussed at the Planning Meeting and this has subsequently had to be revised on safety grounds.</li> <li>*Relocation of “The End of an Era Memorial “ Planning Ref 4/20/2194/ OF1 and the area to be made into 28 Sheffield cycle stands will be certain to generate adverse local comment.</li> <li>* Number of Cycle stands is disproportionate (too many and too remote) for the anticipated occupancy of the building.</li> <li>*Number of Car Park spaces appears inadequate for number of hotel rooms and staff requirements.</li> <li>* Number of used ISO freight containers in the car park will certainly detract from the “Unique and Bold Architectural form” of the building as stated in the Covering Letter.</li> <li>* The Application Form contains inaccuracies and is incomplete.</li> <li>* Is the revised layout and use as hotel rooms compliant with the current Fire Exit Route Regulations?</li> </ul> <p>How will vehicular access to the West Pier, New Old Quay and the Wellington South Beach area which is continuing to show signs of further erosion and collapse be maintained? This development effectively blocks the only access route for Large Vehicles e.g HGVs, Concrete Mixer Trucks, Large Cranes etc which have previously been needed to maintain these important structures.</p> <p>Whitehaven harbour is a working harbour, it is questioned if the lighting scheme has given any consideration for seamen trying to navigate into the harbour under night time conditions where you are trying to pick out the navigation marks from the background lighting in what is currently a dark background.</p> <p>The material finish to the structure has been completely changed from the original specification as it has now been realised that the coastal location would have had a detrimental surface finishes. In the design justification document section heading “conclusions” there is reference to endeavouring to reduce associated financial risks by ensuring all component parts are supported by warranties and insurance backed guarantees. Is the applicant able to state the expected lifespan for this structure, together with the annual maintenance costs to enable the sustainability of the structure to be fully assessed.</p> <p>It is questioned why a further slipway is required given the vehicular access to the slipway and the existing slipways both in the Outer and Inner Harbour areas. What is the point of a Slipway if you cannot get vehicular access?</p> <p>A slipway in a location immediately in front of the proposed development would</p>	
--	---	--

exacerbate wave action and accelerate the sea water up the Slipway and overtop the small wall thereby creating flooding.

It is believed that the slipway has been repositioned.

The Amended application now refers to “Hotel” accommodation and not “Hostel” accommodation..

**Development Plan:**

Copeland Local Plan 2013-2028 (Adopted December 2013):

Core Strategy (CS):

Policy ST1 – Strategic Development Principles

Policy ST2 – Spatial Development Strategy

Policy ER7 – Principal Town Centres, Local Centres and other service areas: Roles and Functions

Policy ER8 – Whitehaven Town Centre

Policy ER10 – Renaissance through Tourism

Policy SS4 – Community and Cultural Facilities and Services

Policy T1 – Improving Accessibility and Transport

Policy ENV1 – Flood Risk and Risk Management

Policy ENV2 – Coastal Management

Policy ENV3 – Biodiversity and Geodiversity

Policy ENV4 – Heritage Assets

Development Management Policies (DMP):

Policy DM6A – Managing Non-Retail Development in Town Centres

Policy DM9 – Visitor Accommodation

Policy DM10 – Achieving Quality of Place

Policy DM11 – Sustainable Development Standards

Policy DM22 – Accessible Developments

Policy DM24 – Development Proposals and Flood

Policy DM25 – Protecting Nature Conservation Sites, Habitats and Species

Policy DM26 - Landscaping

Policy DM27 – Built Heritage and Archaeology

Copeland Local Plan 2001-2016 (LP):

Saved Policy TSP8 - Parking Requirements

**Other Material Planning Considerations**

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).  
The Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 (CHSR).  
Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (PLBA).  
Conservation Area Design Guide SPD December 2017 (CADG).

**Assessment:**

**Principle**

Planning Condition 1 of Full Planning Permission ref. 4/20/2180/OB1 requires that the development permitted be commenced before the 26th June 2020.

The development has been commenced through the completion of works to the approved slipway; therefore, Full Planning Permission ref. 4/20/2180/OB1 remains an extant planning permission.

The proposed revisions whilst material in nature do not change the nature and description of the approved development. The proposed uses that make up the development have not changed in overall terms; however, the proportion of floor space allocated to these uses within the development have changed. This includes the provision of additional hostel rooms and proposed use of the flexible spaces for the provision of classroom space. A planning condition was imposed on the proposed hostel rooms to control their use and this planning condition would continue to apply. The changes are not considered to have materially changed the approved use of the development.

