

contact

From: contact
Sent: 02 June 2026 14:22
To: Demi Crawford
Cc: Nick Hayhurst; Development Control
Subject: Re: 4/26/2115/0F1 - 20 LINGMELL CRESCENT, SEASCALE

Hi Demi,

Thanks for your email.

I note your position regarding Policy N12.

However, I remain concerned that the recommendation appears to place significant weight upon the site's perceived value as open space despite your acknowledgement that the land is not identified or protected within the Development Plan.

Whilst Strategic Policy N12 can apply to undesignated open spaces where there is evidence of community value, I am not aware of any objective evidence before the Council demonstrating that this particular parcel of land performs such a function or holds such value. The application site is privately owned land and is not designated as public open space, a play area, allotment, Local Green Space or other protected recreational asset.

Furthermore, the proposal has attracted substantial support from local residents, together with support from the Parish Council and the local Ward Councillor. These representations indicate that the development is viewed positively by a significant section of the local community and would deliver benefits through the provision of an additional family home within the village.

In my view, the recommendation gives insufficient weight to these material considerations and to the fact that the site is not protected by any specific allocation or designation within the Development Plan.

I am also somewhat disappointed that, notwithstanding the positive and proactive approach to decision making advocated by the NPPF, the Council has concluded that no amendment could render the proposal acceptable. Given the modest scale of the development and the absence of any specific open space designation affecting the site, I remain of the view that there was scope for further discussion regarding potential amendments before reaching such a conclusion.

Given the above, my client does not intend to withdraw the application and respectfully requests that it be determined by Members of the Planning Committee should officers remain minded to recommend refusal.

Best regards

David

From: Demi Crawford <Demi.Crawford@Cumberland.gov.uk>
Sent: 02 June 2026 08:55:24
To: contact

Cc: Nick Hayhurst; Development Control

Subject: RE: 4/26/2115/0F1 - 20 LINGMELL CRESCENT, SEASCALE

Hi David,

Thanks for your email – your comments were noted, however, given the site and the relevant policies, I do not feel that a design revision would achieve a scheme that is acceptable, so will be determining the application based on the information you have already submitted.

I appreciate that this particular area of open green space is not protected, however, Strategic Policy N12 of the Copeland Local Plan does also state that proposals to develop other open spaces (including play areas and allotments) that are not identified on the proposals map should also comply with this policy where there is evidence that they are of value to the community.

On this basis, my previous advice still stands, and I will be recommending the application for refusal.

If your client wishes to withdraw the application, can you please let either myself, Nick or Oli from Development Control know before 3pm today, otherwise he will issue you the decision.

Kind regards,

Demi Crawford

Planning Officer | Development Management

Thriving Places | Place, Sustainable Growth and Transport | Cumberland Council

The Market Hall | Market Place | Whitehaven | CA28 7JG

T: 01946 598413

cumberland.gov.uk



Please note that the advice in this email is given in good faith on the basis of the information available at the present time. The advice may be subject to revision following further examination or consultation, or where additional information comes to light, and is therefore not binding on any future recommendation which may be made to the Council or any formal decision by the Council.

From: contact <contact@wlandp.co.uk>

Sent: 27 May 2026 17:34

To: Demi Crawford <Demi.Crawford@copeland.gov.uk>

Cc: Nick Hayhurst <Nick.Hayhurst@copeland.gov.uk>; Cllr. David Moore <David.Moore@cumberland.gov.uk>; Martin Rigg <martin.rigg.201@gmail.com>

Subject: RE: 4/26/2115/0F1 - 20 LINGMELL CRESCENT, SEASCALE

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

Hi Demi,

Thank you for your email and for the time you have taken to consider the application.

Having reviewed your comments, I respectfully disagree with the conclusion that the proposal conflicts with Policy DS4 of the Copeland Local Plan and Section 12 of the NPPF.

Whilst I acknowledge that parts of Seascale are characterised by open-plan frontages and areas of open space, the application site is not designated as protected open space and there is no specific planning policy which prevents its development. In my view, the proposal represents an appropriate and proportionate form of development within the settlement boundary which would not result in unacceptable harm to residential amenity, highway safety, landscaping, or the wider functioning of the estate.

