

COPELAND LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK

STRATEGY

for

INFRASTRUCTURE

12th March 2012



Contents

	Page
1. Policy context; Copeland's development strategy and infrastructure	4
2. The baseline	6
3. Strategy inputs	8
4. Infrastructure priorities for Copeland	10
5. Developer contributions and the Community Infrastructure Levy	31
6. Taking the strategy forward	33
Annex:	
Anticipated infrastructure delivery 2012-2027	35

1. POLICY CONTEXT: COPELAND'S DEVELOPMENT STRATEGY AND INFRASTRUCTURE

The character and needs of the Borough have guided production of the development plan for Copeland (the Local Development Framework, and the Core Strategy in particular). We have carried out an assessment of the Borough's infrastructure (the Infrastructure Deficit Report, also available as an evidence base document). The conclusions arising from that report are included in this document (Section 4 and appendices).

Drivers of change

The Core Strategy identifies four overarching influences.

1. Climate and sustainability - more concentrated patterns of development, along with the development of green infrastructure, can mitigate the effects of global warming.
2. The 'Energy Coast' and economic growth – planning for a range of growth scenarios. The 'bottom line' of the strategy, however, must be to plan for identified levels of development to fulfil a 'baseline' scenario of meeting Copeland's existing needs, whilst being open to, and able to cope with, more aspirational levels of growth.
3. Household change and housing growth – catering for demographic change, especially a growing proportion of older people.
4. Change in the nuclear industry – the evolution of the work carried out at Sellafield and associated

locations; the proposal for a new power station next to the existing Sellafield site; and the possibility that Copeland will be called upon to host the national high level waste (geological disposal) repository.

From the point of view of infrastructure, the key issues revolve around the need to make sure that Copeland is an attractive location for investment and can cater for existing and proposed development, including providing a good range of homes and the facilities for a rewarding, healthy and environmentally sustainable lifestyle.

What do we mean by 'infrastructure'?

For the purpose of planning, infrastructure is defined as the basic facilities, services, and installations needed to make Copeland work as a place to live, do business or visit

This includes;

1. **Physical infrastructure (infrastructure in the 'normal' usage of the word) – transport and public utilities;**
2. **Social infrastructure – primarily, education, health, leisure and community facilities;**
3. **Green infrastructure – public and informal open space, including areas of nature value.**

Priorities are identified in Section 4.

Copeland Borough and the Lake District National Park

The Strategy for Infrastructure is formulated both to demonstrate that the achievement of the Core Strategy has been considered in the light of infrastructure constraints, and as a basis for further Local Development Framework documents. Most of the rural part of the Borough is within the Lake District National Park, which has its own LDF and Core Strategy (adopted in 2010). All relevant Local Development Documents are being prepared in consultation with the Lake District National Park Authority, and the Borough Council intends that the two

Local Development Frameworks will be compatible with each other.

In planning terms, including infrastructure development, and the raising of developer contributions to fund it, the Borough Council has jurisdiction only within the parts of the Borough not in the National Park. However, this strategy does make reference to infrastructure needs within the Lake District. This is because the Borough Council may wish to use resources, as appropriate, to carry out infrastructure projects relating to its functions within the Lake District area; this would of course be done with proper regard to the role of the Authority and the functions and character of the National Park.

2. TAKING THE STRATEGY FORWARD: THE BASELINE

Growth and delivery

Copeland covers a large area but has a relatively small population. It has a proud industrial tradition and heritage but, partly as a result of this, property prices and thus, development yields, are, at least in the north of the Borough where most people live, well below average. Its 'baseline' position in terms of development is that, other things being equal, attracting growth would be a challenge and its population would not be expected to grow significantly (although the number of households is growing).

The scope for raising funds from planning contributions is, therefore, modest. So it is not possible to base the provisions of this strategy on an assumption that development will come in quantities, and backed by profit expectations, that enable us to timetable delivery with any certainty.

