



Cartmel Conservation Area Management Plan Supplementary Planning Document Consultation Statement

March 2023

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?	6
	Who responded?	7
2.4	What did people say?	9
	Individual responses.....	9
	Summary Main Issues to March - April 2022 Consultation on February Draft CAMP SPD	9
	Summary Main Issues to November - December 2022 Consultation on November Revised Draft CAMP SPD	26
	Appendix 1: Consultee Bodies	33
	Appendix 2: Summary individual responses to first consultation, 3 March - 14 April 2022..	35
	Appendix 3: Feedback from drop in event.....	47
	Appendix 4: Summary individual responses to second consultation, 24 November - 22 December 2022.....	49

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. An updated draft CAMP was prepared and consulted on during November – December 2022 taking account of the feedback received on the early draft. This statement focuses on how we engaged and consulted communities and stakeholders during both consultations. It demonstrates how comments received were taken into account in the revised Draft CAMP November 2022 as well as the final version March 2023.

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;
 - Identify a list of 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;
 - Recommend the making of an Article 4 Direction so that express planning permission is required for works to buildings on the local list that would not ordinarily require an application for planning permission;
 - Provide a strategy for Buildings at Risk;
 - Identify threats to significance;
 - Identify opportunities for environmental enhancement and the need for grant-aid;
 - Make recommendations for future monitoring.

- 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/>

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.
- 2.1.2 This section sets out our approach to consultation and engagement in relation to the Draft CAMP SPD February 2022 and Updated Draft CAMP SPD November 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 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 from 3 March to 14 April 2022. A four week consultation on an updated Draft Cartmel CAMP SPD November 2022 was undertaken between 24 November and 22 December 2022. This section sets out how we engaged (methods chosen).

Engagement Method and 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 at <https://www.southlakeland.gov.uk/planning-and-building/conservation/>

Email/letter mail out

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.

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 March – April consultation. All property addresses proposed for Article 4 Order or Local List received a bespoke letter about both consultations.

Media

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.

Existing Channels and Networks

Full use has been made of existing channels of community representation. Allithwaite and Cartmel Parish ensured the March – April consultation was publicised through local channels such as the Parish newsletter.

Key Stakeholder Groups

Engagement with Cartmel Village Society and Allithwaite and Cartmel Parish Council has taken place in preparing the CAMP SPD.

Questionnaires/ Survey

An online survey using the Cumbria citizen space online portal has been used to enable responses to be received online.

Exhibitions, Leaflets and Posters

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.

Exhibition boards were displayed at the Drop in Event. 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

Meetings have been held on request and where resources allow (Village Society and Parish Council).

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.

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.

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

- 2.3.1 The responses during the March - April 2022 consultation received via the citizen space survey, letter, email and at the drop in event were as follows:
- 9 Citizen Space responses (online)
 - 15 responses by email
 - 2 Responses by letter
 - Responses at the **drop in events** (see Appendix 3)
- 2.3.2 Approximately 40 people attended the Drop in Event.
- 2.3.3 In total, there were 26 individual respondees (online, email and letter) who made a response to the consultation. Responses are available to view online at https://cumbria.citizenspace.com/south-lakeland-district-council/cartmel-conservation-area-management-plan/consultation/published_select_respondent
- 2.3.4 The responses during the November - December 2022 consultation received via the citizen space survey, letter and email were as follows:
- 6 Citizen Space responses (online)
 - 9 responses by email
 - 0 responses by letter
- 2.3.5 In total, there were 15 individual respondees (online, email and letter) who made a response to the consultation.

Who responded?

- 2.3.6 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.

Email / Letter

5 (first consultation) x 5 (second consultation)

Word of Mouth

2 (first consultation) x 0 (second consultation)

Social Media

1 (first consultation) x 1 (second consultation)

SLDC Website

0 (first consultation) x 0 (second consultation)

Drop In Event

Not an option on Citizen Space

Poster / Flyer

0 (first consultation) x 0 (second consultation)

Newspaper including local press

0 (first consultation) x 0 (second consultation)

South Lakeland News

0 (first consultation) x 0 (second consultation)

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 (first consultation) x 0 (second consultation)

Not answered

17 (first consultation) x 9 (second consultation)

