



Shaping our future



SOUTH LAKELAND LOCAL PLAN 2040

Cartmel Conservation Area Management Plan Supplementary Planning Document Interim Consultation Statement

November 2022



Contents

1.	Introduction.....	3
1.1	Purpose of this document	3
1.2	Cartmel CAMP	3
	Context.....	3
2.	Approach to consultation and engagement	4
2.1	Introduction	4
2.2	How did we engage? - Engagement Methods	4
2.3	How did people respond, and how many people responded?	7
	Who responded?	7
2.4	What did people say?	8
	Individual responses.....	8
	Summary Main Issues	8
	Appendix 1: Consultee Bodies	25
	Appendix 2: Summary Individual responses	28
	Appendix 3: Feedback from Drop In Event.....	44



1. Introduction

1.1 Purpose of this document

- 1.1.1 This consultation statement sets out how we have engaged with communities and stakeholders in the preparation of the Cartmel Conservation Area Management Plan Supplementary Planning Document (CAMP/SPD).
- 1.1.2 It sets out:
- Who we have engaged with;
 - How we have engaged;
 - A summary of the main issues raised;
- 1.1.3 A draft CAMP (February 2022) was prepared and consulted on during March – April 2022. This interim statement focuses on how we engaged and consulted communities and stakeholders during this consultation. It demonstrates how comments received have been taken into account in the revised Draft CAMP November 2022. This statement will be updated prior to finalising the CAMP for adoption (including evidence of how we have taken account of comments received from the November – December 2022 consultation).

1.2 Cartmel CAMP

Context

- 1.2.1 The purpose of the Management Plan is to help protect the special character of the Cartmel Conservation Area. The objectives of the Cartmel CAMP are to:
- Set out guidance to promote positive design change to protect of the special character (significance) of Cartmel conservation area
 - Produce a list of unlisted buildings or features of local architectural or historic significance that are of particular merit in the conservation area, so the significance of these buildings will become a material consideration in planning decisions that affect them
 - Consider whether an Article 4 Direction to control permitted development is justified, identifying properties that are considered to merit this additional protection, so that planning permission would be required for some works
 - Provide a strategy for Buildings at Risk
 - Identify threats to significance
 - Identify opportunities for environmental enhancement and the need for grant-aid
 - Identify how the condition of the Cartmel conservation area will be monitored in future



1.2.2 Information on the Cartmel CAMP can be found on the Council’s website at <https://www.southlakeland.gov.uk/planning-and-building/conservation/cartmel-conservation-area-management-plan-supplementary-planning-document/>

2. Approach to consultation and engagement

2.1 Introduction

2.1.1 The Council is committed to early and ongoing community and stakeholder engagement in the planning process. Our approach to community involvement in the planning process is set out in our [Statement of Community Involvement](#)¹.

2.1.2 This section sets out our approach to consultation and engagement in relation to the Draft CAMP SPD February 2022.

2.1.3 Community engagement in relation to planning is guided by national regulations and legislation including the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012. National regulations include basic requirements about who Councils should consult and how and when in the planning process they should do it.

2.1.4 Our approach to consultation and engagement in the Draft Cartmel CAMP February 2022 has been designed to comply with national regulations.

2.2 How did we engage? - Engagement Methods

2.2.1 A six-week consultation on a Draft Cartmel CAMP SPD February 2022 was undertaken between 3 March to 14 April 2022. This section sets out how we engaged (methods chosen).

Engagement Method	Summary
Consultation Documents for Inspection	This is a minimum requirement as set out in the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) 2012 Regulations. Relevant documents have been made available for inspection at South Lakeland House, Kendal, Kendal, Grange-over-Sands and Ulverston libraries. In addition to these inspection points, documents were made available for inspection at Cartmel Priory and Cartmel Village Hall during opening hours.
Website	Relevant documents have been made available on the South Lakeland District Council website. https://www.southlakeland.gov.uk/planning-and-

¹ <https://www.southlakeland.gov.uk/media/6116/sci-october-2018.pdf>



Engagement Method	Summary
	<p><u>building/conservation/cartmel-conservation-area-management-plan-supplementary-planning-document/</u></p>
Email/letter mail out	<p>We maintain a significant mailing list, comprising of statutory and general consultees and any members of the public or other stakeholders who have been asked to be notified of Local Plan consultations.</p> <p>Emails and letters have been sent to specific and general consultees as set out in Appendix 1. All postal addresses within and surrounding Cartmel village received a letter about the consultation. All property addresses proposed for Article 4 Order or Local List received a bespoke letter about the consultation.</p>
Media	<p>The Local Plan officers have worked closely with the Council's communications team to publicise consultation and engagement activities through press releases, press adverts, adverts in local publications (e.g. Grange Now, Parish Newsletter) and the Council's social media channels.</p>
Existing Channels and Networks	<p>Full use has been made of existing channels of community representation. Allithwaite and Cartmel Parish ensured the consultation was publicised through local channels such as the Parish newsletter.</p>
Key Stakeholder Groups	<p>Engagement with Cartmel Village Society and Allithwaite and Cartmel Parish Council has taken place in preparing the Draft CAMP SPD.</p>
Questionnaires/ Survey	<p>An online survey using the Cumbria citizen space online portal has been used to enable responses to be received online.</p>
Exhibitions, Leaflets and Posters	<p>Fliers/Posters were produced and these were distributed to the Parish Council to be displayed in public places in Cartmel Village. The Council placed posters of the fliers in libraries/inspection points.</p> <p>Exhibition boards were displayed at the Drop In Event.</p>



Engagement Method	Summary
	A summary document was also made available at the Drop In Event and at Inspection points/ Cartmel Village Hall and Cartmel Priory to be taken away.
Focus Groups (and other interactive meetings)	None.
Newsletters	No Council Newsletter
Meeting with Communities	<p>Meetings have been held on request and where resources allow (Village Society and Parish Council).</p> <p>A Drop in Event was held at Cartmel Village Hall from 2-6.30pm on Friday 25 March 2022. This was an open public event, enabling members of the public and others to view material and speak to Council officers about the Draft Plan. It enabled people to record their views about the Draft Plan – see Appendix 3.</p>
Schools and Colleges	The Council approached the local Primary School and secondary school – but due to circumstances was unable to engage directly with the Schools and its students.

Table 1: Summary of methods of engagement



2.3 How did people respond, and how many people responded?

2.3.1 The table below indicates the number of responses received via the citizen space survey, letter, email and at the drop in event.

9 Citizen Space responses (online)
15 responses by email
2 Responses by letter
Responses at the drop in events (see Appendix 3)

Table 2: Number of Draft CAMP Responses

2.3.6 Approximately 40 people attended the Drop in Event.

2.3.7 In total, there were 26 individual respondees (online, email and letter) who made a response to the consultation. Responses are available to view online [here](#).

Who responded?

2.3.8 This section of the report outlines the characteristics of who responded to the on-line survey (only 9 people responded). The analysis uses information received from the equalities monitoring questions.