Based upon the above, the proposed revisions can be progressed under Section 73 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended).

The proposed uses will continue to improve the tourism offer including serviced accommodation and increase the range of activities available to local residents and visitors. The additional serviced accommodation will result in additional spend and thus improve the evening and night-time economy within Whitehaven.

**Design**

The proposed development remains unashamedly contemporary. Directly comparable development does not exist in Whitehaven; however, this should not in itself prevent the development but requires justification.

The form of the building remains sculptural, defying demarcation of roof and wall or even foundation and uses materials not found elsewhere in the conservation area. The buildings respond to the site, whilst challenging in aesthetic terms.

Though the materiality and to a degree, the colour of the exterior of the development have changed,

the concept of the development i.e. a 'hewn block' remains discernible as a simple single moulded form. Much of what diluted that simplicity, has now gone, with the palette of so many materials, textures and panel shapes settled down to enable the form to dominate as originally presented. The adoption of metal throughout now makes sense in a way that sandstone could never achieve as a moulded single material.

The use of VMZinc Pigmento Red cladding offers a breakthrough in being durable, light-fast, can be installed at all angles and is true to the original concept. The matt finish overcomes concerns regarding reflection.

The return to recessed windows now has a clear purpose, this being to emphasise, by giving depth and solidity of the modelling. It gains greater relevance because the first and second floor fenestration has shaped edges to fit the moulded facets with the concept model being to break with convention and the fenestration on the upper floors does too by following the facet edges.

The information submitted does not provide details of the proposed windows and plinth.

The overall development continues to comprise a cluster with the main building largely hiding the other structures between it and the land mass and walls to the rear. The group of buildings remain well related and have a clear visual hierarchy, with the main building overseeing and providing managed access to the remainder of the development. The main building and proposed retail building remain visually linked through their external finishes and forms.

In practical terms, the design of the building has not been the subject of environmental modelling in respect of the practicalities of use in this environment i.e. location of openings and water runoff etc. but this reasonably falls beyond the scope of the planning process.

There remains no perimeter security; therefore the development will be publically permeable; however, given the proposed use and resulting continual occupation, this is not likely to be problematic.

The proposed scheme of lighting is considered to be appropriate to the design of the building and location. Any conflict with vessel navigation will be controlled via separate legislation etc..

Part of the requirements of Planning Condition 3 and Planning Condition 4 and the requirements of Planning Condition 6 of Application Ref: 4/20/2180/0B1 can be approved. Compliance is secured via Planning Condition 2. The scope of Planning Condition 3 and Planning Condition 4 have been amended to reflect to the details that can be approved.

### **Heritage**

The initial Full Planning Application was supported by a comprehensive Heritage Statement. The

Heritage Statement reviews the evidence for the evolution of the harbour side area to be occupied by the proposed development and assesses the impacts which the proposed development would have on the scheduled Old Fort site and the Whitehaven Town Centre Conservation Area including the harbour.

The Heritage Statement concludes that the proposed building would be a striking addition to the harbour, but the proposed physical and visual impact of the development would avoid any adverse impact on the identified heritage assets and complement the regenerated form and character of the harbour. It is stated that the special interest of the designated heritage assets would be preserved and enhanced by the proposed development, both in terms of the appropriate conservation of their significant fabric and their contribution to the vitality of this part of the town and coastal area.

Historic England considered that there would be some harm to the setting of Old Fort and the Whitehaven Town Centre Conservation Area; however, that the development will be beneficial in contributing to the regeneration of the historic harbour, encouraging the people to visit an area which is currently little used and be beneficial in enhancing public appreciation of the Old Fort and its significance. No objection is raised to the revised proposals.

As outlined above, the design of the proposed development remains unashamedly contemporary and sculptural, defying demarcation of roof and wall or even foundation and uses materials not found elsewhere in the conservation area. The buildings respond to the site, whilst challenging in aesthetic terms.

The proposed changes whilst altering the external appearance of the building remain true to the initial concept of the development i.e. a 'hewn block' and arguably achieves this more convincingly than the initially approved development.

It remains that the innovative design of the proposed development, whilst contrasting with existing buildings is considered to balance the degree of change to the historic environment and with the delivery of both a sustainable use for this much-altered part of the harbour.

The development proposed seeks to retain the existing statue honouring the 'screen lasses' in accordance with the previously approved scheme.