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

Age range	Number	Percentage
17-25 years	0 (first consultation) x 0 (second consultation)	-
26-35 years	1 (first consultation) x 0 (second consultation)	4% (first consultation) x - (second consultation)
36-50 years	1 (first consultation) x 2 (second consultation)	4% (first consultation) x 13% (second consultation)
51-65 years	3 (first consultation) x 1 (second consultation)	12% (first consultation) x 7% (second consultation)
66-80 years	4 (first consultation) x 2 (second consultation)	15% (first consultation) x 13% (second consultation)
Over 80 years	0 (first consultation) x 1 (second consultation)	- (first consultation) x 7% (second consultation)
Not answered	17 (first consultation) x 9 (second consultation)	65% (first consultation) x 60% (second consultation)

2.3.8 Four (first consultation) and four (second consultation) people who responded identified as male, and five (first consultation) and two (second consultation) people who responded identified as female. One person who responded classified as having a disability (first and second consultation).

2.3.9 Type of respondees – Short Survey

- 10 (first consultation) x 5 (second consultation) Members of the Public
- 2 landowners both represented by an agent who made separate responses on their behalf (4 in total) (first consultation). 1 landowner represented by an agent (second consultation).
- 7 (first consultation) x 5 (second consultation) organisations
- 3 (first consultation) x 1 (second consultation) Business Interest Groups
- 1 (first consultation) x 2 (second consultation) Community/Interest Group
- 1 (first consultation) x 1 (second consultation) Local Authority/Parish

2.4 What did people say?

Individual responses

- 2.4.1 Appendix 2 provides a summary of individual responses received to the first Draft SPD Consultation through the Citizen Space survey, by email or letter. Appendix 3 provides evidence of comments made at the Drop in Event. Appendix 4 provides a summary of individual responses received to the second Draft SPD Consultation.

Summary Main Issues to March - April 2022 Consultation on February Draft CAMP SPD

- 2.4.2 The First Draft Cartmel CAMP received a varied reaction. Some respondents raised concerns about the accuracy of the document with respect to descriptions of properties, and 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 were supportive of the first Draft CAMP believing it will help protect and enhance the qualities of the Conservation Area. Some respondents 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

Issue

Tone of the proposals suggest the SPD will have more status than an SPD should.

SLDC Response

Noted.

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

Issue

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.

SLDC Response

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.

Issue

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.

SLDC response

It is now proposed to apply an Article 4 Direction to locally listed buildings only, identified through the CAMP.

Issue

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.

SLDC response

This is reflected in the revised proposals for the Article 4 Direction.

Issue

Local List - Paragraph 6.2.5 – Unreasonable for non-listed buildings to be treated in the same way as statutorily listed buildings.

SLDC response

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 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.

Issue

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.

SLDC response

This has been deleted.

Issue

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.

SLDC response

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.

Issue

Seems no criteria for the houses on the map - reasons to include based on architecture, age or building materials.

SLDC response

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.

Issue

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.

SLDC response

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.

Issue

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.

SLDC response

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.

Issue

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. Will owners of the listed properties be expected to pay higher energy bills as they cannot implement double glazing or replacement doors?

SLDC response

The amended CAMP provides 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. A range of options is available to owners of listed buildings and often retrofitting is extremely effective, and less costly than replacement windows or doors. Heat pumps may 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.

Issue

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.

SLDC response

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. 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. Commercial buildings in conservation area do not benefit from the same permitted development rights as householders, so any future Article 4 Direction would not apply to these.

Issue

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.

SLDC response

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.'

Issue

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.

SLDC response

There is a proposal in the Allithwaite and Cartmel Neighbourhood Plan to introduce a Principal Main Residence policy that would restrict the use of new dwellings as second homes. It is an issue being considered through the Local Plan Review with regard to whole South Lakeland Local Plan area. The CAMP recognises the potential impacts second homes can have on the character and infrastructure of the village.

Issue

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?

SLDC response

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/>

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.

Issue

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 determine planning applications prior to being in the public domain.

SLDC response

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.

Issue

Should be flexibility built in

SLDC response

Please could further detail be provided?

Issue

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.

SLDC response

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

Issue

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.

SLDC Response

Further opportunity for people to comment as part of November – December 2022 consultation

Issue

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.

SLDC response

Further opportunity for owners of properties to comment through November – December 2022 consultation.

Issue

Many mistakes – example page 22 Figures 14 and 15 are not Garth View they are North View.

SLDC response

Amended.

Issue

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.

SLDC response

Greenfield House has been removed from the local list candidates as this has replacement windows and does not meet the authenticity criterion.