Policy DS4 seeks high quality development that responds positively to local character and maintains high levels of amenity. It does not require the existing character of an area to remain unchanged, nor does it prohibit development on land which contributes to the visual openness of an estate. The policy also seeks the effective use of land whilst maintaining amenity standards.

I note that the concerns raised are principally related to the perceived impact on the open-plan nature of the estate and the potential precedent that may be set. However, planning applications must be determined on their own merits and the possibility of future applications is not, in itself, evidence of planning harm arising from the current proposal.

Furthermore, whilst reference is made to the character of the area, the proposal would retain substantial areas of open space within the estate and would not fundamentally alter the overall character of Seascale. The development would be viewed within the context of an established residential area where there is already variation in plot sizes, layouts and boundary treatments.

I would also ask that significant weight be afforded to the strong level of local support that has been expressed for the proposal. The application is supported by local residents, Seascale Parish Council and the local Ward Councillor. Whilst public support is not determinative, it is a material consideration and demonstrates that those most familiar with the area do not consider the proposal to be harmful to the character of the village or the amenity of local residents. For clarity I have copied the local Ward Councillor in too.

In my view, the proposal accords with the overall objectives of Policy DS4 and the design principles contained within Section 12 of the NPPF. Any limited impact on the existing open-plan character of this part of the estate is significantly outweighed by the benefits of delivering an appropriate form of development within the settlement and the clear support expressed by the local community and their elected representatives.

Given the above, I would respectfully request that the recommendation is reconsidered with a balanced assessment of both the perceived impacts and the material considerations weighing in favour of approval. We want to work with the Council and not against it and if there is anything that you would propose that would make this an acceptable scheme let me know and I can discuss with the applicant.

I look forward to hearing from you.

Best Regards

David Wright MRTPI
Fellpath Planning
E: contact@wlandp.co.uk
T: 07880344165
W: www.fellpathplanning.co.uk



From: Demi Crawford <Demi.Crawford@Cumberland.gov.uk>
Sent: 27 May 2026 16:37
To: contact <contact@wlandp.co.uk>
Cc: Nick Hayhurst <Nick.Hayhurst@Cumberland.gov.uk>
Subject: RE: 4/26/2115/OF1 - 20 LINGMELL CRESCENT, SEASCALE

Hi David,

Having given the application/site some considerable thought, whilst the site is not located on protected green space, the estate (and most of Seascale in general) is largely characterised by scattered areas of open green space/verges and open-plan frontages with the absence of boundary treatments to their frontages.

Policy DS4 of the Copeland Local Plan seeks to create high quality developments which respond positively to the character of the site and the wider setting and states that all new development should maintain high levels of amenity.

Section 12 of the NPPF seeks to safeguard high standards of amenity for existing and future users. Developments should add to the overall quality of the area, should be sympathetic to the local character, and should establish and maintain a strong sense of place. Developments should be visually attractive as a result of good architecture, layout and appropriate and effective landscaping.

I do not feel that the proposal meets the requirements of the policies, particularly Policy DS4 given that proposal seeks to alter the open-plan layout which clearly defines the landscape and character of the estate, which sets an undesirable precedent for others to do the same.

On this basis, I unfortunately won't be recommending the application to Nick for approval.

I am out of the office most of the day tomorrow on site, and on annual leave on Friday so should you wish to withdraw the application based on the above, then if you let Oli in Dev Control, or Nick, know. Alternatively, you can of course appeal any subsequent refusal.

Kind regards,

Demi Crawford
Planning Officer | Development Management



Please note that the advice in this email is given in good faith on the basis of the information available at the present time. The advice may be subject to revision following further examination or consultation, or where additional information comes to light, and is therefore not binding on any future recommendation which may be made to the Council or any formal decision by the Council.

