

Mr and Mrs J Stables

1 South Row

Kells

Whitehaven

Cumbria

CA28-9AY

To whom it may concern,

I am writing to you about to appeal the proposed outline planning permission being declined by my local council Copeland bough council planning application number 4/20/2251/001 (ATTACHED). Below I have out lined the policy's, Copeland bough council highlighted, as to why they would not support this application. I have also given valid reasoning to appealing each policy. I have given planning application numbers that have been accepted through out to which I feel is biased and contradictory, to my outline planning application. Within the findings Copeland bury council state that my land is Situated within the settlement boundary and subject to the satisfaction of other material planning consideration as quoted below.

*" The Copeland Local Plan 2013-2028 seeks to allow residential development within the designated settlement boundaries and subject to the satisfaction of other material planning considerations. Your proposed site is situated within the settlement boundary, close to the west coast on a plot currently used as a residential garden".* This garden is used by my family, but we also use the open green at the back of the houses on south row. I feel that this should not stop us from wanting to develop a family home on our land, if we were successful, part of the land would be still used as a garden.

The first policy that Copeland bury council found fault with was; Policy ST1 of the Copeland Local Plan seeks to protect and enhance the undeveloped coast. The residential gardens on this strip of land opposite West Row provide a softened edge to the coastline and is a definite point of transition from urban to rural in character.

To the left of my land least than 6 meters, another planning application has been accepted, planning application number: 4/192370/001 dated 8/01/20 it was accepted for outline planning for single dwelling and garage. Which I feel is and contradictory to my planning application. This is also in the same strip of land describe above. I am also aware of other planning application being received for this same area same coastline being accepted. Such as

- Building control application number 4/20/0074/1 for 650 residential dwellings. This also on the exact same coastline less than ½ a mile to the left of my land accepted.
- Application number 4/20/2455/0F1 planning for 40 dwellings, although this planning is still awaiting a decision.

The Coal Mine that has nationally been recognised and accepted by the government also, has been accepted this month. I find that this has been a huge disappointment. Finding that my land is objected but other less than 1 mile left of my land can be developed for others financial benefit. This is 3 of 4 planning applications that have been approved one are waiting to be approved from the same area same coastline as described above. Yet my application for outline planning was objected.

Policy ENV5 seeks to "protect all landscapes from inappropriate change by ensuring that development does not threaten or detract from the distinctive characteristics of that particular area". The character of the landscape in this area would be altered with the long views of the coast affected. The recent Copeland Landscape Settlement Study (January 2020) (CLSS) identifies the open exposed character of this coastline

which provides a recreational resource close to the urban area. It states that “the views across the landscape towards open sea and views of expansive skies are sensitive to development that would enclose or interrupt these views”. The settlement character includes a current strong building line on South Row and the proposal would have a negative effect on this, causing sprawl outside the urban area. The CLSS states that in this area of Coastal Urban Fringe Cliffs, “small scale development [is] possible to help define [the] urban edge, but otherwise little capacity for development without causing change to landscape qualities of openness”. In my opinion, the development would intrude into the current landscape and have a negative effect, but also create a precedent for further development on the adjacent land which would completely alter the character in this location and have an irreversible negative effect.

Due to current development in the very same area, I again feel this is biased and contradictory decision. The planning for outline planning, I do not feel this was a holistic decision. And was made on one person’s opinion, having other application accepted around this plot has been a bias and contradictory decision. I would like to point out that no objections from neighbours had been received and from the highway agency. When challenging the individual about other planning application that had been accepted, they stated that they were unaware of these applications, but yet the application had been approved. Further to this conversation, I also made them aware of proposed plans that I am aware that a road is to be put in at the bottom of my land this is for future development and access to other areas that are being developed.

*Policy DM10 seeks to ensure that reasonable standards of general amenity are created and maintained. The loss of the garden is likely to have a negative effect on 1 South Row which will be left without any available amenity space.*

This would not have a negative effect on 1 south row at all, all houses on south row and west row do not have access to gardens and use the open space behind the houses for any garden and social space. Having the space behind the house is more beneficial for 1 south row there is areas also for possible renting to use garages. This would not affect anyone and feel this is a personal and contradictory decision. 1 South Row is an end terrace house and over the years has acquired extra amenities from previous owners. Not having these amenities would not affect 1 south row at all, having lived in 1 south row for over 19 years. We do not use the drive all the time we park beside the house like every other resident who does not have a drive. This is a choice not a luxury.

*Policy DM12 of the Local Plan seeks to ensure suitable development standards for new dwellings to protect the amenity of the new dwelling and any existing dwellings. There are windows serving habitable rooms on the side elevation of 1 South Row, facing west which would require a separation distance of at least 21m from facing habitable rooms on the proposed property to protect the amenity of both properties. This requirement would be exceedingly difficult to achieve in this location and it is considered that there will be likely to be a negative effect on 1 South Row as a result. The National Planning Policy Framework states that the amenity of both current and any future occupiers must be considered when assessing planning proposals, therefore although 1 South Row may be under the same ownership at present, this cannot be relied upon in the future.*

I feel this policy is basically asking for drawings which would be given and submitted with full planning permission. We have applied for outline planning permission, when looking at current houses in the vicinity and the houses erected in the last 5 years opposite 1 south row, I would like these developments evaluated as I feel they are not adhering to meeting this policy. Also, the application 4/192370/001 was this not a barrier to their planning permission also. Again, another biased decision I feel this policy have not been looked at when planning application number 4/192370/001 was considered. This as also brought to my attention that this planning application is also detrimental to 1 south row, having 3 windows overlooking this plot I will have no privacy in my own home. And hope when the drawing for this plot are done this policy is adhered to.

*Furthermore, it is unlikely that off street parking can be achieved for both properties within the available space and safely in accordance with Policies DM12 and DM22 of the Copeland Local Plan. As mentioned previously, the precedent that would be set by the approval of this development would also create an unsafe situation for highway safety and a likely increase of cars parked on the road due to increased dwellings and a lack of off-street parking in the area.*

As noted above highway agency have not declined this, off road parking all houses do not have this on south row and west row, I do not have to and do not use this driveway. Off road parking can be problem in the area, due to extra visitors to other properties. It is not a problem to residents, as stated above the highway's agency did not disapprove of the outline planning permission. If this were the only hindrance to the planning application. One parking space could be considered for sole use of one south row, on my land. I look forward to your correspondence.