

Clerk: Christine Adams

16 November 2017

Dear Members of Duddon Parish Council,

You are hereby summoned to attend the Meeting of Duddon Parish Council to be held in the Victory Hall Rankin Room, Broughton in Furness on Thursday 23 November 2017 at **19.30pm**

Agenda

1. Apologies

To receive apologies for absence.
G Albion

2. Requests for Dispensations

The clerk to report any requests received since the previous meeting for dispensations to speak and/or vote on any matter where a member has a disclosable pecuniary interest.

3. Declarations of Interest

To receive declarations by elected and co-opted members of interests in respect of items on this agenda. Members are reminded that, in accordance with the revised Code of Conduct, they are required to declare any disclosable pecuniary interests or other registrable interests which have not already been declared in the Council's Register of Interests. (It is a criminal offence not to declare a disclosable pecuniary interest either in the Register or at the meeting.)

4. To consider if there are any items on the agenda from which the press and public should be excluded.

5. Minutes

To authorise the chair to sign the minutes of the meeting of the Council held on 26 October 2017 as a true record.

6. Chairs Announcements

7. Public Participation

- a) Local Police Report
- b) County Cllrs report
- c) Community Led Plan Update
- d) Residents are invited to give their views on items on this agenda or raise issues for future agendas. Please note that public participation is limited to a total of 15mins at the Chairs discretion.

8. **Victory Hall**
Cllr Knowles to give an update on Victory Hall matters.
9. **Parish Lengths man**
To consider any jobs for the Parish Lengths man to do.
10. **Trees in the Square**
To give consideration to applying to LDNPA for the work to be done and then to consider the quotes for the work.
11. **Public Space Protection Order**
To give consideration to the PSPO and consider if any areas of Duddon Parish should have a PSPO introduced (details attached).
12. **Consultations**
 - a) Constituency Boundaries in the North West (details attached).
 - b) Publication Development Management Policies DPD (details attached)
13. **Planning Applications (Planning applications can be viewed on the relevant authority's website)**
SL/2017/0882 - Wreaks End Farm, Broughton-in-Furness
Single storey link extension to create a single dwelling unit
Notice of Grant of planning permission
7/2017/5470 – Crosby Cottage, Station Road, Broughton in Furness LA20 7HN
7/2017/5427 – Rawfold, Bank End, Broughton-in-Furness LA20 6DR
7/2017/5580 – Ulpha Water Treatment Works, 1 The Crook LA20 6DZ
7/2017/5240 – Moss Side Farm, Woodland, Broughton-in-Furness LA20 6DJ
14. **Financial Matters**
To authorise payment of accounts (schedule attached).
15. **Correspondence**
To note items of correspondence received since the last meeting.
16. **Councillors Reports**
Each Cllr is requested to use this opportunity to report minor matters of information not included elsewhere on the agenda and to raise items for future agendas. Cllrs are respectfully reminded that this is not an opportunity for debate or decision making.
17. **District Cllr's Report**
18. **Date of Next Meeting**
To note that the next council meeting will be on 25 January 2018.

Signed: *Christine Adams*

Parish Clerk

Duddon Parish Council

Draft Minutes October 2017

DUDDON PARISH COUNCIL

Minutes of the meeting held on Thursday 26 October 2017 in the Rankin Room Victory Hall, Broughton-in-Furness

- Present** Cllr J Curwen, Cllr C Edmondson, Cllr Glessal, Cllr Johnson, Cllr E Knowles, Cllr Longworth, Cllr Pitts and Cllr J Sayers.
- 187/17 Apologies**
Resolved to accept apologies from Cllr G Albion and Cllr A Downe
- 188/17 Requests for Dispensations**
Resolved to note that there were no requests for dispensations.
- 189/17 Declaration of Interests**
Cllr Knowles declared an interest in item 11 Parish Lengths man and.
Cllr Curwen declared an interest in the planning application SL/2017/0882
- 190/17 To consider if there are any items on the agenda from which the press and public should be excluded.**
Resolved that no items are to be discussed in private.
- 191/17 Minutes**
Resolved that the minutes of the meeting held on Thursday 28 September 2017 be signed by the chair as a true record.
- 192/17 New Cllr to sign Declaration of Acceptance form**
New Cllr Jay Sayers signed the Declaration of Acceptance form.
- 193/17 Chairs Announcements**
The Chair welcomed the new Cllr and took this opportunity to remind everyone about the code of conduct in particular item 5 (5)
"You must treat others with respect and promote equality by not discriminating unlawfully against any person, and by treating people with respect, regardless of their sex, race, age, religion, gender, sexual orientation or disability. You should respect the impartiality and integrity of the Council's statutory officers and its other employees".
The Chair also reminded everyone that between the hours of 8.30am and 4.30pm Monday to Friday the clerk is at her full time employment and is only available for matters relating to that full time employment and no other matters.
- 194/17 Public Participation.**
 - a) Police were in not in attendance but had sent an e-mail to the clerk advising that there were assorted accidents and flooding.
He is going to get the signs for the No Cold Calling Zone from Trading Standards and then its just a matter of sticking a letter with a sticker through the doors which he can sort one evening along with the street signs. The Community Speed Watch Group has been very active and the first batch of warning letters have gone out. The log sheet suggest that there has been a positive effect just by having the volunteers present.

