

Eden Planning Committee 14.2.24

Report by Michael Hanley.

1. Demolition of brick garage and erection of replacement garage at Tirril. Main building is listed.

Reason: Applicant is a planning officer.

Size: 6x6x2.7 metres. There has been no objections.

L Baker (LB, LD): Asked about the pebble dashed wall (side wall).

Planning Officer (PO): The front will be stone-faced which will be an improvement.

Vote: unanimous in favour.

2. Modification of section 106 agreement regarding affordable housing.

Reason: Objection from the local parish council.

PO: This had been deferred from the previous meeting.

It has been thought that there might be financial help for the developer to deliver the original 30% of

the houses (7) as affordable ones. The developer had come to the committee requesting that he be excused from delivering the seven affordable. This request was refused at the previous planning committee meeting.

There are support grants available but these are not directed at private developers. They are for housing associations and community groups. So there is no opportunity for grant support.

Lenders wouldn't be willing to enter into lending the money. It is normal for the developer to make 18-20% profit.

This developer is willing to reduce his profit to 13% by offering 2 affordable houses (3 bed units) at 60% of the market value and also give the £72k educational contribution.

Speakers: For: D. Addis (DA, Planning Consultant): This development needs to be viable to get off the ground. The developer offered two houses at the last meeting. If the application is refused, we will enter into the appeals process.

N. LeSage (NL, developer): It was a knee jerk reaction to offer 2 affordable houses (at the last planning committee meeting). 3 would have been difficult. I am more obligated to my staff not to go to appeal. Kicking it to appeal....nobody wins.

T Wolfe (PC): Against: Discussed the original requirement to provide 30% affordable housing. The recent plan put housing as a main target. There is no case for the council to backtrack. The local population is set to increase by 16,000 people. We should be attracting young people to the area. The community is being offered a mess of pottage. To accept the offer would be shortsighted. The choice is either £72k for education or 7 affordable houses.

Debate:

M Hanley (MH, L): Queried the planning officer's recommendation (in the councillor's papers) to approve with the deletion of the requirement for 30% of dwellings to be affordable homes but to retain the requirement for education provision. This implies that we should approve without the inclusion of the two affordable houses that the developer continues to offer.

M Lynch (ML, Planning Development Manager): Agreed that this is confusing and should have included the two affordable houses in the recommendation.

G Simpkins (Chair, GS, LD): Agreed.

M Robinson (MR, I): Asked about the contribution to local education. Can this be stipulated that it goes to a school in Eden.

ML: Yes, it will go to whatever will be required.

I Blinkho (IB, solicitor): The educational provision should be spent in the vicinity.

MR: In the past it went anywhere in Cumbria..

IB: It is quite common to name the school where the money will be spent.

J Murray (JM, LD): I am stuck between a rock and a hard place. Thank you to all the officers. I will reluctantly support the proposal.

M Eyles: I agree. The developer is well within the rules. We have two affordable units. If we push we might end up with none. So this is the best compromise.

Vote: Unanimous in support.

3. 18 metre high wind turbine. Newby (near Penrith).

Reason: Departure from the Development Plan. It is outside the “Wind Energy Suitable Area” (in the north and east of Eden). The farmer who owns the property wants energy for his farm.

Speaker: For: Planning Consultant: It is getting increasingly difficult for farmers to make a profit. Energy costs continue to rise. Also there are concerns about climate change. The turbine is quiet. The farm will be more efficient. The turbine was relocated away from the bridleway (due to a previous objection).

Debate

L Baker (LB, LD): I noticed that there is a condition to inform when construction will start.

ME: It's to make aviation aware. It might affect low flying aircraft.

JM: How close is it to a right of way and what sort of protection will the public have?

PO: It's about 50 metres away (from the bridleway).

JM: Will there be a fence around it?

PO: No.

C Atkinson (CA, C): I have some reservations about large wind farms. Small turbines, carefully sited are okay.

N McCall (NMcC, LD): This is in my ward and the local parish council supported it. There aren't any walkers. It will not be intrusive.

Vote, Unanimous in support.

4. Proposed local village shop and hair salon. Newton Reigny.

Objection: Parish Council: Overspill from car park causing congestion and inconvenience.

PO: Shop: 14 square metres, hairdressers: 18 square metres. To be built in the car park of The Sun pub. This is located centrally in the village. It will have a minimal impact on the landscape and amenity. There will be a loss of a few car parking spaces.

Speaker: For: Lucy Tuer (LT): I own the Sun pub. This idea came about during the pandemic when I thought about supporting the local community. We buy the meat for the pub from local farmers. We also stock a wide range of local products. We make our own chutney, marmalade and gin. All of which will be on sale in the new shop. We are grateful to our local community for their ongoing support. We intend to offer employment in the shop. My sister will run the hair salon.

Debate:

NMcC: How many parking spaces will be lost?

LT: We have moved two trailers from the parking area to another site, so we have two more spaces. This will offset the number of lost spaces.

MR: Asked about the opening hours.

LT: Monday to Saturday, 9-5, starting with 9-1 and extending depending on business.

MR: It's strange you are not opening on Sundays. Life has changed since Covid, by restricting business you're pushing people more to on-line shopping.

PO: Those are the hours that were requested.

ML: The reason came from Highways (Department). If the pub is opened at the same time as the shop, there will be more congestion. On Sunday morning I don't think there would be many people in the pub.

IB: The public have not been consulted on this.

ML: The only impact would be traffic. We would have to manage the opening hours of both.

MR: Would this help you?

LT: Yes. If we could open the shop until 12 midday on a Sunday that would help.

MR: I would ask if that could be put into the recommendation: Sunday morning opening.

CA: I think we need to help this application as much as possible. Sunday morning opening would be very popular and I don't think it would impact on the parking. It would make the business more viable.

IB: This is not in the application.

MR: It's an amendment.

JM: Is that just for the shop.

MR: Yes.

ML: What about bank holidays?

MR: Bank holidays like Sundays, 08.00 to 17.00.

PO: 8.00 start on a Sunday would be better.

LT: Yes, that would help us.

Vote: Unanimous in favour.

End of meeting.