

CUMBERLAND COUNCIL DELEGATED PLANNING DECISION

1.	Reference No:	4/26/2193/PIP
2.	Proposed Development:	APPLICATION FOR PERMISSION IN PRINCIPLE FOR RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT
3.	Location:	BARF SYKE, BARFS ROAD, DISTINGTON
4.	Parish:	Distington
5.	Constraints:	ASC Adverts - ASC;Adverts, Flood Area - Flood Zone 2, Coal - Standing Advice - Data Subject To Change, Outer Consultation Zone - Cycliffe 3KM
6.	Publicity Representations & Policy	See Report.
7.	Report: Site and Location: The Application Site comprises the dwelling known as Barf Sike and part of the Barf Road Depot. The Site extends 0.39ha and comprises an existing dwelling and associated curtilage and a former garage building and curtilage. The Site is enclosed by a combination of timber fencing, timber post and wire fencing, concrete post and wire fencing and vegetation. The Site also includes manicured gardens, an area of scrub and various areas of hardstanding. A felled tree is located within the Site.	

The Site is located in an area identified as potentially contaminated land.

The Site is principally located in Flood Zone 1 with a small element to the west boundary being within Flood Zone 2.

Planning Application History

4/91/0037/0 – 17 Houses – Outline Approved

4/91/0626/0 - 20 Terraced houses and car parking – Approved

Proposal:

This application seeks permission in principle for the erection of up to 9no. dwellings.

An illustrative Schematic Proposal Site Plan has been prepared demonstrating how a development of 8no. dwellings could be accommodated on the Site. This does not form part of the formal planning application.

Consultee:	Nature of Response:
Parish Council	No consultation responses received.
Cumberland Council – Environmental Health	In reviewing this application, Environmental Health have primarily considered that the site sits within a larger envelope of land that is marked on Council GIS mapping as being potentially contaminated land as denoted by Part IIA Environmental Protection Act 1990. This is due to its industrial legacy as a former car sales / garage workshop. A brief walkover of the site showed occasional pieces of asbestos containing material (ACM), carbonised aggregate, evidence of fuel oil spillage, a disused septic tank and associated drainage, made ground of varying materials and a small pond of stagnant water in the north east corner of the site (historical OS maps show a former well and ditch on the site – the word ‘sike’ or ‘syke’ meaning a ditch or stream). The site is also bounded to the immediate north by the former railway and embankments of the Cleator & Whitehaven Jnc Railway and the Whitehaven, Cleator & Egremont Railway. The CL:AIRE Industry Profiles shows that potential pollutants could include organic compounds and persistent organic pollutants (POPs),



Cumberland Council

		inorganic chemicals, metals and semi metals, and per & polyfluoroalkyls (PFAS). It is noted that the end use of the application site is residential with gardens. Environmental Health would therefore not object in principle for this application to proceed but request that it be accompanied by a desk top phase one contaminated land study in order to (i) determine the extent, scale and nature of any contamination, (ii) assess the potential risks it may pose, and (iii) to appraise the remedial options and preferred option/s if necessary.
	Cumberland Council - Ecologist	Habitat Regulation Assessment – Site is located outside of the Zol for the SPA. Given the character of the Site and buildings present, there are no clear habitats or protected species that would likely prevent development. A Preliminary Ecology Appraisal and a Bat Survey will likely be required at Technical Details Consent stage. If the scrubby/ruderal area to the north of the Site is to be cleared, this will likely trigger the requirement for Reptile Surveys.
	Cumbria County Council – Highways and LLFA	Local Highway Authority Response The Local Highway Authority has reviewed the application for Permission in Principle for residential development. Having regard to the scale of development proposed and the matters to be considered at the Permission in Principle stage, the Highway Authority is satisfied that there is a reasonable prospect of achieving a safe and suitable means of access to the site for vehicles and pedestrians. Based on the information submitted (with the caveat that the indicative layout has not been relied on or assessed in any technical capacity), there is no evidence to indicate that the proposed development would result in 'unacceptable highway safety impacts' or that the 'residual cumulative impacts on the road network would be severe'. Detailed matters relating to access design, geometry, visibility, internal layout, parking provision, turning arrangements and any necessary highway mitigation can be fully assessed as part of a future Technical Details Consent application.