2.3.9 The table below identifies how people found out about the consultation.

Method	Number
Email	5
Word of Mouth	2
Social Media	1
SLDC Website	0
Drop In Event	Not an option on Citizen Space
Poster / Flyer	0
Newspaper including local press	0
South Lakeland News	0
Parish Council /Town Council correspondence	Not an option on Citizen Space
Local magazine or other publication	Not an option on Citizen Space
Library	Not an option on Citizen Space
Other	1
Not answered	17

Table 3: How people found out about the consultation

2.3.10 The table below indicates the number of people who responded by age range.

Age range	Number	Percentage
17-25 years	0	-
26-35 years	1	4%
36-50 years	1	4%

Age range	Number	Percentage
51-65 years	3	12%
66-80 years	4	15%
Over 80 years	0	-
Not answered	17	65%

Table 4: Responses by age category

2.3.11 Four people who responded identified as male, and five people who responded identified as female. One person who responded classified as having a disability.

2.3.12 The table below indicates the types of respondees (where known).

Type of respondees – Short Survey
10 Members of the Public
2 landowners both represented by an agent who made separate responses on their behalf (4 in total)
7 organisations
3 Business Interest Groups
1 Community/Interest Group
1 Local Authority/Parish

Table 5: Types of Respondee

2.4 What did people say?

Individual responses

2.4.1 Appendix 2 provides a summary of individual responses received through the Citizen Space survey, by email or letter. Appendix 3 provides evidence of comments made at the Drop in the Event.

Summary Main Issues

2.4.2 The Draft Cartmel CAMP has received various reaction. Some respondents have raised concerns about the accuracy of the document with respect to descriptions of properties, and have questioned the justification for inclusion of properties suggested for Local Listing and/or Article 4 Direction, questioning both the principle and the evidence base used. Some respondents are supportive of the Draft CAMP believing it will help protect and enhance the qualities of the Conservation Area. Some respondents have asked for greater clarification for how elements of the CAMP should be applied and interpreted in decision-making. One or two people expressed views on areas of land for future development put forward through the Local Plan Review. Some respondents have raised wider concerns about the impact of new development in this regard. Other comments discuss existing issues regarding infrastructure (including flooding, traffic and limited social facilities) and the effects of second homes/holiday homes. A few comments relate to suggestions for addressing parking and traffic issues in the village. Suggestions for properties/features that require



additional protection have been put forward. The tables below provide a summary of main issues raised.

Status of the SPD

Main Issue	SLDC Response
Tone of the proposals suggest the SPD will have more status than an SPD should.	Noted

Principle/Justification for Local Listing / Article 4 Direction (General Comments)

Main Issue	SLDC Response
Article 4 Direction Orders – (paragraph 4.5), Not all works that affect the exterior of buildings are development. An article 4 Direction would not remove the right for homeowners to undertake works that are not development. Works must impact on the external appearance of the building as a whole to constitute development. Works such as replacing a single window or door may not constitute development and would not be prevented by any Article 4 Direction, and it could not remove the right for homeowners to undertake works, which are not development.	Development is in part defined as works that would materially affect the external appearance of the building. Therefore works such as replacing a window or door may constitute development if the replacement feature is not of a similar appearance to the existing. The Article 4 Direction is intended to restrict harmful development through removal of historic fenestration, to only those buildings identified for inclusion on the local list.
Article 4 Direction Orders - Paragraph 4.5.5 – No justification for some of the works proposed to be restricted by the Article 4 Direction. The photographs show examples of windows and doors, render, chimney stacks but no examples of the other things listed.	It is now proposed to apply an Article 4 Direction to locally listed buildings only, identified through the CAMP.
Article 4 Direction Orders - Paragraph 4.5.12 – No justification for including buildings identified as 'neutral' in the Cartmel Conservation Character Appraisal for Article 4 Direction.	This is reflected in the revised proposals for the Article 4 Direction.
Local List - Paragraph 6.2.5 – Unreasonable for non-listed buildings to be treated in the same way as statutorily listed buildings.	This has been deleted and clarified. The inclusion in the local list does not impose any additional planning restrictions, but inclusion on the local list would become a material planning consideration in decisions that affect its architectural or



Main Issue	SLDC Response
	historic significance. There is a proposal to introduce an article 4 Direction at a later date which would restrict the works that could be carried out without the need for express planning permission, but this is only a recommendation in the CAMP at present.
Local List - Paragraph 6.2.12 – unreasonable because it sets a presumption against the demolition or replacement of neutral buildings, which is not supported by local or national planning policy. Each case consider on own individual merits. Paragraph 203 of NPPF should not be applied to ‘neutral’ buildings.	This has been deleted.
Permitted development rights should not be withdrawn from any home unless shown to be of historic and notable architectural value, not just because of the location within the boundary plan.	This approach has been adjusted to ensure that only those buildings with outstanding historic and architectural interest are included in the proposed Article 4. These buildings are also proposed to be added to the local list.
Seems no criteria for the houses on the map – reasons to include based on architecture, age or building materials.	The buildings proposed for inclusion in the Article 4 has been reduced to include only buildings proposed for inclusion in the local list, to ensure the Article 4 Direction would only apply to those buildings with outstanding architectural and historic interest.
Article 4 will be difficult to introduce because of the damage done to many properties and features in the 8 years since the original survey undertaken.	Where works have taken place that have damaged character, these no longer warrant inclusion in an Article 4 Direction. It is now proposed to apply this only to the local list candidates.
Current climate change and drive for better insulation and draught proofing of windows as part of zero carbon footprints will be a dilemma, as methods available will not fit in with the architectural requirements of retaining features.	The amended CAMP provides some advice on energy efficiency and highlights the guidance provided by Historic England, which is designed to ensure there is no conflict between energy efficiency, reaching carbon net zero and retaining features.
How will properties be allowed to introduce green energy and efficiency measures, such as high levels of insulation, double or triple glazing, replacement doors, skylights,	The amended CAMP provides advice on energy efficiency and highlights the guidance provided by Historic England, which is designed to ensure there is no



Main Issue	SLDC Response
<p>external insulation and heat pumps. Will owners of the listed properties be expected to pay higher energy bills as they cannot implement double glazing or replacement doors.</p>	<p>conflict between energy efficiency, reaching carbon net zero and retaining features. A range of options are available to owners of listed buildings and often retrofitting is extremely effective, and less costly than replacement windows or doors. Heat pumps would require listed building consent but would not be unacceptable in principle, subject to detail and location. Where original or historic windows are in situ and repairable consent would not usually be granted for their replacement due to the harmful impact this would have on character. However secondary glazing is extremely effective, and often cheaper, than new windows.</p>
<p>There needs to be a fine balance between the protection of Locally Listed Buildings and the need for those commercial businesses operating tourism sites such as the Priory and Racecourse to be able to enhance and adapt to the ever-changing market demands of people visiting Cartmel. Being able to adapt and enhance visitor experience to Cartmel through existing and new commercial operations without restrictive lists blocking possible developments for local business, will be key to the long-term success of retaining this historic market town.</p>	<p>The inclusion of a commercial building on a local list does not put any additional planning burdens on businesses, but its significance will be a material planning consideration in proposals that affect the building.</p> <p>The introduction of an Article 4 Direction would restrict certain types of development meaning some works would require express planning permission, but this is only a proposal in the CAMP and would be subject to a separate public consultation and legal process.</p>
<p>Grey areas in the document, which require clarification particularly on rebuilding style, whether any new building should be in a pastiche style to complement the existing buildings or a modern style to avoid confusion with the protected buildings. Without clarification, much is left to interpretation.</p>	<p>This has been amended to clarify: 'Design approach should be based on the surrounding context and setting of each building, and be determined on a case-by-case basis.'</p>
<p>Strongly opposed to the Plan. Key issue in the village is the number of second homes. This destroys the local community and impacts negatively on social infrastructure. The draft plan does nothing to address this.</p>	<p>There is a proposal in the Allithwaite and Cartmel Neighbourhood Plan to introduce a Principle Main Residence policy that would restrict the use of new dwellings as second homes. It is an issue being considered</p>