Issue

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.

SLDC response

Ivy House has been removed from the local list candidates as this does not meet the authenticity criteria, the description and photograph for Brook House has been updated.

Issue

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.

SLDC response

Amended to state Tanley.

Issue

Wells House Farm & Lowdene, correct description as follows:

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 'I 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.'

SLDC response

Description has been amended to reflect comments.

Objections – justification specific properties Local Listing / Article 4 Direction

Issue

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:

- 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.

SLDC response

This building has been demolished.

Issue

Greenfield Lodge – Not suitable for inclusion for Article 4, makes a neutral contribution

SLDC response

Demolished.

Issue

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.

SLDC response

These buildings are no longer included in the proposed Article 4.

Issue

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.

SLDC response

This is no longer included in the proposed Article 4.

Issue

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

SLDC Response

Greenfield House is no longer proposed for inclusion on the local list as it does not meet the authenticity criteria.

Issue

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.

SLDC Response

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 context on the house, what is there at present and what would best preserve the special interest of the building and conservation area.

Evidence Base

Issue

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).

SLDC Response

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.

Issue

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.

SLDC Response

This building has been demolished and is no longer proposed for inclusion in the local list.

Issue

Is the information in the CAMP robust enough?

SLDC Response

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

Issue

Is there Council or successor resource to introduce an Article 4 Directive

SLDC Response

The CAMP recommends the introduction of an Article 4 Direction. This would need to be progressed by the Council, through a separate legal process.

Issue

Must return the plan for public consultation before adoption

SLDC Response

The CAMP is subject to a further consultation (November 2022) before adoption.

Issue

Lack of confidence plans will be implemented / enforced, reference to previous planning decisions

SLDC Response

Noted

Issue

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?

SLDC Response

Should the proposed Article 4 Direction be progressed, the resource implications will be assessed and considered as part of that separate legal process.

Issue

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.

SLDC Response

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.

Issue

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.

SLDC Response

Noted.

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

Issue

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 be developed without interpreting the key rural views from Priest Lane and Barngarth. No key views are identified from Aynsome Road.

SLDC Response

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.

Issue

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.

SLDC Response

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.

Parking / One-Way System

Issue

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.

SLDC Response

Noted.

Issue

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.

SLDC Response

Noted.

Issue

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.

SLDC Response

Noted.

Issue

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. 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.

The County Council will continue to work with stakeholders including the Parish Council on parking issues in the village.

SLDC Response

Noted.

Other Matters

Issue

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.

SLDC response

Noted.

Issue

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 footprint. Small-scale additions can be coped with but not large-scale estates (reference to call for sites put forward in Cartmel)

SLDC response

Noted.

Issue

Field in front of Greenfield House should not be developed is an important view of the village.

SLDC response

Noted.

Issue

Concerns about Haggs Lane housing allocation site, impact on infrastructure and services in the village. Sewerage network not adequate, development will cause flooding.

SLDC response

Noted.

Issue

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.

SLDC response

Noted.

Issue

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.

SLDC response

Noted - yes this is necessary.

Issue

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 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).

SLDC response

This has been added to the revised Cartmel CAMP.

Issue

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.

SLDC response

Noted.

Issue

Section 3.4.2 – Suggest reference is included to Historic England being a statutory consultee for scheduled monuments in respect of Cartmel Priory.

SLDC response

Thank you- Historic England is the determining body for applications for scheduled monument consent, this has been added.

Issue

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.

SLDC response

This has been amended.

Issue 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.

SLDC response

This has been added.

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

Issue

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.

SLDC response

This is included on the proposed list and is considered to warrant inclusion.

Issue

Why is **Field Beck** not included for Article 4?

SLDC response

Could further address details please be provided? This is not referenced in the CAMP.

Issue

Enamel Raleigh sign needs attention to prevent further deterioration

SLDC response

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.'

Issue

Consider **steps** down to river beside Anvil House.

SLDC response

Depending on exact location, these may form part of the listing. Could exact location please be provided?

Issue

Cobbled curtilages generally should not be sealed off and used for commercial purposes (cafes and pubs)

SLDC response

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.

Issue

Unlist the Racecourse grandstand.

SLDC response

This is no longer proposed for inclusion on the local list.

Support

Issue

Supportive of properties 31 and 32 1 and 2 Priory Court (owner)

SLDC response

Noted

Issue

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).