		Accordingly, the Local Highway Authority raises no objection in principle to the proposal. Lead Local Flood Authority Response The Lead Local Flood Authority has reviewed the application for Permission in Principle for residential development. Having regard to the matters to be considered at the Permission in Principle stage, the LLFA is satisfied that there is a reasonable prospect of delivering an appropriate surface water drainage strategy for the site. Based on the information available, there is no evidence to indicate that the site is subject to such significant flood risk constraints that residential development would be unacceptable in principle. Furthermore, there are no apparent constraints to suggest that surface water arising from the development, and any areas of surface water flood risk could not be appropriately managed or discharged through a suitable drainage solution to be determined at the subsequent Technical Details Consent stage. Detailed consideration of flood risk, surface water management, discharge rates, attenuation requirements, sustainable drainage measures, exceedance flows, maintenance arrangements and any necessary supporting evidence can be fully assessed through a future Technical Details Consent application. Accordingly, the LLFA is satisfied that there is a reasonable prospect of achieving an acceptable drainage strategy for the site and raises no objection in principle to the proposal.
	United Utilities	All options for the sustainable management of surface water must be thoroughly investigated before we will accept any surface water connections from new development to the public sewer. Where a new surface water connection to the public sewer is proposed, we will require robust evidence to demonstrate the drainage hierarchy has been fully investigated and there are no more sustainable options available for the management of surface water. Should the applicant receive Planning in Principle permission for this proposal, United Utilities will review the drainage element of any application for Technical Detail Consent in line with comments made above. In the event of us reviewing an application for Technical Detail Consent,

		it is likely we may request the following condition: CONDITION Prior to the commencement of development, details of a sustainable surface water drainage scheme and a foul water drainage scheme shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The drainage schemes must include: (i) An investigation of the hierarchy of drainage options in the National Standards for Sustainable Drainage Systems (or any subsequent amendment thereof). This investigation shall include evidence of an assessment of ground conditions and the potential for infiltration of surface water; (ii) A restricted rate of discharge of surface water agreed with the local planning authority (if it is agreed that infiltration is discounted by the investigations); (iii) Levels of the proposed drainage systems including proposed ground and finished floor levels in AOD; (iv) Incorporate mitigation measures to manage the risk of sewer surcharge where applicable; (v) Details of points of discharge for foul and surface water; and (vi) Foul and surface water shall drain on separate systems. The approved schemes shall be in accordance with the National Standards for Sustainable Drainage Systems (2025) or any subsequent replacement national standards. Prior to occupation of the proposed development, the drainage schemes shall be completed in accordance with the approved details and retained thereafter for the lifetime of the development. Reason: To promote sustainable development, secure proper drainage and to manage the risk of flooding and pollution.
	Environment Agency	Environment Agency position We have no objection to the Permission in Principle application but we wish to make the following comments: Contaminated Land The current or previous use(s) of the development site relating to garage / car repair suggest that the land may be affected by contamination. Land contamination can harm human health, soils, ecosystems, property,

		drinking waters supplies, groundwater and surface water. Land contamination is a material planning consideration. The planning decision should ensure that the site is suitable for its proposed use, considering any risks from contamination and any proposed land remediation. The planning application should therefore be supported by adequate site investigation information, prepared by a competent person. After remediation is carried out, as a minimum, the land should not be capable of being determined as contaminated land under Part IIA of the Environmental Protection Act 1990. This approach is supported by paragraph 196 of the National Planning Policy Framework. The current or previous use(s) of the site may present an unacceptable risk of contamination that could be mobilised during site works and construction, potentially leading to pollution of controlled waters. Controlled waters are particularly sensitive in this location because the proposed development site is located upon a secondary aquifer A. The proposed development will be acceptable, if a planning condition is included requiring the submission and validation of a detailed land contamination management strategy for unsuspected contamination during the enabling, construction and/or development works. By cleaning up land contamination, it will be helping to protect and improve the groundwater quality that supports existing drinking water supply, future supply of drinking water and other environmental uses. Without this condition we would object to the proposal in line with paragraph 187 of the National Planning Policy Framework because it cannot be guaranteed that the development will contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by remediating and mitigating despoiled, degraded, derelict, contaminated and unstable land, where appropriate or will not be put at unacceptable risk from, or be adversely affected by, unacceptable levels of water pollution. Condition If, during development, contamination not previously identified is found to be present at the site then no further development (unless otherwise agreed in writing with the LPA) shall be carried out until further investigation and a remediation strategy detailing how this contamination will be dealt with has been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the LPA. The remediation strategy shall be implemented as approved. Reason To ensure that the development does not contribute to, and is not put at unacceptable risk from or adversely affected by, unacceptable levels of water pollution from previously unidentified contamination sources at the
--	--	---