- 5
- b) County Cllr Matt Brereton was in attendance and advised that he supports the Community Speed Watch Group and has asked for a meeting to push for a 20mph zone. He would also like to see the data from the SID which was recently in Foxfield. He has e-mailed Victoria Upton for an update on the walk around in Broughton. County Cllr Brereton has written to the director of Highways regarding the flashing 30mph signs not working at Foxfield. County Cllr Brereton does think that the state of the A595 from Grizebeck up to the west is unacceptable and has to be a priority. There has been a bad accident involving a bike and he would like to have a bikability session in Broughton, the session includes bike maintenance. Raised concern that no weed killing has been done this year and there will be no more resurfacing until the new year. Also raised concern that there is no bus stop on one side of the road at Foxfield even though it is a pick up point.
- c) The Chair of the Community Led Plan Steering Group was not in attendance but had sent an update to the clerk, to summarize there was an update on the Broughton Community Steering Group. Jay Sayers is the Volunteer Co-ordinator and Annette Carmichael is the Group organizer. The purpose of the group is to discourage motorists from breaking the current 30mph limit and also to strengthen the campaign for a 20mph speed limit for Broughton. 12 volunteers have received training from PCSO Paul Harris. Various sites have been assessed and approved by Cumbria Police for volunteers to operate from. Station Road is not suitable for Community speed watch sessions but PCSO Harris has agreed to carry out a speed gun session there himself. 35 speeding vehicles have been reported and Cumbria Constabulary is sending out warning letters. Persistent offenders will be prosecuted. The group are looking at fund raising to purchase a permanent speed gun. The chair of the Community Led Plan Steering Group has continued to press for a meeting between herself, Elaine Knowles (chair to the Parish Council, Cllr Matt Brereton and Victoria Upton) to discuss the implementation of a 20mph speed limit.
- d) Public – There were no public in attendance.

195/17 Christmas Tree

Resolved to ask David Roe to arrange the Christmas tree as he did last year.

196/17 Victory Hall

There was no update on Victory Hall matters but concern was raised about the cooker not working right.

197/17 Parish Lengths Man

Resolved to ask the Parish Lengths man to cut back all the saplings from Keppleway over to Wreaks End.

198/17 Progress Reports

- a) Public Toilets- Healthmatic have suggested that the Parish Council get quotes directly to them as it may be cheaper for them. The clerk will get some quotes.
- b) Trees in the Square – The clerk is not in receipt of the all the quotes yet but is confident she will have them all for the next meeting
- c) No Cold Calling Zone- update in police report above.
- d) Edward Postlethwaite and Mabel Barker Charity – Cllr Knowles has got the signatories changed on the bank account and thinks the money is to be transferred into the Garner Grave Fund.

199/17 Planning Applications

SL/2017/0882 2 Foxfield Road, Broughton in Furness

Single storey rear extension and front porch – No objections.

7/2017/5691 - Syke House, Church Street, Broughton-in Furness LA20 6ER

Extension and alterations to dwelling and change of use section of paddock to improve parking amenity – No objections.

7/2017/5669 - Troutal, Seathwaite, Broughton-in-Furness LA20 6EF

To roof over existing agricultural yard – No objections.

Notice of Grant of Planning Permission

7/2017/5427 - Rawfold, Bank End, Broughton-in-Furness LA20 6DR

200/17 Financial Matters

Resolved that the following Direct Debits, Standing Orders be paid:

E-on	69.37
HMRC	51.60
C Adams	225.00
Healthmatic	385.99
Hawthwaite Garden Services	640.00
Optech Fibres	145.20
Tony Sanders	450.60
Chatsworth Signs Ltd	66.60
	<u>£2034.36</u>

201/17 Correspondence

Resolved to note items of correspondence received since the last meeting.