SLDC response

Noted

Issue

A few respondents supportive of the CAMP considering further controls are needed to prevent the future character of Cartmel. Its success dependent on enforcement.

SLDC response

Noted.

Issue

Cumbria County Council supportive of the proposed Local Listing of the Wheelhouse Bridge and Pepper Bridge, which are in CCC ownership.

SLDC response

Noted.

Summary Main Issues to November - December 2022 Consultation on November Revised Draft CAMP SPD

Proposed Article 4 Direction

The properties proposed for inclusion in the proposed Article 4 Direction were reviewed on site. It was considered that inclusion of many properties initially proposed would not help to preserve or enhance the significance of the Cartmel conservation area as they had already lost their original or historic architectural features, and it was considered that this would place an unnecessary burden on many property owners. As a result, approximately half of the properties were removed from the proposed Article 4 Direction leaving only the Local list candidates which had retained historic architectural features. Most respondents were supportive of the Article 4 Direction, with one respondent raising concern about inclusion of the two properties on Haggs Lane, Meeting House Cottages, but these have been assessed against the Council's adopted criteria for local listing and have been found to warrant inclusion. No responses were received from the owners of Meeting House Cottages.

Clarification has been provided in the CAMP that adoption of the CAMP will not result in the making of an Article 4 Direction, which would be subject to a separate legal consultation, should this approach be supported.

A map showing the potential candidates for inclusion in a future Article 4 Direction can be found at Appendix 5 of the CAMP.

Proposed Local List

The properties proposed for inclusion on the Council's Local list in the first draft of the CAMP were assessed against the adopted criteria on site in autumn 2022 following feedback from

the first consultation. It was found that many fell short of the Authenticity criteria, which requires each building to retain the majority of its architectural features to be included on the Local list. As a result the number of properties proposed for inclusion on the local list has been significantly reduced to only those that retain the majority of their original features. A map of the properties proposed for inclusion on the Local List can be found at Appendix 4, and justification for removal of the previous candidates at Appendix 3. The Council's adopted selection criteria is at Appendix 2 of the CAMP.

The implication of inclusion of a building on a local list has been explained in the revised CAMP.

Interpretation of the CAMP in relation to open spaces

One respondent stated land to the north of Priest Lane should not be designated as open space in the South Lakeland Local Plan Review, and requested clarification on open green space identified in the appraisal and CAMP as making a strong contribution to the significance of the conservation area. As a result the Townscape features map which identifies these areas in the Conservation area character appraisal is now included in the CAMP at Appendix 6. Two respondents supported land to the North of Priest Lane to be considered as important open space due to the contribution it makes to the conservation area.

Proposed Article 4 Direction

Issue

Article 4 should go out to consultation as it will go a long way to eliminating further damage to the fabric of the conservation area.

SLDC response

Noted.

Issue

Supportive of the principle of introducing Article 4 Direction and the properties that are listed.

SLDC response

Noted.

Issue

Support the principle of introducing an Article 4 Direction as set out in the draft CAMP.

SLDC response

Noted.

Issue

Any Article 4 Direction needs to be reasonably administered.

SLDC response

Any future Article 4 Direction would be subject to a separate legal consultation which would allow any concerns to be formally submitted for consideration. The number of properties proposed for Article 4 Direction inclusion has been reduced significantly to cover only those properties that strictly meet the criteria for local listing to avoid unnecessary burdens and cost on home owners.

Issue

The principle of retaining the wonderful features of the village is a fabulous idea.

SLDC response

Noted.

Issue

Some of the properties included in Haggs Lane are not of architectural significance and I'm unsure why those properties up to the Quaker church have been included. These are houses at the lower price range for Cartmel and I would be concerned about the financial pressure placed on these families regarding the future roof/window/ inability to use solar etc.

SLDC response

The properties Meeting House Cottages are identified as local list candidates due to the retention of their original features and contribution to the conservation area's special interest.

Local listing of a building would not result in property owners being unable to make changes. Any future Article 4 Direction, should this come forward, would restrict certain types of development that could be carried out without express planning permission, but this would be subject to a separate legal public consultation process.

Proposed Local list properties

Issue

Supportive of the recommendations regarding the proposed Local Listed Buildings.

SLDC response

Noted.

Issue

The process of listing must not result in the need to reinstate work that has been carried out prior to the listing.

SLDC response

The local listing of identified buildings will not result in the need to reinstate work but is intended to prevent future harmful removal of features and to encourage more sympathetic development.