Main Issue	SLDC Response
	<p>through the Local Plan Review with regard to whole S Lakeland Local Plan area. The CAMP recognises the potential impacts second homes can have on the character and infrastructure of the village.</p>
<p>Draft Plan excludes businesses, some have been allowed to destroy internal heritage and build inappropriate extensions even when listed, some have been allowed to remove render or painted in non-natural colours, cobbles have been removed outside properties and they have been allowed to extend over walkways including erecting barriers, furniture and A Boards. Businesses won't be affected by the proposals as many are holiday lets or registered businesses, please confirm if the case?</p>	<p>All proposals are assessed by the Council's conservation officer, to ensure that heritage impact is properly considered. Where unauthorised development is suspected, these will be investigated by the Council's enforcement team, where they are reported. Suspected unauthorised works can be reported via the planning enforcement complaint form https://www.southlakeland.gov.uk/planning-and-building/planning/planning-enforcement/report-a-breach-of-planning-rules/</p> <p>Unfortunately, the removal of cobbles may not be classed as development, but painting, which is permitted development, will be monitored and if this becomes a widespread issue an Article 4 could be considered to control this, on a wider area of the conservation area, which would be subject to a separate consultation. Removal of render may require planning permission, and can be reported and investigated through enforcement. Extending over walkways would usually require planning permission, as may erection of barriers. A-boards on pavements require planning permission. Buildings that are in commercial use in conservation areas do not benefit from the same permitted development rights as householders, so the works that can be done under permitted development are more restricted for commercial premises.</p>
<p>Concerns expressed regarding the CAMP and Article 4 Directive. The plan will restrict further growth plans that the business (L'Enclume) may have in the future in Cartmel. Plan has been very contentious, partly because it has been used to</p>	<p>The Article 4 would be subject to a separate consultation, but the works that can be carried out to commercial properties without express planning permission are already more restricted in a conservation area.</p>



Main Issue	SLDC Response
determine planning applications prior to being in the public domain.	
Should be flexibility built in	Please could further detail be provided?
Article 4 Direction is over bureaucratic and unnecessary if the planning department had sufficient resources to properly implement existing planning directives within the conservation area and could cite information in the local list.	Since the March- April 2022 draft CAMP consultation, the proposed Article 4 Direction, which is not adopted by the adoption of the CAMP, has been reduced to cover only those buildings with the highest architectural and historic interest that are not nationally designated through listing.

Inaccuracies – Descriptions of Properties

Main Issue	SLDC Response
Saddened to hear locals are unhappy with the descriptions of their properties in the document. Before adoption, it is vital to hear more from the locals it will affect and for them to hear more about the plans.	Further opportunity for people to comment as part of November – December 2022 consultation
Strongly advise that where an entry on an individual property is seriously out of date for any reason is inaccurate then the owner has the right to have the entry amended.	Further opportunity for owners of properties to comment through November – December 2022 consultation
Many mistakes – example page 22 Figures 14 and 15 are not Garth View they are North View	Amended.
Description of Greenfield House contains many errors. The render, which I presume, means wet or dry dash render has not been stripped from the front elevation as it never existed. Front elevation was originally slate hung, like the current east elevation; moulded gutters are no longer original. Low quadrant walls with timber railings – not so, they are made of hollow galvanised structural steel sections. The window shaped openings on the east gable are not bricked up windows as they contain original fireplaces behind and were presumably just for effect.	Greenfield House has been removed from the local list candidates as this has replacement windows and does not meet the authenticity criterion.
Do not disagree with the need for the principle of the local listing procedure, but object to	Ivy House has been removed from the local list candidates as this does not



Main Issue	SLDC Response
<p>owners being saddled with extra bureaucracy as a result of inaccurate descriptions at this initial stage. Descriptions for Ivy House, Brook House are out of date as an example.</p>	<p>meet the authenticity criteria, the description and photograph for Brook House has been updated.</p>
<p>Reference to Tanley House and Tanley Cottage, there is only one property not two known as 'Tanley'. Believe the property known more recently as Wayside Cottage was the original Tanley Cottage.</p>	<p>Amended to state Tanley.</p>
<p>Wells House Farm & Lowdene, correct description as follows:</p> <p><i>Former farmhouse, barn and rear shippon, now three independent dwellings and remains of central barn with Planning Consent for conversion into a fourth dwelling. Mid-18th century, original house altered 19th Century, Lowdene conversion 1965 and rear Shippon 2015. Datestone to Wells House inscribed '1 Wells 1752.' Datestone to barn 1827. House and barn on linear plan, with Wells House taller to south. Rubblestone walls, Cumbrian slate roof to barn ad Lowdene but with mixed slates to Wells House and rear. Projecting verges and gable end stacks to house. Central doorway to house with 6-pane timber sashes and lean to south gable. Barn retains large boarded doors with slate canopy. Lowdene mullioned openings with four pane intercepts with lean to conversion to north. Significant as a good example of an 18th century vernacular farmstead in Cartmel, remodelled in the 19th and 20th centuries. Prominent views across the paddock from the east on entry into the village.'</i></p>	<p>Description has been amended to reflect comments.</p>



Objections – justification specific properties Local Listing / Article 4 Direction

Issue	SLDC response
<p>Greenfield Lodge – no robust justification for Local List, it was previously highlighted in the Conservation Area Character Appraisal as a neutral building. Believe the property in its current state is detrimental. Very much extended and altered over time and little remains of the original building. Property does not meet the criteria to qualify for Local Listing for following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Trellis shown in the photograph is not original, appears to be a 20th century construction • No evidence that the windows are replacement of sashes. Photos taken in 1984 do not show sash windows • The property was never a lodge as it is not located at the end of a drive into a property • The property does not meet the criteria ‘authenticity’ for Local Listing, it has been substantially altered and much of the original fabric has been removed. The alterations cannot be described as ‘very modest in scale’, are not easily reversible and do not represent the highest architectural quality. • It does not meet architectural significance criteria; this is a moot point as it must meet the authenticity first before consideration for local listing. 	<p>This building has been demolished.</p>
<p>Greenfield Lodge – Not suitable for inclusion for Article 4, makes a neutral contribution</p>	<p>Demolished.</p>



Issue	SLDC response
<p>Query reference Windy Nook, is Pitt Cottage shown as part of Windy Nook included for Article 4 Direction? Do not believe it has architectural features to justify this.</p>	<p>These buildings are no longer included in the proposed Article 4.</p>
<p>Reference to 'Mereness', The Causeway – object to inclusion for Article 4 Order. Property is a converted bungalow in the 1950s and further conversion in the late 1980s into a two storey home. Property has no historic value. The neighbouring properties on the Causeway have</p>	<p>This is no longer included in the proposed Article 4.</p>
<p>The draft CAMP recommends Greenfield House to the north of the site should be listed. The description at Appendix 2 highlights many of the original features have been altered and no assessment has been undertaken to the rear of the property. Conclusions are not robust; therefore consider it should not be added to the local list.</p>	<p>Greenfield House is no longer proposed for inclusion on the local list as it does not meet the authenticity criteria.</p>
<p>Practical implications not thought through, what type of replacement windows/doors would be appropriate for the property given they are mix of Practical implications not thought through, what type of replacement windows/doors would be appropriate for the property given they are mix of styles, materials and age. Property (Tanley House/Tanley) also in view from all sides making it challenging to make any changes. Property (Tanley House/Tanley) also in view from all sides making it challenging to make any changes.</p>	<p>Should proposals come forward for alterations requiring planning permission, these would be assessed Should proposals come forward for alterations requiring planning permission, these would be assessed by the Council's conservation officer, and the style of doors/windows would be determined based on the contextby the Council's conservation officer, and the style of doors/windows would be determined based on the context of the house, what is there at present and what would best preserve the special interest of the building and conservation area.</p>