202/17 Cllr Reports

Cllr Pitts raised concern about the BT Box being full. Also advised that Millom Without are having a meeting regarding the Coastal path as there is concern about having to get on a train for part of the route. Cllr Pitts is no longer the Chair of the Duddon Estuary Partnership. Dave Savage is now the chair and Cllr Pitts is the vice chair. He also advised that everything with the Pylons is at a standstill at the moment.

Cllr Knowles reported that Anne Harrison was looking for someone to paint the notice board, Anne has the paint.

Cllr Edmondson asked if it was possible to put a link to High Cross on our website. He also raised concern about a resident being flooded.

203/17 District Cllr Curwen

Cllr Curwen reported that a resident was going to be told that he must sort out the beck that he owns in so that other residents do not get flooded. Raised concern about dolids going into the beck and someone needs to check. He has spoken to the Environment Agency about this. Cllr Curwen has recently had the CEO from SLDC out for a visit around Cllr Curwen's wards. One of the issues discussed was the footpath at Foxfield which needs Extending to Bush Green. P Hosking is getting a quote for this and then funding will need to be sought. Raised concern about a house vibrating when wagons go pas at Wreaks Causeway but it has been reported. Also raised concern about the sides of the road giving way at Galloper Pool.

204/17 Date of Next Meeting

To note that the next meeting is 23 November 2017 at 7.30pm.

South Lakeland District Council
South Lakeland House
Lowther Street
Kendal
Cumbria
LA9 4DQ

Tel: 01539 733333
www.southlakeland.gov.uk

Our Ref: PSPO Consultation

Date: 07 November 2017

Dear Parish Councils LAP representatives,

RE: Public Space Protection Orders

We are writing to make you aware that the existing Dog Control Orders (DCO's) have expired and will be replaced with the Public Space Protection Order (PSPO).

Introduced in The Anti-Social Behaviour, Crime and Policing Act 2014, PSPO's are designed to give local authorities more power to protect areas where anti-social behaviour, such as dog fouling, is seen as a big problem.

SLDC have recently completed a consultation for the support and implementation of a PSPO that will cover all SLDC owned or managed land that were previously protected by Dog Control Orders. The results of this consultation will go to Cabinet for decision on Wednesday 29 November 2017. The PSPO includes control measures for five areas:-

- 1. Fouling of land by dogs restriction
- 2. Dogs on lead by direction restriction
- 3. Dogs on lead restriction
- 4. Dog exclusion restriction
- 5. Number of dogs walked by an individual restriction, limited to five dogs
- 6. Requiring the means to pick up after a dog restriction
- 7. Dogs on leads restriction in Rothay Park Children's Playground.

If your organisation would like to replace your existing DCO or introduce a PSPO on Parish or Town Council owned or managed land, the process is very similar, but SLDC are required to complete the legal process to introduce your PSPO.

SLDC would like to guide you through the process and I am pleased to confirm that I am here to help you. The steps to introduce your PSPO are as follows:-

- 1. A decision or agreement from a Town or Parish Council meeting, to include which aspects of the PSPO
- 2. A map which indicates the areas the PSPO will cover

3. A consultation that proves the need for a PSPO (SLDC will assist with this process)

The timeframe for the introduction of your PSPO would be either May or autumn 2018. I am happy to discuss with you your individual process, the anticipated time this may take in order to understand which date would be most appropriate for your organisation.

I hope all of the above makes sense to you, I also include a helpful answers and questions leaflet, which was used for the SLDC consultation and you may find useful.

If you have any questions please do not hesitate to get in touch with me.

Yours Sincerely,



Cameron Yazdi | Partnership and Community Project Officer

Dogs in open spaces

Public Space Protection Order Survey



ENJOY OUR
GREEN SPACES

Frequently asked questions

About the consultation

What does the consultation seek to do?

The consultation is aimed at balancing the interests of the general public. We are seeking the views of local residents and interested groups (local access groups, police, schools, public houses, dog clubs etc). People have strong views about dogs, whether they are about dog fouling or the rights of dog owners to exercise their dogs.

We wish to ensure that both those directly affected by the proposals and the general public are aware; giving everyone the opportunity to help us in developing the PSPO.