Issue

Some of the properties included in Haggs Lane are not of architectural significance and I'm unsure why those properties up to the Quaker church have been included. These are houses at the lower price range for Cartmel and I would be concerned about the financial pressure placed on these families regarding the future roof/window/ inability to use solar etc.

SLDC response

The Meeting House cottages meet the criteria for local listing due to retention of original features. Local listing of a building would not result in any additional planning restrictions. Should an Article 4 Direction be introduced in future then this may restrict the work that can be done without express permission, but this would be subject to a separate legal process. Currently the inclusion of a building on the local list does not place any additional planning restrictions on properties.

Retention of historic features rather than replacement, where possible, is often the most financially beneficial choice and repair and addition of secondary glazing is usually very effective. Where windows/features are beyond repair the Council will work with property owners to find the most sympathetic approach.

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

Issue

Land to the north of Priest Lane should not be designated as open space in the South Lakeland Local Plan Review.

SLDC response

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. The decision whether to designate land as open space will be reviewed through future Local Plan Review.

Issue

In general agreement with the draft document.

In particular the need to preserve the open spaces identified in the report are essential if we are to preserve the special look and feel of the village.

The land to the north of Priest lane, bordering Aynsome road offers a unique view of both the Priory and the varied roof line of the many historic houses.

SLDC response

These comments are noted. For clarity, the CAMP is not intended to provide an assessment of suitability of land for open space designation – this will be considered through future Local Plan Review. 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. The decision whether to designate land as open space will be reviewed through future Local Plan Review.

Issue

The fields north of Priest Lane should be considered for open space designation since they significantly contribute towards the special character of the village and are important with respect to the conservation of the whole of the area. In addition they provide significant visual amenity to the existing residents. This is in line with Annex 2 of the National Planning Policy Framework. In addition, whilst these fields are not publicly accessible, any future access would be from an already busy and dangerous road (this is acknowledged by the speeding restrictions near the primary school).

SLDC response

Noted. As above, for clarity, the CAMP is not intended to provide an assessment of suitability of land for open space designation – this will be considered through future Local Plan Review.

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. The decision whether to designate land as open space will be reviewed through future Local Plan Review.

Issue

Reference has been added to the Townscape features map at paragraph 9.2.3 to define the importance of retaining views out of the conservation area across the fields to the north of Priest Lane. Consider with sensitive design the potential exists for housing to be developed in this location without interrupting these key rural views. This paragraph goes on to state that consideration could be given to the designation of the land to the north of Priest Lane as open space through the next Local Plan. Welcome the flexibility applied to this paragraph. However, wish to take this opportunity to reemphasise that land to the north of Priest Lane should not be designated as open space in the South Lakeland Local Plan Review for the reasons outlined in the previous letter [submitted in the last consultation].

SLDC response

It is not the purpose of the CAMP to define areas for potential designation as open space, which would form part of the next local plan review. However for greater clarity, in light of these comments, the Townscape features map is now included as an appendix (Appendix 6) in the CAMP, to help define the areas to the north of Priest Lane that are referenced in

the Cartmel conservation area character appraisal at paragraph 6.2.14, and in the CAMP at paragraphs 9.1.3, 9.2.2 and 9.2.3.

It is important to note that the appraisal states at paragraph 6.0.17 'Please also note that this character appraisal and its attached analysis maps should not be seen as a comprehensive audit of every single aspect of the conservation area'.

Other issues raised

Issue

Recommendations for inclusion of green infrastructure, biodiversity and landscape enhancement measures in the CAMP.

SLDC response

These recommendations have been added to the CAMP under General guidelines for new development.

Issue

The Highways Authority (Cumbria County Council) requests continued engagement in respect to the recommendations that impact on its areas of authority and interest including any proposals to introduce a one-way traffic system, in the redesign or reprioritisation of use of areas of public highway, or in relation to reviewing parking provision and regulation within the village.

SLDC response

Noted.

Issue

Reference was made to dark skies and lighting and lack of reference to heritage-friendly design and public realm perspective. No reference to glazing other than in relation to replacing existing heritage windows.

SLDC response

Noted. Reference to dark skies and paragraph 185 of the NPPF which describes the importance of dark skies, has been added under General guidelines for new development, at section 10 of the CAMP.

Reference to heritage-sympathetic lighting and a link to Historic England's lighting for historic buildings guidance has been added under section 10 of the CAMP.

