

PENRITH – HEART OF EDEN 2019 – 2032

NEIGHBOURHOOD DEVELOPMENT PLAN REGULATION 14 CONSULTATION COMMENTS AND RESPONSES



June 2019



Regulation 14 Comments – Ordered by Policy No

Paragraph /Policy	Response Origin	Comments	Town Council Response
-------------------	-----------------	----------	-----------------------

OBJECTIVE 1: SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT

Policy 1 – Sustainable Development in Penrith

1	Business	PV Panels are unsightly, small wind turbines contradict heritage statements	Comment noted. The PNDP includes development management policy to manage such conflicts.
1	Resident	Developers must be made to honour contracts re schools, affordable housing	Comment noted. Not a matter for PNDP. This is managed by EDC as part of the planning application process.
1,6	Resident	Strongly object to loads more housing in Penrith	Comment noted. This is a confusion with EDCs Masterplan The PNDP does not propose any housing beyond that in EDCs Local Plan.
Objective 1	Resident	Impressed by emphasis on sustainability and low cost heating. More street trees would make the town look must greener.	Support noted.
Obj 1,6,8	Resident / Business	Imprecise use of language fails to clearly express intentions. The connection between the vision, objectives and policies is unclear and the argument is insufficiently made between vision, objectives and policies. The connections (cause and effect) should be made explicit and evidenced.	Strengthen imprecise language. The link between Vision, Objectives and Policies is clear – no change.
1-7	Resident	Agree with the policies but not with more and more development	Support noted. This is a confusion with EDCs Masterplan The PNDP does propose any development beyond that in the Local Plan.
1.3	Resident	No wind turbines	Comment noted. No change.
1	Resident	Silent on economic sustainability. Penrith Town Centre has been in economic decline in recent years and requires a dynamic campaign and investment to reverse this including plans to support local businesses to offer a unique shopping and evening experience which capitalises on local assets and utilises all existing retail units in a way that is economically sustainable	Comment noted. This issue is addressed in EDCs Local Plan. No change.

OBJECTIVE 1: SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT
Policy 1 – Sustainable Development in Penrith

Paragraph /Policy	Response Origin	Comments	Town Council Response
Objective 1	Resident	I can't see the list of locally designated buildings /key views and vistas – should this be an appendix?	These are mapped.
1	Resident	Wind turbines look awful	Comment noted. No change
1	Resident	Need to create water storage facilities and educate inform residents of the need to recycle and what they can recycle	Comment noted. No change.
1,2	Resident	The Eamont and Eden should be dredged to allow for excess water and eliminate flooding – in days gone by people took gravel from the river	Outside the remit of the TC – comments will be passed on to Environment Agency
1.2	Resident	Tree planting is crucial in holding up rain-water run-off	Comment noted. No change
1,2	Resident	Targets for renewable energy are too low.	Comment noted. Further research being undertaken to see if targets can be increased.
Objective 1	Resident	We support sustainable growth but do not support the Masterplan. Development on flood zones should be stopped.	Masterplan is not statutory and was idea of EDC
1	Statutory Network Rail	Sustainable drainage proposals should take in to account the impacts upon adjacent railway infrastructure, i.e. proposals must not import a risk of flooding, pollution, soil slippage onto the existing operational railway. Sustainable drainage systems within the Local Plan area should be directed away from the railway and should not use soakaways within 30m of the railway boundary. Attenuation ponds/basins on sites adjacent to or near to the railway boundary should only be included in proposals with the agreement of Network Rail and should not be included in proposals that are adjacent to a railway cutting.	Add reference to this comment in Background/Justification to Policy 1.
1.2	Resident	To aid the prevention of flooding drains should be cleaned regularly, there are a lot around town (including A6 and around the church yard) which don't seem to be checked often.	Comment noted. Not a planning matter. No change.
1.5	Resident	Cannot encourage use of public transport if it doesn't meet the needs of residents and visitors. Train links are poor on a Sunday, very few trains in the morning. Would support reinstating the Keswick train line. Bus services are not comprehensive e.g. Keswick bus finishes quite early in the evening. Intercity bus companies should stop in Penrith. A bus link to Newcastle, Darlington and York would be useful and surely attractive to visitors. We need a joined-up approach – e.g. Cumbria Tourism promote rail links to Penrith, websites such as goodjourney.co.uk promote visiting Penrith and the surrounding area by public transport.	Comments noted. Public transport services not a planning matter Promotion to be considered at a Town Council meeting.

OBJECTIVE 1: SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT

Policy 1 – Sustainable Development in Penrith

Paragraph /Policy	Response Origin	Comments	Town Council Response
1.5	Resident	Cycling hub in Penrith needs to be extended, perhaps more bike lockers, bike hire.	Policy 1 includes cycle storage – no change.

Policy 2 – Environmentally Sustainable Design

2,3	Resident	2 is limited and should also apply to small and individual developments. Policy 3 is open to avoidance can the minimum of 10% not be increased, viability should not be a factor.	Comment on Policy 2 noted – no change – this applies only to major development. Policy Group to consider increasing renewables target.
2	Resident	The Town Council should object to EDC about building on and behind the Beacon	PTC have already submitted their views to EDC and will respond to any further consultation
2	Resident	Should be specific in not building on natural springs or floodplains	Comment noted. Flood risk is managed through national and Local Plan policy. No change.
2	Resident	More precise plans for the energy efficiency of new buildings are out of date and do not reflect current, let alone future, best practice	Comment noted. No change.
2	Resident	I do not know what sustainable means. Currently most buildings are designed to ensure that the profit margins for developers are sustained if not enhanced over times. There is significant evidence to show that poor quality construction means many buildings designed to gold, silver or bronze standards fail to achieve this by a significant margin. Whilst on site production of energy is an option it is expensive and is unnecessary as houses built to Passivhaus standards will reduce energy costs by 80% or less than £2 per sq metre rendering renewables unnecessary.	Comment noted. No change.
2	Resident	If we believe that electric cars are the way forward why is the plan not insisting that all new houses have their own charging points	No change – this is already included in Policy 2.3v.

Paragraph /Policy	Response Origin	Comments	Town Council Response
-------------------	-----------------	----------	-----------------------

Policy 2 – Environmentally Sustainable Design

2	Statutory United Utilities	<p>United Utilities recommends additional wording with respect to Surface Water Management. We recommend the following is included in the plan, as a separate policy.</p> <p><i>"New development should be designed to maximise the retention of surface water on the development site and to minimise runoff. The approach to surface water drainage should be considered in liaison with the LLFA, the public sewerage undertaker and where appropriate the Environment Agency".</i></p> <p><i>Surface water should be discharged in the following order of priority:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>An adequate soakaway or some other form of infiltration system.</i> • <i>An attenuated discharge to watercourse or other water body.</i> • <i>An attenuated discharge to public surface water sewer.</i> • <i>An attenuated discharge to public combined sewer.</i> <p><i>Applicants wishing to discharge to the public sewer will need to submit clear evidence demonstrating why alternative options are not available as part of the determination of their application.</i></p> <p><i>All residential developments of 10 properties or more and major commercial development should incorporate sustainable drainage systems which minimises surface water run-off and ensures that all surface water is addressed within the site boundary. These may include features such as ponds, swales and permeable paving designed as part of the development and to reflect the rural character of the area. Every option should be investigated before discharging surface water into a public sewerage network, in line with the above surface water hierarchy."</i></p>	<p>Comment noted. No change – the suggested policy repeats Policy DEV2 Water Management and Flood Risk that is already part of the Local Development Plan.</p>
---	--------------------------------------	--	---

Paragraph /Policy	Response Origin	Comments	Town Council Response
-------------------	-----------------	----------	-----------------------

Policy 2 – Environmentally Sustainable Design

2	Resident	As far as energy use and reducing carbon emissions are concerned Governmental rules are changing all the time with less or no subsidies being paid at all, should the plan not take in to account on site energy storing facilities.	Comment noted. No change.
2	Resident	I am not sure what you mean about sustainability, this needs clarity if it is to mean anything. Statements made are not forward thinking – the plan should be looking well into the future and considering passive housing for example rather than those built by developers which are poorly built and to my mind the slums of the future. Standards set now should be fit for the future not those of the past.	Comment noted. Sustainable development is defined in national planning policy. Government view is that technical standards for housing are set through the Building Regulations. No change.
2	Resident	Can the plan actually turn down a development proposal because it uses mineral wool rather than sheeps wool or that development does not include water harvesting. If it cannot enforce compliance what is the point of including this type of detail.	Planning applications are assessed against development plan policy (including the PNDP) if such matters become policy they can be used to turn down or seek amended proposals.
2	Resident	BREEAM was last upated in 2014 and is in the process of being updated. The standards set should be fit for the future not a throw back to the past	Noted. No change. The PNDP cannot go beyond standards set by Government.
2.3	Resident	Please sort out recycling, kerbside is good but the bags/boxes need to be covered. The recycling point near the leisure centre is an eyesore, too much flytipping – there should be CCTV and fines.	This is the remit of EDC – comments passed on to them.

Paragraph /Policy	Response Origin	Comments	Town Council Response
-------------------	-----------------	----------	-----------------------

Policy 3 – Energy Use and Reducing Carbon Emissions

3	Resident	Consideration should be given to encouraging/forcing all new housing to have solar panels	Comment noted. This is addressed by Policy 1.3 – no change.
3	Resident	Would like to see a higher requirement for renewables ie up from 10% to possibly 20%	Group to consider increasing renewables target.
3	Resident	Drop the get out clause, solar or small scale wind turbine power generation is always available and viable.	Comment noted. The policy provides flexibility, no change.
3	Resident	Shame this is minimal and can't be increased. Should be applied to ALL developments	Comment noted. No change.
3	Resident	Should be much higher than 10%	Group to consider increasing renewables target.
3	Resident	Should be more than the 10% stated.	Group to consider increasing renewables target.
3	Resident	10% minimum is far too low	Group to consider increasing renewables target.
3	Resident	Is 10% the right level	Group to consider increasing renewables target.
3	Resident	The government are seeking to change the rules regarding energy generated in the home. This could mean that householders no longer get paid for energy fed back into the grid. To maximise benefits from solar panels householders would therefore need to invest in on site energy storage facilities. Has this been factored in. It would be better building to a standard where energy costs are minimised.	Add reference to on-site energy storage.
3	Resident	I would like the percentage of predicted energy requirement to be provided by the developments to be a lot more than 10% and that every new build and extension should have solar panels.	Group to consider increasing renewables target.
3	Resident	10% minimum renewable energy for houses seems low. It would be good if there was a requirement to put solar panels on the roof of all new houses unless it can be demonstrated that it is not practical or viable	Group to consider increasing renewables target.

Paragraph /Policy	Response Origin	Comments	Town Council Response
-------------------	-----------------	----------	-----------------------

Policy 4 – Accessibility and Social Inclusion

4	Resident	Social inclusion is about diversity, age, culture. Housing proposals don't seem to lend themselves to this	Comment noted. No change.
4	Resident	Should be mixed development proposals. At the moment its families on new builds at the edge of town and retirement homes in town. This needs to be much more mixed as you create age enclaves.	Comment noted. Policy 7 of the PNDP seeks to influence housing type and mix.
4	Resident	Physical access to community facilities is a necessary but not sufficient instrument for social inclusion	Comment noted. The PNDP, as a land use plan, can influence such matters through physical access. No change.
4	Business / Resident	More clarity needed on the words 'all development proposals' and 'meet the needs of all groups' and the list of accessibility requirements. Does it mean that if a proposal did not meet the needs of all groups and was not accessible by all means it would be rejected. This is too restrictive.	"all development proposals " is clear. No change. To meet the public sector Equality Duty development should be accessible to all. No change.
4	Resident	What would this policy exclude if any/all of these criteria are met i.e. any house is accessible by car – what the policy does exclude is a one off stand alone development as it would not meet the requirement to be welcoming, overlooked and safe – is this is what is intended?	The policy seeks to ensure development is accessible by all – not just those with access to a private car. No change.
4	Resident	What design features would make a building flexible to adapt and change. Most walls in any modern building can be removed or changed as required. Are you advocating wider doors to take a wheel chair – if so it isn't clear.	Amend the policy by providing examples of flexibility to adapt and change.
4,6,7	Resident	We shouldn't restrict potential development with these constraints	Comment noted. No change.

Paragraph /Policy	Response Origin	Comments	Town Council Response
-------------------	-----------------	----------	-----------------------

Policy 5 – Conservation Areas In Penrith (Penrith Conservation Area and New Streets)

5 A & B	Business	Redevelopment round Kilgour Street and Victoria Rd poor, should have used sandstone from demolished buildings to fully face new development. New construction not in keeping with the town.	Comment noted. No change.
5	Resident	Old buildings need to be sympathetically renovated, a local building firm has been doing this and it improves the appearance of the town.	Comment noted. No change.
5	Resident	Please incorporate more local stone in new developments.	Comment noted. PNDP seeks to do this. No change.
5A1	Resident	Include 360 degree view including that of the Howgill Fells to the South and the Pennines to the East	Include in views.
5b	Resident	Should be enforcement of owner of New Squares to maintain empty properties in appropriate condition i.e. paint is currently peeling	Comment noted. Not a PNDP matter. No change.
5.7	Resident	Views to and from the Beacon should be clear and good from every angle not just one way and from the top of hills	Consider including in views.
5 (and 1.8)	Resident	Crucial. Penrith has some fabulous architecture and a very distinctive style. Would hate to see it suffer as plans such as the Masterplan progress. There are a lot of empty and poorly maintained buildings within the conservation area – this must be addressed as new houses are built. We cannot allow the heart of the town to deteriorate. The areas mentioned should be protected.	Comment noted. PNDP seeks to do this. No change.
5	Business / Resident	Delete the words 'and sandstone boundary walls' as this is restrictive and can constrain the need for privacy between neighbours through erecting replacement boundary fencing and is not a matter of public interest in respect of non-street facing boundaries.	Policy does not seek to be so restrictive. No change. Sandstone boundary walls are a distinctive feature of the area – perhaps needs to be reworded to be clearer
5 & supporting actions	Resident	Beacon Edge with its distinctive and historically significant properties and cemetery should be part of the conservation area.	Comment noted. Conservation Area boundary not a matter for the PNDP No change.

Paragraph /Policy	Response Origin	Comments	Town Council Response
-------------------	-----------------	----------	-----------------------

Policy 5 – Conservation Areas In Penrith (Penrith Conservation Area and New Streets)

5	Land Owner	Neither Beacon Hill nor the Northeastern Fells are part of the Heritage Asset, namely the two Conservation Areas of Penrith. Therefore a view from Beacon Hill to the Northeastern Fells is not part of the setting of the heritage asset. Only part of Castle Park lies within a Conservation Area. The view of Beacon Hill from that part of Castle Park is 1.7km distant and is not a particularly important view when experienced from within the asset (the Conservation Area). Beacon Hill is not an important or “key” part of the surroundings from where the Conservation Areas of Penrith are experienced. In this context, the views to and from Beacon Hill do not merit identification by Policy 5 of the draft NDP as requiring special protection.	Delete view 7i.
5	Resident	Policy 5 as a whole is excellent 5.6 is admirable look at Leamington Spa	Support noted. No change.
5	Resident	Admirable but the appearance of the New Streets has been sacrificed to the tide of motor vehicles	Support noted. No change.
5	Resident	In principle but needs to have feasibility to also align with innovative and environmental design as outlined in Policy 2. People should be able to effectively manage mature trees many of which are rotten and diseased so need sustainable management.	Comments noted. No change.
5b	Resident	Agreed but there has been insufficient scrutiny of many of the changes to the houses. The widespread and continuing use of PVCU windows with inappropriate mullion patterns has had a detrimental effect on the unity of these streets.	Comment noted. No change.
5.7	Resident	Should read ‘View of the Lakeland Fells from green above Scaws Drive and from Beacon Edge. Congratulations on such a comprehensive review of Penrith and its future.	Amend as suggested.
5	Resident	Why aren’t non designated heritage assets listed here eg Brunswick Road School, QEGS VI Form, main QEGS building, Hunter Lane Police Station	This policy is concerned with the Conservation Areas. No need to list these assets here. No change

Paragraph /Policy	Response Origin	Comments	Town Council Response
-------------------	-----------------	----------	-----------------------

Policy 5 – Conservation Areas In Penrith (Penrith Conservation Area and New Streets)

5	Resident	EDCs original guidance included guidance on signage and colour scheme – would inclusion of such detail add value to the plan.	Signage and colour are not matters for PNDP. No change.
5	Resident	In the New Street, large gardens are being developed with infill housing. It is important to seek to retain these and protect the mature trees which are a key feature of the area.	Comments noted. Policy 5 seeks to achieve this. No change.
5b	Resident	There are enough rules and regulations already governing conservation and the New Streets areas of Penrith without putting even more burden on householders and restricting what they can and cannot do.	Comment noted. No change.