Do my views matter?

Yes, very much so. Your ideas and suggestions are very welcome and all views will be considered. What is most important is to achieve the correct balance between the needs and wishes of all the community.

Will South Lakeland District Council (SLDC) be replying to every response?

Unfortunately due to the number of questionnaires we expect to receive we cannot reply to everyone, but all comments received will be considered.

We will communicate as much information as we can by using the council's website www.southlakeland.gov.uk and social media.

About Public Space Protection Orders

What is a Public Space Protection Order (PSPO)?

PSPOs were introduced in the Anti-Social Behaviour, Crime and Policing Act 2014. A PSPO is designed to deal with a particular nuisance or problem in an area. The behaviour must be having a detrimental effect on the quality of life of those in the community, it must be persistent or continuing and it must be unreasonable.

The PSPO can impose restrictions on the use of that area which apply to everyone who is carrying out that activity. The orders are designed to ensure that the law-abiding majority can enjoy public spaces, safe from anti-social behaviour.

For further information on powers to control dogs and PSPOs please visit: www.gov.uk/guidance/control-dogs#pspo

Why are Dog Control Orders being replaced?

The current Dog Control Order legislation expires in October 2017 and a PSPO has been used by many other local councils in England to replace Dog Control Orders.

We believe that by introducing a PSPO we can build on the effectiveness of the previous Dog Control Orders in South Lakeland and create a fair and consistent approach when dealing with issues.

How would a PSPO differ from Dog Control Orders?

Some of the locations covered in the PSPO would be different in size and shape compared to the Dog Control Orders. Maps of these areas are available on our website at: www.southlakeland.gov.uk/pspo

The PSPO could also allow us to introduce a limit on the number of dogs that could be walked by a person at any time and a requirement for a dog walker needing to possess the means to pick up faeces if asked to by an authorised officer.





ENJOY OUR
GREEN SPACES

Frequently asked questions

About Public Space Protection Orders (cont.)

Is there anybody that would be exempt from the PSPO?

The PSPO would not apply to a registered blind person or someone who has a trained by a charity to support a person suffering from mobility, manual dexterity disability or deafness. A dog that is working on the land with the consent of the person in control of the land and a person in control of police or rescue dogs on official duty would also be exempt.

Will the PSPO apply to public rights of way?

Dogs will not be prohibited from public rights of way, however there may be a requirement to keep dogs on leads in certain areas e.g. cemeteries, or excluded from children's play areas or sports pitches.

What about the needs of dog owners?

Owning a dog can bring great happiness but also places a lifelong responsibility on the owner to ensure that the dog is not a hazard, a health risk, or a nuisance to other members of our society. Unfortunately some owners do not take a responsible attitude towards dog ownership and as a result the council receives a high number of complaints a year covering a range of issues such as noise nuisance from barking or uncollected dog faeces.

The council needs to balance the needs of those in charge of dogs with the interests of those affected by the activities of dogs, bearing in mind the need for people, in particular children to have access to dog free areas and areas where dogs are kept under strict control.

What is the penalty for a PSPO?

If you ignore a PSPO, you can be fined, £100 on the spot (a Fixed Penalty Notice) or up to £1,000 if it goes to court.

You can't be fined if you're a registered blind dog owner.

Who will enforce the Order?

Fixed Penalty Notices would be issued by any of SLDC's Enforcement Officers or by Police Officers or Police Community Support Officers (PCSOs).

We are not an authority which aims to issue large numbers of Fixed Penalty Notices. Our preferred and current approach is to encourage responsible behaviour and to issue Fixed Penalty Notices where this guidance is not adhered to.

What happens next?

What will happen as a result of the consultation?

The results of the consultation will help us decide if the PSPO will be put in place. If it is, it will also affect how and where the order is implemented across the district. We will consider all the responses in order to achieve the best possible result that balances the needs of the public. The results will be published on the council's website: www.southlakeland.gov.uk/pspo

How can I report problems with dog fouling in my area?

SLDC also encourages you to report incidences of dog fouling, which can be made anonymously, to our Customer Services on 01539 733333. This will help us to identify hot spot areas and our enforcement teams will be able to take a more targeted approach.

Please give us as much detail as you can including: name of site, description of dog and dog owner, date and time the incident was witnessed, any other information such as, is it a regular occurrence, description of car etc. Please do not approach the person yourself.