The proposed development has the potential to disturb buried archaeological assets related to 18<sup>th</sup> and early 19<sup>th</sup> century buildings that once stood on the quay. It is also possible that the proposed landscaping within the scheduled monument of Whitehaven Old Fort may reveal the buried remains of the fort. A proposed archaeological scheme of works has been submitted and confirmed as acceptable by the Historic Environment Officer of Cumbria County Council. A planning condition is proposed to secure completion of the development in accordance with the submitted details.

In applying the tests of the LBCA the proposal would result in some enhancement and some harm to

the identified heritage assets and so fails to preserve its heritage asset significance. Utilising the terminology of the NPPF, the impacts would be less than substantial.

The development would result in heritage related public benefits including enhancing public appreciation of the Old Fort and its significance, contributing to the regeneration of the historic harbour, encouraging the people to visit an area which is currently little used and delivering wider economic and social benefits to the locality. In weighing up these benefits against those adverse aspects identified, the proposal would provide a sufficient set of gains with which to outweigh the harm that would occur to the heritage assets, and so allow for a departure from the statutory duty of the LBCA, in accordance with the provisions of the NPPF.

### **Highway Safety, Parking and Access**

The Site comprises an existing vehicle parking area and is accessible via an un-adopted highway.

The development will continue to result in the loss of existing public parking spaces within the vicinity of the harbour. As a percentage of the existing spaces, the loss is limited; therefore, the impacts would not be significant.

In the context of the existing use, the development will not result in a material increase in the use of the existing highway. The width of the highway is sufficient to permit access and turning by vehicles with trailers and refuse vehicles.

No changes are proposed to the approved level of parking provision etc.. Whilst the additional hostel rooms hold potential to increase demand for vehicle parking, the proposed provision is not unacceptable given the location as demand could easily be met through the other public parking areas within the locality and wider town centre.

The development will not impact upon any public rights of way. The development has the potential to impede access to the existing footways during construction. A planning condition is proposed to secure details of any required closures or diversion as part of a Construction Environmental Management Plan.

Issues are raised in objections regarding the accessibility to the areas beyond the development post construction. The proposed development includes measures limiting access along the promenade area; however, access will remain from the rear of the site if required and space would exist for light goods vehicles to pass to the front of the building if required. The public realm has been designed to provide pedestrian priority etc. as is encouraged. Access to the slipway exists by car if required; however, this is not given priority within the public realm design. The primary use of the slipway would be on foot.

Cumbria County Council – Highways has raised no objection.

### **Flood Risk and Drainage**

The design of the development has been amended in response to the conclusions of the Flood Risk Assessment, this includes increasing the finished floor levels rather than permitting water flows into the ground floor level.

It is proposed to dispose of foul water to the existing public main system and surface water to the Outer Harbour as per the existing arrangements. In principle, these arrangements accord with the national drainage hierarchy subject to the detailed design. Cumbria County Council – LLFA confirm that a petrol interceptor should be included in any final drainage scheme.

Whilst drainage details were initially submitted, these were subsequently withdrawn.

A pre-commencement planning condition is proposed to secure a detailed drainage design and its implementation in advance of occupation.

The requirements of Planning Condition 9 of Application Ref: 4/20/2180/OB1 cannot be approved.

No alterations are proposed to the approved slipway.

### **Land Contamination**

A Preliminary Investigation, Geoenvironmental Appraisal and Gas Risk Assessment have been completed.

The requirements of Planning Condition 8 attached to Planning Permission ref. 4/20/2180/OB1 have previously been approved; therefore, this planning condition is no longer required, with the details of compliance with the approved details secured via Planning Condition 2.

### **Ecology**

No additional ecological impacts will result beyond the approved development.

The impacts of the development continue to be controlled via suspensive planning conditions.

### **The Planning Balance**

The revised proposals are considered to remain in accord with the provisions of the Development Plan.