OBJECTIVE 2:HOUSING

Policy 6 – High Quality New Homes

Objective 2	Resident	Low cost housing is essential but it still needs to look good like Penrith houses and needs to be functional. New development should aim to be award winning and inspirational. I support all these policies. There should be a policy requesting builders to include car charging points in all new houses and possibly subsidising some in lampposts within the town centre.	Support noted. No change.
Objective 2	Resident	Opening para talks about a 'level' of high quality housing without specifying the level – people are confusing this with the Masterplan which generated lots of concern.	Quality will be assessed at planning application stage. Comment on EDCs Masterplan noted. No change.
6	Resident	Also needs to be in keeping with Policy 2	Comment noted. PNDP is to be read as a whole. No change.
6	Resident	We would query whether 3 & 4 bed houses would require parking spaces quoted as standard – 2 could be sufficient	The standard is set by Cumbria CC. No change.
6	Resident	Minimise any further traffic generation – there is already too much traffic in town.	Comment noted. No change.

Paragraph /Policy	Response Origin	Comments	Town Council Response
-------------------	-----------------	----------	-----------------------

OBJECTIVE 2: HOUSING

Policy 6 – High Quality New Homes

6	Resident	There should be much more affordable housing and social housing like bungalows for the aging population. More affordable homes for younger people that they can afford.	Comment noted. No change.
6	Resident	Any additional housing should follow the main arterial roads ie A6, A66	Comment noted. Location of new homes is a matter for the EDCs Local Plan. No change.
6	Resident	Needs to be more on affordable homes, £150,000 for a new build 2 bed semi is not affordable. Discourage extensions being added to smaller homes this has reduced the number available and made them less affordable.	Comment noted. No change.
6	Resident	Do not build anywhere behind the Beacon, Plenty of houses have been built already but they are not affordable to young people.	PTC are not proposing any additional build – confusion with EDC Masterplan
6	Resident	Build houses of all types, bungalows and starter homes not too many executive homes. Make parking easier in town	Comment noted. No change.
6.8	Business	There should be no encouragement for householders to have unnecessary no of vehicles	Comment noted. No change.
6	Resident	Don't build more houses, health and schools can't cope now.	PTC are not proposing any additional build – confusion with EDC Masterplan
6.5	Resident	We have a problem now	Comment noted. No change.
6	Resident	Parking provision should be increased ie 1 bed 2 spaces, 2 bed, 2.5 spaces, 3 bed 3 spaces, 4 bed 3.5 spaces. Young people remain at home for longer and need transport plus visitors	The standard is set by Cumbria CC. No change.
6	Resident	The amount of parking must be the absolute minimum with the preferred amount of spaces being at least one more per property.	The standard is set by Cumbria CC. No change.

Paragraph /Policy	Response Origin	Comments	Town Council Response
-------------------	-----------------	----------	-----------------------

OBJECTIVE 2: HOUSING

Policy 6 – High Quality New Homes

Policies 6 Combined Comments with Policy 7 – Housing Type and Mix

6	Resident	New developments should be on brown field sites and low cost housing in empty retail units	Comment noted. No change.
6	Resident	Not sure that 'high quality design that reinforces local identity' means. It probably refers to the use of local red sandstone but is this what you are proposing for new developments? Recent developments by large house builders in Penrith could have been built anywhere in the country and have no local or distinctive character.	Comment noted. The PNDP sets policy to improve design and reinforce local identity. Individual proposals would be assessed at the planning application stage. No change.
6	Resident	What does 'encourage high levels of social interaction' mean? Use plain English rather than abstract terms and concepts	This reference is not in the PNDP. No change.
6	Resident	Penrith does not have the economic diversity to support jobs for young people. Primarily jobs are seasonal within the service industry. There are a few local businesses but non on the scale that would sustain the numbers of jobs that I think the Council is perceiving that will come should this plan be realised. The consultation does not set out or specify explicitly the scale of development that is being proposed. In my view the public cannot make an informed judgement in the absence of this information.	PTC are not proposing any additional build – confusion with EDC Masterplan
6	Resident	There is a positive presumption in the wording. Where is the identified need for 'high quality housing that retains Penrith's identity? Penrith's identity is as a market town.	Planning policy should be positively worded. No change.
6	Resident	Parking within the town needs to be addressed also. How planning permission is given for two blocks of flats on Victoria Rd without adequate parking is nonsensical. There is a constant battle with vehicles being left in unsatisfactory/illegal spaces around the area and on pavements. Could residents not be allocated spaces in car parks – this already happens in the multi-storey at Sainburys where Highways England have allocated spaces.	Comment noted. No change.
6	Resident	More parking should be provided as most couples work these days and family stays at home longer for 1 bedroom – 2 spaces, 2 bedroom – 3 spaces, 3 bedroom – 4 spaces, 4 be3droom – 5 spaces	The standard is set by Cumbria CC. No change.

Paragraph /Policy	Response Origin	Comments	Town Council Response
-------------------	-----------------	----------	-----------------------

OBJECTIVE 2: HOUSING

Policies 6 Combined Comments with Policy 7(or others) – Housing Type and Mix

6	Resident	We should encourage less car use or smaller cars with low emissions. More development brings greater car use and poor air quality	Comment noted. PNDP seeks to do this. No change.
6	Resident	Proposals for large housing estates are out of keeping with the town.	PTC are not proposing any additional build – confusion with EDC Masterplan
6,7	Business	There has been substantial development (Carleton) without any infrastructure creating bottlenecks at Kemplay and J40. No need for any additional houses beyond permissions granted	Comment noted. PNDP does not allocate additional housing. No change.
4,6,7	Resident	We shouldn't restrict potential development with these constraints	Comment noted. PNDP does not restrict development. It is setting policy against which planning proposals will be assessed.
6,7	Resident	Tear up the plan and don't build lots of new houses.	PTC are not proposing any additional build – confusion with EDC Masterplan
6,7	Resident	Current housing policy is too large and will have an adverse effect on the current population.	Comment noted. PNDP does not allocate additional housing. No change.
6,7	Resident	New buildings should not be built with sandstone it deteriorates over time. Use durable building materials. Make sure builders build affordable homes for young people and low paid workers, in a lot of cases they build too many expensive homes	Comment noted. No change.
6,7	Resident	No more large housing estates eg Carleton, Coldsprings. No building on/behind the Beacon.	PTC are not proposing any additional build – confusion with EDC Masterplan
6,7	Resident	Young people need to feel that Penrith is affordable, thriving and supportive	PNDP seeks to support this. No change.
6,7	Resident	The town needs jobs, business, infrastructure etc before any new housing is built. We need to think of the next generation	Comment noted. PNDP does not allocate additional housing. No change.

Paragraph /Policy	Response Origin	Comments	Town Council Response
-------------------	-----------------	----------	-----------------------

OBJECTIVE 2: HOUSING

Policies 6 Combined Comments with Policy 7(or others) – Housing Type and Mix

6,7	Resident	We do not need these additional villages behind the Beacon, there aren't enough jobs, schools, health facilities etc	PTC are not proposing any additional build – confusion with EDC Masterplan
6,7	Resident	There should be a policy that all new homes / areas should have access to fibre optic broadband to benefit the locality and home working	Comment noted. Not a matter for PNDP. No change.
6,7	Resident	Limited development is fine but no new builds in Penrith have given consideration to wildlife e.g. bird and bat boxes, gaps in walls for hedgehogs etc	Change to Policy 6,7 to be more prescriptive to say bird boxes, bat roosts, hedgehog holes etc

Policies 6 Combined Comments with Policy 7 – Housing Type and Mix

6,7	Resident	I would like you to provide in the housing mix sites for building your own home. I have wanted to build my own home here in Penrith for over 20 years but there no available land ever made available to self builders.	Comment noted. See detailed comment from EDC.
6,7	Resident	What are 'suitable building materials' Fully agree with cheap long term parking for workers.	Amend to "use of traditional local materials and innovative materials where the latter is sympathetic to the character of the immediate surrounding area".
6,7	Resident	No new homes are necessary especially with so many already on the market, if houses are needed to be built more affordable housing is required and I agree with the policies here	Comment noted. PNDP does not allocate additional housing. Confusion with Masterplan No change.
6,7	Resident	Be explicit and encourage use of brown field sites to be used before building on open green space. Ban any further development within 5 miles of Penrith.	Comment noted. PNDP does not allocate additional housing. No change.
6,7	Resident	Affordable housing is a must to keep young people and families in the town.	Comment noted. No change.

Paragraph /Policy	Response Origin	Comments	Town Council Response
-------------------	-----------------	----------	-----------------------

OBJECTIVE 2:HOUSING

Policies 6 Combined Comments with Policy 7 – Housing Type and Mix

6,7	Resident	In the context of the pattern of future housing development and the desirability of avoiding an excess of parked local cars visiting the town centre, it is particularly necessary that the town bus service is improved and extended.	Comment noted. No change.
6,7	Resident	All building companies should give priority to low cost housing and amenities, not leaving it until last – if ever.	Comment noted. No change.
6,7	Resident	Existing brownfield sites should be developed before greenfield sites, bungalows are not a local style	Comment noted. PNDP does not allocate additional housing. No change.
General	Resident	The housing section is too vague and should be more explicit. I am not saying no houses should be built but they should be proportionate relative to the scale of the town.	Comment noted. PNDP does not allocate additional housing. No change.
6,7	Resident	Building proposals lack imagination. Why build more of the same inefficient buildings using brick and block. Look for new materials and designs using modern construction methods	Comment noted PNDP sets policy to try to avoid this. No change.

Policy 7 – Housing Type and Mix

7	Resident	Linkages with retaining architectural style with existing / innovating with modern design and sustainability.	Comment noted. No change.
7	Resident	Acknowledge the key assumption driving the 2018 Housing Need Survey that rapid population growth is inevitable and desirable – it is neither	Comment noted. No change
7	Resident	The view from Croft Terrace is being lost due to large non indigenous trees which have been allowed to grow too large.	Comment noted. No change
7	Resident	Excellent objectives as builders don't build bungalows which are needed	Supporting comment noted.
7	Resident	Penrith needs more bungalows and affordable housing.	Comment noted. No change

Paragraph /Policy	Response Origin	Comments	Town Council Response
-------------------	-----------------	----------	-----------------------

Policy 7 – Housing Type and Mix

7	Resident	Agreed, we need more fit for purpose dwellings, bungalows, retirement bungalows and small houses – too many flats have been built, we don't need large executive houses	Supporting comment noted.
7	Resident	We need houses to rent for younger families with gardens and car parking	Comment noted. No change
7	Resident	Build houses of all types, bungalows, starter homes but not too many executive homes	Comment noted. No change
7	Business / Resident	Relies upon a single time-period snapshot of evidence – namely the Housing Need Survey 2018 – in order to establish needs for a period of 14 years. Given the expected change in demographics, employment, transport and development, the evidence base must be reviewed on a regular (max 5 yearly) basis and cross validated by other sources of data.	This comment is addressed in para. 6.38 of the PNDP. No change.
7	Business / Resident	Delete the word 'local' as this is likely to unnecessarily restrict the sustainability of a vibrant future for Penrith. Local needs must be balanced against county, regional and national needs.	The use of the word "local" is in conformity with Policy HS4 of the Local Plan. No change.
7	Resident	Don't allow bungalows which have a huge floor area and do not fit the vernacular of Penrith. 2 story accommodation should be easy to adapt for elderly or disabled with wheel chair sized lift / chair lift. Turn New Squares into low cost housing.	Comments noted. No change.
7	Business	There is no need for additional housing developments. The population is aging and the young are moving away	Comment noted. PNDP does not allocate additional housing. Confusion with EDCs Masterplan No change.
7	Resident	Any houses and bungalows should be built in a simple local style	Comment noted. No change.
7	Resident	Building more houses is not the answer and may compound existing issues. Any plan that has at its heart the well being of Penrith people will succeed better than a financially driven one. On paper the NP seems to cover the areas of public concern quite well.	Comment noted. PNDP does not allocate additional housing. Confusion with EDCs Masterplan No change.
7	Resident	Few local people can afford market led housing – need more emphasis on local affordable housing. There should be more effort made to secure as high a %age as possible from new developments as there is often a difference between the policy as stated and the %age that is actually delivered by developers who seem to be able to reduce to a minimum – even on sites which do not have abnormal costs.	Comment noted. No change.

Paragraph /Policy	Response Origin	Comments	Town Council Response
-------------------	-----------------	----------	-----------------------

OBJECTIVE 2:HOUSING

Policy 7 – Housing Type and Mix

7	Resident	All new homes should be built with sufficient parking spaces. This should include properties converted in the centre of town. Developers / planners should be looking at underground parking in order to retain the identity of the street scene. This would help keep the streets and pavements free from the overcrowding of parked cars	Comment noted. Car parking standards set by Cumbria CC.
7	Resident	I suggest more large blocks of flats town centre e.g. old Co-op building	Comment noted. No change.
7	Resident	I recommend that space standards are specified, especially for affordable housing, at least of national standard.	Space standards not a matter for PNDP. No change.
7	Resident	The ownership and maintenance of shared areas in new developments is a cause of concern – service charges can be very high while work done is unreliable. Some attempt to regulate this innovation would be welcome.	Comment noted. Not a matter for PNDP. No change.
7	Resident	I would like to see some policy aimed at encouraging developers to increase contributions to local society through S106 agreements or otherwise	Developers already contribute through s106 money which goes to EDC. PTC have asked CALC to lobby EDC to adopt CIL
7	Resident	Are you suggesting that new housing should be built of sandstone? The type of housing being erected is not of high quality as we should be looking at passive housing.	Amend to “use of traditional local materials and innovative materials where the latter is sympathetic to the character of the immediate surrounding area”. This allows flexibility. PNDP cannot specify a housing standard.
7	Resident	There needs to be more above passive housing rather than just referring to ‘sustainable development’ which doesn’t mean much. Penrith could lead the way in passive housing development.	PNDP cannot specify a housing standard. No change.
7	Resident	This policy is not very detailed on how the Council plans to bring in new homes that are affordable. It needs a more detailed outline of how new homes will be accessed by a range of buyers	Affordable housing will be delivered partly through planning policy – allocations is not a matter for the PNDP. No change.

Paragraph /Policy	Response Origin	Comments	Town Council Response
-------------------	-----------------	----------	-----------------------

OBJECTIVE 2:HOUSING

Policy 7 – Housing Type and Mix

7	Resident	<p>We agree that new housing development should provide a varied housing type and mix, however from visiting the new developments such as Fairways and Carleton Meadows in Penrith and Brockley Bank at Plumpton it appears that there is nothing suitable in size or value for a family of four such as ourselves to move to. We currently live in a 100 year old 2 bedroom end terraced house (total size 50sqm), with paved off street parking for 3-4 cars, we have added a double garage/workshop with electricity, and have a good sized patio area for the children to play, but unfortunately the house itself is too small in terms of bedroom space and general living space which is why we are wanting to move. The new 3 bedroom semi detached homes that have been built are only around 90sqm in total size basically gaining 1 small extra bedroom, a wider hallway and an ensuite for a price of just over £200,000. However these new houses do not provide enough off street parking, the gardens are tiny for a family and do not even come with a garage. To afford these it would mean we would have to borrow a further £60,000-£80,000 on top of the mortgage we already have, we would also have to increase our mortgage term and that is something we do not really want to do considering we are in our 30's. we would be looking at paying nearly £1000 a month just on mortgage but we would not really be gaining anything. The new four bedroom houses being built do come with garages, larger parking areas and much larger gardens, but are over expensive so we are straight away outpriced from this market. There has been far too much focus on building starter homes for first time buyers, small temporary starter homes meaning that once you have family you are going to outgrow that home. This has lead to people like us now being stuck in the current house we have because we cannot afford to move into a suitable larger property on the new developments. For the last 3 years we have looked at 3-4 bedroom older houses on the market but again for anything decent for a family with parking and garage space we would be looking to pay anything upwards from about £220,000 and they need modernising on top of this too. The new developments have not provided a home decent enough in terms of size and affordability for us people that already have families and are wanting to up size. Most first time buyers are single couples whom both work full time and can afford to pay these prices especially more so now that interest rates are at their lowest and whom also get help to buy too, however for us we have a young family meaning that only one of us works at the moment and the other is a stay at home parent because we found that the cost of childcare was far too expensive, add this to already paying a mortgage, no help to buy schemes, do you not think there should have been more emphasis on providing decent affordable homes for people in our situation instead.</p>	<p>Comment noted. The PNDP, alongside the Local Plan, seeks to address these issues of affordability and quality. No change.</p>
---	----------	---	---

Paragraph /Policy	Response Origin	Comments	Town Council Response
-------------------	-----------------	----------	-----------------------