If we haven't answered your question, please contact us

If your question isn't answered here, or you have any further questions, please get in touch with us call on: **01539 733333** or email: parks@southlakeland.gov.uk

of Local Councils Cumbria Association <calc@cumbria.gov.uk>

31/10/2017 14:57

LGBCE Consultation on Constituency Boundaries in the North West

To of Local Councils Cumbria Association <calc@cumbria.gov.uk>

Dear Colleague,

I've attached the link to the current Local Government Boundary Commission England (LGBCE) consultation on proposals for new constituency boundaries in Cumbria – ie the proposal that 6 constituencies go down to 5. The report includes specific comments about areas in Cumbria that will be potentially affected by the proposed changes.

Revised proposals, published on 17 October 2017, are set out with comments from earlier consultation exercises. You (either as an individual or as a council) have until 11 December 2017 if you wish to tell LGBCE what you think of their findings. There is more information on the link below.

<https://www.bce2018.org.uk/node/6487?postcode=CA125BL>

Kind regards,

Samantha

Samantha Bagshaw
Chief Officer
Cumbria Association of Local Councils (CALC)

Our contact details:

-
Samantha - Monday to Wednesday, Sonia - Thursday and Friday

Post: Fire and Rescue Service Headquarters, Carleton Avenue, Penrith, Cumbria, CA10 2FA

Email: office@calc.org.uk

Telephone: 01768 812663

Web: www.calc.org.uk

This e-mail contains confidential information (which may also be legally privileged) and is intended solely for the use of the intended named recipient. If you are not the intended recipient you may not disclose, copy, distribute or retain any part of this message or its attachments. If you have received this message in error please notify the originator immediately by using the reply facility in your e-mail software. Incoming and outgoing emails may be monitored in line with current legislation. All copies of the message received in error should be destroyed. Any views or opinions expressed are solely those of the original author. This email message has been scanned for viruses, and declared to be virus free at the point of exit from Cumbria County Council's network.

<http://www.cumbria.gov.uk/>

PARLIAMENTARY BOUNDARY COMMISSION REVIEW

CUMBRIA 3.9 - 3.21

Merseyside as separate sub-regions, we proposed that the Southport constituency would cross the county boundary, combining the town with three wards from the borough of West Lancashire. Additionally, we initially proposed two constituencies (Altrincham and Tatton Park, and Bramhall and Poynton) that contained wards from both Cheshire and Greater Manchester.

3.7 There was support for our proposed sub-regional arrangement. The counter-proposals of the Conservative Party (BCE-33246), the Labour Party (BCE-31193), the Liberal Democrat Party (BCE-29373), and the representation of the Green Party (BCE-29032) did not suggest any different sub-regions. However, a counter-proposal from Oliver Raven (BCE-39493) suggested a constituency which crossed the Greater Manchester and Lancashire county boundary.

3.8 We received proposals to split wards in several constituencies. Our assistant commissioners advised us that, in the main, these recommendations provided small benefit to the wider community, and none of the proposals were 'exceptional or compelling' or in any way met this criteria. Therefore, they did not recommend any counter-proposals that suggest a division of wards, and we concur with their judgement.

Cumbria

3.9 Of the six existing constituencies in Cumbria, none are within the permitted electorate range. With its entitlement to 5.02 constituencies, under our initial proposals the number of constituencies within Cumbria was reduced by one

to give the sub-region a total of five constituencies. Significant changes were required to bring these five constituencies within the permitted electorate range.

3.10 In the north of the county we proposed a Carlisle constituency, coterminous with the boundaries of Carlisle City Council, and encompassing the city and its rural hinterland.

3.11 We proposed that the existing Barrow and Furness constituency, which needed to gain electors in order to be within the permitted range, should extend northwards rather than eastwards, due to poor transport links across Cartmel Sands. Noting that the electorate of the existing Copeland constituency (60,785) was well outside the permitted electorate range, we also suggested the creation of a coastal Workington and Whitehaven constituency in the west, extending from the town of Maryport down to the River Mite.

3.12 We then divided the Lakeland areas of Cumbria along an east-west axis creating the constituencies of Penrith and Solway, and Westmorland and Lonsdale. In our initial proposals, we proposed that the town of Appleby-in-Westmorland should be included in our Westmorland and Lonsdale constituency, which also contained the southern lakes, while the northern lakes and fells would be included in the Penrith and Solway constituency that extended to the Solway Firth in the west.