		development site. This is in line with paragraph 187 of the NPPF. Flood risk standing advice – advice to applicant / LPA Part of the proposed development site falls within Flood Zone 2, which is land defined in the planning practice guidance as being at risk of flooding. We have produced a series of standard comments for LPAs and planning applicants to refer to on ‘lower risk’ development proposals. These comments replace direct case-by-case consultation with us. Your proposed development falls within this category. These standard comments are known as Flood Risk Standing Advice (FRSA). They can be viewed at Flood risk assessments: applying for planning permission - GOV.UK. We recommend that you view our standing advice in full before submitting the required information as part of your planning application. The LPA will then determine whether flood risk has been considered in line with FRSA recommendations. Sequential test - advice to LPA What is the sequential test and does it apply to this application? In accordance with the NPPF (paragraphs 175-177 (inc. footnote 62)), development in flood risk areas should not be permitted if there are reasonably available alternative sites, appropriate for the proposed development, in areas with a lower risk of flooding. The sequential test establishes if this is the case. Development is in a flood risk area if it is in Flood Zone 2 or 3, or it is within Flood Zone 1 and your strategic flood risk assessment shows it to be at future flood risk or at risk from other sources of flooding such as surface water or groundwater. The only developments exempt from the sequential test in flood risk areas are: Householder developments such as residential extensions, conservatories or loft conversions • Small non-residential extensions with a footprint of less than 250sqm • Changes of use (except changes of use to a caravan, camping or chalet site, or to a mobile home or park home site) • Applications for development on sites allocated in the development plan through the sequential test and: the proposed
--	--	---

		development is consistent with the use for which the site was allocated; and there have been no significant changes to the known level of flood risk to the site, now or in the future, which would have affected the outcome of the test • Developments where no built development within the site boundary, including access or escape routes, land raising or other potentially vulnerable elements, would be located on an area that would be at risk of flooding from any source, now and in the future Avoiding flood risk through the sequential test is the most effective way of addressing flood risk because it places the least reliance on measures such as flood defences, flood warnings and property level resilience. Who undertakes the sequential test? It is for you, as the LPA, to determine an appropriate area of search and to decide whether the sequential test has been passed, with reference to the information you hold on land availability. You may also ask the applicant to identify any other 'reasonably available' sites which are on the open market and to check on the current status of identified sites to determine if they can be considered 'reasonably available'. Further guidance on the area of search can be found in paragraphs 027-030 of the planning practice guidance here. What is our role in the sequential test? We can advise on the relative flood risk between the proposed site and any alternative sites identified - although your strategic flood risk assessment should allow you to do this yourself in most cases. We won't advise on whether alternative sites are reasonably available or whether they would be suitable for the proposed development. We also won't advise on whether there are sustainable development objectives that mean steering the development to any alternative sites would be inappropriate. Further guidance on how to apply the sequential test to site specific applications can be found in the planning practice guidance here. Foul Drainage – advice to applicant The Building Regulations 2010 and Government Guidance contained within the PPG for Water Supply, Wastewater and Water Quality (paragraph 020 ID: 34-020-20140306) sets out a hierarchy of drainage options that must be considered and discounted in the following order: 1. Connection to the public sewer 2. Connection to a private sewer that drains to a public sewer 3. Package sewage treatment plant or septic tank 4. Cesspool
--	--	---

		Foul drainage should be connected to the main sewer whenever it is feasible to do so. Where this is not possible, under the Environmental Permitting (England and Wales) Regulations 2016 any discharge of sewage or trade effluent made to either surface water or groundwater will need to either comply with General Binding Rules for Small Sewage Discharges or comply with a permit issued by the Environment Agency, additional to any planning permission that may be required. This applies to any discharge to ground, inland freshwaters, coastal waters or relevant territorial waters. Further information about the permitting process can be found at Septic tanks and sewage treatment plants: what you need to do. Further advice is available at: Septic tanks and treatment plants: permits and general binding rules
	Neighbour Responses:	
	The application has been advertised by way of an application site notice and neighbour notification letters sent to neighbouring properties. One representation has been received in support and one representation has been received in objection. The issues raised comprise the following: The proposed development would be a welcome addition to Distington. Distington is a thriving community, but like many areas across West Cumbria, there is a growing need for more homes to meet local demand. Providing additional housing can help support young people and families wishing to remain within the village, enable existing residents to downsize while staying close to their community, and attract new residents who will contribute positively to local life. Sensitive and well-planned residential development is essential if villages such as Distington are to remain vibrant and sustainable. Additional homes can help support local businesses, schools, community groups and services by maintaining and increasing the local population. Granting Permission in Principle for this site would represent a positive investment in the future of Distington and would help address the ongoing need for housing within the area. The development is a terrible idea very detrimental to the community not only will it spoil the views of Distington, it will also destroy the wildlife of the field with the lost of habitat for rabbits, moles, frogs, toads and newts etc.	