OBJECTIVE 2:HOUSING

Policy 7 – Housing Type and Mix

7	Resident	<p>My parents have given me around 0.3 acres of land right next to their home where I was born and grew up because they felt that it would be more affordable for us to be able to self build a decent sized home for ourselves, with decent sized outside space. However due to Eden District Planning Policies we have been faced with a brick wall because we are not allowed to build unless we provide 100% affordable housing which means that if we ever sell the property we would have to sell it at a 40% discounted rate which is absolutely ridiculous (a rate that is not even outlined in the NPFF) as apparently the area is classed as a rural exception site meaning its isolated from the main service centre and key hubs and a place where they do not want sporadic development. We agree that we do not want builders and developers scooping up land outside of Penrith and the key hubs etc to start building hundreds of houses ruining the countryside and we can understand that is why this policy exists, however we feel that due to our personal circumstances this ridiculous affordable housing rule should not apply, especially when we would be adding our current home on the market as an extra excellent affordable 2 bed starter home, the self build would be situated next to my parents and the home where I was born and grew up so I have very strong local connections to the area, the area consists of at least 17 dwellings already and is situated only around 1.5 miles from Penrith so the self build is not exactly going to be isolated or is in the open countryside. EDC have already stated in their masterplan that the area behind the Beacon is a suitable place to build a brand new village of hundreds of open market homes but we are not allowed to build even one open market home. We cannot understand why we cannot build a home with only a local occupancy clause which would make it affordable in perpetuity in its own right.</p> <p>When we have to put our own hard earned cash into building our own home, having to sell our current home and in effect making ourselves homeless to fund the build and take out a self build mortgage, we feel its very unfair how EDC can stipulate what you should sell the property for when you come to sell it in the future and whom you should sell it to when undertaking a self build is already a great risk. Why should we be penalised because we are wanting to help ourselves and our family by building our own home because Storys, Persimmons and Reiver Homes have not provided a home suitable enough for our needs. We feel that when you update the neighbourhood plan that there needs to be something included for us people whom are wanting to build our own homes. People in this situation are most often from areas outside of key hubs and the main service centre. (rural exception sites) They are most likely from the open countryside areas where their families have agricultural land and have given their sons/daughters land to build their own homes on.</p>	<p>Comment noted. Site specific matters fall beyond the scope of the PNDP. No change. See comment made below by EDC about NaCSBA</p>
---	----------	--	---

Paragraph /Policy	Response Origin	Comments	Town Council Response
-------------------	-----------------	----------	-----------------------

OBJECTIVE 2:HOUSING

Policy 7 – Housing Type and Mix

7	Resident	We don't think that Affordable restrictions should apply to people in these circumstances where the build is for their own family home. Affordable restrictions should only apply to house builders and developers in these areas. Maidenhill is also part of Penrith Parish and is one of the closest small settlements to Penrith than any other village or hamlet in the area so its far from isolated. We feel that EDC are being very unfair in this particular situation and would hope that Penrith Town Council will be more sympathetic to our situation. We have personally visited the neighbouring properties at Maidenhill and handed out letters outlining our situation and asked the owners to sign whether they would support or object to us building a normal open market (non affordable)family home there and all the responses we received back have all supported us. We would be grateful if you would take our comments into consideration and we would welcome any feedback.	Comment noted. Site specific issues not a matter for PNDP. No change.
7	Resident	It would be good if it was required that a certain proportion of the housing was affordable without the buyer having to purchase a shared ownership home. Shared ownership is not full home ownership and in some cases it is not possible to buy the house outright in the future. Looking at new developments around Penrith there are currently no affordable houses that could be bought outright.	Comment noted. Affordable housing is defined in NPPF and includes shared ownership as one of a range of options. No change.
7	Resident	Garages are being built to the minimum size standard which is inadequate to accommodate a modern family car such as a Ford Mondeo or Volvo let alone an SUV. E.g. in Planning App 19/0153 the developer proposes garages which have a floor area of 15sq m but the minimum required to accommodate a Ford Mondeo is 18.3 sq m. Parking is a concern on many older developments and the PNDP is an opportunity not to perpetuate the problems on new developments	Comment noted. Standard set by Cumbria CC. No change.
7	Resident	Each site should target 1 or 2 groups of buyers – far too much mixing on modern sites	Comment noted. No change.

Paragraph /Policy	Response Origin	Comments	Town Council Response
-------------------	-----------------	----------	-----------------------

OBJECTIVE 3: GREEN SPACES

Policy 8 – Identifying and Protecting Local Green Space

8	Resident	Cowraik Quarry should be added to protected green spaces.	SSSI so already protected
8	Resident	Protect Cowraik Quarry and the field off Chancery Lane / Carleton Road	SSSI so already protected
8,9	Resident	Green spaces on Voreda Park that children play on should be protected	Group to consider adding to Local Green Spaces?
8	Resident	Please protect both green open spaces at Bowscar as the children use both on a daily basis	Group to consider adding to Local Green Spaces?
8	Resident	Scaws Drive Playing Field should be protected. The Play area is mentioned but the wider area should be included.	Already covered - PE6
8	Resident	Include the green space on Carleton Meadows in front of houses 47 to 40 bounded by the public footpath to the North East	Add to local green spaces
8	Resident	Include the green spaces identified on the new Carleton Meadows development	Add to local green spaces
8	Resident	Woods in Lonsdale Villa Gardens should actually be referred to as Fell Lane Pinfold	Amend as suggested.
8	Resident	Ban any further building on Beacon Edge beyond Carleton Meadows and Carleton Manor Park and accessed by Carleton Hill Road or Beacon Edge – to preserve existing quality of life have a 20 year moratorium against any further development on the foothills.	Comment noted. No change.
8	Resident	Not enough on protecting green spaces AROUND Penrith or on 'Keeping Penrith Special' – the plan is not ambitious enough	Comment noted. No change.
8	Resident	Add field bordering Beacon Edge (Southside)	PN17 is the open green space
8	Resident	Certain green spaces may in the future prove difficult to protect. Some should be better off identified as untouchable, whilst the rest are considered on a points basis or only as a last resort.	Comment noted. Local Plan COM2 protects other open spaces. No change.
8	Resident	PTCs Plan is based on the existing local plan and as long as it remains based on the proposed buildings development as in the existing local plan I am fully in favour of it. If the Masterplan gets incorporated into the Local Plan I am against it totally. Would want to see the whole of Beacon Hill and forest to be protected as it is an integral part of Penrith.	Comment noted. No change.

Paragraph /Policy	Response Origin	Comments	Town Council Response
-------------------	-----------------	----------	-----------------------

OBJECTIVE 3: GREEN SPACES

Policy 8 – Identifying and Protecting Local Green Space

8	Resident	Access for wheelchair users to all green spaces should be included	Add as a Town Council Supporting Action.
8	Resident	Land between Meadowcroft and Brentfield Way is extensive and a valued 'green lung' but little used as a play area. Could there be more planting / trees at the Parklands end.	Comment noted. Land understood to be owned by EDC No change.
8	Resident	The wood south of Scaws Drive needs to be included (as it is in the shaded area online)	Included under PE6
8	Resident	Advantage should be taken of any open space including roadside verges for wild flower and tree planting.	Comment noted. No change. Verges are responsibility of CCC
8	Resident	Allotments are very important	Included in Policy 8
8	Land Owner	Whether or not the land is a "backdrop to the town" is irrelevant as to whether it is an extensive tract of land. 41 hectares is clearly a large area of open countryside and " <i>an extensive tract of land.</i> " Its designation as LGS fails for reason of extensiveness alone. To compound the extensiveness, three parcels of proposed LGS are located adjacent to each other; PN14 (41 hectares), P29 (0.8 hectares) and P28 (8.9 hectares). Collectively, this continuous track of land measures 50.7 hectares.	Agreed to leave in and add more detail about why it is demonstrably special to the town.
8	Land Owner	PN14 is not "demonstrably special to the local community" or a "valuable local amenity". Appendix VIII of the draft NDP correctly states the land is " <i>privately owned by Lowther Estates and the Lonsdale Settled Estates</i> ". The paths to Beacon Hill and across PN14 are not designated public footpaths or bridleways. The recreational value of PN14 to the local community is limited to a single permissive footpath and occasional community events allowed by the landowner. However, the permissive footpath and occasional public access can be closed at any time. Public access to this land is highly restricted. Although lack of public access does not preclude its designation as LGS, it serves to weaken its alleged role as a space valuable to the local community. A permissive footpath on PN14 does not make PN14 special in terms of its recreational value. Indeed, many public footpaths providing limited recreation to the local community radiate around Penrith on land not designated LGS.	Agreed to leave in and add more detail about why it is demonstrably special to the town.
8	Resident	It is important we keep green spaces and access be possible with pushchair / wheelchair – can no longer get to Thacka in a wheelchair due to gate	Add as a Town Council Supporting Action.

Paragraph /Policy	Response Origin	Comments	Town Council Response
-------------------	-----------------	----------	-----------------------

OBJECTIVE 3: GREEN SPACES

Policy 8 – Identifying and Protecting Local Green Space

8	Land Owner	A Scheduled Monument at Beacon Hill comprises a tiny percentage of the overall area of the LGS. The SM is the only part of Beacon Hill with “historic significance” and the SM will not be affected by LGS designation. There is no public footpath to the SM Beacon Hill. The view from PN14 to Penrith and the Lake District Fells is limited to a single point - the Beacon itself. This single viewpoint does not justify the designation of 41 hectares as LGS. Furthermore, there are no public footpaths to the viewpoint.	Agreed to leave in and add more detail about why it is demonstrably special to the town.
8	Land Owner	PN11 lies outside the settlement boundary of Penrith. A 45 minute walk from the town centre to the Beacon is not “reasonably close” or “easy walking distance” to Penrith. Furthermore, given the extensive tract of PN14 (41 hectares), large parts of PN14 are located more than 45 minutes from the town centre. Being a predominately commercial non-native forest, PN14 is not a tract of land with exceptional beauty, landscape sensitivity or local significance. There is no Habitat Biodiversity Audit that demonstrates a particularly special level of habitat diversity at PN14. The land does not have a national or local ecological or habitat designation. For example, PN14 is not a Local Nature Reserve or a Local Wildlife Site. In conclusion, PN14 should be removed as a Local Green Space designation from the Neighbourhood Plan.	Agreed to leave in and add more detail about why it is demonstrably special to the town.
8	Resident	Please include the Friends Meeting House Garden and Allotments in the list	Add as local green space to map and Policy 8
8	Resident	No enough green spaces being identified to be protected – add in all remaining unbuilt land on the slopes of Beacon Edge (above A686 and adjacent to Carleton Hill Road and accessible from Beacon Edge)	Comment noted. No change.
8	Resident	Support with great conviction but would like assurance secured in place that no development whatsoever will be considered now or in the future	Support noted. No change.
8	Resident	Brunswick Square needs proper maintenance. Conservation area should include the Beacon	Comment noted. No change.
8	Resident	The area behind the Beacon would be ideal for walking and cycling – not for building houses	Confusion with EDC Masterplan – PTC are not proposing any new development area

Paragraph /Policy	Response Origin	Comments	Town Council Response
-------------------	-----------------	----------	-----------------------

OBJECTIVE 3: GREEN SPACES

Policy 8 – Identifying and Protecting Local Green Space

8	Resident	Are these the only green spaces that will be protected? E.g the green space at the junction of Arthur Street and Beacon Park is very popular with locals, children and dog walkers – will it be protected, can we guarantee other similar spaces will be untouched. Local Green Spaces are important for the well being of the local community.	Add as local green space to map and Policy 8
8	Resident	There is nothing about how green spaces will be developed, maintained or enhanced. Currently for example Castle Park is hardly used by the local population so where are the plans to make it a valuable community asset.	Castle Park is an EDC owned asset – comments will be passed on
8	Resident	Residents need these vital green spaces scattered all over the town.	Support noted. No change.
8	Resident	I would like to see the whole of the Beacon Forest designated as green space. If the inspector disagrees that is unfortunate but the inspector will certainly not designate it all unless asked to and he can ask for the area to be reduced without affecting the approval of the plan as a whole. 'Extensive' does not mean large – if the NPPF had meant large it would have said so.	Support noted. No change, but see other comments on Beacon Hill.
8	Resident	As the owners of PN14 have not been consulted I anticipate that the Town Council will receive a robust objection.	Owners have been consulted twice as part of the process and provided responses
8	Resident	Query the term 'inappropriate development on local green spaces' Inappropriate in whose eyes? Surely it needs to read 'will be protected from development.	This term comes from national planning policy. Amend to: "Development of these spaces will only be permitted when consistent with national planning policy for Green Belt."
8	Resident	This should not mean that other green spaces can be built on because they are not protected	Other open spaces are protected by COM2 of the Local Plan. No change.
8	Resident	Fully support the protection and safeguarding of all existing open spaces.	Support noted. No change.
8, 9	Resident	Strongly support the objectives on green space and leisure	Support noted. No change.
Objective 3	Resident	Designation of green spaces including the Beacon is very important – agree with all those listed	Support noted. No change, but see other comments on Beacon Hill.

Paragraph /Policy	Response Origin	Comments	Town Council Response
-------------------	-----------------	----------	-----------------------

OBJECTIVE 3: GREEN SPACES

Policy 8 – Identifying and Protecting Local Green Space

8	Business	Concerned that opening up Beacon Wood to greater use will encourage portable BBQs, wild camping etc – the wood needs to be left as it is	Comment noted. Not a planning matter. Beacon Wood would not be opened up merely designated as protected green space. It has permissive paths only. See other comments regarding Beacon Hill. No change.
8	Resident	Improvements should be made to Kemplay Roundabout (The Gateway to Penrith). The general upkeep is very poor and could benefit from the grass being cut on a more regular basis combined with some flower beds it would make it more pleasing to the eye and advertise Penrith in a better light.	Comment noted. Not planning matters. No change. Pass comment on to owners.
8	Resident	Protecting the greenspaces in the town no matter how small/random is a priority for health, wellbeing and environmental reasons.	Comment noted. No change.

OBJECTIVE 4: CULTURE AND LEISURE

Policy 9 – Protecting and Enhancing Sport, Leisure and Recreation Facilities

9	Resident	Sport and recreation should be encouraged to facilitate health and wellbeing. Encouragement and expansion of functional green space needs to be better	Comment noted. No change.
9	Resident	Hunter Hall and Frenchfield is ideal for many sports enthusiasts and would be ideal for a cycle track	Comment noted. Owned by EDC comments passed on No change.
9	Resident	There is no mention of Penrith Football Club is this an oversight.	Change mapping to show them as separate, at the current time the mapping includes them with Frenchfield sports facilities
9	Com Grp	Castle Park looks neglected, new roses / trees required, paved picnic / seating areas especially behind the shop where the pool was. Some water sprinklers would be good. Check over footpaths and provide some parking – some grassed areas are not used – the park needs to attract all ages.	Comment noted. Castle Park owned by EDC – comments to be passed to them.

Paragraph / Policy	Response Origin	Comments	Town Council Response
9	Resident	Develop sporting facilities based at Frenchfield. Move Cricket Club there and build all weather and indoor tennis facilities, squash courts and gym facility. Current sports provision is sporadic, relies on too many diverse committees and is inadequate in size and quality for such a large community	Comment noted. Not a planning matter for the PNDP. No change.
9	Resident	The Crescent Playing Fields drainage issues need to be rectified as a matter of urgency. The fact that raw sewerage spills over during high flows water in the drainage system can't be good for the wellbeing of the young people using the facility.	Comment noted. Not planning matter. No change.
9	Resident	Parking facilities in Castle Park would benefit those who use the park's facilities (Bowls, tennis) and those with young children who would use the facilities if there were parking.	Comment noted. Pass to EDC.
9	Resident	Should include Penrith Tennis Club and Squash Club.	Currently included in the mapping for the RFU as it is on their land.
9	Resident	Fully support the list of facilities listed to allow children in Penrith to maintain a healthy lifestyle and wellbeing.	Support noted. No change.
9	Resident	Why oh why isn't more made of Castle Park	Comment noted. No change.
Objective 4	Business / Resident	Delete the words 'young people' and replace with 'local people and visitors' otherwise older people and visitors will be de-prioritised by this policy which is too narrow.	Comment noted. No change.
9	Resident	More support for a theatre or indoor facility for visitors	Comment noted. No change.
9	Resident	Allow parking inside Castle Park and improve the children's play area in the park	Comment noted. Castle Park owned by EDC, comments passed on.
9	Resident	Include the land directly in front of the Hunter Hall main school house	Amend site boundary
9	Resident	More focus on leisure facilities – wave machine, fun slide would be good so don't have to travel to Keswick / Darlington. Needs more fun filled active things to do in town to retain people.	Comment noted. No change.
8-11	Resident	Really agree with these, we need more for young people so a youth zone type facility is a good idea	Support noted. No change.

