

## Oliver Hoban

---

**From:** Christie Burns  
**Sent:** 02 May 2024 12:04  
**To:** Development Control  
**Subject:** FW: Dwellings, Land South of Dale View Gardens, Egremont - Amended Information

Hi all,

Please can the below be put online for application 4/23/2313/0F1.

Please note that the advice in this email is given in good faith on the basis of the information available at the present time. The advice may be subject to revision following further examination or consultation, or where additional information comes to light, and is therefore not binding on any future recommendation which may be made to the Council or any formal decision by the Council.

Kind Regards,

**Christie Burns MRTPI**

Senior Planning Officer | Development Management  
Thriving Place and Investment | Cumberland Council  
The Market Hall | Market Place | Whitehaven | CA28 7JG



---

**From:** Hunton, Andrew  
**Sent:** Wednesday, May 1, 2024 5:28 PM  
**To:** Christie Burns  
**Subject:** Dwellings, Land South of Dale View Gardens, Egremont - Amended Information

**CAUTION: External email, think before you click!**  
Please report any suspicious email to our [IT Helpdesk](#)

Your Ref 4/23/2313/0F1  
My Ref CO/1558/23

Hello Christie

Many thanks for your email of 29<sup>th</sup> April 2024.

I am indebted for this further information on behalf of the Applicant in reply to my comments of 24<sup>th</sup> April 2024. Consequently, I wish to offer the following;

- Unit 68 This dwelling is directly adjacent to a designated entry into the development but provides negligible supervision of the associated space. Accordingly, this area is more likely

to attract unwelcome and anti-social behaviour to the detriment of this householder and others nearby.

I contend that the present arrangement (route and adjacent POS) does not comply with Council Policy as required, i.e. DM10, D,

- ii) Overlooked routes and spaces within **and on the edges of development**

Policy DS5PO: Development Principle also requires:

In order to achieve sustainable development in the Borough and meet Local Plan objectives, development must, where possible:

- Provide or safeguard good levels of residential amenity and security, reducing the fear of crime and minimising the opportunities for crime and anti-social behaviour

Policy DS7PO: Design Standards states:

The Council will expect all new development to meet high quality standards of design. This means that developments must: (this list is not exhaustive)

**h) Incorporate measures to design out crime, taking into consideration secured by design principles**

The proposed arrangement does not reflect Secured by Design Homes 2024:

8.1 Vehicular and pedestrian routes should be designed to ensure that they are visually open, direct, well used and should not undermine the defensible space of neighbourhoods.

8.10 Public footpaths should not run to the rear of, and provide access to gardens, rear yards or dwellings as these have been proven to generate crime.

8.20 Where it is expected that a footpath will be in constant use, it should have all the required attributes as listed at paragraph 8.11 and be lit in accordance with BS 5489-1:2020.

**8.11 Where a segregated footpath is unavoidable**, for example where there is a public right of way, an ancient field path or heritage route, designers should consider making the footpath a focus of the development and ensure that they are: as straight as possible wide well lit (see paragraphs 8.20 to 8.22) devoid of potential hiding places **overlooked by surrounding buildings** and activities well maintained so as to enable natural surveillance along the path and its borders

- Deployment of close-boarded fencing – I acknowledge that on this issue, the applicant prioritises privacy of residents above security, i.e. compromising views of owners vehicles parked outside the dwelling curtilage
- Street lighting scheme – I presume the applicant will have an expectation for the design of the street lighting scheme, i.e. by illuminating vehicle access routes *and* pedestrian links. Having regard to the magnitude of this development and the extent of POS, the central footpath running East – West through the entire development should be suitably illuminated, i.e. designated access via Uldale View (between Units 82 and 159) POS (between Units 89, 93, 139 and 141), POS (between Units 96 and 140, 102 and 103), POS (between Units 31 and 34, 33 and 38)  
The applicant should advise if the street lighting will also illuminated other pedestrian routes, i.e. in front of Unit 15, Unit 82, designated access at Units 72 / 78. Street lighting on footpath adjacent to Unit 68 – as already highlighted as unsupervised, in front of Unit

57 this POS will likely be exploited as a short-cut towards Units 54 – 56. The Detailed Site Layout suggests unrestricted pedestrian access along the entire South boundary of this development.

The Agents refers to the details being provided when discharging conditions, so I would support the street lighting scheme being subject to a planning condition.

I shall be pleased to advise on any queries relating to the implementation of appropriate crime prevention measures or the application of Secured by Design principles.

Very best regards

**Andy Hunton**  
**Designing Out Crime Officer**

Cumbria Constabulary  
C/O Carlisle Police Station, Brunel Way, Durranshill Industrial Estate, Carlisle, CA1 3NQ