Unsure what is meant by reference to glazing- clarification required in order to address this.

Issue

I hope that the village consider the impact of empty second homes and the pressure this places / increased social isolation and reduced community support to those who don't have any neighbours in whole streets as the properties are all vacant.

SLDC response

Although this impact falls outside the scope of the CAMP this concern has been noted.

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).
- 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).

Appendix 2: Summary individual responses to first consultation, 3 March - 14 April 2022

Name of respondent

Claire Shawbridge (resident)

Summary Feedback

Broadly agree with the document including proposals for Local Listing and Article 4 Direction.

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.

Name of respondent

Christopher Hill (Hales of Cartmel) – (Local Business)

Summary Feedback

Confused the Council sees fit to preserve the village but is happy to install yellow lines giving a negative appearance to the village.

Name of respondent

Jonathan Wood/ Richard Davis (landowner/property owner)

Summary Feedback

Objection to the Cartmel CAMP. 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. 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. Is there Council resource to introduce an Article 4 Directive? Greenfield Lodge is not suitable for inclusion for Article 4.

Due to the many inaccuracies in the Draft Plan it must return to public consultation before adoption to gain public approval.

Name of respondent

Steven Abbott Associates on behalf of Mr Wood and Mr Davis

Summary Feedback

Representing clients of owners of Greenfield Lodge. Significant concerns about the CAMP SPD.

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).

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.

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.

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.

Paragraph 4.5.12 – No justification for including buildings identified as ‘neutral’ in the Cartmel Conservation Character Appraisal for Article 4 Direction.

Paragraph 6.2.5 – Unreasonable for non-listed buildings to be treated in the same way as statutorily listed buildings.

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 should not be applied to neutral buildings.

Greenfield Lodge does not meet the criteria for Local Listing, reasons why:

- 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.

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.

Name of respondent

Beatrix English (Local Business)

Summary feedback

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.

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.

Name of respondent

Marilyn Frazer (local resident)

Summary feedback

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.

Seems no criteria for the houses on the map – reasons to include based on architecture, age or building materials.

Name of respondent

Mr and Mrs Frazer

Summary feedback

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.

Name of respondent

Cartmel Village Society

Summary feedback

Welcome the fact the draft Cartmel CAMP is nearing completion. Will give an additional layer of protection to the village and its built environment.

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.

Disappointed the Draft CAMP document prior to being submitted to Cabinet for approval was used as substantive evidence in the refusal of planning permission.

Does SLDC or its successor authority have the resources to develop Article 4 Order process?

Name of respondent

Charlotte Mitchell (Local Business Owner and resident)

Summary feedback

Not satisfied the survey only allows people to register an individual interest as either a resident or business owner and not both. Unsatisfactory.

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? Tone of draft proposals seems to imply that the SPD will carry more weight than SPD status should. Is the information in the CAMP robust enough?

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.

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.

Planning applications supported by the Parish Council and have neighbourhood support are rejected.

Will owners of the listed properties be expected to pay higher energy bills as they cannot implement double glazing or replacement doors?

Concerns about housing allocation sites, flooding and drainage issues in the village. United Utilities have declared the main sewer unfit. Site at Haggs Lane will have adverse effect in this respect. Infrastructure and amenities in the village must receive increased support and funding before new housing is built.

Name of respondent

David Huggett (local resident)

Summary feedback

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. Existing infrastructure roads, utilities, schools, shops will not cope with such development. Not enough job opportunities in the area, and these developments will increase traffic and carbon footprint. Small-scale additions can be coped with but not large scale estates.

Reservations how Local List Buildings were compiled. Many mistakes. Example, P22 – Figures 14 and 15 are not Garth View they are North View.

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.

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.

Concerns about how community views are taken into account in recent planning decisions.

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.

Name of respondent

Jude Rowley (local resident)

Summary feedback

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.

Name of respondent

Amanda Fogg

Summary feedback

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. Believe process is costly, and waste of Council resources

Name of respondent

Cumbria Police – Crime Prevention Officer

Summary feedback

No comments

Name of respondent

The Coal Authority

Summary feedback

No comments

Name of respondent

Environment Agency

Summary feedback

No comments

Name of respondent

Historic England

Summary feedback

SLDC should take account of Historic England Advice Note which should be read in conjunction with relevant Good Practice Advice and Advice Notes.

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.

Name of respondent

Holker Estates (landowner)

Summary feedback

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.

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.

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.