Paragraph /Policy	Response Origin	Comments	Town Council Response
-------------------	-----------------	----------	-----------------------

OBJECTIVE 4: CULTURE AND LEISURE

Policy 9 – Protecting and Enhancing Sport, Leisure and Recreation Facilities

9	Resident	I have noted some antisocial behaviour in town. The multi-storey car park at Sainsburys is a particular meeting point and is used by car, bike and skateboard racers of all ages as a racetrack on occasion. If we are promoting the town's facilities and greenspaces for all then people have to respect this and any problems dealt with and not ignored. In York there are dispersal orders to combat anti-social behaviour and they do work.	Comment noted. Not planning matters. No change. Comments to be passed to appropriate bodies
---	----------	---	--

OBJECTIVE 5: WELLBEING

Policy 10: Protecting and Enhancing Health and Community Facilities

10	Resident	Another Drs surgery is essential	Comment noted. No change.
10	Resident	Include the proposals for community facilities for Carleton Meadows	Comment noted No change, not developed yet
10	Resident	More access to Drs, medical facilities and mental health facilities	Comment noted. No change.
10	Resident	Are pubs really community facilities to be protected?	Yes. They can be protected by such a policy. No change.
10	Resident	The phrase ` no longer economically viable' covers a multitude of sins – would there be further consultation if this was a potential reason for closure	This wording is in conformity with EDC Local Plan Policy COM1 – no change.

OBJECTIVE 5: WELLBEING

Policy 11: Walking and Cycling

11	Resident	Wheelchair users can benefit from cardio exercise so all efforts should be made to make access to and upgrade existing footpaths / bridleways for their use.	Comment noted. Add as a Town Council Supporting Action.
11	Resident	Current designated cycleways are abysmal and potentially dangerous, they often stop suddenly and are frequently ignored by car drivers	Comment noted. No change. Comments to be passed to CCC

Paragraph /Policy	Response Origin	Comments	Town Council Response
-------------------	-----------------	----------	-----------------------

OBJECTIVE 5: WELLBEING

Policy 11: Walking and Cycling

11	Resident	The footpath from the new Fire Station / Police Station needs updating. There is no crossing point at the bottom of the hill south or the underpass where the road turns left into Carleton Hall. There is also no street lighting at this point and the lighting up the hill towards the Police Station is poorly lit. Generally in and around the town the upkeep to the footpaths is very poor with slippery overgrown vegetation, hedges and overhanging trees not cut back and maintained. The footpath out of Eamont Bridge is in the above mentioned state. The grass to the side of the footpath was only cut once last year.	Comments noted. Not planning matters. All comments passed on Policy 11 passed to CCC. No change.
11	Resident	Better provision is needed for walking e.g. east along Beacon Edge towards the A686. There is no safe path for walking or cycling along this stretch.	Comment noted. The PNDP seeks to support more walking.
11	Resident	Look at potential for an off road pavement / cycle path from Penrith to Stoneybeck but do not divert over Fairhill which is poor and has steep gradients	Comment noted. No change.
11	Resident	Ensure that all cyclepath designs comply with specifications set out by Sustrans and not just the local and district Highways Authority	Comment noted. Not a planning matter. No change.
11	Resident	Dog fouling is a real issue – dog wardens should be more visible and more bins should be provided with signs stating that should your dog foul it should be bagged and binned.	Comment noted. Not a planning matter. No change.
11	Resident	Make environmentally and cheap transport more of a focus to bring business to the town, reduce isolation of older people and bring health benefits.	Comment noted. No change.
11	Business	Hard to have cycle paths without narrowing existing roads, avoid town centre and artery routes which have heavy commuter traffic and HGVs	Comment noted. No change.
11	Resident	Need proper cycle lanes separated from motorised vehicles	Comment noted. No change.
11	Resident	All new developments must be designed to accommodate walking and cycling with special consideration to access to town centre and work places.	Comment noted. No change.
11	Resident	Although the National Cycle Network passes through the town there are no dedicated or even mixed use traffic free cycle / pedestrian paths. Cycle paths are not just painted lines in the gutter of a busy road (eg Ullswater Road). Many more people would use bikes if proper traffic free paths were created.	Comment noted. PNDP seeks to support such measures.
11	Resident	More bicycle stands should be installed around the town.	Comment noted

Paragraph /Policy	Response Origin	Comments	Town Council Response
-------------------	-----------------	----------	-----------------------

OBJECTIVE 6 -TOWN CENTRE CAR PARKING

Objective 6	Business	Promote Sainsbury's 3 hour free parking more, lower in town parking to attract longer stay. Cheap parking for workers is essential.	Comment noted. Car parking charges not an NDP matter, but already referred to in para 6.63. No change.
Objective 6	Business	There are places in Sainsbury's, Booth's Morrisons which always have places, people should park and walk	Comment noted. No change.
Objective 6	Resident	Other areas have fitted car chargers to lamp-posts – can this be considered	Comment noted. No change.

OBJECTIVE 6 -TOWN CENTRE CAR PARKING

Objective 6	Resident	Build a 2/3 storey car park clad in sandstone lower decks for general parking, top deck for workers at a low rate	Comment noted. No change.
Objective 6	Resident	Overnight parking for campervans etc more suited to Haweswater Rd	Comment noted no change
Objective 6	Resident	Sign posts to parking for drivers and walkers should be better, excellent idea for cheap parking to get workers cars off the streets	Comment noted. No change.
Objective 6	Resident	Park and Ride is a stupid idea for a town this size	Delete park and ride.
Objective 6	Resident	Park and ride systems don't work in a town the size of Penrith	Delete park and ride.
Objective 6	Resident	Some on-street parking is required in the middle by car owners who may not have a blue badge but are not able to walk very far	Comment noted. No change.
Objective 6	Resident	Homes without parking spaces provided should still be allowed to use Zone parking ie D Zone.	Comment noted. No change.
Objective 6	Resident	A Zone residents are discriminated against as there is no residents parking.	Comment noted. No change.
Objective 6	Resident	The Bus Station needs to move to Gilwilly and the current land used for low cost housing with parking underneath	Comment noted. No change.
Objective 6	Resident	Park and Ride is a stupid idea, dog fouling is a big issue and send someone to Valley Gardens in Harrogate to see how a park should be run.	Delete park and ride.
Objective 6	Resident	Cheap long term parking for workers is essential to get workers off the residential streets	Comment noted. Car parking charges not an NDP matter, but already referred to in para 6.63. No change..

Paragraph /Policy	Response Origin	Comments	Town Council Response
-------------------	-----------------	----------	-----------------------

OBJECTIVE 6 -TOWN CENTRE CAR PARKING

Objective 6	Resident	Make car parking free to encourage visitors and support workers. Improve pedestrian crossings in town square (currently vague) with different coloured tarmac Make Middlegate and town square pedestrian only on Saturdays Combine Sandgate mini roundabouts into one and sacrifice parking spaces at the top	Comment noted. Car parking charges not an NDP matter, but already referred to in para 6.63. No change.
Objective 6	Business / Resident	Objective 6 is far too restrictive/negative and should be re-worded as follows: 'To promote the vibrancy, accessibility and permeability of the Town Centre, including by cars, by providing adequate car parking for local people and visitors alike'	Amend Objective 6 as suggested.
Objective 6	Resident	Make parking cheaper and easier in town for everyone	Comment noted. Not a planning matter. No change.
Objective 6	Resident	A park and ride is a very silly idea and won't work in Penrith, it's too small	Delete park and ride.
Objective 6	Resident	As this doesn't have any supporting policies could it be deleted and combined with Policy 12	No. These are supporting actions because they are not planning matters and cannot be included in Policy 12.
Objective 6	Resident	Council should look to provide free parking	Comment noted. Car parking charges not an PNDP matter, but already referred to in para 6.63. No change.
Objective 6	Resident	Something must be done about parking on the streets and estates as they are full of workers cars. The gas works site would have made a good cheap car park for workers.	Comment noted. No change.
Objective 6	Resident	Needs more disabled parking. Parking for camper vans is a good idea.	Comment noted. No change.
Objective 6	Resident	On-Street parking works well for quick visits but cheap long stay is essential for workers.	Comment noted. No change.
Objective 6	Resident	Park and Ride would not work in Penrith – volume is too low and many workers are part time	Delete park and ride.
Objective 6	Resident	Modern car parking infrastructure usually includes a charging element – would this be the case for local people?	Comment noted. No change.

Paragraph /Policy	Response Origin	Comments	Town Council Response
-------------------	-----------------	----------	-----------------------

OBJECTIVE 6 -TOWN CENTRE CAR PARKING

Objective 6	Resident	Do your proposals for car parking take into account the view that private car parking will diminish in future years with the development of driverless vehicles and the move away from private ownership	No. PNDP seeks to deal with existing car parking issues.
Objective 6	Resident	Difficult to achieve we don't want multi storey. Park and ride is a good idea but would need to be frequent	Comment noted. No change. See other responses on park and ride.
Objective 6	25 responses	The idea of an overnight stopping area for motorhomes is a good one. UK is far behind other countries in the EU as far as provision is concerned. It improves safety as drivers are not tired or stressed and can be a source of income. Not necessary to provide hook up as motorhomes are self contained for short period of light., heat, cooking etc. Water and used water dump are a necessity however. Would need careful consideration as to how to ensure the facility isn't abused	Support noted. Delete the words 'and power hook-up points'
Objective 6	Resident	There are too many spaces taken up by permit holders during the day. All parking permits should be chargeable. Blue Bell car park should be multi-storey. Park and ride or parking for people who travel to work from the villages at a much cheaper day / yearly rate should be made available	Comments noted. No change.
Objective 6	Resident	I do not think there would be a realistic need for park and ride.	Delete park and ride.
Objective 6	Resident	I think town centre car parks should be low/no charge with shorter stay i.e. 2 hrs max. However there should be very cheap parking for workers further out but walkable. This should be in identified area and not simply displaced to residential areas. In fact residential parking should be all permits within the town.	Comments noted. No change.
Objective 6	Resident	We need cheap town centre car parking for people who live outside Penrith and commute into town to work to get cars out of the residential streets.	Comments noted. No change.
Objective 6	Resident	I'm delighted to see overnight motorhome parking being considered. Hook up isn't necessary but fresh water and a waste disposal point would be of more importance. It would be lovely to have an aire in the town centre. I think it would be very well used.	Support noted. Delete the words 'and power hook-up points'.

Paragraph /Policy	Response Origin	Comments	Town Council Response
-------------------	-----------------	----------	-----------------------

OBJECTIVE 6 -TOWN CENTRE CAR PARKING

Objective 6	Resident	We need some kerbside parking on Victoria Road to run our business, without this we would have serious problems. There is too much illegal parking. There are lots of legitimate parking spaces in car parks around town, it does seem that people cannot be bothered walking to/from them. A scheme to book parking spaces prior to arrival would be better if it could be booked on line and you were allocated a parking space to go to	Comments noted. No change.
Objective 6	Resident	Residential areas near the train station are used by people leaving their cars for us to a week at a time or to leave cars and car share elsewhere. Long stay cheap car parking is essential for Penrith for commuters and to encourage footfall.	Comments noted. No change.
Objective 6	Resident	With regard to parking have you taken into account that the way we travel will change with the advent of driverless cars.	No. PNDP seeks to deal with existing car parking issues.
Objective 6	Resident	There is not a problem with general car parking in Penrith unless you want to park outside the shop you want to go into. With various supermarkets providing free parking for 2-3 hours this has helped considerably although people are generally lazy and don't want to work.	Comment noted. Car parking charges not an NDP matter, but already referred to in para 6.63. No change..
Objective 6	Resident	On-street parking should be used to encourage town centre visits and make off street parking free for visitors for 3 hours and cheap for workers. Visitors should not fear a penalty ticket for infringement	Comments noted. No change.
Objective 6	Resident	Some town centre on street parking will always be needed.	Comments noted. No change.
Objective 6	Resident	Reasonably priced accessible parking for workers, visitors and residents alike	Comment noted. Car parking charges not an NDP matter, but already referred to in para 6.63. No change.
Objective 6, 7	Resident	It seems to cover all the needs and aspirations of the local community. In terms of Objective 6 not sure where you are going to be able to find a suitable area to provide parking infrastructure. Policy 12 – believe Penrith desires and needs pedestrianisation.	Comments noted. No change.
Objective 6	Resident	Don't utilise an existing car park for camper vans and touring caravans, they should be kept out of town.	Comments noted. No change.
Objective 6	Resident	Not relevant advertising facilities in Castle park as there are no parking facilities as promised by EDC three years ago	Comments noted. No change.

Paragraph /Policy	Response Origin	Comments	Town Council Response
-------------------	-----------------	----------	-----------------------

OBJECTIVE 6 -TOWN CENTRE CAR PARKING

Objective 6	Resident	A park and ride scheme won't work in Penrith, it's too small. Definitely need cheap long term Parking for workers to get cars off the streets.	Delete park and ride.
Objective 6	Residents	Supermarkets do a home delivery service, why can't they do a sponsored minibus service to help ease traffic problems, good advertising tool, build customer goodwill and a loyal customer relationship.	Comments noted. No change.
Objective 6	Resident	The lack of long stay CHEAP parking for workers has resulted in an increase of cars in residential streets. This should be a priority. Overnight motorhome parking is a good idea	Comment noted. Car parking charges not an NDP matter, but already referred to in para 6.63. No change.
Objective 6	Resident	Penrith should welcome visitors with cheaper or free parking to draw away from places like Carlisle and Keswick. Not enough season tickets and too expensive	Comments noted. No change.
Objective 6	Resident	Short stay drop in parking in the town centre needs to be retained for local businesses for banking etc.	Comments noted. No proposal to stop on street parking. No change.
Objective 6	Resident	Consider assisting Christ Church in their plan to introduce parking on the north side of the Church with a low daily charge divided between the Church and Council.	Comments noted. No change.
Objective 6	Resident	Generous areas of free or cheap parking would be helpful for businesses and visitors	Comments noted. No change.
Objective 6	Resident	By reducing on street parking in the town centre you would reduce footfall moving people out to shopping centres. A parking facility close to the centre eg the Old Gas Works site London Road would provide for workers	Comments noted. No change.
Objective 6	Resident	Park and ride won't work, no multi-storey car parks.	Delete park and ride.
Objective 6	Resident	Encourage a better and more frequent public transport system around the town.	Comments noted. No change.
Objective 6	Resident	On-Street parking is ample for residents and the free parking at supermarkets have large car parks.	Comments noted. No change.
Objective 6	Resident	Park and ride isn't necessary and wouldn't work in Penrith but camper van / caravan parks are a good idea.	Delete park and ride. Support noted.
Objective 6	Resident	Don't agree with overnight parking for camper vans and caravans this would add to litter	Comments noted. No change.

Paragraph /Policy	Response Origin	Comments	Town Council Response
-------------------	-----------------	----------	-----------------------

OBJECTIVE 6 -TOWN CENTRE CAR PARKING

Objective 6	Resident	Parking needs to be extensive and affordable. Cheap long term parking is essential especially due to the lack of public transport – this would get cars off streets. Charging for electric cars needs to be throughout town. Overnight parking for motorhomes is a good idea but would need to be time limited and carefully regulated.	Comments noted. No change.
Objective 6	Resident	There is a desperate feel to this and other references to cars, there are already too many	Comments noted. No change.
Objective 6	Resident	Stop the indiscriminate parking of contractors vehicles overnight and at the weekends in resident only areas. There has been a systematic abuse of the scheme.	Comments noted. No change.
Objective 6	Resident	Parking is a big problem up on (Wetheriggs) estate	Comments noted. No change.
Objective 6	Resident	Agreed that long term cheap parking for commuters is a must but where will a car park go.	Comments noted. No change.
Objective 6	Resident	Cheap long term parking for workers is essential to get cars off the residential streets but to entice people into Penrith you should be offering cheap or free parking not putting the price up.	Comments noted. No change.
Objective 6	Resident	I disagree with objective 6 ie to reduce on-street parking. I really enjoy the disc zones which are free. I don't want to have to park my car in a paying car park for a short time.	Comments noted. No proposal to stop on-street parking. No change.
Objective 6	Resident	The present provision of car parking in Penrith seems to be poor. 2 hours does not allow visitors to enjoy shopping, eating, drinking, wandering round and admiring the architecture. Local businesses need visitors and sadly they are being discouraged. I don't agree with then policy of reducing on street parking.	Comments noted. No proposal to stop on-street parking. No change.
Objective 6	Resident	Would like to see resident parking areas that are 24 hours reduced to being disc zones to facilitate better use of the town during normal working hours while residential streets can accommodate short term parking during daytime hours.	Comments noted. No change.
Objective 6	Resident	Do not reduce on-street parking	Comments noted. No proposal to stop on-street parking No change.
Objective 6	Resident	Extended and improved town bus service should be developed, reduce parking in town centre	Comments noted. No change.