Evidence Base

Main Issue	SLDC Response
Paragraph 4.4.2 – reference is made to a 2019 survey. Further survey work appears to have been undertaken but it is not clear when this happened or which buildings were assessed, as details not made available. Limited details to provide explanation how individual buildings have been assessed (Appendix 2 – Local List).	The buildings proposed for inclusion on the local list were surveyed on site in 2015, 2019 and 2022, from the public right of way. This assessment was based on what could be seen from the public vantage point, and with reference to historic maps to help determine approximate ages.
Paragraph 4.4.3 – No references to the Greenland Archaeology Heritage Assessment, except in the reference lists. The description of Greenfield Lodge is contradicted by the findings of the Heritage Assessment.	This building has been demolished and is no longer proposed for inclusion in the local list.
Is the information in the CAMP robust enough?	The information in the CAMP was based on extensive assessment and has been reviewed by the Council and updated to reflect comments. It is considered robust.

Consultation / Resources/ Decision Making

Main Issue	SLDC Response
Is there Council or successor resource to introduce an Article 4 Directive	The CAMP recommends the introduction of an Article 4 Direction. This would need to be progressed by the Council, through a separate legal process.
Must return the plan for public consultation before adoption	The CAMP is subject to a further consultation (November 2022) before adoption.
Lack of confidence plans will be implemented / enforced, reference to previous planning decisions	Noted
Concerns around the current resourcing of SLDC Planning Department. Planning Decisions are frequently delayed beyond statutory periods. Conservation Officer has not been given time to do the job required. How will the additional time required for more detailed scrutiny of planning applications within the conservation area be funded? Is SLDC	Should the proposed Article 4 Direction be progressed, the resource implications will be assessed and considered as part of that separate legal process.



Main Issue	SLDC Response
<p>allocating more funding for additional staff and does it feel the current planning department is able to function adequately at present. Has SLDC calculated the additional workload and therefore cost that implementing the proposed changes will require. Can it justify either increasing the planning department's budget or putting greater workload on existing staff?</p>	
<p>Concerns about how community views are taken into account in recent planning decisions. Planning applications supported by the Parish Council and have neighbourhood support are rejected.</p>	<p>Planning applications are determined based on adopted local and national policy. Everyone has a right to comment on a planning application, and where the views are material planning considerations, they will be considered as part of the application process.</p>
<p>Little confidence in public consultation and planning decisions often seem subjective and arbitrary – one example the traffic control measures, yellow lines and designate parking spaces would happen as Holker Estates had committed to provide extra parking – this has not happened. Public consultation following the implementation of the traffic management plan was not good. Concerns raised about how opinions taken into account.</p>	<p>Noted</p>

Application / Interpretation of the CAMP (protected views, character)

Main Issues	SLDC Response
<p>Need clarity how paragraphs 6.1.2 and 6.5.1 should be interpreted and applied in decision making the areas of most importance should be precisely defined on a plan within the CAMP. Argue the eastern part of the site (SHEELA site 345 Land west of Pitt Farm) – the developable area which sits outside of Flood Zone 3 should not be identified as a protected area in the Draft CAMP. This part of the site is screened from the core of the conservation area and designated heritage assets by existing development. Consider the site can</p>	<p>The CAMP does not designate any additional open spaces or land, but recognises the value areas of land have in contributing to the significance of the conservation area. This site will be subject to a separate assessment as part of the Strategic Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment (SHELAA), and any proposals for the site that may come forward would be assessed as part of a separate planning application process.</p>

Main Issues	SLDC Response
<p>be developed without interpreting the key rural views from Priest Lane and Barngarth. No key views are identified from Aynsome Road.</p>	
<p>Paragraph 6.5.2 – refers to fields north of Priest Lane being important spaces in the conservation area but not identified as open space on the land allocations map. The land is not publicly accessible and has no sport or recreation function and should not be designated for such purpose.</p>	<p>The CAMP makes reference to the Cartmel Conservation Area Character Appraisal. It acknowledges these areas are not designated open space, but it is considered they could be considered for open space designation as part of future open space designation review. There are existing areas of land that have no public access function or sports or recreation function within the conservation area that are designated as amenity open space in the current adopted Local Plan on account of their important contribution to the visual and historical interests of the conservation area.</p>

Parking / One-Way System

Main Issue	SLDC Response
<p>Paragraph 5.2.4 / 5.2.5 – The Square would be more pleasant if traffic was limited such as a one-way system and less parking etc.</p>	<p>Noted</p>
<p>Paragraph 5.2.4 – The proposals for a one-way system through the village and out through the racecourse car park is an initiative that remains a long-term aspiration. The proposed route would have to allow for the highway's adoption of the existing Holker Estate owned track that leads out of the racecourse car park and over the River Ea. Costs of adopting this would need serious consideration by the County Council. Holker Estate supportive in principle of the proposed one-way system remaining a long-term initiative.</p>	<p>Noted</p>
<p>Holker Estates supports the need to consult further to assess parking availability. Holker Estate has applied and been granted planning permission to extend the existing village car park at the Racecourse.</p>	<p>Noted</p>



Main Issue	SLDC Response
<p>Section 5.2.4 – reference to aspirations for a one-way system. The County Council would be prepared to review and comment on any proposal for a one-way system. If evidenced that there is a viable scheme it would be necessary to implement Traffic Regulation Order(s) which would involve statutory consultation with stakeholders and the community. Any changes to the highway would need to be undertaken with highway specification materials.</p> <p>Noted that the draft Neighbourhood Plan proposed to include policies to support walking and cycling access to and within the village. In investigating further options in respect to traffic management in Cartmel, consideration should be given to the role that walking and cycling could play in supporting reductions in traffic levels in the village.</p> <p>The County Council will continue to work with stakeholders including the Parish Council on parking issues in the village.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>

Other Matters

Main Issue	SLDC response
<p>Current open spaces around the village vital to retaining the character of the village. Land to the east of Aynsome Road and part of Pitt Farm are important for views to Hampsfell, but were not included in the Local Plan. This area has been put forward through the Call for Sites for future development, it should be resisted, size and location will destroy the character of the village and its historic qualities.</p>	<p>Noted</p>
<p>Existing infrastructure roads, utilities (including sewerage), schools, shops will not cope with such development. Not enough job opportunities in the area, and these developments will increase traffic and carbon</p>	<p>Noted</p>