The development will destroy the nature reserve that many of the villagers walk through and use to exercise their dogs.

This is a bad money grabbing pointless scheme.

Development Plan

On 1st April 2023, Copeland Borough Council ceased to exist and was replaced by Cumberland Council as part of the Local Government Reorganisation of Cumbria.

Cumberland Council inherited the local development plan documents of each of the sovereign Councils including Copeland Borough Council, which combine to form a Consolidated Planning Policy Framework for Cumberland.

The inherited local development plan documents continue to apply to the geographic area of their sovereign Councils only.

The Consolidated Planning Policy Framework for Cumberland comprises the Development Plan for Cumberland Council until replaced by a new Cumberland Local Plan.

Copeland Local Plan 2021 - 2039 (LP):

Cumberland Council continued the preparation of the LP as commenced by Copeland Borough Council.

The LP was adopted by Cumberland Council on the 5th of November 2024 replacing the Copeland Local Plan 2013-2028 and the saved policies of the Copeland Local Plan 2001-2016.

Strategic Policy DS1: Settlement Hierarchy

Strategic Policy DS2: Settlement Boundaries

Strategic Policy DS3: Planning Obligations

Policy DS4: Design and Development Standards

Strategic Policy DS6: Reducing Flood Risk

Strategic Policy H1: Improving the Housing Offer

Strategic Policy H2: Housing Requirement

Strategic Policy H3: Housing Delivery

Strategic Policy H4: Distribution of Housing

Policy H6: New Housing Development

Policy H7: Housing Density and Mix

Strategic Policy N1: Conserving and Enhancing Biodiversity and Geodiversity

Policy N5: Protection of Water Resources

Strategic Policy N10: Green Wedges



**Cumberland
Council**

Strategic Policy N12: Protected Open Spaces
Strategic Policy N13: Local Green Spaces
Strategic Policy N6: Landscape Protection
Strategic Policy N9: Green Infrastructure
Policy N14: Woodlands, Trees and Hedgerows
Strategic Policy CO2: Priority for improving transport networks within Copeland
Strategic Policy CO4: Sustainable Travel
Policy CO5: Transport Hierarchy
Policy CO7: Parking Standards

Other Material Planning Considerations

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).
Planning Practice Guidance (PPG).
National Design Guide (NDG).
The Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 (CHSR).
Cumbria Development Design Guide (CDDG).

Assessment:

The Application is seeking 'Permission in Principle' for the erection of 1-5 no. dwellings; therefore, the matters for consideration comprise the location, land use and amount of development only. Points of details, such as the layout of the dwellings and scale of dwellings etc. are to be considered at technical details consent stage if 'Permission in Principle' is approved.

Principle:

A five year housing land supply can be demonstrated in the former Copeland area of Cumberland Council and the housing delivery test has been passed.

Policy DS1 of the LP defines the settlement hierarchy for the Copeland area.

The Site is located within the settlement of Distington, which is defined as a Local Service Centre in Policy DS1

Policy DS2 of the LP defines the settlement boundaries for all settlements within the hierarchy and states that development within these boundaries will be supported in principle where it accords with the Development Plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

The Site is located within the settlement boundary for Distington as defined in Policy DS2 of the LP.

The Site is not allocated for residential development or for other purposes in the LP.

The principle of market led housing is supported subject to site specific matters.

A development of up to 9no. dwellings is of a scale that is appropriate to the Local Service Centre of Distington.

Settlement Character, Landscape Impact and Visual Impact:

The Site comprises an existing dwelling and associated curtilage and a former garage building and curtilage.

The Site previously accommodated a large number of vehicles etc. associated with the previous use; however, these have been removed and the appearance of the Site has been significantly improved.

The Site is located at the entrance to the settlement of Distington and is bounded by a range of commercial buildings and scrubby/ruderal land.