Paragraph /Policy	Response Origin	Comments	Town Council Response
-------------------	-----------------	----------	-----------------------

OBJECTIVE 6 -TOWN CENTRE CAR PARKING

Objective 6	Business	It must be recognised that the only means of transport in this rural area is cars. Provision must be made for the elderly and infirm (not badge holders) to park on street for essentials: optician, chemist, hairdressers, solicitors etc otherwise they will go elsewhere and reduce the viability of the town. Our strength must be in small businesses not supermarkets – look at Yorkshire towns, busses, cheap or free parking and on-street	Comments noted. No change.
Objective 6	Business	Main concern is customer parking as everyone is aware of time restraints in free car parking as other car parks cost too much. We want people to be able to wander around, have something to eat without worrying about whether they will get a ticket.	Comments noted. No change.
Objective 6	Business	We need a three storey car park on Bluebell Lane with pay on exit, knock down Argos on Middlegate and make a pedestrian space to include seats, flowerbeds.	Comments noted. No change.
Objective 6	Business	It would be useful to have a similar scheme to Kendal where if you park before 9am it is only £1 charge all day encouraging people to stay and shop longer in the town, also utilising existing car parks eg upstairs in Sainsburys/the bus station as both are rarely full	Comments noted. No change.

OBJECTIVE 7 – TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT

Policy 12: Traffic Management

12	Resident	Because of the narrowness of some streets and the one-way systems required, circulation of traffic on the fringe of the town centre is circuitous. This aspect is more and more serious as further planned and infill housing development takes place. In particular it will be necessary to improve capacity and traffic flow along the axis Victoria Rd / Langton St / / Benson Row / Meeting House Lane / Drovers Lane / Portland Place. Some of the junctions along this route are confusing and have poor visibility for drivers and pedestrians. It is a route which also serves the bus station. In addition, street parking along this route is not well laid out and managed.	Comments noted. No change.
12	Resident	No one way traffic on New Streets	Comments noted. Remove reference to New Streets
12	Resident	No ring road. Traffic through town is important for the shops of Penrith. No one way systems on the New Streets – adds no value	Comments noted. Remove reference to New Streets.

Paragraph /Policy	Response Origin	Comments	Town Council Response
-------------------	-----------------	----------	-----------------------

OBJECTIVE 7 – TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT

Policy 12: Traffic Management

12	Resident	An inner ring road is a must as is a link road from Cowper Road Gilwilly to Junction 41 to alleviate congestion at J40 and link with new business park at Stoneybeck.	Comments noted. No change.
12	Resident	Objection to large commercial vehicles (work vans) on town roads and streets.	Comments noted. No change.
12	Resident	A one-way system through the New Streets is desperately needed	Comments noted.
12	Resident	A one way system on the New Streets would not work – there isn't a problem of access for emergency vehicles as things stand but traffic does go too fast	Comments noted. Remove reference to New Streets
12	Resident	A one way system in the New Streets wouldn't work	Comments noted. Remove reference to New Streets.
12	Residents	Would like to request Beacon Edge and New Streets becoming a 20mph zone	Comments noted. Pass to CCC.
12	Resident	Has to be a high priority, a link road parallel with the M6 between Gilwilly linking with J41 would make a massive impact of taking traffic from entering the town between 9am and 4pm	Comments noted. No change.
12	Resident	Something needs done about the traffic on the A6 which has increased considerably in two years. HGVs use it as a short cut when they have no reason to go through the town. Why keep Amey in a residential area and put extra industrial there, their trucks move down to dusk and new flats are being built opposite. Serious consideration needs to be given to making the road one way through town and for re-routing as many large vehicles as possible – no access unless delivering?	This is addressed in Policy 12.1. No change.
12	Business	Victoria Rd is used as a race track at night – it wouldn't be difficult to catch speeders	Comment noted. Speeding not a planning matter. No change. Refer to Police
12	Resident	A new route round town would certainly ease congestion and needs to be considered especially if the introduction of pedestrianisation is considered.	Comment noted. No change.
12	Resident	Don't agree with a one way system as this will mean that cars are driven further and this is bad for air quality and the environment.	Comment noted. Remove reference to New Streets.
12	Resident	All the traffic from Carleton Heights and Carleton Meadows all come down one road (Carleton Hill) is dangerous with poor sight lines and access for emergency vehicles	Comment noted. No change.

Paragraph /Policy	Response Origin	Comments	Town Council Response
-------------------	-----------------	----------	-----------------------

OBJECTIVE 7 – TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT

Policy 12: Traffic Management

12	Resident	Introduce a speed restriction along the full length of Beacon Edge	Comment noted. Speeding not a planning matter. Pass comment to CCC. No change.
12	Resident	Support looking at traffic flow but not by diverting along Drovers Lane as it's not wide enough. Any provision to keep traffic out of the town needs to make provision for the disabled / less mobile. Already the area around Angel Lane is difficult for some, perhaps more disabled places are needed.	Comment noted. No change.
12	Business	More active representation to Highways should take place to look at traffic movement before the Summer gridlock becomes a year round issue, air quality should be considered at Eamont Bridge.	Comment noted. Comments passed to CCC. No change.
12	Resident	Consideration should be given to imposing a vehicle weight limit on Beacon Edge and impose parking restrictions for 15 metres at the top of Wordsworth Street.	Comment noted. Not a planning matter. Refer to CCC.
12	Resident	Increasingly pedestrians are being obstructed by vehicles parking on pavements	Comment noted. Not a planning matter. Refer to CCC
12	Resident	Park and Ride is not required as Penrith is not large enough.	Delete park and ride.
12	Resident	Disagree with a one way system proposal for the New Streets	Comment noted. See above.
12	Resident	One way in the New Streets would be a disaster	Comment noted. See above.
12	Resident	Don't think that a one way system in the New Streets would work or be welcome by residents. There should be mention of supporting a new route from Gilwilly to J41 to remove heavy traffic from J40 and the town.	Comment noted. See above.
12	Resident	Moving traffic from the Town Centre onto narrower/residential streets would create problems and hazards	Comment noted. No change.
12	Resident	Cars travel too fast along Beacon Edge and turn too fast into the New Streets (Wordsworth Street) this will be exacerbated if it becomes one way. Better having it as it is with speed limits reduced to 20mph	Comment noted. Speeding not a planning matter. Refer to CCC
12	Resident	Agree in principle but any new route requires careful thought and execution. We don't want a 'northern bypass'	Support noted. No change.

Paragraph /Policy	Response Origin	Comments	Town Council Response
-------------------	-----------------	----------	-----------------------

OBJECTIVE 7 – TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT

Policy 12: Traffic Management

12	Resident	The town centre should be totally pedestrianised with exceptions for people with mobility issues. I support an alternative route away from the town centre.	Comment noted. No change.
12	Resident	Don't support a 'new route' as described. The Town Centre needs to be both more appealing and more accessible to walkers, cyclists and cars. Diverting cars won't help this. Suggest more study of issues, impact and options. Suggest rewording to read '1. A thorough analysis of the traffic congestion zones facing the Town Centre (and existing by-passes?), the reasons for these issues and the desirability of diverting through traffic away from the Town Centre. 2. An assessment of the benefits and issues arising from a one-way system through the New Streets' Supporting actions needs to include bolder, more ambitious plans for economic sustainability as mentioned in the policy above. A food-town is fine but not nearly enough	Comment noted. No change.
12	Resident	Fear that diverting traffic from the centre will have an adverse impact on trade.	Comment noted. No change
12	Resident	Not in favour of a one-way system in the New Streets as this has the potential to add significant traffic in a relatively quiet residential area.	Comment noted. Remove reference to New Streets.
12	Business	Creating a new route through Penrith makes sense but businesses need footfall and roadworks cause chaos in the town resulting in a loss of footfall. We can't afford to lose customers to Carlisle even for a limited period.	Comment noted. No change
12	Resident	Pedestrianise Devonshire Street only	Comment noted. No change
12	Resident	Road infrastructure needs upgrading in and around Penrith, A66 duelling, J41	Comment noted. Ongoing
12	Resident	Don't see the need for a one-way system on the New Streets this could exacerbate problems	Comment noted. Remove reference to New Streets
12(1)	Business / Resident	Delete words from 'including accessing the benefits....emergency vehicles' and replace with: Sub Para 1a – 'introduce 20mph speed restrictions and speed calming schemes and a one-way system to the New Streets area in order to improve traffic flow, reduce safety risk both to humans and animals and improve access for emergency vehicles'	Change to read 'A new route to divert through-traffic around the town, introduce 20mph speed restrictions and traffic calming schemes in order to improve traffic flow, reduce safety risk both to humans and animals and improve access for emergency vehicles.

Paragraph /Policy	Response Origin	Comments	Town Council Response
-------------------	-----------------	----------	-----------------------

OBJECTIVE 7 – TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT

Policy 12: Traffic Management

12	Resident / Business	Traffic management lacks sufficient ambition as its one of the most serious challenges facing Penrith, the objective merely suggests that the current situation should not be allowed to worsen. That is far too low a level of ambition. This objective must be proactive and really support the vision.	Comment noted. No change
12, 13	Resident	Car use in 2030 and certainly later will be quite different. Fewer cars, more electric self driving cars and 'Uber' style services leading to fewer cars and less parking requirements. We need 2030 solutions to 2030 not 2019 solutions.	Comment noted. No change
12	Resident	De classify the A6 between Kemplay and Scotland Road to discourage it being a short cut for heavy traffic	Not an NDP matter. No change.
12	Resident	More details required on plans to divert through traffic and one- way system – a one-way system on New Streets could actually double traffic movement.	Comment noted. No change
12	Resident	No merit in making New Streets one-way, this would not help emergency vehicles which only have difficulties when cars are badly parked. Merit in looking at pedestrianizing some of the town centre.	Comment noted. Remove reference to New Streets
12	Resident	Look at parking and road infrastructure before new developments are occupied.	These are matters to be considered at planning application stage. No change.
12	Resident	Shame the A6 goes through the centre of town, by-pass needed. Pedestrianise Market Square and the Clock Tower and much longed for Café Culture will follow	Comment noted. No change
12	Resident	New Streets should be resident only parking. Dedicated cheap parking at £1 a day as suggested for workers would be beneficial	Residents only parking not an NDP matter. Comment noted. No change.
12	Business	Do not direct traffic away from the town centre and through the New Streets, this would adversely impact on tourist traffic. Time limit HGVs through the town centre. Park and Ride wouldn't work in Penrith – too small and costly	Comment noted. No change
12	Resident	Road markings need to be re-done throughout the town.	Not an NDP matter. Comment noted. No change. Refer to CCC

Paragraph /Policy	Response Origin	Comments	Town Council Response
-------------------	-----------------	----------	-----------------------

OBJECTIVE 7 – TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT

Policy 12: Traffic Management

12 & 13	Business	Provision of sensible low cost parking for workers is well overdue. Some pedestrianisation is welcome	Comment noted. Car parking charges not an NDP matter, but already referred to in para 6.63. No change.
12	Business / Resident	New developments should provide sufficient parking, even in the middle of towns, residents have vehicles.	PNDP seeks to implement Cumbria CC standards. No change.
12,13	Resident	Penrith is at a unique cross roads but fails to attract large nos of visitors because it is pedestrian unfriendly with as dangerous and constant flow of traffic. On Sundays it is a ghost town because most of the shops are closed. It should be promoted as a popular visitor destination with an ancient market town heritage. Devonshire Street and Market Square should be pedestrianised to provide a safe space for shoppers, tourists, market stalls, town events and street entertainers. Bigger and brighter signs advertising Penrith should be erected on the approaches and it should be professionally marketed as a visitor destination thereby revitalising the town, creating new openings for small businesses and attracting larger retailers.	Comments noted. PNDP seeks to address these. No change.
12	Resident	Traffic management needs urgent improvement as congestion backs up through the one-way system. Don't build a by-pass work with what we have to ensure visitors come into town.	Comments noted. PNDP seeks to address these. No change.
12	Residents	New streets should not be made one-way.	Comment noted. Remove reference to New Streets.
12	Resident	One way system through New Streets likely to increase traffic flows and increase traffic speed. Leave things the way they are.	Comment noted. Remove reference to New Streets.
12 .7	Resident	More information would be required on any one way system and how it might affect the town.	Comment noted. Remove reference to New Streets.

Paragraph /Policy	Response Origin	Comments	Town Council Response
-------------------	-----------------	----------	-----------------------

OBJECTIVE 8 – PENRITH TOWN CENTRE

Policy 13: Penrith Town Centre Improvements

13	Resident	Pedestrian access, especially through Devonshire St/Market Sq/Cornmarket could be improved with street surfaces and furniture which give pedestrians priority over vehicles. However in order that servicing of business premises is maintained, it would not be advisable to restrict vehicle access beyond present measures.	Comments noted. PNDP seeks to address such issues. No change.
13	Resident	The Ullswater Rd approach is a disaster – the opportunity was lost years ago.	Already included in Policy 13. No change.
13	Resident	Pedestrianisation will be detrimental to the heart of Penrith. Planting of street trees and placing of street furniture would be a total waste of council funds.	Comments noted. No change.
13	Resident	How many more retail outlets for food can the town support – there should not be a conflict between food retail and well-being	Comments noted. Where within planning control, these matters are dealt with by the Eden Local Plan. No change.
13	Resident	The TC should work hard with the community to redevelop the town centre for modern requirements. Less shops (too many charity shops / empty shops), more leisure activities, performance area, bowling, ice rink, art galleries, exhibitions, education, nature, community space	Comments noted. PNDP seeks to address such issues. No change.
13	Resident	Don't agree with pedestrianisation. This would mean traffic being redirected via Sandgate which would not improve the environment, the turn at the two junctions at the top of Sandgate would be a major hinderance to lots of traffic	Comments noted. No change.
13	Resident	Some pedestrianisation would be welcome – perhaps initially trialled on a Saturday between certain times.	Comments noted. No change.
13	Resident	Eating out is now a leisure activity and we are lacking choice and the number of places to eat, especially in the evening. More in the centre should increase footfall by providing better facilities	Comments noted. Where within planning control, these matters are dealt with by EDCs Local Plan. No change.
13	Resident	Priorities are empty shops and New Squares. Could the bigger premises be used to enhance the leisure activities in the town eg ten pin bowling or a skating rink.	Comments noted. Where within planning control, these matters are dealt with by EDCs Local Plan. No change.

Paragraph /Policy	Response Origin	Comments	Town Council Response
-------------------	-----------------	----------	-----------------------

OBJECTIVE 8 – PENRITH TOWN CENTRE

Policy 13: Penrith Town Centre Improvements

13	Resident	You need to preserve the character of the town. The town is not keeping up with present problems eg potholes, littering, shortage of police, parking.	Comments noted. Where planning related, these matters are addressed in PNDP. No change.
13	Business	We need retail and to create jobs rather than more new expensive houses that most local people can't afford	Comments noted. Where within planning control, these matters are dealt with by the Eden Local Plan. No change.
13	Resident	Something must be done about the empty shops, rent and rates should be made cheaper to try to get them filled.	Comments noted, not planning matters. No change.
13	Resident	Town centre should be pedestrianised	Comments noted. No change.
13	Resident	What sort of town is Penrith – Market town / Food town it should be very clear and we should build on that. The centre should be pedestrianised to boost retail activity.	Comments noted. No change.
13	Resident	There is no mention of public toilets which are essential for residents and visitors	Comment noted. Not a planning matter.
13	Business	More trees please. Bridge Lane used to be beautiful with an avenue of trees. Each entrance into town should be lined with trees (to help the environment). Tree planting should be encouraged on estates.	PNDP seeks to support such measures. No change.
13	Resident	There is nothing here to drive/support the necessary reduction in the commercial size of the town centre and redevelop for other purposes eg housing.	Comments noted. Where within planning control, these matters are dealt with by EDCs Local Plan. No change.
13	Resident	Nothing about potential pedestrianisation of parts of the town centre with a view to turning it into a social hub	Comment noted. Policy 13.3. No change.
13	Resident	I don't disagree with the sentiments but it is disappointing that no mention has been made of the considerable changes which are going to happen in the high street, not only in Penrith but across the UK.	Comments noted. Where within planning control, these matters are dealt with by EDCs Local Plan. No change.