### **Reconciliation of Previously Imposed Planning Conditions**

Planning Condition	Retain/Amend
1 .The development hereby permitted shall be commenced before the 26th June 2020.	Development has commenced – Remove.
<p>2. Permission shall relate to the following plans and documents as received on the respective dates and development shall be carried out in accordance with them: -</p> <p>Site Location Plan – Drawing No. L(00)001 Rev. P1 received 30th January 2019</p> <p>Existing Site Plan – Drawing No. L(00)002 Rev. P1 received 30th January 2019</p> <p>Proposed Site Plan – Drawing No. L(00)102 Rev. P2 received 7th May 2019</p> <p>Proposed Equipment Storage Compound – Drawing No. L(01)103 Rev. P2 received 7th May 2019</p> <p>Proposed Ground and Upper Floor Plan – Drawing No. L(01)105 Rev. P1 received 30th January 2019</p> <p>Proposed First Floor Plan – Drawing No. L(01)106 Rev. P1 received 30th January 2019</p> <p>Proposed Second Floor Plan – Drawing No. L(10)107 Rev. P1 received 30th January 2019</p> <p>Proposed Roof Plan – Drawing No. L(01)108 Rev. P1 received 30th January 2019</p> <p>Elevations – Sheet 1 – Drawing No. L(02)100 Rev. P1 received 30th January 2019</p> <p>Elevations – Sheet 2 – Drawing No. L(02)101 Rev. P1 received 30th January 2019</p> <p>Elevations – Sheet 1 – Drawing No. L(02)110 Rev. P1 received 30th January 2019</p> <p>Elevations – Sheet 2 – Drawing No. L(02)111 Rev. P1 received 30th January 2019</p>	Amend as per revised plans and details.



	<p>Elevations – Sheet 3 – Drawing No. L(02)112 Rev. P1 received 30th January 2019</p> <p>Proposed Storage Shed – GA Plan – Drawing No. L(01)109 P1 received 30th January 2019</p> <p>Proposed Storage Shed Elevations – Drawing No. L(02)104 Rev. P1 received 30th January 2019</p> <p>Proposed Storage Shed – Roof Plan – Drawing No. L(01)110 Rev. P1 received 30th January 2019</p> <p>Proposed Retail Unit – Plans &amp; Elevations – Drawing No. L(01)111 Rev. P1 received 30th January 2019</p> <p>Proposed Arch Storage – Drawing No. L(02)103 Rev. P1 received 30th January 2019</p> <p>Planning Application Form received 30th January 2019</p> <p>Preliminary Investigation – Report No. M656/01 received 30th January 2019</p> <p>Design and Access Statement received 30th January 2019</p> <p>Flood Risk Assessment – Ref. PG/MB/FRA/9542 V4 received 25th June 2019</p> <p>Planning, Heritage and Public Participation Statement received 30th January 2019</p> <p>Ecological Assessment received 30th January 2019</p> <p>MEP Engineering Utilities Revision 1 received 30th January 2019</p> <p>MEP Engineering Energy Statement Revision 1 received 30th January 2019</p> <p>Whitehaven Slipway GA – Drawing No. 100 received 25th March 2020</p> <p>Slipway Indicative Flood Gates – Drawing No. MP304-01-P-200 received 25th March 2020</p>		
	<p>3. The erection of the superstructure of the buildings hereby approved shall not</p>	<p>Amend – Details now provided and secured via Planning Condition 2 in part. Retain for details</p>	

	commence until samples and details of the materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces and how these materials are finished where connections between materials exist have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details of materials unless otherwise agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority.	not provided.	
	4. The erection of the superstructure of the buildings hereby approved shall not commence until detailed specifications of the proposed external windows and doors to be used in the construction of the development have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details of materials unless otherwise agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority.	Amend – Details now provided and secured via Planning Condition 2 in part. Retain for details not provided.	
	5. -	-	
	6. The installation of external lighting shall not commence until a scheme for the provision of external lighting has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme shall include full details of the location, design, luminance levels, light spillage and hours of use of all external lighting within the site. The approved lighting scheme shall be implemented in full prior to first occupation of the development hereby approved.	Remove – Details now provided and secured via Planning Condition 2.	
	7. Prior to the commencement of the construction of each phase of the development hereby approved, including any works of demolition, a Construction Environmental Management Plan relating	Retain.	

	<p>to that phase of the development shall be submitted to, and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The Statement shall provide for:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) the parking of vehicles of site operatives and visitors;</li> <li>b) loading and unloading of plant and materials;</li> <li>c) storage of plant and materials used in constructing the development;</li> <li>d) the erection and maintenance of security hoarding including decorative displays and facilities for public viewing, where appropriate;</li> <li>e) measures to control the emission of dust and dirt during construction;</li> <li>f) a scheme for recycling / disposing of waste resulting from demolition and construction works;</li> <li>g) measures to control noise and vibration; and,</li> <li>h) measures or diversions to permit access during the construction.</li> </ul> <p>The approved Construction Method Statement shall be adhered to throughout the construction period.</p>		
	<p>8. No development shall commence until a scheme that includes the following components to deal with the geotechnical and contaminative risks detailed in the Preliminary Environmental Risk Assessment shall each be submitted to and approved, in writing, by the local planning authority:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Site investigation scheme, based on the Preliminary Environmental Risk Assessment to provide information for a detailed assessment of the risk to all receptors that may be affected, including those off-site.</li> <li>b) The results of the site investigation and</li> </ul>	Remove as requirements have been approved.	