Main Issue	SLDC response
<p>footprint. Small-scale additions can be coped with but not large-scale estates (reference to call for sites put forward in Cartmel)</p>	
<p>Field in front of Greenfield House should not be developed is an important view of the village.</p>	Noted
<p>Concerns about Hags Lane housing allocation site, impact on infrastructure and services in the village. Sewerage network not adequate, development will cause flooding.</p>	Noted
<p>Section 7 must be considered in line with matters contained within Section 6. Development of the two housing allocations will be undertaken in a manner that respects the heritage qualities of the Conservation area and in respect to The Stables allocation also matters addressed in section 7.1.2 and 7.1.3.</p>	Noted
<p>Reference to the Allithwaite and Cartmel Neighbourhood Plan. Important that the SPD and Neighbourhood Plan are aligned where relevant to ensure consistency of policy approach.</p>	Noted – yes this is necessary
<p>Paragraph 6.5.3 – Beneficial for the draft SPD to be amended to clarify what is meant by “compatible with access” e.g. if it relates to compatibility of materials then the SPD could say “where it is considered to be a compatible material for use on the highway”. Where the County Council undertakes construction within the public highway and when construction as part of the new development is to be adopted by Cumbria County Council as public highway, the construction of the adopted areas needs to be consistent with the County Council’s highways standards and policies. It should be noted that generally the County Council will not use non-standard highway materials. Notwithstanding this, consideration can be given to different surface materials providing they meet the</p>	This has been added to the revised Cartmel CAMP.



Main Issue	SLDC response
<p>County Council highways standards and policies. If any ‘approved enhanced materials’ are agreed, consideration will also need to be given to a commuted sum being deposited to meet the future additional maintenance costs of any approved enhanced materials. Any use of non-standard materials / enhancement scheme affecting the public highway would need to be agreed in advance by the County Council and fully funded by a party other than the County Council (including the developer where the works relate to a development).</p>	
<p>Reference to use of Design Guides. In assessing development applications and delivering infrastructure schemes, the County Council will apply the provisions in the Cumbria Development Design Guide (2017). All development within the conservation area will adhere where relevant to the guidance set out within the Guide. Any ‘local’ Design Code needs to align with the County Council’s Design Guide where relevant and should not duplicate matters set out in the County Design Guide but rather should express the requirements at the local level. The County Council would discourage inappropriate tree planting within or near the highway as this might result in roots lifting the footway, damaging carrier drains and utility services, or blocking gullies and drains which will lead to flooding issues.</p>	<p>Noted</p>
<p>Section 3.4.2 – Suggest reference is included to Historic England being a statutory consultee for scheduled monuments in respect of Cartmel Priory</p>	<p>Noted Thank you- Historic England is the determining body for applications for</p>



Main Issue	SLDC response
	scheduled monument consent, this has been added.
Section 6.8.1 – With reference to the Cumbria Archaeology Service, please note that this service is called the Historic Environment Service and the SPD should be amended accordingly.	This has been amended.
Section 6.8.1 – Suggest an additional bullet point is included stating that early pre-application consultation should be undertaken with Historic England for any development that may affect the Cartmel Priory scheduled monument.	This has been added.

New suggestions for Local Listing / Article 4 – and more or less protection to features

Main Issue	SLDC Response
Wish for Cartmel Methodist Church to be added to the local list of buildings of architectural/historic interest. An excellent example of Gothic revival architecture.	This is included on the proposed list and is considered to warrant inclusion.
Why is Field Beck not included for Article 4	Could further address details please be provided? This is not referenced in the CAMP.
Enamel Raleigh? sign needs attention to prevent further deterioration	Added sentence 'A consultation response on the March - April 2022 draft CAMP highlighted that the Raleigh sign on the barn adjacent to Chestnut Cottage would benefit from maintenance.'
Consider steps down to river beside Anvil House	Depending on exact location, these may form part of the listing. Could exact location please be provided?



Main Issue	SLDC Response
<p>Cobbled curtilages generally should not be sealed off and used for commercial purposes (cafes and pubs)</p>	<p>Noted. Any development onto the public realm usually requires planning permission due to highway implications. Use of A-boards on public realm requires planning permission.</p>
<p>Unlist the Racecourse grandstand</p>	<p>This is no longer proposed for inclusion on the local list.</p>

Support

Main Issue	SLDC response
<p>Supportive of properties 31 and 32 1 and 2 Priory Court (owner)</p>	<p>Noted</p>
<p>Supportive of the intentions of the CAMP, welcome it setting out a positive strategy for historic environment. It will help ensure change within the conservation area is managed in a way that conserves and enhances its character and appearance. It could also prove useful in augmenting the evidence base for local and neighbourhood plans in relation to the historic environment (Historic England)</p>	<p>Noted</p>
<p>A few respondents supportive of the CAMP considering further controls are needed to prevent the future character of Cartmel. Its success dependent on enforcement.</p>	<p>Noted</p>
<p>Cumbria County Council supportive of the proposed Local Listing of the Wheelhouse Bridge and Pepper Bridge, which are in CCC ownership.</p>	<p>Noted</p>



Shaping our future



SOUTH LAKELAND **LOCAL PLAN** 2040

Appendix 1: Consultee Bodies

Specific Consultation Bodies

The Coal Authority.
 The Environment Agency.
 Historic England.
 Marine Management Organisation.
 Natural England.
 Network Rail.
 Highways England.
 Neighbouring planning authorities (Eden District, Lake District National Park, Barrow Borough, Lancaster City, Yorkshire Dales National Park, Copeland Borough, Cumbria County, Lancashire County and North Yorkshire County).
 Telecommunications organisations.
 Primary Care Trusts and Clinical Commissioning Group (Morecambe Bay Clinical Commissioning Group/NHS England).
 Electricity and Gas transmission and distribution bodies (Electricity Northwest, National Grid, Cadent).
 Sewerage and Water Undertakes (United Utilities).
 Homes England.

General Consultation Bodies

Voluntary Bodies active in the area for example Age UK South Lakeland, Cumbria CVS, The Birchall Trust, Cumbria Action for Sustainability, Action with Communities in Cumbria.

Representatives of interests of racial, ethnic or national groups in the area for example AWAZ, South Lakes Equality and Diversity Partnership, National Federation of Gypsy Liaison Group.

Representatives of different religious groups in the area example South Lakes Interfaith Forum, Buddhist Group of Kendal, Quaker Trust.

Representatives of interests of disabled persons in the area example Cumbria Deaf Association – South Lakes, Sight Advice South Lakes.

Representatives of people carrying on business in the area

Duty to Cooperate bodies

Environment Agency.
 Historic England.
 Natural England.
 Civil Aviation Authority.
 Homes England.



NHS Primary Care Trusts (Morecambe Bay Clinical Commissioning Group / NHS England).
Office of Rail and Road.
Integrated Transport Authority (Transport for the North).
Highway Authority (Cumbria County Council).
Marine Management Organisation.
Local Enterprise Partnership (Cumbria LEP).
Local Nature Partnership (Morecambe Bay and Cumbria LNPs).