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.

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.

Name of respondent

Homes England

Summary feedback

No comments.

Name of respondent

Sarah Murray

Summary feedback

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 area between the village and Hampsfell would harm the open countryside setting.

Name of respondent

Simon Rogan (L’Enclume and Rogan & Co)

Summary feedback

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.

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.

Criticism around some of the descriptions of properties with inaccuracies which need correction.

Concerns about the Article 4 Directive and how this will impact L’Enclume and its associated buildings.

Once the plan has been corrected it is felt it will need to be subject to further consultation before adoption.

Name of respondent

Canal and River Trust

Summary feedback

No comments

Name of respondent

Natural England

Summary feedback

No comments

Name of repsondee

Mr White

Summary feedback

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.

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.

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.

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.

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?

Name of repsondee

Cartmel Methodist Church

Summary feedback

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.

Name of repsondee

Barton Willmore on behalf of Holker Estates Company Ltd

Summary feedback

Reference to Call for Sites – SHEELA Ref 346 land north of Priest Lane, SHEELA ref 345 Land to west of Pitt Farm.

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 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.

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.

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.

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.

Name of repsondee

Cumbria County Council

Summary feedback

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

Supportive of the proposed Local Listing of the Wheelhouse Bridge and Pepper Bridge, which are in CCC ownership.

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.

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. The County Council will continue to work with stakeholders including the Parish Council on parking issues in the village.

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 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).

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.

Section 3.4.2 – Suggest reference is included to Historic England being a statutory consultee for scheduled monuments in respect of Cartmel Priory.

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.

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.

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 'I 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.

Appendix 4: Summary individual responses to second consultation, 24 November - 22 December 2022

Name of respondent

Anthony Wrathall

Summary feedback

Documents appear relevant to other towns & villages with conservation areas in South Lakeland. The Kendal Civic Society is concerned about the status of conservation areas in the area. The current focus by SLDC on Cartmel is considered to be positive.

Name of respondent

Natural England (National team)

Summary feedback

Suggests inclusion of green infrastructure, biodiversity and landscape enhancement measures in the CAMP.

Name of respondent

Cumbria County Council

Summary feedback

The Highways Authority requests continued engagement in respect to the recommendations that impact on its areas of authority and interest including any proposals to introduce a one-way traffic system, in the redesign or reprioritisation of use of areas of public highway, or in relation to reviewing parking provision and regulation within the village.

Name of respondent

Cartmel Village Society

Summary feedback

The CVS welcomes the draft plan and supports the principle of a Conservation Area Management Plan without qualification. The CAMP is seen as an additional layer of protection for one of the county's finest villages both in visual and historical terms. It is important that the village's built heritage is protected and celebrated. The CVS thinks the plan enhances the village whilst at the same time ensuring that it can be a vibrant place in which to live and work and also visit.

The village, set in a unique rural landscape, and clustered around its historic medieval Priory is of immense significance. Those who live and work in the village

and those who have local authority responsibility for it have a duty of care regarding its present condition and its future.

It is vital that there is protection and defence given to the historic buildings, the setting for those buildings, the landscape that surrounds the village and the approaches to the village. There have been attempts in very recent times to damage the village and its approaches by speculative planning applications on the eastern, northern and southern edges of the settlement. The CVS expects a robust position from local planners on this and see the CAMP as a further instrument in maintaining that robust position.

The CVS accepts that a position of 'no change ever' is not possible but accepts CAMP's position on the need for any change to be sensitively done. The CVS welcomes recommendations on materials, colour palates and design. The reduced number of properties on the local list makes it much more manageable and less contentious and is welcome.

The CVS recommends a proactive approach from local planners with the adoption of CAMP, not just a passive approach that reacts when a new application is made but an active coalition of the local authority, the Parish Council, interested bodies such as CVS that has a strategy for:

- The championing of the needs of buildings or features of particular merit
- A strategy for buildings or features at risk
- A championing of the village and its environment
- A robust sense of significance of the area
- A proactive seeking of opportunity for improvement to the environment with a sub strategy on obtaining significant funding
- An approach to monitoring that develops best practice.
- CAMP has been long in the making. There needs now to be no delay in its adoption and strong implementation. The CVS would welcome too a declaration that funds will be found to make it strong, vigilant and proactive.

Name of responsee

David Crabtree

Summary feedback

It was interesting and somewhat disturbing to note the reasons why many of the properties originally included in the Property Listing were excluded due to replacement plastic windows.