	<p>detailed risk assessment referred to in 1) and, based on these, an options appraisal and remediation strategy giving full details of the remediation or mitigation measures required and how they are to be undertaken.</p> <p>c) A verification plan providing details of the data that will be collected in order to demonstrate that the works set out in the remediation strategy in 2) are complete and identifying any requirements for longer term monitoring of pollutant linkages, maintenance and arrangement for contingency action.</p> <p>The scheme shall be implemented as approved.</p>		
	<p>9. Prior to the commencement of the development not comprising works relating to the relocation of the statue referenced in Planning Condition 10 and works relating to the construction of the slipway, a scheme of surface water management and the disposal of sewage works shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall not be occupied until the approved surface water management and the disposal of sewage works have been provided on the site to serve the development.</p> <p>The approved works shall be retained as such thereafter.</p>	<p>Retain. Amend to reference 'Prior to the commencement of development not comprising works relating to the relocation of the statue and works relating to the construction of the slipway...' for the avoidance of doubt.</p>	
	<p>10. The relocation of the 'existing screen lasses' statue shall not commence until a scheme for the retention and relocation of this statue has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The approved scheme shall be implemented in full prior to first occupation of the development hereby approved.</p>	<p>Remove. Details controlled via Planning Condition 2.</p>	

	<p>11. In the event that contamination is found at any time when carrying out the approved development that was not previously identified it must be reported in writing within 14 days to the Local Planning Authority and once the Local Planning Authority has identified the part of the site affected by the unexpected contamination, development must be halted on that part of the site. An assessment must be undertaken and where remediation is necessary a remediation scheme, together with a timetable for its implementation, must be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The measures in the approved remediation scheme must then be implemented in accordance with the approved timetable. Following completion of measures identified in the approved remediation scheme a validation report must be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.</p>	Retain.	
	<p>12. The accommodation on the second floor of the development hereby approved shall not be occupied other than as short term holiday accommodation. It shall not be used at any time as sole and principal residences by any occupants or be occupied independently by any family, group or individual for more than three months (cumulative) in any one calendar year.</p>	Amend to reference all holiday accommodation.	
	<p>13. Prior to the first occupation of the development hereby approved, the approved parking layout and turning space shall be constructed, marked out and made available for use and shall be retained as such thereafter. The parking spaces shall be used solely for the benefit of the occupants and visitors of the</p>	Retain.	

	development hereby approved and for no other purpose.	
	14. The development here by approved shall not proceed except in accordance with the details described in Flood Risk Assessment prepared by Thomason Partnership Limited reference PG/MB/FRA/9542 V4 received 25th June 2019.	Retain.
	15. All hard and soft landscape works shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details. The works shall be carried out before any part of the development is occupied or in accordance with a programme to be agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority prior to any development commencing. Any trees / shrubs which are removed, die, become severely damaged or diseased within five years of their planting shall be replaced in the next planting season with trees / shrubs of similar size and species to those originally required to be planted unless the Local Planning Authority gives written consent to any variation.	Retain.
8.	<b>Recommendation:</b> Approve	
9.	<b>Conditions:</b>  1. -  2. Permission shall relate to the following plans and documents as received on the respective dates and development shall be carried out in accordance with them: -  Site Location Plan – Drawing No. L(00)001 Rev. P1 received 30th January 2019 Existing Site Plan – Drawing No. L(00)002 Rev. P1 received 30th January 2019 Proposed Site Plan (with Refuse Vehicle Tracking - Drawing No. 2452_L(00)102 Rev. 4 received Proposed Equipment Storage Compound – Drawing No. L(01)103 Rev. P2 received 7th May 2019	