3.13 We received broad support for the initial proposals in Cumbria, particularly for the proposed constituencies of Carlisle, and Penrith and Solway, the latter of which prompted a small letter writing campaign in support of the initial proposals

(BCE-33241). The official responses to the initial proposals from the Conservative Party (BCE-33246 and BCE-40902), and the Liberal Democrat Party (BCE-29373) supported the initial proposals in full. The Labour Party (BCE-31193 and BCE-40903) suggested minor changes to all the constituencies within Cumbria. The Green Party (BCE-29032) did not submit a counter-proposal for any constituencies in the county.

3.14 Two counter-proposals suggesting larger-scale change in the county were received from the Morecambe Bay Independents (BCE-25945), and from Councillor Darren Clifford (BCE-32939) including a proposal for a constituency that crossed the county boundary into Lancashire, thereby altering our sub-regional arrangement. This proposal will be addressed in further detail later when we come to consider Lancashire.

3.15 Across the county, two principal issues with the initial proposals arose. The first was the question raised in representations on whether the Bootle ward on the west coast, which we suggested should be included in the Barrow and Furness constituency, might more appropriately be included in the Workington and Whitehaven constituency. The second was whether the ward of Dalston, which was proposed to be part of the Carlisle constituency, should be included in Penrith and Solway, as suggested by the Labour Party.

3.16 The Labour Party (BCE-40903) on a broader front argued that 'the wards of Crosby Ravensworth and Long Marton look towards the market town of Appleby as their local centre, being historically

part of Westmorland, and that therefore their inclusion in the Westmorland & Lonsdale CC breaks fewer ties and makes the constituency a better shape.' Simon Bennett (BCE-19327) and Peter Naylor (BCE-27655) shared this view. To accommodate this change, the Labour Party would transfer the Dalston ward to be included within the Penrith and Solway constituency. In light of this suggestion, our assistant commissioners investigated whether the evidence provided supported this proposition. They accepted that a valid case existed in respect of the proposal to reinforce the links between Crosby Ravensworth and Long Marton wards with the town of Appleby but did not believe it was sufficiently strong to require the annexation of Dalston ward from the Carlisle constituency, particularly in the light of other representations that confirmed the integral nature of Dalston to the rest of the city of Carlisle. David Mallinson (BCE-21219) for example, stated: 'I agree with the new boundary position including Dalston with the Carlisle constituency. Dalston is closely linked to Carlisle over any other local area and should be within the boundary of Carlisle. Local transport routes and public services are all linked to Carlisle. The MP for Carlisle should be the MP for Dalston.' On day two of the public hearing in Carlisle, Neville Lishman (BCE-32891) further highlighted the connections of the Dalston ward to the rest of Carlisle, stating that 'Carlisle racecourse, after its name, is in the Dalston ward. The Nestlé plant, a major employer for Carlisle people, is in the Dalston ward. You come off the motorway at junction 42 for Carlisle south; junction 42 is in the Dalston ward.'

3.17 Similar support was expressed by the Conservative Party (BCE-33246 and BCE-40902), the Liberal Democrat Party (BCE-29373), and by members of the public such as David Ward (BCE-21819) and Robert Currie (BCE-32846).

3.18 Our assistant commissioners carefully considered the evidence presented, and in light of the considerable support for the proposed Carlisle constituency, and in the absence of more persuasive evidence to support the Labour Party's counter-proposal, recommended to us that the initial proposals should not be altered. Having considered the evidence as presented by the assistant commissioners, we have decided not to modify the initial proposal for the Carlisle constituency.

3.19 With respect to the Barrow and Furness constituency, the Labour Party (BCE-31193 and BCE-40903) considered that Bootle ward looks more to the north than the south, being part of the chain of coastal and industrial communities of West Cumbria, and has stronger ties with Seascale, Sellafield, and Whitehaven. As a consequence they proposed that Bootle ward should be moved from the Barrow and Furness constituency (as put forward in the initial proposals), into the Workington and Whitehaven constituency. This view was shared by a number of residents of Bootle ward. The representation sent in by David Robson (BCE-33808) is a typical example of this, in which he states: 'Most of what is currently South Copeland looks north to Whitehaven for its services and main sources of employment not to Barrow-in-Furness. The main hospital is, for now at least, in Whitehaven. The principal places of employment are at Sellafield and Whitehaven. Shopping is also generally

based there. The normal daily routine of people's lives is based to the north.' John Woodcock, the Member of Parliament for Barrow and Furness (BCE-29535), told us that placing Bootle ward in the Barrow and Furness constituency would lead to 'a greater division of the existing constituency and a further breaking of local ties than would otherwise be necessary.'