Paragraph /Policy	Response Origin	Comments	Town Council Response
-------------------	-----------------	----------	-----------------------

OBJECTIVE 8 – PENRITH TOWN CENTRE

Policy 13: Penrith Town Centre Improvements

13	Resident	There needs to be a major discussion over pedestrianisation making the town centre more of a community space rather than just shopping and how we make Penrith into an experience in its own right. Unfortunately the plan is very woolly in regard to the future of the town centre and needs to be beefed up	Comments noted. PNDP should be read in conjunction with EDCs Local Plan. No change.
13(3)	Business / Resident	Care must be taken NOT to pedestrianise vehicular access and permeability to the Town Centre otherwise it will likely become as impenetrable and unwelcoming as the existing new pedestrianised development know as New Squares. Pedestrainisation must NOT take place at the expense of sustaining healthy and easy vehicular access otherisew trade will be driven away from the town centre to the outskirts where free and easy parking is available, consequently killing off the existing vibrancy and character of the town centre.	Comments noted. No change.
13	Resident / Business	Town centre should be vibrant, accessible and permeable with strong healthy trading, pedestrianisation would kill the town centre.	Comment noted. No change.
13	Resident	Plan does not go far enough to encourage and look at sustainability of the town centre, shops are shutting due to internet shopping	Comments noted. Where within planning control these matters are dealt with by EDCs Local Plan. No change.
13	Resident	Can shops that have been empty for over a certain period of time be offered lower rates / rents to encourage people to take them up	Not a planning matter. No change. Refer to EDC
13	Resident	Penrith is a small market town and development needs to be in keeping with that, build on what we have, fill shops with independents and promote properly. Industrial develop0ment needs controlling to suit the area.	Comments noted. Where within planning control, these matters are dealt with by EDCs Local Plan. No change.
13	Resident	Address the issue of empty shops and general cleaning of the town centre. The alley ways need to be improved and cleaned, overgrown shrubs cleared and graffiti removed.	Comments noted. Where within planning control, these matters are dealt with by EDCs Local Plan. Litter etc. not land use planning matters. No change.

Paragraph /Policy	Response Origin	Comments	Town Council Response
-------------------	-----------------	----------	-----------------------

OBJECTIVE 8 – PENRITH TOWN CENTRE

Policy 13: Penrith Town Centre Improvements

13	Resident	More litter bins around seating areas all around town and in green spaces.	Comments noted. Bins are responsibility of EDC. Comments passed on
13	Resident	Planting native trees do nothing to enhance the town, times have moved on and you need blossoming or statement trees	Comments noted. No change.
13	Resident	More emphasis on suitability for disabled persons. More attention to acceptable surfaces of pavements for electric scooters / wheelchairs eg slopes, potholes on Bridge Lane, broken glass on pavements, dog fouling. More litter bins needed.	Addressed in Policy 13. No change.
13	Resident	Flowering Cherries on Portland Place were lovely and should be re-instated.	Comments noted. No change.
13	Resident	Castlegate needs a facelift – poor first image from the station as it’s the natural way into town	Addressed in Policy 13. No change.
13	Resident	Town Centre needs improvement to attract return tourists. Nowhere open on Sunday. Encourage independent traders to open on a Sunday, perhaps on a rota basis	Not a planning matter. No change.
13	Resident	Middlegate is shabby, pedestrianisation is urgent.	Addressed in Policy 13. No change.
13	Business	Rates should be more attractive to fill empty premises. Signage is cluttered and faded making some useless	Rates are not a planning matter. Signage addressed in Policy 13. No change.
13	Business	Middlegate and Little Dockray need to be pedestrianised	Comment noted. No change.
13	Business	Demolish Argos and create an open area through to Bluebell Lane which should be 2 storey	Comment noted. No change.
13	Resident	Pedestrianisation could be detrimental to the viability of the town centre	Comment noted. No change.
13, 14	Resident	Encourage regeneration of the high street and its shops.	Comment noted. No change.
13	Resident	Market day needs relaunching – it takes time for things to build up so deciding it hasn’t got support after a couple of weeks is short sighted	Not a planning matter. No change.
13	Resident	Poorly put together document – no mention of new or re-furbished public toilets for use of visitors or locals this should be responsibility of the town council	Comment noted: not a planning matters

Paragraph /Policy	Response Origin	Comments	Town Council Response
-------------------	-----------------	----------	-----------------------

OBJECTIVE 8 – PENRITH TOWN CENTRE

Policy 13: Penrith Town Centre Improvements

13	Resident	No mention of filling town centre shops by giving incentives eg no business rates for 12 months and assistance with improvements	Not a planning matter. No change.
13	Resident	Do NOT pedestrianise Middlegate – King Street as it causes havoc when it is closed on many Saturdays	Comment noted. No change.
13	Resident	New Squares emptiness is a disgrace – change use to housing or office space	Comments noted. Where within planning control, these matters are dealt with by EDCs Local Plan. No change.
13	Resident	Empty units are an eye-sore and put people off visiting Penrith. The centre is a lovely market town with the cobbles, clock, bandstand etc in Summer with all the floral displays and in Winter the Christmas displays really light up the town.	Comments noted. PNDP seeks to improve centre and enhance character. No change.
13	Resident	3 hours free car parking at Sainsburys is great for bringing in visitors however they have to rush back to avoid a fine rather than spending time eating and looking around. It's embarrassing for people to walk through New Squares which is often covered in dog mess before they reach the 'nice part'. From Clintons onwards is lovely but I wouldn't be surprised if half the visitors turn around before then.	Comment noted. No change.
14	Resident	Other traditional market towns have national chains that have sympathetic wooden signage. Fully agree with this we have some awful shop signs in Penrith	Support noted. No change.
14	Business	Fully support, good idea	Support noted. No change.
14	Business	Agree with the shop front design. Pride must be taken in the town centre however it must be in conjunction with other bodies such as Penrith BID so that schemes are not duplicated and money spent wisely. As much as possible should be made of events where Penrith can pull together for the benefit of residents and visitors	Support noted. No change.
14	Business	The look of the town is key to encouraging footfall. Existing businesses should be made to maintain existing facias to the highest standards.	Comment noted. No change.

Paragraph /Policy	Response Origin	Comments	Town Council Response
-------------------	-----------------	----------	-----------------------

OBJECTIVE 8 – PENRITH TOWN CENTRE

Policy 14: Shopfront Design

14	Resident	If this will stop bright colour plastic signs it would be good.	Comment noted. No change.
14	Resident	Improvements to shop fronts as suggested will improve the appearance of the town.	Support noted. No change
14	Resident	Fully support as it seeks to maintain quality, character and distinctiveness. Concerned with the use of 'existing' as this will result in preservation of shop fronts that do not add to quality, character and distinctiveness. Recommend that the following words be added in brackets immediately after the word 'existing' "but only where that existing building or shopfront demonstrably adds to the quality, character and distinctiveness of Penrith Town Centre'	Support noted. No change – Policy 14 seeks to manage future development of new and alterations to existing shopfronts where planning approval is needed.
14	Resident	It will help to maintain the key features of Penrith and provide modern facilities that work for the future.	Support noted. No change
14	Resident	Fast food outlets shouldn't be allowed blatant frontage – should blend into the original sandstone frontage therefore enhancing the early buildings and history of the town. This should apply to the vacant premises in Burrowgate before and after occupation.	Comments noted. No change.
14	Business	Incentives would be a good idea to encourage people to follow guidelines	Comment noted. No change.
14	Resident	New shop fronts spoil the character of the town. Other town force shops including national chains to adopt much more low key signage – what are their policies?	Comments noted. Policy 14 seeks to improve quality of shopfronts.
14	Business	Totally agree	Support noted. No change
14	Business	We have lovely distinctive buildings and would be happy to see more preservation of shop fronts for the benefit of future citizens and to preserve the character of the town	Comment noted. No change.
14	Resident	Fully support this policy	Support noted. No change
14	Resident	Disagree. What shops? There won't be any soon except empty ones. If you change the town centre you would change the character of the town and this would not be good.	Comment noted. No change.

Paragraph / Policy	Response Origin	Comments	Town Council Response
--------------------	-----------------	----------	-----------------------

GENERAL / MULTIPLE COMMENTS

General	Resident	Build on the character Penrith has don't spoil its features – move with the times	Comments noted. Policy 14 seeks to improve quality of shopfronts.
General	Resident	Needs to be road improvement, drainage infrastructure, career opportunities, schools and health care BEFORE development	Comment noted. No change.
General	Resident	Grow Penrith in a way that maintains its charm and appeal for locals, tourists and businesses	Comment noted. PNDP seeks to do this. No change.
General	Resident	Housing is over-priced, shopping non-existent, Droving portrays Penrith as living in the dark ages. Promote as a proper market town with a market or go for the younger generation.	Comment noted. No change.
General	Resident	Changes should be sympathetic to the town not the same as everywhere else, schools and health facilities are require as they are unable to cope with demand now.	Comment noted. PNDP seeks to do this. No change.
General	Resident	The station car park is an eyesore – new buildings should be in keeping	Comment noted: add Station car park to list of potential improvements
Obj 1,6,8	Resident / Business	Imprecise use of language fails to clearly express intentions. The connection between the vision, objectives and policies is unclear and the argument is insufficiently made between vision, objectives and policies. The connections (cause and effect) should be made explicit and evidenced.	Comment noted. Link between Vision, Objectives and Policies clear. No change.
General	Resident	Developers should be made to build new facilities, there was meant to be a new school at Meadowcroft when it was built but 30 years later there still isn't a school	Comment noted. No change.
General	Resident	Need more health facilities and schools, keep all local green space and stop building in Penrith.	PNDP seeks to support such issues. No change.
General	Resident	Penrith needs to attract businesses and fill empty shops in town,	Comment noted. No change.
General	Resident	The young are crying out for activities and things to do that will keep them out of McDonalds and away from drugs which are readily available in the town. There has been a recent spike of violent thefts by young people in the town. There is an ignorance amongst local businesses amongst local businesses to the needs of those with dementia and mental health issues.	Comments noted. No change.

Paragraph / Policy	Response Origin	Comments	Town Council Response
--------------------	-----------------	----------	-----------------------

GENERAL / MULTIPLE COMMENTS

General	Resident	There is a lot of litter around Penrith some of which will be collecting from roadside recycling and the recycling points. More could be done to keep the town tidy e.g. around Sainsburys and new Squares where the garden space seems to be neglected. There is also broken glass around the town centre and it is often left. Businesses should take more responsibility if it outside their premises.	Comment noted. Not planning matters. No change.
General	Resident	Very happy with the statement of the key issues and the wording of the policies, they will really make a difference to Penrith and help provide a sustainable and healthy lifestyle for the residents.	Support noted. No change.
General	Resident	The plan is far too generalised particularly over new housing and as a result would not be enforceable in my opinion. It lacks ambition and does not provide a vision for the future.	Comments noted. No change.
General	Resident	I understand that the Masterplan has not been adopted but I do believe that the opportunity to inform this plan has been missed.	Masterplan is an EDC initiative with no statutory weight.
General	Eden Housing Association	Supportive of well-considered, well thought through, strategic improvements for the town of Penrith and will look to take action in collaboration with the Town Council in support of its objectives.	Support noted. No change.
General	Resident	There is no mention of business or retail, there are too many shop fronts for the population and no new initiatives to encourage retailers.	These matters are covered by policies in EDCs local Plan. No change.
General	Resident	Bring higher paid jobs to the community and give something for my children to look forward to growing up here.	Comment noted. No change.

Paragraph / Policy	Response Origin	Comments	Town Council Response
--------------------	-----------------	----------	-----------------------

GENERAL / MULTIPLE COMMENTS

General	Resident	<p>We would support the plan where the plan supports us people whom want to self build our own open market family homes in rural areas without being bound by unfair affordable restrictions (outside main service centres, key hubs, villages or hamlets). Where somebody is self building in a rural area where they have a strong local and family connection, affordable restrictions should not apply. Where somebody is adding their current home as an extra house on the market due to self building a new home, affordable restrictions should not apply. If somebody wants to self build within a 2 mile radius of the main service centre or a key hub (a reasonable travelling distance) and so long as there are already 3 or more coherent dwellings near the building plot, affordable restrictions should not apply as the area cannot be classed as being isolated from services or facilities and the self build cannot be classed as being in open countryside when there are other dwellings in the vicinity. Affordable restrictions should only apply to new development being built by housing developers who make hefty profits. Self builders have to take out self build mortgages, use their savings and sell their current home to fund their self builds, its already a risk, EDC should not stipulate in these circumstances whom and how much you should sell your own home that you have built and the possible risk of putting genuine people in negative equity. Self builders are helping the housing crisis that for years EDC have failed to do. Allow families to build their own homes so that they can free up their current smaller homes for the first time buyers. The main reason why there are no homes for first time buyers and why you are having to build brand new ones is because families like us cannot afford to move into larger houses in the area to free up the smaller homes. Perhaps the housing needs survey should have looked at the larger picture and thought outside the box a little more. It is not the lack of small starter homes that is required, its the lack of larger decent family homes allowing families to move out of the numerous small starter homes already in the town. 12 years ago mortgage interest rates were nearly 7% meaning most people could only afford to buy a very small home in the hope to move in the future. Now these people are in a position where they need and can move to a larger house, but we now cant. the problem that has now been caused is now that new starter homes are being built, first time buyers don't want our small older houses meaning we struggle to sell. It has now made the smaller houses in town worthless so people don't want to pay the price. this impacts on families funding a move to a larger house.</p>	<p>Comments noted. No change.</p>
---------	----------	---	--

Paragraph / Policy	Response Origin	Comments	Town Council Response
--------------------	-----------------	----------	-----------------------

GENERAL / MULTIPLE COMMENTS

General	Business / Resident	The absence of an explicit objective related to trades, employment and local businesses is a fatal omission. Fundamentally the PNDP vision depends upon a healthy, sustainable economic base for Penrith and the surrounding area. The total future of the plan to address this critical subject seems to undermine the whole basis of the remainder of the plan.	These matters are covered by policies in EDCs Local Plan. No change.
General	Resident	A high tech focus is needed to attract and retain business and enterprise and to improve access by householders ie fast broadband	Comments noted. No change.
General	Resident	Need more litter bins to keep green spaces clean for wildlife, children and dog walkers. We don't need more houses, the town centre needs sorting and the empty shops near Sainsbury's filled	Comments noted. No change.
General	Resident	No point as you have your own agenda and the feelings of the people of Penrith are never going to be taken into account	The NDP is being changed to reflect the wishes of the public following this consultation
General	Resident	This is a sensible approach to the future of Penrith	Support noted. No change.
General	Resident	I don't support any development on land behind the Beacon. A link to Gilwilly Industrial Estate to the A6 north of the town would reduce the use of Norfolk Rd as a link to the estate. This would also reduce congestion at J40	Comments noted. No change.
General	Resident	Penrith is a market town, over development will spoil it.	Comments noted. No change.
General	Resident	Finally a sensible plan for Penrith, thoughtful, well put together and feels right for the town.	Support noted. No change.
General	Resident	The policies are too vague	Comments noted. No change.
General	Resident	I support the plan which aims to retain the character of Penrith. Would like to see New Squares converted to apartments / office space with retail being concentrated in the old town. Need more diversification of retail – less hairdressers and charity shops	Support noted. No change.
General	Resident	Fully support the Plan as I can about the future of our town and I want it to prosper.	Support noted. No change.

Paragraph / Policy	Response Origin	Comments	Town Council Response
--------------------	-----------------	----------	-----------------------

GENERAL / MULTIPLE COMMENTS

General	Resident	Very constructive blueprint for the future.	Support noted. No change.
General	Resident	I object to the whole plan as there are plenty of empty buildings, there is no need to build any more it is not what Penrith needs or requires.	Comments noted. No change.
General	Resident	The policies are too vague to have any real meaning, it depends how they are interpreted.	Comments noted. No change.
General	Resident	This is a good detailed blueprint for the future of the town with consideration to all areas	Support noted. No change.
General	Resident	There doesn't seem to be any consideration of light pollution. The plan should have policies which support the objective of 'Dark Skies Reversed	Group to consider adding a Dark Sky policy.
General	Resident	Waste of money, office could have been accommodated in the Town Hall or Mansion House	Comments noted. No change.
General	Resident	Plan should be put in the bin, poorly thought out by persons who don't know what they are thinking about. The Council should have meetings at a time and place where persons who work can attend. The Council honest and open about matters which concern town residents.	Comments noted. No change.
General	Statutory National Coal Board	No specific comments	Noted.
General	Statutory National Grid	No implications	Noted.
General	Statutory Network Rail	Consideration should be given in Transport Assessments to the potential for increased footfall at Penrith Railway Station as a result of proposals for residential development / employment areas within the neighbourhood plan area. Location of the proposal, accessibility and density of the development, trip generation data should be considered in relation to the station. Where proposals are likely to increase footfall and the need for car parking at the station; the council should include developer contributions (either via CIL, S106) to provide funding for enhancements as part of planning decisions	Comments noted. These matters will be considered at planning application stage. No change.