	<p>Proposed Ground Floor Plan - Drawing No. 2452_L(01)105 Rev. 2 received 28<sup>th</sup> June 2021</p> <p>Proposed First Floor Plan - Drawing No. 2452_L(01)106 Rev. 2 received 28<sup>th</sup> June 2021</p> <p>Proposed Second Floor Plan - Drawing No. 2452_L(01)107 Rev. 2 received 28<sup>th</sup> June 2021</p> <p>Proposed Roof Plan - Drawing No. L(01)108 Rev. 2 received 28<sup>th</sup> June 2021</p> <p>North East Elevation - Drawing No. 2452_L(02)101 Rev. 2 received 28<sup>th</sup> June 2021</p> <p>South East + North West Elevations - Drawing No. 2452_L(02)102 Rev. 3 received 2<sup>nd</sup> August 2021</p> <p>South West Elevation - Drawing No. 2452_L(02)103 Rev. 2 received 28<sup>th</sup> June 2021</p> <p>Envelope Details 1 - Drawing No. 2452_D(21)106 Rev. 1- received 28<sup>th</sup> June 2021</p> <p>Envelope Details 2 - Drawing No. 2452_D(21)107 Rev. 2 received 2<sup>nd</sup> August 2021</p> <p>Enlarged Elevation Bay - Drawing No. 2452_L(02)104 received 28<sup>th</sup> June 2021</p> <p>Sections A - B - Drawing No. 2452_L(03)100 Rev. 1 received 28<sup>th</sup> June 2021</p> <p>Section C - E - Drawing No. 2452_L(03)101 Rev. 2 received 2<sup>nd</sup> August 2021</p> <p>External Door Schedule_02 - Drawing No. S(31)100 and Specifications received 2<sup>nd</sup> August 2021</p> <p>Proposed Storage Shed – GA Plan – Drawing No. L(01)109 P1 received 30th January 2019</p> <p>Proposed Storage Shed Elevations – Drawing No. L(02)104 Rev. P1 received 30th January 2019</p> <p>Proposed Storage Shed – Roof Plan – Drawing No. L(01)110 Rev. P1 received 30th January 2019</p> <p>Proposed Retail Unit – Plans &amp; Elevations – Drawing No. L(01)111 Rev. P1 received 30th January 2019</p> <p>Proposed Arch Storage – Drawing No. L(02)103 Rev. P1 received 30th January 2019</p> <p>Preliminary Investigation – Report No. M656/01 received 30th January 2019</p> <p>Design and Access Statement received 30th January 2019</p> <p>Flood Risk Assessment – Ref. PG/MB/FRA/9542 V4 received 25th June 2019</p> <p>Planning, Heritage and Public Participation Statement received 30th January 2019</p> <p>Ecological Assessment received 30th January 2019</p> <p>MEP Engineering Utilities Revision 1 received 30th January 2019</p> <p>MEP Engineering Energy Statement Revision 1 received 30th January 2019</p> <p>Whitehaven Slipway GA – Drawing No. 100 received 25th March 2020</p> <p>Slipway Indicative Flood Gates – Drawing No. MP304-01-P-200 received 25th March 2020</p> <p>The Edge External Lighting Information – Revision 1 - 03.02.2021 received 28<sup>th</sup> June 2021</p> <p>The Edge - Design Justification received 28<sup>th</sup> June 2021</p> <p>Geoenvironmental Appraisal For Land At Cumbria Coastal Activities Centre, Whitehaven – Ref. M656/03 received 30th June 2020</p> <p>Gas Risk Assessment - Cumbria Coastal Activities Centre, Whitehaven – Ref. M656/00 received 19th August 2020</p>
Reason	<p>To conform with the requirement of Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, as amended by the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.</p>

Pre-Commencement of Phase and Pre-Superstructure Planning Conditions

3. The erection of the superstructure of the main building hereby approved shall not commence until samples and details of the materials to be used in the construction of the stone plinth to the building including details of the stone coursing and detailed specifications of the windows have submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details of materials unless otherwise agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority.

Reason

To ensure the development is of a high quality design.

4. The erection of the superstructure of the Proposed Workshop/ Retail / Cycle Store shall not commence until samples and details of the all materials on the exterior of the building have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details of materials unless otherwise agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority.

Reason

To ensure the development is of a high quality design.

5. –

6. –

7. Prior to the commencement of the construction of each phase of the development hereby approved, including any works of demolition, a Construction Environmental Management Plan relating to that phase of the development shall be submitted to, and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The Statement shall provide for:-

- a) the parking of vehicles of site operatives and visitors;
- b) loading and unloading of plant and materials;
- c) storage of plant and materials used in constructing the development;
- d) the erection and maintenance of security hoarding including decorative displays and facilities for public viewing, where appropriate;
- e) measures to control the emission of dust and dirt during construction;
- f) a scheme for recycling / disposing of waste resulting from demolition and construction works;
- g) measures to control noise and vibration; and,
- h) measures or diversions to permit access during the construction.