From: contact <contact@wlandp.co.uk>
Sent: 06 May 2026 09:16
To: Demi Crawford <Demi.Crawford@copeland.gov.uk>
Subject: RE: 4/26/2115/0F1 - 20 LINGMELL CRESCENT, SEASCALE

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

Hi Demi,

Thanks for the update and I'll be back in touch at the beginning of June but keep an eye out if you need anything in the mean time.

Cheers

David

David Wright MRTPI
Fellpath Planning
E: contact@wlandp.co.uk
T: 07880344165
W: www.fellpathplanning.co.uk



From: Demi Crawford <Demi.Crawford@Cumberland.gov.uk>
Sent: 05 May 2026 13:51

To: contact <contact@wlandp.co.uk>

Subject: RE: 4/26/2115/OF1 - 20 LINGMELL CRESCENT, SEASCALE

Hi David,

The application is still out for consultation as we consult for 28 days, with the 8 week period not expiring until 2nd June.

If there are any comments that require any action from you once the consultation period expires then I will let you know.

Kind regards,

Demi Crawford

Planning Officer | Development Management

Thriving Places | Place, Sustainable Growth and Transport | Cumberland Council

The Market Hall | Market Place | Whitehaven | CA28 7JG

T: 01946 598413

cumberland.gov.uk



Please note that the advice in this email is given in good faith on the basis of the information available at the present time. The advice may be subject to revision following further examination or consultation, or where additional information comes to light, and is therefore not binding on any future recommendation which may be made to the Council or any formal decision by the Council.

From: contact <contact@wlandp.co.uk>

Sent: 03 May 2026 18:46

To: Demi Crawford <Demi.Crawford@copeland.gov.uk>

Subject: RE: 4/26/2115/OF1 - 20 LINGMELL CRESCENT, SEASCALE

You don't often get email from contact@wlandp.co.uk. [Learn why this is important](#)

CAUTION: External email, think before you click!

Please report any suspicious email to our [IT Helpdesk](#)

Hi Demi,

Hope you're well and have enjoyed the Bank Holiday weekend!

I am just having a quick review to see how this planning application is progressing.

I see the In house Ecologist has agreed that the application is exempt from BNG which is good news.

I can see the highways department have confirmed there is no objection to the planning application too.

Has there been any other responses submitted that are not online? If all response are back in could the application now be determined now it has been out for consultation for 21+ days?

Happy to discuss if easier.

Best Regards

David

David Wright MRTPI
Fellpath Planning
E:contact@wlandp.co.uk
T: 07880344165
W: www.fellpathplanning.co.uk



From: contact
Sent: 19 April 2026 11:29
To: 'Demi Crawford' <Demi.Crawford@Cumberland.gov.uk>
Subject: RE: 4/26/2115/OF1 - 20 LINGMELL CRESCENT, SEASCALE

Hi Demi,

Thanks for the email and please find attached a BNG Exemption Statement as requested.

It would be great if we could get this application determined and approved following the statutory consultation period there was no statutory consultees objecting previously and there was no direct conflict with planning policy either.

If you need anything else from me then just let me know.

Best Regards

David

David Wright MRTPI
Fellpath Planning
E:contact@wlandp.co.uk

T: 07880344165

W: www.fellpathplanning.co.uk



From: Demi Crawford <Demi.Crawford@Cumberland.gov.uk>

Sent: 16 April 2026 11:09

To: contact <contact@wlandp.co.uk>

Subject: 4/26/2115/OF1 - 20 LINGMELL CRESCENT, SEASCALE

Hi David,

Our Ecologist has asked if you can please provide a statement to accompany the application which details whether the site is BNG exempt.

Kind regards,

Demi Crawford

Planning Officer | Development Management

Thriving Places | Place, Sustainable Growth and Transport | Cumberland Council

The Market Hall | Market Place | Whitehaven | CA28 7JG

T: 01946 598413

cumberland.gov.uk



Please note that the advice in this email is given in good faith on the basis of the information available at the present time. The advice may be subject to revision following further examination or consultation, or where additional information comes to light, and is therefore not binding on any future recommendation which may be made to the Council or any formal decision by the Council.