

Oliver Hoban

From: Christie Burns
Sent: 14 May 2024 11:33
To: Development Control
Subject: FW: Planning Application 4/23/2119/0F1

Hi all,

Please can the comments below be put online for this application.

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: millom withoutparishcouncil
Sent: Tuesday, May 14, 2024 10:56 AM
To: Christie Burns
Subject: Planning Application 4/23/2119/0F1

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

Dear Christie

The Parish Council reviewed the application at its meeting last night and have agreed the following response:

The most recent amendments/submissions to the application are little more than the inclusion of a guest policy and a disagreement with planning on the issues raised by highways on parking.

Looking at these;

- a) The guest policy is not an analysis of the impact on residential amenity or a properly measurable or enforceable set of mitigations, and it's not really binding on guests either.
- b) The sales specs for the lights don't actually answer the concern we raised over glare or visual intrusion.
- c) They clearly don't feel they need to justify their approach to traffic and parking (linked to residential amenity). This would seem to be counterintuitive, except that increasing parking would potentially mean them accepting the arguments about car numbers.

Because of this, we would ask that our objections in this matter stand. The applicant has made no attempt to properly assess the impact of this development or its operation on residential amenity and neither have they offered sensible mitigations that might be controlled by condition. In addition, the applicant and their agent have been dismissive of local concerns throughout and we remain committed to the option of having any decision to grant planning permission reviewed by a barrister with a view to potential judicial review.

One thing I have been asked to request is the reasoning for not having public responses to the application visible online. Having checked with other local authorities this seems common practice (perhaps indeed best practice) and may be exacerbating the applicants claims to the Parish Council that he wasn't aware of their objections or that of local residents.

In conclusion, we would ask that this application is refused on the grounds that the applicant has had no material regard to the potential impact on residential amenity and has not properly attempted to assess these, speak directly to local residents or provide any kind of mitigation.

Regards

Lesley Cooper
Clerk

Sent from Millom without Parish Council

for more information go to:

www.millomwithoutparishcouncil.com