The approved Construction Method Statement shall be adhered to throughout the construction period.

Reason

These details are required to be approved before the commencement of development to safeguard the amenity of neighbouring occupiers, prevent highway impacts and ecological impacts.

8. -

9. Prior to the commencement of the development not comprising works relating to the relocation of the statue and works relating to the construction of the slipway, a scheme of surface water management and the disposal of sewage works shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

The development shall not be occupied until the approved surface water management and the disposal of sewage works have been provided on the site to serve the development.

The approved works shall be retained as such thereafter.

Reason

To ensure adequate provision is made for the management of surface water and sewage disposal.

10. -

Pre-occupancy or Other Stage Conditions

11. In the event that contamination is found at any time when carrying out the approved development that was not previously identified it must be reported in writing within 14 days to the Local Planning Authority and once the Local Planning Authority has identified the part of the site affected by the unexpected contamination, development must be halted on that part of the site. An assessment must be undertaken and where remediation is necessary a remediation scheme, together with a timetable for its implementation, must be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

The measures in the approved remediation scheme must then be implemented in accordance with the approved timetable. Following completion of measures identified in the approved remediation scheme a validation report must be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason

To prevent harm to human health and the environment.

12. The accommodation on the first and second floor of the main building hereby approved shall not be occupied other than as short term holiday accommodation. It shall not be used at any time as sole and principal residences by any occupants or be occupied independently by any family, group or individual for more than three months (cumulative) in any one calendar year.

Reason

For the avoidance of doubt and to ensure that the development continues to contribute positively towards the tourism economy and to ensure adverse issues in respect of residential amenity and highway safety do not arise.

13. Prior to the first occupation of the development hereby approved, the approved parking layout and turning space shall be constructed, marked out and made available for use and shall be retained as such thereafter. The parking spaces shall be used solely for the benefit of the occupants and visitors of the development hereby approved and for no other purpose.

Reason

In the interests of highway safety.

14. The development hereby approved shall not proceed except in accordance with the details described in Flood Risk Assessment prepared by Thomason Partnership Limited reference PG/MB/FRA/9542 V4 received 25th June 2019.

Reason

To ensure appropriate mitigation of the flood risk at the site.

15. All hard and soft landscape works shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details. The works shall be carried out before any part of the development is occupied or in accordance with a programme to be agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority prior to any development commencing. Any trees / shrubs which are removed, die, become severely damaged or diseased within five years of their planting shall be replaced in the next planting season with trees / shrubs of

similar size and species to those originally required to be planted unless the Local Planning Authority gives written consent to any variation.

**Reason**

To safeguard and enhance the character of the area and secure high quality landscaping.

16. An archaeological watching brief should be undertaken during the construction of the permitted development, by a qualified archaeologist and in accordance with the submitted written scheme of archaeological investigation entitled 'Specifications for a Programme of Watching Brief Investigation, The Edge, Whitehaven', dated 8<sup>th</sup> June 2021. Within two months of the completion of the development, a digital copy of the archaeological report shall be furnished to the Local Planning Authority.

**Reasons:**

To afford reasonable opportunity for an examination to be made to determine the existence of any remains of archaeological interest within the site and for the investigation and recording of such remains.

**Informative**

The proposed development lies within a coal mining area which may contain unrecorded coal mining related hazards. If any coal mining feature is encountered during development, this should be reported immediately to the Coal Authority on 0345 762 6848.

Further information is also available on the Coal Authority website at:

[www.gov.uk/government/organisations/the-coal-authority](http://www.gov.uk/government/organisations/the-coal-authority)

**Statement:**

The Local Planning Authority has acted positively and proactively in determining this application by assessing the proposal against all material considerations, including planning policies and any representations that may have been received, and subsequently determining to grant planning permission in accordance with the presumption in favour of sustainable development as set out in the National Planning Policy Framework.

<b>Case Officer:</b> Chris Harrison	<b>Date :</b> 19.08.2021
<b>Authorising Officer:</b> N.J. Hayhurst	<b>Date :</b> 23/08/2021
<b>Dedicated responses to:-</b>	