The sooner approval is given for CAMP the better. Article 4 should go out to consultation as it will go a long way to eliminating further damage to the fabric of the conservation area.

Name of responsee

Ian Holcroft

Summary feedback

An excellent document and I am fully supportive of its content and recommendations. I am supportive of the recommendations regarding the proposed Local Listed Buildings. I am supportive of the principle of introducing Article 4 Direction and the properties that are listed.

Name of respondent

Friends of the Lake District

Summary feedback

Dark skies and lighting

We see nothing in the draft CAMP on lighting either from a Dark Skies or heritage-friendly design and public realm perspective. Similarly, we see no reference to glazing other than in relation to replacing existing heritage windows. We support the principle of introducing an Article 4 Direction as set out in the draft CAMP.

Name of respondent

Andrew Stow

Summary feedback

I am in general agreement with the draft document.

In particular, the need to preserve the open spaces identified in the report are essential if we are to preserve the special look and feel of the village.

The land to the north of Priest lane, bordering Aynsome road offers a unique view of both the Priory and the varied roofline of the many historic houses, which are identified as possible properties to be listed. The need to preserve and hopefully reinstate over time the historic look of the village should not impact on the practical need for Cartmel to continue to be a vibrant and living environment.

The process of listing must not result in the need to reinstate work that has been carried out prior to the listing. By practical example Knot house and Hartwell house were a single property originally and they have been split, rejoined and split again in the recent past. Any Article 4 Direction needs to be reasonably administered.

Name of respondent

Julie Colclough (Cartmel Surgery)

Summary feedback

Some of the properties included in Haggs Lane are not of architectural significance and I'm unsure why those properties up to the Quaker church have been included. These are houses at the lower price range for Cartmel and I would be concerned about the financial

pressure placed on these families regarding the future roof/window/ inability to use solar etc.

The principle of retaining the wonderful features of the village is a fabulous idea.

I hope that the village consider the impact of empty second homes and the pressure this places / increased social isolation and reduced community support to those who don't have any neighbours in whole streets as the properties are all vacant.

Name of repsondee

Peter Marks

Summary feedback

We approve of protecting the conservation of Cartmel village and agree that the draft CAMP will help to protect and enhance the qualities of the conservation area, however we do have the following concerns with regards to areas of land proposed for possible future development as set out in the February 2022 CAMP document.

6.5.1 and 6.5.2 The fields north of Priest Lane should be considered for open space designation since they significantly contribute towards the special character of the village and are important with respect to the conservation of the whole of the area. In addition they provide significant visual amenity to the existing residents. This is in line with Annex 2 of the National Planning Policy Framework. In addition, whilst these fields are not publicly accessible, any future access would be from an already busy and dangerous road (this is acknowledged by the speeding restrictions near the primary school). Furthermore, Section 6.1 of the Draft CCAMP, Paragraph 6.1.2 acknowledges that development on these areas would be harmful to the conservation area (as above in 6.5.1). In conclusion, we consider that any development on the land to the north of Priest Lane (SHELAA Ref. 345) would destroy key rural views and would not conserve these views for existing residents.

Name of repsondee

Barton Wilmore/Stantec on behalf of Holker Estates

Summary response

Our Client welcomes the proposed amendments made in response to our previous letter in relation to the removal of Greenfield House from the Local List and reference to views of Hampsfell.

We note that reference has been added to the Townscape features map at paragraph 9.2.3 to define the importance of retaining views out of the conservation area across the fields to the north of Priest Lane. As set out in our previous letter, we consider with sensitive design the potential exists for housing to be developed in this location without interrupting these key rural views. This paragraph goes on to state that consideration could be given to the designation of the land to the north of Priest Lane as open space through the next Local Plan. We welcome the flexibility applied to this paragraph. However, we

wish to take this opportunity to reemphasise that our Client's land to the north of Priest Lane should not be designated as open space in the South Lakeland Local Plan Review for the reasons outlined in our previous letter.

Name of respondent

Natural England Cumbria Area Team

Summary feedback

No specific comments on the proposals.

Name of respondent

Canal & River Trust

Summary feedback

Do not own or manage any waterways within the area covered by the Plan or that would be indirectly impacted by it and as such have no comments

Name of respondent

Historic England

Summary feedback

No further comments to make on the revised draft CAMP

Name of respondent

Coal Authority

Summary feedback

No comments to make.