Table X: Consultee Bodies



Shaping our future



SOUTH LAKELAND LOCAL PLAN 2040

Appendix 2: Summary Individual responses



Name of respondee	Summary Feedback
<p>Claire Shawbridge (resident)</p>	<p>Broadly agree with the document including proposals for Local Listing and Article 4 Direction.</p> <p>Paragraph 5.2.4 / 5.2.5 – The Square would be more pleasant if traffic was limited such as a one-way system and less parking etc.</p>
<p>Christopher Hill (Hales of Cartmel) – (Local Business)</p>	<p>Confused the Council sees fit to preserve the village but is happy to install yellow lines giving a negative appearance to the village.</p>
<p>Jonathan Wood/ Richard Davis (landowner/property owner)</p>	<p>Objection to the Cartmel CAMP.</p> <p>Believe there are inaccuracies in the CAMP, including specific reference to Greenfield Lodge which is currently the subject of a planning appeal. Should replace evidence with an Archaeology Report commissioned by Greenlane Archaeology.</p> <p>Object to the inclusion of Greenfield Lodge for Local Listing. It was previously highlighted in the Conservation Area Character Appraisal as a neutral building. Believe the property in its current state is detrimental. It has never been a lodge, very much extended and altered over time and little remains of the original building. Property does not meet the criteria to qualify for Local Listing.</p> <p>Is there Council resource to introduce an Article 4 Directive? Greenfield Lodge is not suitable for inclusion for Article 4.</p> <p>Due to the many inaccuracies in the Draft Plan it must return to public consultation before adoption to gain public approval.</p>





Name of respondee	Summary Feedback
<p>Steven Abbott Associates on behalf of Mr Wood and Mr Davis</p>	<p>Representing clients of owners of Greenfield Lodge. Significant concerns about the CAMP SPD.</p> <p>Paragraph 4.4.2 – reference is made to a 2019 survey. Further survey work appears to have been undertaken but it is not clear when this happened or which buildings were assessed, as details not made available. Limited details to provide explanation how individual buildings have been assessed (Appendix 2 – Local List).</p> <p>Paragraph 4.4.3 – No references to the Greenland Archaeology Heritage Assessment in the CAMP, except in the reference list. The description of Greenfield Lodge is contradicted by the findings of the Heritage Assessment.</p> <p>Paragraph 4.5 – Not all works which affect the exterior of buildings are development. An article 4 Direction would not remove the right for homeowners to undertake works which are not development.</p> <p>Paragraph 4.5.5 – No justification for some of the works proposed to be restricted by the Article 4 Direction. The photographs show examples of windows and doors, render, chimney stacks but no examples of the other things listed.</p> <p>Paragraph 4.5.12 – No justification for including buildings identified as ‘neutral’ in the Cartmel Conservation Character Appraisal for Article 4 Direction.</p> <p>Paragraph 6.2.5 – Unreasonable for non-listed buildings to be treated in the same way as statutorily listed buildings.</p> <p>Paragraph 6.2.12 – unreasonable because it sets a presumption against the demolition or replacement of neutral buildings which is not supported by local or national planning</p>



Name of respondee	Summary Feedback
	<p>policy. Each case consider on own individual merits. Paragraph 203 should not be applied to neutral buildings.</p> <p>Greenfield Lodge does not meet the criteria for Local Listing, reasons why:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Trellis shown in the photograph is not original, appears to be a 20th century construction • No evidence that the windows are replacement of sashes. Photos taken in 1984 do not show sash windows • The property was never a lodge as it is not located at the end of a drive into a property • The property does not meet the criteria 'authenticity' for Local Listing, it has been substantially altered and much of the original fabric has been removed. The alterations cannot be described as 'very modest in scale', are not easily reversible and do not represent the highest architectural quality. • It does not meet architectural significance criteria, this is a moot point as it must meet the authenticity first before consideration for local listing. <p>Article 4 – Works must impact on the external appearance of the building as a whole to constitute development. Works such as replacing a single window or door may not constitute development and would not be prevented by any Article 4 Direction, and it could not remove the right for homeowners to undertake works which are not development. No robust justification for Article 4 Direction – Greenfield Lodge makes a neutral contribution.</p>
Beatrix English (Local Business)	Saddened to hear locals are unhappy with the descriptions of their properties in the





Name of respondee	Summary Feedback
	<p>document. Before adoption, it is vital to hear more from the locals it will affect and for them to hear more about the plans.</p> <p>Only heard about the community engagement/consultation a day before it had happened, and appears many others were unaware. Need another consultation day to allow residents and local businesses to fully understand the proposed changes before the final document is written.</p>
Marilyn Frazer (local resident)	<p>Permitted development rights should not be withdrawn from any home unless shown to be of historic and notable architectural value, not just because of the location within the boundary plan.</p> <p>Seems no criteria for the houses on the map – reasons to include based on architecture, age or building materials.</p>
Mr and Mrs Frazer	<p>Reference to 'Mereness', The Causeway – object to inclusion for Article 4 Order. Property is a converted bungalow in the 1950s and further conversion in the late 1980s into a two storey home. Property has no historic value. The neighbouring properties on the Causeway have not been included for consideration which are of earlier date and of stone construction.</p>
Cartmel Village Society	<p>Welcome the fact the draft Cartmel CAMP is nearing completion. Will give an additional layer of protection to the village and its built environment.</p> <p>Strongly advise that where an entry on an individual property is seriously out of date for any reason is inaccurate then the owner has the right to have the entry amended.</p> <p>Disappointed the Draft CAMP document prior to being submitted to Cabinet for approval was used as substantive evidence in the refusal of planning permission.</p>





Name of respondee	Summary Feedback
	<p>Does SLDC or its successor authority have the resources to develop Article 4 Order process.</p>
<p>Charlotte Mitchell (Local Business Owner and resident)</p>	<p>Not satisfied the survey only allows people to register an individual interest as either a resident or business owner and not both. Unsatisfactory.</p> <p>Concerns around the current resourcing of SLDC Planning Department. Planning Decisions are frequently delayed beyond statutory periods. Conservation Officer has not been given time to do the job required. How will the additional time required for more detailed scrutiny of planning applications within the conservation area be funded? Is SLDC allocating more funding for additional staff and does it feel the current planning department is able to function adequately at present. Has SLDC calculated the additional workload and therefore cost that implementing the proposed changes will require. Can it justify either increasing the planning department's budget or putting greater workload on existing staff?</p> <p>Tone of draft proposals seems to imply that the SPD will carry more weight than SPD status should.</p> <p>Is the information in the CAMP robust enough?</p> <p>Article 4 Direction is over bureaucratic and unnecessary if the planning department had sufficient resources to properly implement existing planning directives within the conservation area and could cite information in the local list.</p> <p>Little confidence in public consultation and planning decisions often seem subjective and arbitrary – one example the traffic control measures, yellow lines and</p>





Name of respondee	Summary Feedback
	<p>designate parking spaces would happen as Holker Estates had committed to provide extra parking – this has not happened. Public consultation following the implementation of the traffic management plan was not good. Concerns raised about how opinions taken into account.</p> <p>Planning applications supported by the Parish Council and have neighbourhood support are rejected.</p> <p>Will owners of the listed properties be expected to pay higher energy bills as they cannot implement double glazing or replacement doors.</p> <p>Concerns about housing allocation sites, flooding and drainage issues in the village. United Utilities have declared the main sewer unfit. Site at Hags Lane will have adverse effect in this respect. Infrastructure and amenities in the village must received increased support and funding before new housing is built.</p>
David Huggett (local resident)	<p>Current open spaces around the village vital to retaining the character of the village. Land to the east of Aynsome Road and part of Pitt Farm are important for views to Hampsfell, but were not included in the Local Plan. This area has been put forward through the Call for Sites for future development, it should be resisted, size and location will destroy the character of the village and its historic qualities. Field in front of Greenfield House should not be developed is an important view of the village.</p> <p>Existing infrastructure roads, utilities, schools, shops will not cope with such development. Not enough job opportunities in the area, and these developments will</p>