The existing dwelling comprises a moderately attractive modern dwelling that faces onto Barfs Road. The dwelling and garage building are not of heritage significance.

A scheme of up to 9no. dwellings could be accommodated on the Site of a scale and form that will respond positively to the characteristics and constraints of the Site and could deliver enhancement of the entrance to the settlement if well designed.

Given the location of the Site a development of up to 9no. dwellings will not result in adverse landscape and visual impacts.

Flood Risk and Drainage:

The Site is principally located in Flood Zone 1 with a small element to the west boundary being within Flood Zone 2. The Environment Agency's 2070s Upper End climate change scenario (2061–2125) does not identify an increased area of the Site being within Flood Zone 2.

The proposed comprises a more vulnerable use and is therefore a compatible use in Flood Zone 1.

The Site is not identified as being at risk from surface water flooding at present. The Environment Agency's 2070s Upper End climate change scenario (2061–2125) identifies the area of the Site in Flood Zone 2 being at risk from surface water flooding.

All built development, access arrangements and other vulnerable elements associated with a development of up to 9no. dwellings could be accommodated on the land within Flood Zone 1. Any development could be designed so that only elements such as public open space, biodiversity and amenity areas are in areas at risk of any source of current or future flooding.

In accordance with the NPPF, Planning Practice Guidance and Environment Agency Guidance, vulnerable elements of the development can be directed to the area of lowest flood risk within the Site and would not need to be accommodated within Flood Zone 2; therefore, the Sequential Test is not considered necessary.

Based on the information available, there is no evidence to indicate that the Site is subject to such significant flood risk constraints that residential development would be unacceptable in principle. Furthermore, there are no apparent constraints to suggest that surface water arising from the development, and any areas of surface water flood risk could not be appropriately managed or discharged through a suitable drainage solution to be determined at the subsequent Technical Details Consent stage.

Cumberland Council Lead Local Flood Authority have been consulted and confirm that having regard to the matters to be considered at the Permission in Principle stage, the LLFA is satisfied that there is a reasonable prospect of delivering an appropriate surface water drainage strategy for the Site.

The Environment Agency has raised no objections and confirmed that the standing advice is to be applied.

Ecology:

Habitat Regulation Assessment – Site is located outside of the Zone of Influence for the SPA.

The Site comprises an area of residential curtilage and a former yard area, which does not appear to be of high ecological interest. Trees have previously been removed from the Site.

The existing building is modern and in good condition with few potential bat roosting opportunities evident.

The development is unlikely to adversely impact upon protected or local important species.

Whilst a Preliminary Ecology Appraisal, a Bat Survey and potentially a Reptile Survey will be required at the Technical Details Consent stage, it is considered unlikely that these will prevent at development of up to 9no. dwellings.

Amenity:

Given the relationship to the existing surrounding development, it is considered that a development of up to 9no. dwelling could be accommodated without adverse impact upon the residential amenity of the surrounding dwellings through overlooking, loss of light, overshadowing and overbearing etc..

The Site is located adjacent to a range of existing commercial buildings, which have the potential to generate noise disturbance.

A dwelling is existing on the Site and large number of dwellings already exist within c.60m of the commercial buildings to the west

The impacts arising from noise and the detailed design measures necessary to secure acceptable living conditions, including site layout, building orientation, acoustic mitigation and construction specifications, can be considered at the Technical Details Consent stage. These will need to be tailored to the number of dwellings proposed. There is no evidence to demonstrate that satisfactory mitigation could not be achieved for a development of up to 9no. dwellings.

There is already an established residential receptor on the Site and within approximately 60m of the commercial use, demonstrating that residential occupation already co-exists with the commercial development; therefore, the proposed development would not reasonably represent an agent for change.

Highways:

Cumberland Council – Highways have been consulted and confirm that having regard to the scale of development proposed and the matters to be considered at the Permission in Principle stage, the Highway Authority is satisfied that there is a reasonable prospect of achieving a safe and suitable means of access to the site for vehicles and pedestrians. Based on the information submitted (with the caveat that the indicative layout has not been relied on or assessed in any technical capacity), there is no evidence to indicate that the proposed development would result in 'unacceptable highway safety impacts' or that the 'residual cumulative impacts on the road network would be severe'.

Ground Conditions

The Site sits within a larger envelope of land that is marked on Council GIS mapping as being potentially contaminated land as denoted by Part IIA Environmental Protection Act 1990. This is due to its industrial legacy as a former car sales / garage workshop.

