

April 20th 2015

Response to:

Planning Carlisle's Future: Notification of Public Consultation

Carlisle District Local Plan 2015 – 2030: Proposed Submission
Draft

From Castle Carrock Parish Council

General comment on consultations: Much is made of community engagement and consultation, as demanded by the Localism Act and NPPF, however, our experience is we have no voice, our opinions are sought (because the Council has a statutory duty to consult) – and then ignored.

How do we become more involved with shaping the decisions so that localism can be seen to work – we are not against development as our responses to recent many applications will show?

Section 2 – Visions and objectives – Several major issues feature here but the District's natural environment and ecology should also feature (in addition to the historic) as these are also important contributors to the local economy and also a significant part of why the District is of interest to tourism. It is featured in Section 10 (the last section) The Plan is more specific in terms of AONB, SSSI (areas that already have protection, but the large areas of local interest to communities have no specific protection – a survey of trees will not protect them. How does this Plan aim to protect and promote the natural environment?

Section 3 – SP1 – How will the City Council 'work proactively with communities' to jointly find solutions – there is little evidence that the community has a voice. How can this be measured to ensure developers and communities are well served by the Council? **Para 3.28** – How (and who) will 'need' be assessed and against what criteria?

Section 6 – IP2 - Public transport is in extremely short supply and emission reduction targets as well as the inefficiency of the resulting congestion are only going to exacerbate this. Where does the Plan seek to stimulate improvements, especially in rural areas, so that sustainable communities beyond the City can flourish?

Section 6 Infrastructure – Who will assess the adequacy of the infrastructure; recent experience shows consultation with relevant authorities informs a planners report and a Committee overrules the report.

Policy CC4 – Flood risk; this is OK, but it only addresses primary sources of flooding from watercourses not the secondary floods experienced resulting from inadequate drainage and sewerage – this type of flooding is more common and should be considered to make this policy comprehensive.

Policy CC5 – This implies that if a developer can argue a SUDS compliant design isn't necessary they need not provide assessment of the impact of the development on SW drainage; surely this is precisely where a full drainage assessment and design is required.