3.20 Opposition to this change was limited. The Conservative Party response (BCE-40902) was that the Bootle ward should be in the same constituency as the town of Millom. Another representation, from Christopher Whiteside (BCE-32871), argued that the initial proposal for Barrow and Furness had a strong geographical border at Ravenglass, and that placing a border between Bootle ward and Millom Without ward would 'make much less sense.'

3.21 Our assistant commissioners carefully considered the evidence that had been received, and were persuaded by the arguments put forward by residents of the Bootle ward that it does indeed look north for its services and community links. They recommended that the initial proposals for Cumbria should be amended to accommodate the transfer of the Bootle ward from the Barrow and Furness constituency into the Workington and Whitehaven constituency. They further suggested that, as proposed by some representations, the proposed name of the Workington and Whitehaven constituency should be changed to West Cumbria. Having considered the evidence, we agreed with the recommendations of our assistant commissioners. In respect of the Westmorland and Lonsdale, and Penrith and Solway constituencies, our

assistant commissioners noted that very few representations or counter-proposals were received. Due to the broad support of the proposals generally, they recommend that the initial proposals for these constituencies should remain unaltered. We agree with them.

Lancashire

3.22 Of the 16 existing constituencies currently within Lancashire, three (Chorley, South Ribble, and Ribble Valley) have electorates that are within the permitted range, and many of the remaining constituencies have electorates that are significantly lower than the permitted range. In formulating our initial proposals we noted that Lancashire's entitlement to 14.06 constituencies meant that the county could have been treated on its own, but we proposed the inclusion of three West Lancashire Borough wards in a cross-county Southport constituency – primarily so that the town of Formby would not be divided.

3.23 The low electorates of both the Morecambe and Lunesdale (63,283) and Lancaster and Fleetwood (58,789) constituencies meant that we proposed the combination of both Lancaster and Morecambe into one constituency, although this did not include Lancaster University, which is located in the mostly rural University & Scotforth Rural ward. The geographically large ward sizes, but conversely small ward electorates, led us to include this ward in a constituency that stretched from the Cumbrian border to the estuary of the River Wyre and to the outskirts of the City of Preston, which was named North Lancashire.

3.24 On the Fylde, the electorates of both Blackpool South (54,607) and Blackpool North and Cleveleys (60,324) were particularly low, and we proposed modifications to both. We proposed that the Kilnhouse, and St. Leonard's wards be transferred to the Blackpool South constituency, and that the Fylde constituency should include the four wards comprising the town of Poulton-le-Fylde to increase its electorate.

3.25 With an electorate of 56,110, Preston had the fourth lowest total electorate in the North West. We suggested that the whole of the city area, including Fulwood, could be included in a compact, urban constituency.

3.26 In our initial proposals, we recommended a minor change to the existing Blackburn constituency – the transfer of the Fernhurst ward from the existing Rossendale and Darwen constituency. In turn, we proposed that Rossendale and Darwen should gain two wards from the existing Hyndburn constituency to bring it within the permitted electorate range, and to create a geographically better shaped constituency.

3.27 As a result of these changes, the Hyndburn constituency needed to increase in electors so that it was within the permitted electorate range. We proposed the inclusion of three wards on the eastern side of the constituency from the existing Burnley constituency and, in view of these changes, suggested that the constituency should be called Accrington. Burnley meanwhile, in addition to the change mentioned above, would extend northwards to include eight wards from the existing Pendle constituency.

Development Plans <development.plans@southlakeland.gov.uk>

2/11/2017 10:39

Publication Development Management Policies DPD

To info@duddonparishcouncil.org.uk <info@duddonparishcouncil.org.uk>

South Lakeland Local Plan: Development Management Policies Development Plan Document (DM DPD) – Publication

South Lakeland District Council would like to invite you to make representations on the Publication Development Management Policies DPD.

The DPD will provide detailed policies that will be used in the determination of planning applications, and help manage and shape the quality of new development.

The Publication Development Management Policies DPD was approved at Full Council on 12 October 2017 and has now been published for a 6 week consultation to give everyone the opportunity to make representations on the soundness of the document.