Name of respondee	Summary Feedback
	<p>increase traffic and carbon footprint. Small-scale additions can be coped with but not large scale estates.</p> <p>Reservations how Local List Buildings were compiled. Many mistakes. Example, P22 – Figures 14 and 15 are not Garth View they are North View.</p> <p>Description of Greenfield House contains many errors. The render which I presume means wet or dry dash render has not been stripped from the front elevation as it never existed. Front elevation was originally slate hung, like the current east elevation; moulded gutters are no longer original. Low quadrant walls with timber railings – not so, they are made of hollow galvanised structural steel sections. The window shaped openings on the east gable are not bricked up windows as they contain original fireplaces behind and were presumably just for effect. Authenticity final criteria needs qualifying. Do not disagree with the need for the principle of the local listing procedure, but object to owners being saddled with extra bureaucracy as a result of inaccurate descriptions at this initial stage. Descriptions for Ivy House, Brook House are out of date as an example.</p> <p>Article 4 will be difficult to introduce because of the damage done to many properties an features in the 8 years since the original survey undertaken.</p> <p>Concerns about how community views are taken into account in recent planning decisions.</p> <p>Current climate change and drive for better insulation and draught proofing of windows as part of zero carbon footprints will be a dilemma as methods available will not fit in with the architectural requirements of retaining features.</p>



Name of respondee	Summary Feedback
Jude Rowley (local resident)	Draft CAMP is extensive, further controls are needed to prevent the future destruction of the character of Cartmel. Local List is necessary and extensive, no obvious omissions. 100% favour of introduction of an Article 4 Directive. Its success dependent on enforcement.
Amanda Fogg	<p>Query reference Windy Nook, is Pitt Cottage shown as part of Windy Nook included for Article 4 Direction Order?. Do not believe it has architectural features worthy of inclusion. Also query whether Windy Nook is worthy of inclusion.</p> <p>Believe process is costly, and waste of Council resources.</p>
Cumbria Police – Crime Prevention Officer	No comments
The Coal Authority	No comments
Environment Agency	No comments
Historic England	<p>SLDC should take account of Historic England Advice Note which should be read in conjunction with relevant Good Practice Advice and Advice Notes.</p> <p>Supportive of the intentions of the CAMP, welcome it setting out a positive strategy for historic environment. It will help ensure change within the conservation area is managed in a way that conserves and enhances its character and appearance. It could also prove useful in augmenting the evidence base for local and neighbourhood plans in relation to the historic environment.</p>
Holker Estates (landowner)	<p>Section 5 – Paragraph 5.2.3 – the implementation of the permit parking at Cartmel Racecourse has been a successful scheme. The take up on the scheme has been at capacity since its introduction and has been capped now at a total of sixty permits.</p> <p>Paragraph 5.2.4 – The proposals for a one-way system through the village and out through the racecourse car park is an initiative that remains a long-term</p>





Name of respondee	Summary Feedback
	<p>aspiration. The proposed route would have to allow for the highway's adoption of the existing Holker Estate owned track that leads out of the racecourse car park and over the River Ea. Costs of adopting this would need serious consideration by the County Council. Holker Estate supportive in principle of the proposed one-way system remaining a long-term initiative.</p> <p>Holker Estates supports the need to consult further to assess parking availability. Holker Estate has applied and been granted planning permission to extend the existing village car park at the Racecourse.</p> <p>Section 7 must be considered in line with matters contained within Section 6. Development of the two housing allocations will be undertaken in a manner that respects the heritage qualities of the Conservation area and in respect to The Stables allocation also matters addressed in section 7.1.2 and 7.1.3.</p> <p>There needs to be a fine balance between the protection of Locally Listed Buildings and the need for those commercial businesses operating tourism sites such as the Priory and Racecourse to be able to enhance and adapt to the ever changing market demands of people visiting Cartmel. Being able to adapt and enhance visitor experience to Cartmel through existing and new commercial operations without restrictive lists blocking possible developments for local business, will be key to the long-term success of retaining this historic market town.</p>
Homes England	No comments
Sarah Murray	Paragraph 6.1.4 last bullet point – suggest this is amended to read ‘.... Should not be permitted’.. rather than ‘should be discouraged’. Any building works in the





Name of respondee	Summary Feedback
Simon Rogan (L'Enclume and Rogan & Co)	<p>area between the village and Hampsfell would harm the open countryside setting.</p> <p>Concerns expressed regarding the CAMP and Article 4 Directive. The plan will restrict further growth plans that the business may have in the future in Cartmel. Plan has been very contentious, partly because it has been used to determine planning applications prior to being in the public domain.</p> <p>Grey areas in the document which require clarification particularly on rebuilding style, whether any new building should be in a pastiche style to complement the existing buildings or a modern style to avoid confusion with the protected buildings. Without clarification, much is left to interpretation.</p> <p>Criticism around some of the descriptions of properties with inaccuracies which need correction.</p> <p>Concerns about the Article 4 Directive and how this will impact L'Enclume and it's associated buildings.</p> <p>Once the plan has been corrected it is felt it will need to be subject to further consultation before adoption.</p>
Canal and River Trust	No comments
Natural England	No comments
Mr White	<p>Reference to Tanley House and Tanley Cottage, there is only one property not two known as 'Tanley'. Believe the property known more recently as Wayside Cottage was the original Tanley Cottage.</p> <p>Strongly opposed to the Plan. Key issue in the village is the number of second homes. This destroys the local community and impacts negatively on social infrastructure. The draft plan does nothing to address this.</p>



Name of respondee	Summary Feedback
	<p>Practical implications not thought through, what type of replacement windows/doors would be appropriate for the property given they are a mix of styles, materials and age. Property also in view from all sides making it challenging to make any changes.</p> <p>Draft Plan excludes businesses, some have been allowed to destroy internal heritage and build inappropriate extensions even when listed, some have been allowed to remove render or painted in non-natural colours, cobbles have been removed outside properties and they have been allowed to extend over walkways including erecting barriers, furniture and A Boards. Businesses won't be affected by the proposals as many are holiday lets or registered businesses, please confirm if the case.</p> <p>How will properties be allowed to introduce green energy and efficiency measures, such as high levels of insulation, double or triple glazing, replacement doors, skylights, external insulation and heat pumps.</p>
Cartmel Methodist Church	Wish for Cartmel Methodist Church to be added to the local list of buildings of architectural/historic interest. An excellent example of Gothic revival architecture.
Barton Willmore on behalf of Holker Estates Company Ltd	<p>Reference to Call for Sites – SHEELA Ref 346 land north of Priest Lane, SHEELA ref 345 Land to west of Pitt Farm.</p> <p>Site 346 adjoins east boundary of the Conservation Area. Reference to paragraph 6.1.4 last bullet point, Hampsfell forms the higher ground to the north of Cartmel, the topography of the land to the east of the village descends to the south and is hidden by development in the village core. As such, any new development in this location would unlikely affect views out of the conservation area towards Hampsfell. Moreover views to Hampsfell are not</p>