Paragraph / Policy	Response Origin	Comments	Town Council Response
--------------------	-----------------	----------	-----------------------

GENERAL / MULTIPLE COMMENTS

General	Resident	These plans look generally good for Penrith however I do have concerns about the infrastructure to support new development.	Support noted. No change.
General	Resident	Penrith is a market town and should stay that way to accommodate the farming and agricultural sector. With the auction moving out of the town the weekly market no longer exists	Comment noted. No change.
General	Resident	Local business should be encouraged to stock and promote local produce	Not planning matter. No change.
Industry	Resident	Light industry including agricultural and forestry businesses are required as is business administration – link to Newton Rigg?	Comment noted. Business issues addressed in Eden Local Plan. No change.
Vision	Resident	Drop the word 'market' going forward	Comment noted. No change.
Supporting Actions	Resident	Outside commercial interests have been on the main streets for a long time but the development game has ramped up dramatically with housing, supermarkets etc with generally negative effects. The view from the side lines has been that Local Authorities are completely overwhelmed by predatory developers.	Comment noted. No change.
General	Resident	The plan is well put together and quite exhaustive. Penrith Needs to develop and better facilities will hopefully be supported. Changes should be carefully planned and gradual to avoid overkill.	Support noted. No change.
General	Resident	Keep Penrith idyllic as it is and not ruin it like the white elephant next to Sainsburys	PNDP seeks to support this. No change.
General	Resident	In general agreement with all objectives and policies in the draft plan including Policy 14.	Support noted. No change.
General	Resident	Appreciate that the TC doesn't not have any direct powers over employment, traffic management and parking but they are key issues to the successful development, conservation and life of the town. Continuing maintenance of various forms of employment in the town and their enhancement should be underlying so that proposals which are prejudicial to employment are not encouraged. Measures need to be taken to maintain and increase off-street parking provision, if necessary at more than one level of building for use throughout the day.	Comments noted. PNDP seeks to influence these issues where it can. No change.
General	Resident	A priority should be to improve occupancy levels of New Squares shop units (without transferring existing businesses from other parts of the town). Solution – alternative uses / lower rentals	Comment noted. Retail issues addressed in Eden Local Plan. No change.

Paragraph / Policy	Response Origin	Comments	Town Council Response
--------------------	-----------------	----------	-----------------------

GENERAL / MULTIPLE COMMENTS

General	Resident	Generally a good plan if there are enough financial resources to fund it.	Support noted. No change.
General	Resident	A market town with no outdoor market whatsoever	Comment noted. No change.
General	Resident	Town Centre regeneration must come first followed by infrastructure, hospital, health facilities, schools and road improvements. Developers should stick to promises. Put a proper market back in the market town and stop calling Penrith gateways to the Lakes because the gate is always open and visitors pass the town by.	Comment noted. No change.
General	Resident	EDC and PTC need to get together with others to make changes and listen to residents	PTC are working with all key partners. No change.
General	EDC	Hedgehogs are protected under Schedule 6 of the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981. Laws make hedgehogs a material; planning consideration – include hedgehog highways in all new developments. Boundaries within and surrounding developments including fencing, railings and gates should be preamble eg through the use of fence panels with 13x13 cm holes at ground level, leaving a sufficient gap beneath gates and leaving brick spaces at the base of brick walls	Such issues are dealt with by Policy 6.7 – no change.
General	Historic England Statutory	Agree that an SEA is not required from their point of view	Noted. No change.
General	Resident	Growth needs a great deal of considered planning, green spaces need to be retained, car parking and traffic needs rationalised. Visitors need to be encouraged but life for residents should not be made more difficult.	PNDP seeks to help address these issues. No change.
General	Resident	Wildriggs stench needs eliminating	Comment noted. No change.
General	Resident	To get back to being a market town we should have a proper street market to benefit townsfolk and encourage tourists to visit (Keswick and Skipton for example)	Comment noted. No change.
General	Resident	Penrith is a market town without a weekly market such as Keswick	Comment noted. No change.
General	Resident	Empty buildings such as the old Co-op and New Squares could be used for housing	EDCs Local Plan sets policy for consideration of such changes of use. No change.
General	Resident	All the proposals make sense in relation to the aim of improving quality of life in the town and rising to the challenges of sustainability and climate change – community led housing can lead the way.	Support noted. No change.

Paragraph /Policy	Response Origin	Comments	Town Council Response
-------------------	-----------------	----------	-----------------------

GENERAL / MULTIPLE COMMENTS

General	Resident	It would be great if New Squares had people interested in filling up these units and it would be good to see if we could have a market back in Penrith again.	Comment noted. No change.
General	Business	Years ago lots of coach trips came to Penrith from Lancs and the NE, it was a favourite destination. There is no provision for a coach park and facilities – could this be explored.	Comment noted. Does this need explored?
General	Business	More focus on conservation and increase in wildlife habitats and green corridors.	These matters are also addressed in EDCs Local Plan and through other legislation. No change.
General	Business	Would like to see specific sites in Penrith for musicians, festival performers etc developed.	Beyond scope of PNDP. No change.
General	Resident	You must review the nonsense of the Masterplan, wrong location, unproved demand, wrong housing type, wrong industrial location.	Masterplan is EDCs initiative – no change.
General	Resident	A66 improvements should achieve: minimal disruption to Penrith economy, separate passing traffic to local traffic long term, is good enough to avoid there ever being a need for a northern relief road.	Comment noted. Not matter for PNDP. No change.
General	Resident	The plan needs to be SMART and forward looking and critically present a compelling vision for the future – simply not evident in current set of proposals	Comment noted. No change.
General	Resident	The plan does not achieve many of the objectives outlined in the definition of a Neighbourhood Plan	Comment noted. No change.
General	Resident	There is nothing specific about where new homes, shops, offices should be built and ther critical opportunity to inform the EDC Master Plan has been missed.	These matters are addressed in EDCs Local Plan. No change.
General	Resident	One of the key opportunities of a Neighbourhood Plan is to choose where new homes, offices and shops will be built but there is no mention of this in the document.	These matters are addressed in EDCs Local Plan. There is no requirement on an NDP to allocate sites. No change.
General	Resident	Addressing the increasing number of empty retail units throughout the town is a priority	Comment noted. Retail issues addressed in EDCs Local Plan. No change.

Paragraph / Policy	Response Origin	Comments	Town Council Response
--------------------	-----------------	----------	-----------------------

GENERAL / MULTIPLE COMMENTS

General	Resident	I support the plan as I feel the proposals put forward are for the good of the local community. We need to encourage and support local families to stay and live in Penrith. We don't want to see locals move away as has happened in the villages over the past 40 years.	Support noted. No change.
General	Resident	We have to remind ourselves that Penrith is a traditional market town. We should encourage smaller retailers as well as national chains (Keswick) and should encourage bus tour companies not the town by providing suitable town centre parking as was provided in the old South End Road car park.	Comment noted. Retail issues addressed in Eden Local Plan. No change.
General	Resident	I am totally supporting your plan	Support noted. No change.
General	Resident	The people of Penrith need to be consulted properly on ANY developments	Comment noted. The PNDP is being prepared in line with the NDP Regulations and from two previous consultation. All planning applications are consulted upon by EDC. No change.
General	Resident	The language used would not pass the Plain English test. I would encourage the Council to seek assistance when drawing up consultations. The use of plain English can give the public confidence that we are not being misled.	Plain English has been used where possible. The PNDP will be a legal, technical document and some use of legal and technical wording is unavoidable. Review final text for Plain English.

Paragraph/Policy	Comments	Town Council Response
------------------	----------	-----------------------

EDC Response

Policy/paragraph number	Comments	
Foreword (2 nd paragraph) Pg 6	Amend the final sentence to: <i>This means that the PNDP will then be used to help decide upon planning applications that are considered by Eden District Council's Planning Committee and Planning Officers under delegated powers.</i>	Amend as suggested.
2.2 Pg 11	The paragraph starting 'Today, Penrith it strategically located...' is missing a paragraph number. This is a recurring error throughout the document. It is helpful when referring to the document in reports if every single paragraph has a separate number.	Check and correct paragraph numbering.
Figure 4 Pg 11	This map is out of date and does not show the revised National Park boundaries.	Update map.
3.1.1 (Inclusiveness) Pg 13	There is scope to expand upon 'Inclusiveness' to give a clearer indication of how the neighbourhood plan can promote inclusiveness. Suggested wording: <i>Create places that foster inclusiveness and are accessible to existing and future communities.</i>	Amend as suggested.
3.1.1 (Infrastructure) Pg 13	'Include' probably isn't the right word to use here – it is not clear where 'appropriate energy...' should be included. Suggested wording: <i>Encourage renewable and low carbon energy, reduce waste and promote sustainable transport and other infrastructure.</i>	Amend as suggested.
3.2.3 Pg 14	Where does the application specify that 9 dwellings will be passively ventilated?	Check and amend if necessary.
3.2.9 Pg 15	This paragraph should reflect that there is no overriding character of Penrith as there have been many decades of varying types of design implemented and we shouldn't be beholden to a design or material from a specific time period. Suggested wording: <i>It is important that the design of new housing is of high quality and complements the local vernacular.</i>	Amend as suggested.
3.6.9 Pg 20	The installation of charging points are planned for Drovers Lane Car Park, Penrith – Two 22kw fast charge points for a quick charge or top up. Penrith Leisure Centre – Four 22kw charge points and four 7.2kw charging points, so users can take a fast charge or top up or overnight. Broad Close Car Park, Appleby – Two 22kw charge points.	Add reference to these charging points.

Paragraph/Policy	Comments	Town Council Response
------------------	----------	-----------------------

EDC Response

3.8 Pg 23	The suggestion that man-made materials will be out of character with the town centre conflicts with your objective for environmentally sustainable design. This paragraph needs re-wording to support the use of environmentally sustainable building materials but should suggest that these should be sensitively designed to conserve the character of the town centre.	Amend as suggested.
4.1 Pg 27	The NPPF has been revised again with a new date of February 2019.	Amend to take account of revised NPPF.
Policy 1 point 6 Pg 32	Will it be easy for Planning Officers to identify when toxic or carcinogenic materials are proposed to be used? More information should be provided in the background text to explain to applicants how they should demonstrate that the materials meet this requirement e.g. incorporate a section in the Design and Access Statement.	Expand information in Background text.
Policy 1 point 8 Pg 32	It would be helpful to applicants and decision makers if you expanded on the character and distinctiveness you are aiming to protect and enhance.	Expand on character and distinctiveness.
Policy 2 Pg 33	<p>'High quality, contemporary design will be encouraged where it reflects these criteria.' It is not clear what criteria you are referring to here. Suggested wording: <i>High quality, contemporary design will be encouraged where it promotes local distinctiveness.</i></p> <p>Delete 'Planning applications will be assessed against the following:' as the following points make it clear that they are requirements.</p> <p>Point 2 – The local list already requires applicants to submit a 'renewable energy statement' as part of a major application so referring to this instead of requiring a separate energy statement would be simpler. Suggested wording: <i>For planning applications classed as major development the Renewable Energy Statement shall set out how the proposal meets zero or low carbon targets and includes climate change resilience measures...</i></p> <p>Point 2 – For clarity insert a reference to the NPPF definition for major development.</p> <p>Point 2 – Specify either 'good' or 'excellent' as a minimum requirement for BREEAM. Alternatively a phased approach to the higher levels could be set out e.g. up to 2020 'good', 2020 to 2021 'excellent' etc.</p> <p>Point 2 – the Code for Sustainable Homes no longer exists but you could refer to Build for Life instead.</p>	<p>Amend to read 'High quality contemporary design will be encouraged, which may promote local distinctiveness or, where appropriate, reflect a different aesthetic which expresses 21st Century responses, including design for climate change'</p> <p>Amend rest as suggested.</p>

Paragraph/Policy	Comments	Town Council Response
------------------	----------	-----------------------

EDC Response

Policy 4 Pg 36	Delete 'where appropriate' and include separately in the points below. Including it in this sentence gives the impression that sometimes it is not appropriate to improve social inclusion, which does not align with your objectives.	Amend as suggested.
Policy 5	The Town Council may wish to consider the inclusion of a policy or action relating to the identification, conservation and enhancement of non-designated heritage assets (a Local Heritage Assets list).	This has been considered previously by the Group.
Policy 5A point 4 Pg 38	This policy would restrict innovative design and conflict with Policy 2 by being too prescriptive about building materials. Add 'or sympathetic alternatives that would introduce and encourage high quality, innovative design.' As in Policy 5B (2).	Amend as suggested.
Policy 5A point 7 Pg 38	It is not clear where the identified key views and vistas have developed from (Policy 5A.7) – an evidence base covering an assessment of key views in relation to the setting of the conservation areas would be useful to support this policy. Nobody has a right to a view so this Policy needs a very strong evidence base to demonstrate that these views are crucial to the conservation and enhancement of the conservation area.	Review evidence base.
Policy 5B final paragraph Pg 39	This paragraph is not required, applications for development within the conservation area are already obligated to submit a heritage asset statement. Delete or move to background text.	Amend as suggested.
Town Council Supporting Actions Pg 39	Drovers Lane and Brunswick School are within the conservation areas.	Check and amend.
6.30 Pg 42	Delete 'housing' from the first sentence.	Amend as suggested.
Policy 6 Pg 42	Consider adding more detail to points 1 to 4 as currently they are repeating Local Plan policy (DEV3 and DEV5). It may be beneficial to add some background text about appropriate features to encourage wildlife (point 7) e.g. bat boxes, swift nest sites, etc.	Amend as suggested.
6.34 Pg 43	Move this paragraph into the Town Council Actions section.	Amend as suggested.
Policy 7 Pg 44	The first paragraph of this policy is repeating Local Plan policy. You could consider wording that adds more detail to the criteria set out in Policy HS4 of the Local Plan or provide more guidance on the type of housing required based on the results from the Housing Needs Survey (see Grange Over Sands Neighbourhood Plan – policy 8).	Amend as suggested. Add wording on self and custom build.

Paragraph/Policy	Comments	Town Council Response
------------------	----------	-----------------------

EDC Response

<p>Policy 7 Pg 44</p>	<p>We strongly encourage Penrith Town Council to consider amending Policy 7 'Housing Type and Mix' to include wording on self-build and custom-build housing.</p> <p>By way of background, the Self-build and Custom Housebuilding Act requires local authorities to publicise and keep register of people who want to self/custom build in their area and to have regard to the Register when exercising planning, housing, land disposal and regeneration functions. The Housing and Planning Act 2016 furthermore places a duty on Councils to meet demand on the Register by granting development permissions for enough serviced plots to meet demand on a rolling annual basis. Additionally, the NPPF requires Councils to 'make sufficient provision of land with permission and bring this forward without delay to meet the needs of different groups'(para 59)...including 'people wishing to commission or build their own home' (para 61 footnote 26). Footnote 26 also notes that self and custom-build properties could provide market or affordable housing.</p> <p>Unfortunately, the Eden Local Plan 2014 - 2032 was submitted for examination in the same year that the Self-build and Custom Housebuilding Act 2015 was enacted. Consequently, the Local Plan missed the opportunity to incorporate specific policy support for self-build and custom-build housing. However, Neighbourhood Plans can support Custom and Self Build housing, even where a Council's Local Plan does not include any policies, as national policy provides for this.</p> <p>Notably, there is significant interest in self-build housing across Eden, with the recent District-wide Housing Needs Study (December 2018) indicating that as many as 445 households would like to move to a self-build property. Such housing is likely to be more sustainable, affordable, of a higher quality design and community focused (providing opportunities for community cohesion) than conventional development, however competing for sites and finding the resources to undertake the development can be a difficult task. Intelligence from the Right to Build Task Force suggests difficulties with finding a suitable plot is one of the biggest barriers to individuals realising their self-build aspirations. If there are opportunities to solve this problem, through the application of planning policy, these solutions are worth considering.</p> <p>Given that the Local Plan requires Penrith to accommodate 50% of the District's housing (2,178 homes) over the period 2014 - 2032, the Penrith NDP presents a real opportunity to encourage, and provide policy support for, a diverse housing offer that includes opportunities for self-build and custom-build. NDP policies can take a range of approaches to support Custom and Self Build (CSB), such as:</p>	<p>Amend as suggested</p>
---------------------------	---	---------------------------

Paragraph/Policy	Comments	Town Council Response
------------------	----------	-----------------------

EDC Response

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • encouraging it in the area or asking new housing developments to include serviced building plots in a scheme (see the adopted Teignbridge Local Plan, Torbay Local Plan, the emerging Allerdale Local Plan (Part 2) Site Allocations and the made Wincanton NDP and Lawrence Weston NDP) • identifying specific sites and areas where CSB should be directed. This would give confidence and encourage local people and landowners to initiate projects (see the emerging South Lakeland Development Management DPD and the made Frome NDP and Petersfield NDP) • promoting affordable CSB projects on rural exception sites – either as single homes or as part of a larger site. This could be subject to meeting criteria such as a local connection test, and the homes being subject to below market value resale restrictions in perpetuity (see the emerging Ropley NDP and made Brereton NDP) • asking for a percentage of affordable housing on a site to be delivered as affordable CSB homes via serviced plots, either individually or as a group project • encouraging and identifying suitable sites where ‘group projects’ can be built • promoting specific projects, possibly through Community Right to Build Orders. <p>We would kindly ask you to give detailed consideration to these comments. Eden District Council can provide you with further support in this regard. Alternatively, the Right to Build Task Force is able to provide specific support on developing policy for CSB.</p>	
--	---	--