After the end of the publication period, the Development Management Policies DPD will be submitted to the Secretary of State for examination by an Independent Inspector.

The purpose of the Independent Examination is to consider whether the Development Management Policies DPD is **'sound', legally compliant and have been produced in accordance with the Duty to Cooperate**. This means that the document is positively prepared, effective, justified and consistent with national policy. When making your representations, please indicate whether you consider the DPD to be 'sound' and if not, what changes you wish to see which would make it sound. Further guidance on the tests of soundness is given on the notes which form part of the representation form.

Representations are invited between **2 November 2017 and 5pm 14 December 2017** and can be made by:

- Using our [online consultation response facility](#) (recommended), or
- Filling out and returning a representation form, available online, at the locations below or on request. Completed forms can be returned to us by email developmentplans@southlakeland.gov.uk or post to Development Plans, South Lakeland House, Lowther Street, Kendal, Cumbria LA9 4DQ.

Representations received after the deadline will not be accepted.

From Thursday 2 November 2017 the proposed submission documents will be available to view and download from www.southlakeland.gov.uk/dm-dpd

The 'proposed submission documents' means the following documents:

- The Development Management Policies DPD;
- Maps showing the proposals set out in the DM DPD;
- The Sustainability Appraisal Report and Habitats Regulations Assessment Report;
- The Consultation Statement;
- The Statement of Representations Procedure;
- Supporting documents* that are relevant to the preparation of the DM DPD

These documents are available for inspection at the Council Offices below during normal opening hours:

- South Lakeland House, Lowther Street, Kendal LA9 4DL;
- District Council Offices, Coronation Hall, County Square, Ulverston, Cumbria LA12 7LZ

All documents except the supporting documents* are also available at the following libraries during normal opening hours: Kendal, Ulverston, Grange over Sands, Milnthorpe, Kirkby Lonsdale and Arnside.

For further information, visit the council's website or contact the Development Plans team by email: development.plans@southlakeland.gov.uk, Tel: 01539 793388 or writing to: Development Plans Team, South Lakeland House, Lowther Street, Kendal, Cumbria, LA9 4DQ.

Yours sincerely,

Alastair McNeill | Development Plans Manager
South Lakeland District Council, South Lakeland House, Lowther Street, Kendal, Cumbria LA9 4DQ

Tel: 01539 733333 | Direct Tel: 01539 793388

South Lakeland District Council *Making South Lakeland the best place to live, work and explore*

South Lakeland District Council

Making South Lakeland the best place to live, work and explore

Information contained in this email is intended only for the individual to whom it is addressed. It may contain privileged and confidential information and if you are not the intended recipient you must not copy, distribute or take any action in reliance on it. If you have received this email in error please notify the sender immediately by telephone on 01539 733333. Please also destroy and delete the message from your computer.

All communications sent to or from South Lakeland District Council may be subject to recording and/or monitoring in accordance with relevant legislation.

Nothing in this email message amounts to a contractual or other legal commitment on the part of South Lakeland District Council.

Schedule of Payments and Receipts November 2017
Duddon Parish C

Payee	Net	Vat	Gross	Reason
E-on	68.27	3.41	71.68	Street lighting
HMRC			51.60	PAYE
C Adams			225.00	Wages
Healthmatic	321.66	64.33	385.99	Public Toilets
Travis Perkins	114.00	22.80	136.80	Slate for Donkey Rocks
N Power	97.75	4.89	102.64	Electricity in Public toilets
Pyroartistry	700.00	140.00	840.00	Fireworks in the Square
T. Glessal & Co	60.00	12.00	72.00	Flail Cuttinr
	<u>1361.68</u>	<u>247.43</u>	<u>1885.71</u>	

Receipts

<u>CGP</u>	1000.00
Pubic Toilets	13.88
Land Rent	150.00
E-on	831.23
	<u>£1,995.11</u>

Correspondence November 2017

	Sender	Subject
196	CALC	Friday round up
197	CALC	AGM
198	LDNPA	Temporary Prohibition of Traffic Order
199	LDNP Partnership	Meeting Notes
200	SLDC	Community Resilience Across SLDC
201	Millom Without	English Coastal Pathway meeting
202	LDNPA	Village Halls with Solar Panels
203	CALC	LDNPP Chair recruitment
204	ACT	Newsletter
205	Innogy Renewables	Kirkby Moor Wind Farm Community Fund
206	Connecting Cumbria	New Cab Live
207	DEP	New Chairman