

**Subject:** Request for Call-In  
**Date:** Thursday 25 April 2024 at 10:24:32 British Summer Time  
**From:** JENKINSON, Mark  
**To:** pcu@communities.gov.uk  
**CC:** CONNELL, John, planning1@cumberland.gov.uk  
**Attachments:** image001.png, image002.png, image003.png, image004.png

Dear Sirs,

I wish to request the call-in of Cumberland Council application FUL/2022/0285. The panel met yesterday, but the formal decision is yet to be issued, so a **holding request may be necessary** in the interim.

My request is based upon the following:

- The catchment school is oversubscribed, which is acknowledged by the authority, yet no secondary education contribution has been requested. Seaton is one of two catchment villages that miss out on school places due to distance, and this development will remove parental choice entirely from the whole village. It is therefore in contravention of Para. 99 of the NPPF:

*It is important that a sufficient choice of school places is available to meet the needs of existing and new communities. Local planning authorities should take a proactive, positive and collaborative approach to meeting this requirement, and to development that will widen choice in education.*

The authority's answer is to force pupils to one school of faith character, thus reducing parental choice and providing no secular options.

- The application as approved is in contravention of Policy S8 of the Allerdale Adopted Local Plan Part 1.

*Within the Principal and Key Service Centres housing development of 10 dwellings (or 0.3 ha) or more will be required to make provision for 20% affordable housing.*

*The Council will require the provision of affordable housing to be in clusters throughout the development so as to be indistinguishable from open market dwellings.*

The development as agreed has just 10% affordable housing, and the affordable housing is distinguishable by virtue of being different house types to open market properties. The developer acknowledges oversubscription of their houses in the village, and uses comparators that do not command the same price point on the open market as Story Homes do. This would seem to be an attempt to reduce the viability. The viability assessment also includes nearly £1m in secondary school contributions which were not sought.

- Despite the application being determined in 2024, the traffic assessments are from a quieter period during covid, when most of our major employers had moved to (and were still) working from home. Updated traffic assessments should have been provided to the

panel. National Highways also raised concerns about the A66 junction at Ramsay Brow, at which works are planned and contribution should have been sought.

This means that proper assessment of traffic movement could not be carried out, which may result in contravention of Para. 108 of the NPPF:

*Transport issues should be considered from the earliest stages of plan-making and development proposals, so that:*

*(a) the potential impacts of development on transport networks can be addressed;*

*(b) opportunities from existing or proposed transport infrastructure, and changing transport technology and usage, are realised – for example in relation to the scale, location or density of development that can be accommodated;*

*(c) opportunities to promote walking, cycling and public transport use are identified and pursued;*

*(d) the environmental impacts of traffic and transport infrastructure can be identified, assessed and taken into account – including appropriate opportunities for avoiding and mitigating any adverse effects, and for net environmental gains; and*

*(e) patterns of movement, streets, parking and other transport considerations are integral to the design of schemes, and contribute to making high quality places.*

It may also mean that contraventions of policy S32 of the Allerdale Adopted Local Plan Part 1 on 'Safeguarding Amenity' may have occurred:

*Proposals will not be supported where they would:*

*c. Generate severe highway infrastructure or network problems in relation to access, road safety, traffic flow or car parking;*

- There was maladministration, with a political whip on Labour party councillors; and there could be perception of political influence as there was no declaration of a £100,000 donation to the Labour Party by the Chief Executive and major shareholder of the applicant company.

Kind regards

Mark Jenkinson MP

Member of Parliament for Workington

01900 876189 | 104 Senhouse Street · Maryport · CA15 6BS | [www.mark-jenkinson.co.uk](http://www.mark-jenkinson.co.uk)

[Find me on Facebook](#) · [Follow me on Twitter](#) · [Sign up to my newsletter](#)

To see how this office processes your data, please visit [www.mark-jenkinson.co.uk/privacy](http://www.mark-jenkinson.co.uk/privacy)