Paragraph/Policy	Comments	Town Council Response
------------------	----------	-----------------------

EDC Response

<p>Policy 8 Pg 46</p>	<p>The following sites should be removed from this policy as they are adequately protected by Policy COM2 of the Eden Local Plan 2014-2032.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - PE8 Land between Brentfield Way and Meadowcroft - PN17 Open area at top of Croft Terrace - PN28 Penrith Cemetery - PW38 Informal recreation area between Musgrave St Allotments/Newton Road - PS39 Wetheriggs Country Park <p>Development of these areas will not be permitted except where there is a strong social or economic justification and there is no longer a need for the facility or where alternative provision will be provided nearby. It is important that the Council has the opportunity to provide development when and where there is a social need and the designation of this land as Local Greenspace would severely restrict these opportunities.</p> <p>Eden District Council also objects to the designation of PP53 Pategill Back Field in this policy for the reasons above.</p>	<p>Delete following sites:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - PE8 Land between Brentfield Way and Meadowcroft - PN17 Open area at top of Croft Terrace - PN28 Penrith Cemetery - PW38 Informal recreation area between Musgrave St Allotments/Newton Road - PS39 Wetheriggs Country Park - PP53 Pategill Back Field
<p>Policy 9 Pg 48</p>	<p>Some of the sites designated in this policy are identified under Policy COM2. To avoid repetition of Local Plan policy remove the following sites:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - C1 Carleton Heights play area - In part C2 Penrith RUFC (the rugby pitches are already designated as public open space in the Local Plan although the field between the pitches and the houses on Carleton Road is not). - C5 Frenchfield Sports Centre - PE7 Scaws play area - PE10 Friars Bowling Club - PN19 Penrith Golf Course - PN21 Fairhill playing field - PN31 Bowscar play area - PW37 Castletown recreation area - PS40 The Crescent playing fields - In part PS41 Ullswater CC playing fields (the area to the south of the cricket ground is already designated as public open space in the Local Plan although the field between the cricket ground and Bridge Lane is not) - PS42 Penrith Cricket Ground - PS43 playing field at southern gateway to town between A66 and Clifford Road - PS44 Clifford Road play area - PS50 Castle Park - PP54 Pategill play area and recreation ground 	<p>Delete following sites:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - C1 Carleton Heights play area - In part C2 Penrith RUFC (the rugby pitches are already designated as public open space in the Local Plan although the field between the pitches and the houses on Carleton Road is not). - C5 Frenchfield Sports Centre - PE7 Scaws play area - PE10 Friars Bowling Club - PN19 Penrith Golf Course - PN21 Fairhill playing field - PN31 Bowscar play area - PW37 Castletown recreation area - PS40 The Crescent playing fields - In part PS41 Ullswater CC playing fields (the area to the south of the cricket ground is already designated as public open space in the Local Plan although the field between

Paragraph/Policy	Comments	Town Council Response
------------------	----------	-----------------------

EDC Response

	<p>Designating PN20 as a leisure facility to be protected does not conform with strategic policy in the Eden Local Plan 2014-2032. The Local Plan designates this piece of land as a future growth site for housing.</p> <p>It is not clear what you mean by 'place-based'</p>	<p>the cricket ground and Bridge Lane is not)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - PS42 Penrith Cricket Ground - PS43 playing field at southern gateway to town between A66 and Clifford Road - PS44 Clifford Road play area - PS50 Castle Park - PP54 Pategill play area and recreation ground <p>Delete PN20.</p> <p>Amend to make clear meaning of "place-based".</p>
<p>Policy 11 point 2 Pg 52</p>	<p>Amend to: <i>Connections to the existing network of walking and cycle path routes, <u>where this is feasible</u>, including ease and directness of any new connections created to the existing footpath and cycle routes (Map B, page 129)</i></p> <p>Include background text to explain what is considered feasible i.e. where an existing route is adjacent to the development proposal.</p>	<p>Amend as suggested.</p>
<p>Policy 12 point 1 Pg 54</p>	<p>This is a highways matter that cannot be achieved through neighbourhood plan policy. A new route through Penrith is something that should be investigated through discussions with CCC.</p>	<p>Comment noted. No Change, Already in discussion with CCC and EDC</p>
<p>Policy 13 Pg 56</p>	<p>Pedestrianisation of the town centre is a highways matter and is something that should be investigated through discussions with CCC. It cannot be achieved through neighbourhood plan policy.</p>	<p>Comment noted. No change. Already in discussion with CCC and EDC</p>
<p>Policy 14 Pg 60</p>	<p>The first paragraph would read better if it was all one sentence.</p>	<p>Amend as suggested.</p>
<p>Glossary – Affordable Housing Pg 63</p>	<p>It may be helpful to provide a reference to the definition of 'intermediate housing' as not everyone will know this term e.g. <i>see definition on page 64.</i></p> <p>To make slightly clearer, amend the first bullet point to: <i>Meet the needs of eligible households including availability at a cost low enough for them to afford. Eligibility is determined with regard to local incomes and local house prices</i></p>	<p>Amend as suggested.</p>

Paragraph/Policy	Comments	Town Council Response
------------------	----------	-----------------------

EDC Response

Figure 4 Pg 71	This map is out of date and does not show the revised National Park boundaries.	Update map.
Appendix VIII – PN27 Pg 97	<p>The proposal of this as Local Green Space conflicts with the following statement included in the 'demonstrably special to a local community section':</p> <p>'Potential for development as parking for a Community Hub for the estates to the north of the Town.'</p> <p>This is unlikely to get permission for a car park as the church is Grade II listed and the churchyard is an important part of its setting. Furthermore this type of development would be even more unlikely if it is designated as Local Green Space.</p>	Amend to take account of these comments.
Appendix VIII – PP57 Pg 109	<p>The demonstrably special section needs to be more robust for this site. The following amendments should help to strengthen the evidence for this section.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - It may be beneficial to expand upon why the gateway to the town is important and how the open space contributes to this importance. - State whether the space is used by the residents of the care home or other users. <p>The Plague Stone is Grade II* listed not Grade I.</p>	Amend to take account of these comments.
Appendix VIII – PP58 Pg 109	<p>The demonstrably special section needs to be more robust for this site. The following amendments should help to strengthen the evidence for this section.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - It may be beneficial to expand upon why the gateway to the town is important and how the open space contributes to this importance. - State whether the space is used by the residents of the care home or other users. 	Amend to take account of these comments.
Map A Pg 128	It is not clear where Bowscar Play Area is and may be confusing if you do not know the area. Maybe have a separate map on the next page.	Provide separate map.

Paragraph/Policy	Comments	Town Council Response
------------------	----------	-----------------------

EDC Response

	<p>Eden District Council is currently considering membership of the NaCSBA as this would seem to have benefits in the provision of custom build and self build housing within Eden. As Penrith has 50% of the residential allocations for housing across Eden it would seem that there is an opportunity to consider whether custom build and self build housing could well be a feature of the Penrith neighbourhood plan as it is yet to move towards the regulation 14 consultation. Unfortunately for Eden our local plan has now been adopted and it is too late to consider amending policies in relation to the provision of custom and self build housing on its allocated sites, both for market led and affordable housing developments.</p> <p>However, this is a window of opportunity for yourselves to take this further and consider the provision of such developments within the allocated sites within Penrith, before moving to the regulation 14 consultation.</p>	<p>See previous comments on self and custom build.</p>
--	--	--

Paragraph/Policy	Comments	Town Council Response
------------------	----------	-----------------------

Cumbria County Council Comments

Policy number	Comments	
Policy 1	<p>It is considered that this policy from being more explicit about the important role of infrastructure in ensuring the sustainability of development.</p> <p>In text supporting this policy there would be value in highlighting the important role of infrastructure providers, including the County Council. In doing so there would be an opportunity to cross refer to the Cumbria County Council Planning Obligations Policy Document (September 2013)¹; this sets out the County Council's policy approach to seeking developer contributions towards infrastructure as part of the planning process.</p>	Amend as suggested.
Policy 6	The County Council supports this policy in particular the emphasis given to the importance of: new homes being accessible to local facilities (3); the need to consider the impact of development on local infrastructure (4); consideration of traffic generation and its impact (5); and clear reference to the importance of the Cumbria Development Design Guide	Support noted. No change.
Policy 7	The County Council supports the recognition given in the Plan to Lifetime Homes. The County Council, through the Extra Care Housing and Supported Living Strategy (2016- 2025), is committed to the development of extra care housing and supported living throughout the County. The County Council requests that the Neighbourhood Plan should provide more explicit support to the potential role of extra care housing in supporting the future needs of Penrith	Amend as suggested.
Policy 11	Please see the comments below in relation to Policy 12: Traffic Management. Sustainable Transport measures have been identified as part of the Infrastructure Delivery Plan to support the delivery of Eden Local Plan (2014-2032). It is therefore important that this is cross referenced and acknowledged to ensure a consistent approach to scheme identification and promotion.	Add reference to IDP.

Paragraph/Policy	Comments	Town Council Response
------------------	----------	-----------------------

Cumbria County Council Comments

Policy 12	Policy 12 of the Penrith Neighbourhood Plan promotes “1. A new route to divert through-traffic around the Town...” What is intended by a “new route” lacks clarity and is not evidenced by any technical transport modelling assessment or has been underpinned by any business case processes. Cumbria County Council is currently updating the Penrith Transport Model. The updated model could be used to test potential alterations the highway network, but we would suggest that this is done logically and consistently as part of consideration of future growth strategy as part of the Eden Local Plan.	Comments noted. This is put forward as a long-term aspiration and could be brought forward and tested as suggested. Add reference to Penrith Transport Model and Eden Local Plan.
Policy 13	Proposed improvements to key gateways and the main routes through the town should be developed in consultation with the County Council as Highways Authority to ensure that highways safety is maintained and/or enhanced. The Penrith Transport Improvements Study included highway improvement schemes to relieve congestion and manage vehicle movements. Some of these schemes included elements of public realm enhancements. It is therefore important that any developments which include public realm enhancements take into account the improvement schemes contained with the Penrith Transport Improvements Study and that if there is impact on the public highway that Cumbria County Council as highway authority are involved in the scope, design and delivery.	Amend as suggested.
Town Council Supporting Actions	Parking in Penrith is supplied by a number of partners. Cumbria County Council’s Eden Local Committee has responsibility for on-street parking schemes within Eden. Cumbria County Council are about to commission a study into on street parking provision. The study will engage and work with all parking providers to develop a sustainable approach to parking that reflects the needs of residents, businesses and visitors.	Study noted. Town Council are involved in a tri-partite group looking at parking and movement within the town.
Town Council Supporting Actions	The changes made from the previous iteration of the neighbourhood plan are welcomed and there is much to support in this draft. This response identifies further amendments for the Town Council to consider in enhance the content of the neighbourhood plan. There is significant ongoing activity by stakeholders in respect of considering future improvements plans for Penrith. It is important that the different work areas are looked at in a holistic manner to allow for the development of a coherent and integrated ‘whole place’ approach to the phasing, planning and delivery of potential improvements in Penrith	Support noted. No change.

Comments	Town Council Response
----------	-----------------------

Historic England Response

Comments	
<p>It is important that your plan identifies heritage assets in the area, and includes a positive strategy to safeguard those elements that contribute to their significance. This will ensure they can be appropriately conserved and enjoyed now and in the future. For example, policies might address the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Considering how the plan’s objectives can be achieved by maximising the wider social, cultural, economic and environmental benefits flowing from heritage, eg. regeneration, tourism, learning, leisure, wellbeing and enjoyment. □ Locating new development to protect heritage assets and their settings. • Giving detail on the expected scale, density, massing, height, landscape, layout, materials and access of new development. • Offering solutions to heritage assets that are at risk from their condition or vacancy, or are vulnerable to becoming so during the life of the plan. The plan area contains a number of entries on the national Heritage At Risk Register, which policy might help address; the national register does not ordinarily cover Grade II listed buildings or non-designated heritage assets, so your plan could usefully consider whether any of these are also at risk. 	<p>Comments noted. The PNDP seeks to support these aims. No change.</p>
<p>As well as designated heritage assets (such as listed buildings and conservation areas), your plan is also an important opportunity to include a positive strategy for local heritage assets. Such ‘non-designated heritage assets’ may include buildings, monuments, sites, places, areas or landscapes important to the local community for their heritage value. If identifying these, your plan should include enough information to set out the elements that make them special so they, too, can be appropriately conserved and enjoyed.</p>	<p>Group to consider identifying non-designated heritage assets.</p>
<p>The strategy and policies in your plan should be based on proportionate, robust evidence. For heritage, this might include a characterisation study, historic area assessment or archaeological appraisal, a summary historical narrative, or identifying locally significant buildings, areas and other assets. Rather than just the presence or absence of heritage assets, evidence should focus on what makes them significant and, where relevant, vulnerable.</p>	<p>Comment noted. PNDP has suitable evidence base. No change.</p>
<p>We note that the Plan appears to propose no site allocations/policies which would have significant environmental effects upon the historic environment and as such we concur that in this regard Strategic Environmental Assessment is not required</p>	<p>Comment noted. No change.</p>

Comments	Town Council Response
----------	-----------------------

Network Rail Response

Comments	
<p>Should the Neighbourhood Plan envisage any land or property interests (inc. rights) from Network Rail, then the Council should engage with Network Rail in respect to such interests at the earliest opportunity. The grant of any rights / property interests would be subject to all relevant Network Rail, and the wider rail industry, approval processes including the agreement of commercial terms</p>	<p>Comment noted. No change.</p>
<p>Consideration should be given in Transport Assessments to the potential for increased footfall at Penrith Railway Station as a result of proposals for residential development / employment areas within the neighbourhood plan area. Location of the proposal, accessibility and density of the development, trip generation data should be considered in relation to the station. Where proposals are likely to increase footfall and the need for car parking at the station; the council should include developer contributions (either via CIL, S106) to provide funding for enhancements as part of planning decisions.</p>	<p>Comment noted. Development is proposed through the Eden Local Plan, not the PNDP. No change.</p>
<p>Sustainable drainage proposals should take into account the impacts upon adjacent railway infrastructure, i.e. proposals must not import a risk of flooding, pollution, soil slippage onto the existing operational railway. Sustainable drainage systems within the Local Plan area should be directed away from the railway and should not use soakaways within 30m of the railway boundary. Attenuation ponds/basins on sites adjacent to or near to the railway boundary should only be included in proposals with the agreement of Network Rail and should not be included in proposals that are adjacent to a railway cutting.</p>	<p>Comment noted. These matters will be considered at planning application stage. No change.</p>

Network Rail Response

Developments in the neighbourhood areas should be notified to Network Rail to ensure that:

- (a) Access points / rights of way belonging to Network Rail are not impacted by developments within the area.
- (b) That any proposal does not impact upon the railway infrastructure / Network Rail land e.g.
- Drainage works / water features
 - Encroachment of land or air-space
 - Excavation works
 - Siting of structures/buildings less than 2m from the Network Rail boundary / Party Wall Act issues
 - Lighting impacting upon train drivers ability to perceive signals
 - Landscaping that could impact upon overhead lines or Network Rail boundary treatments
 - Any piling works
 - Any scaffolding works
 - Any public open spaces and proposals where minors and young children may be likely to use a site which could result in trespass upon the railway (which we would remind the council is a criminal offence under s55 British Transport Commission Act 1949)
 - Any use of crane or plant
 - Any fencing works
 - Any demolition works
 - Any hard standing areas

All initial proposals and plans should be flagged up to the Network Rail Town Planning Team London North Western Route at the following address

Comment noted. These matters will be considered at planning application stage. No change.

Comments	Town Council Response
----------	-----------------------

Network Coal Authority

Comments	
The Coal Authority have no specific comments to make on the NDP	Comment Noted. No change.

National Grid Response

Comments	
<p>Whilst there are no implications for National Grid Gas Distribution's Intermediate / High Pressure apparatus, there may however be Low Pressure (LP) / Medium Pressure (MP) Gas Distribution pipes present within the proposed development sites. From the consultation information provided, the overhead powerline and gas transmission pipeline do not interact with any of the proposed development sites:</p> <p>ZZ Route – 400kv two circuit route from Hutton substation in South Lakeland to Harker Substation in Carlisle</p> <p>FM15 – Longtown to Plumpton Head</p> <p>FM11 – Carlisle A to Grayrigg</p>	Comments noted. No change.