Environmental Health have completed a brief walkover of the Site, which showed occasional pieces of asbestos containing material (ACM), carbonised aggregate, evidence of fuel oil spillage, a disused septic tank and associated drainage, made ground of varying materials and a small pond of stagnant water in the north east corner. Historical OS maps show a former well and ditch on the site – the word 'sike' or 'syke' meaning a ditch or stream. The Site is also bounded to the immediate north by the former railway and embankments of the Cleator & Whitehaven Jnc Railway and the Whitehaven, Cleator & Egremont Railway.

The CL:AIRE Industry Profiles shows that potential pollutants could include organic compounds and persistent organic pollutants (POPs), inorganic chemicals, metals and semi metals, and per and polyfluoroalkyls (PFAS). The end use of the Site is residential with gardens.

Environmental Health have not objected in principle for this application to proceed but request that it be accompanied by a desk top phase one contaminated land study in order to (i) determine the extent, scale and nature of any contamination, (ii) assess the potential risks it may pose, and (iii) to appraise the remedial options and preferred option/s if necessary.

Environmental Health have confirmed that Site can be remediated to a standard that would allow the proposed use.

The Environment Agency have confirmed that the proposed development will be acceptable, if a planning condition is included requiring the submission and validation of a detailed land contamination management strategy for unsuspected contamination during the enabling, construction and/or development works. By cleaning up land contamination, it will be helping to protect and improve the groundwater quality that supports existing drinking water supply, future supply of drinking water and other environmental uses.

It is confirmed that without this condition they would object to the proposal in line with paragraph 187 of the National Planning Policy Framework because it cannot be guaranteed that the development will contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by remediating and mitigating despoiled, degraded, derelict, contaminated and unstable land, where appropriate or will not be put at unacceptable risk from, or be adversely affected by, unacceptable levels of water pollution.

Permission in Principle does not permit the imposition of planning conditions, with such matters required to be considered at Technical Details Consent stage.

Given the position of Environmental Health and the Environment Agency being that the Site can be remediated and that assessment details and a remediation scheme can be controlled via planning condition, it is considered that ground conditions will not prevent development for residential development and can be adequately controlled at Technical Details Consent stage.

The Planning Balance;

The application seeks Permission in Principle for the erection of up to 9 dwellings on a previously developed Site located within the defined settlement boundary of Distington, a Local Service Centre. The principle of residential development within the settlement boundary is supported and the proposal would contribute towards the delivery of additional housing within a sustainable location with access to existing services, facilities and public transport opportunities.

The Site occupies a prominent but previously developed location which currently comprises an existing dwelling, former garage premises and associated hardstanding. Subject to good design, there is potential for redevelopment to enhance the appearance of the Site and the entrance to the settlement. The proposal would make effective use of previously developed

	land and would provide social and economic benefits through the delivery of additional housing and associated investment. In assessing the matters relevant to Permission in Principle, no technical consultee has raised an objection to the proposed residential use of the Site. The Highway Authority and Lead Local Flood Authority are satisfied that there is a reasonable prospect of achieving acceptable access and drainage arrangements at the Technical Details Consent stage. The Ecologist has advised that whilst further ecological surveys will be required, there is no evidence to suggest that ecological constraints would prevent development in principle. Similarly, whilst the Site is affected by potential contamination arising from its historic use, both Environmental Health and the Environment Agency confirm that the matter is capable of investigation and remediation and does not preclude residential development of the Site in principle. The concerns raised through third-party representations relating to impacts on wildlife, views and the wider character of the area have been carefully considered. However, the Site does not comprise designated open space, a nature reserve or protected habitat and there is insufficient evidence to conclude that development of up to 9 dwellings would result in unacceptable ecological, landscape or visual harm. Matters relating to layout, appearance, landscaping, biodiversity enhancement and mitigation measures would be considered in detail through any subsequent Technical Details Consent application. Overall, having regard to the Development Plan, the NPPF and all material considerations, it is concluded that the benefits of redeveloping this sustainable and previously developed site for up to 9 dwellings outweigh any identified harms. The proposal is acceptable in principle and accords with the spatial strategy and housing policies of the Copeland Local Plan 2021-2039. Planning Balance therefore weighs in favour of granting Permission in Principle.	
8.	Recommendation: Approve	
9.	Condition(s): N/A	
Case Officer: Chris Harrison		Date : 31.07.2026
Authorising Officer: N.J. Hayhurst		Date : 06.08.2026
Dedicated responses to:-		