Name of respondee	Summary Feedback
	<p>identified as important vistas in the Cartmel Conservation Area Character Appraisal, and no further view analysis has been included in the Draft CAMP to suggest this view makes an important contribution towards the character of the conservation area. As such this requirement is unjustified and should be omitted.</p> <p>Site 345 – Need clarity how paragraphs 6.1.2 and 6.5.1. should be interpreted and applied in decision making, the areas of most importance should be precisely defined on a plan within the CAMP. Argue the eastern part of the site – the developable area which sits outside of Flood Zone 3 should not be identified as a protected area in the Draft CAMP. This part of the site is screened from the core of the conservation area and designated heritage assets by existing development. Consider the site can be developed without interpreting the key rural views from Priest Lane and Barngarth. No key views are identified from Aynsome Road.</p> <p>Paragraph 6.5.2 – refers to fields north of Priest Lane being important spaces in the conservation area but not identified as open space on the land allocations map. The land is not publicly accessible and has no sport or recreation function and should not be designated for such purpose.</p> <p>The draft CAMP recommends Greenfield House to the north of the site should be listed. The description at Appendix 2 highlights many of the original features have been altered and no assessment has been undertaken to the rear of the property. Conclusions are not robust, therefore consider it should not be added to the local list.</p>





Name of respondee	Summary Feedback
Cumbria County Council	<p>Reference to the Allithwaite and Cartmel Neighbourhood Plan. Important that the SPD and Neighbourhood Plan are aligned where relevant to ensure consistency of policy approach</p> <p>Supportive of the proposed Local Listing of the Wheelhouse Bridge and Pepper Bridge, which are in CCC ownership.</p> <p>Section 5.2.4 – reference to aspirations for a one-way system. The County Council would be prepared to review and comment on any proposal for a one-way system. If evidenced that there is a viable scheme it would be necessary to implement Traffic Regulation Order(s) which would involve statutory consultation with stakeholders and the community. Any changes to the highway would need to be undertaken with highway specification materials.</p> <p>Noted that the draft Neighbourhood Plan proposed to include policies to support walking and cycling access to and within the village. In investigating further options in respect to traffic management in Cartmel, consideration should be given to the role that walking and cycling could play in supporting reductions in traffic levels in the village.</p> <p>The County Council will continue to work with stakeholders including the Parish Council on parking issues in the village.</p> <p>Paragraph 6.5.3 – Beneficial for the draft SPD to be amended to clarify what is meant by “compatible with access” e.g. if it relates to compatibility of materials then the SPD could say “where it is considered to be a compatible material for use on the highway”.</p>





Name of respondee	Summary Feedback
	<p>Where the County Council undertakes construction within the public highway and when construction as part of the new development is to be adopted by Cumbria County Council as public highway, the construction of the adopted areas needs to be consistent with the County Council's highways standards and policies. It should be noted that generally the County Council will not use non-standard highway materials. Notwithstanding this, consideration can be given to different surface materials providing they meet the County Council highways standards and policies. If any 'approved enhanced materials' are agreed, consideration will also need to be given to a commuted sum being deposited to meet the future additional maintenance costs of any approved enhanced materials. Any use of non-standard materials / enhancement scheme affecting the public highway would need to be agreed in advance by the County Council and fully funded by a party other than the County Council (including the developer where the works relate to a development).</p> <p>Reference to use of Design Guides. In assessing development applications and delivering infrastructure schemes, the County Council will apply the provisions in the Cumbria Development Design Guide (2017). All development within the conservation area will adhere where relevant to the guidance set out within the Guide. Any 'local' Design Code needs to align with the County Council's Design Guide where relevant and should not duplicate matters set out in the County Design Guide but rather should express the</p>



Name of respondee	Summary Feedback
	<p>requirements at the local level. The County Council would discourage inappropriate tree planting within or near the highway as this might result in roots lifting the footway, damaging carrier drains and utility services, or blocking gullies and drains which will lead to flooding issues.</p> <p>Section 3.4.2 – Suggest reference is included to Historic England being a statutory consultee for scheduled monuments in respect of Cartmel Priory.</p> <p>Section 6.8.1 – With reference to the Cumbria Archaeology Service, please note that this service is called the Historic Environment Service and the SPD should be amended accordingly.</p> <p>Section 6.8.1 – Suggest an additional bullet point is included stating that early pre-application consultation should be undertaken with Historic England for any development that may affect the Cartmel Priory scheduled monument.</p>





Shaping our future



SOUTH LAKELAND **LOCAL PLAN** 2040

Appendix 3: Feedback from Drop In Event



A. Post-it notes comments from sounding board:

- Not sure if people have confidence in the implementation of CAMP when we don't feel listened to over existing planning issues;
- Possibilities for protection (if not already on one or other lists):-
 - The enamel Raleigh sign need attention to prevent further deterioration;
 - Steps down to river beside Anvil House;
 - Cobbled curtilages generally – some have not only been commandeered by café / pub tables but also enclosed & separated off from road (Devonshire Square).
- Re Housing Allocation Sites – Please, please, please can the existing infrastructure be improved PRIOR or AS A CONDITION OF approval – drains & sewers are obsolete;
- A map which shows both Local List/Article 4 proposals and listed buildings would have been useful so that we could see what features were covered in total;
- Other local issues more worthy of time, effort, money, resources (e.g. staff);
- I'd be very happy to see the racecourse grandstand unlisted!
- Perhaps the fundamental problems in the existing Planning Dept should be addressed first;
- Surely this will require either more staff or take up excess time of existing staff. Planning is already slow & unfit for purpose;
- I think that it is good that you're keeping the history and beautiful parts of this beautiful village, however this could [lead] in need of excess staff;
- There is too much gentrification of frontages – slate planters, etc. Slowly the natural historic look of odd corners of the village is being lost;
- Cartmel is too important to push issues of 'change' and to destroy historic aspects of the village. The infrastructure is too fragile and whilst there are many persons trying to help preserve these, the aim of some is to create a 'chocolate box village.' Try to be bold and uphold its heritage!

B. Owner contact details confirmed various properties

- Tanley / Tanley House
- Bridge Cottages
- St Mary's Lodge
- Croft House
- Laburnum Cottage
- Cobble Cottage
- Wells House Farm & Low Dene owner confirmed:



** 'Former farmhouse, barn and rear shippon, now three independent dwellings and remains of central barn with Planning Consent for conversion into a fourth dwelling. Mid-18th century, original house altered 19th Century, Lowdene conversion 1965 and rear Shippon 2015. Datestone to Wells House inscribed '1 Wells 1752.' Datestone to barn 1827. House and barn on linear plan, with Wells House taller to south. Rubblestone walls, Cumbrian slate roof to barn ad Lowdene but with mixed slates to Wells House and rear. Projecting verges and gable end stacks to house. Central doorway to house with 6-pane timber sashes and lean to south gable. Barn retains large boarded doors with slate canopy. Lowdene mullioned openings with four pane intercepts with lean to conversion to north. Significant as a good example of an 18th century vernacular farmstead in Cartmel, remodelled in the 19th and 20th centuries. Prominent views across the paddock from the east on entry into the village.'*

C. Other comments and map annotation:

- Why is Field Beck not included? Art 4
- Concerns raised:
 - Energy efficiency important to be able to have double-glazed windows; won't be able to do it;
 - Principle should have flexibility;
 - Get the planning system right first before adding bureaucracy.
- See also page 2 of scanned document entitled 'Scan of other comments' – this is an annotated map indicating properties in vicinity of Wells House Farm / shippon.