The strategy for infrastructure is thus a statement of priorities which the Council will seek to fulfil, aided by development funding and supported by any other money that can be obtained. The prospect for other funds is uncertain in the current economic climate, so that again does not give us a basis to programme the realisation of the strategy.

Two other scenarios exist.

- The first is that the level of growth which the plan aspires to, and for which enough land is available, happens. This would enable some at least of Copeland's needs to be met more quickly; though the costliest priority, improving the

strategic road network, would still not be likely to be met.

- The second (which might accompany the first, or help to bring it about) is that of a new nuclear power station. If that goes ahead, improvements to strategic infrastructure (especially, transport) will be necessary to enable it to be built. Additionally, the Council will in its approach to the development seek infrastructure contributions to match the needs and priorities identified in this strategy. This policy will apply both to those essential to the development and those which are identified as needing to be done to mitigate the impacts of the development. These will include projects that may be termed as 'community benefit'.

The Infrastructure Deficit Report

This is available on the Council's web site as a Local Development Framework evidence base document. Hard copies of the summary, which contains all the relevant conclusions, can be obtained from the Local Development Framework team.

The Deficit Report has identified types of infrastructure which are deficient across the Borough or which would need to be addressed if the needs of the residents or users of further development are to be met. The investment priorities that arise from this are dealt with in more detail in Section 4 and the Appendices.

3. STRATEGY INPUTS

Themes relating to the provision of infrastructure run through the whole of the Core Strategy.

The Vision for Copeland looks forward to the Borough being economically and socially sustainable, well-connected and environmentally responsible, and the objectives set out in the Core Strategy reflect that.

To some degree the provision and improvement of infrastructure helps to fulfil all plan objectives, but the following are particularly relevant: -

- town centre vitality (Obj. 4),
- supporting education (Obj. 5),
- relating the focusing of development to infrastructure provision (Obj. 7)
- sustainable, accessible settlements meeting people's needs (Obj. 9),
- development meeting high standards including enhancing the public realm and creating locally distinctive places (Obj.10),
- supporting the sustainability of rural communities (Obj. 11),
- improving access to jobs, services etc. (Obj. 13),
- protecting places, landscapes, buildings of value, biodiversity and green infrastructure (Objs. 18 and 19).

The central strategic policy is ST 1 – Strategic Development Principles, which contains a number of relevant elements, such as sustainable transport infrastructure (A iii), energy infrastructure (B i), development contributing to social and community infrastructure (B iv), nature conservation (C i), protecting cultural and historic features (C ii), recreational opportunities (C iii) and the creation of quality places (D I, ii and iii).

Policy ST4 – Providing infrastructure – will provide the foundation for developing the Council's framework for developer contributions via a Supplementary Planning Document and introduction of the Community Infrastructure Levy if judged appropriate and subject to further consultation and examination.

Policies ER1 and ER3 set out the Council's approach to accommodating major infrastructure whilst ensuring that its contribution to the Borough's economy and quality of life is optimised, be that via exercise of the Council's development control role or as its approach to dealing with the Major Infrastructure Unit for nationally significant projects.

Policies ER 7, 8, 9 and 10 cover the contributions made by the Borough's towns to the prosperity and attractiveness of Copeland, and the promotion of tourism more generally.

Policy SS4 is at the heart of the maintenance and development of our settlements as fully functioning centres of community life via the provision of local, accessible services and facilities.

Policies T1 and T2 relate to sustainable accessibility as regards both transport and other forms of communication.

Policies ENV 1 and 2 ensure that flood risk concerns inform development decisions, and allow for the securing of developer contributions to assist in that.

Policy ENV 3 provides a basis for making sure that development contributes to green infrastructure, such as by boosting wildlife corridors, while ENV 5 and 6 relate to landscape impact (ENV5C – mitigation) and access to open space.

Last but by no means least, ENV4 refers to the built environment and the protection of heritage assets.

The Development Management policies, in the companion Development Plan Document to the Core Strategy, will be the operational tools, used in the consideration of planning applications, to express these policies and the infrastructure priorities set out below.

4. INFRASTRUCTURE PRIORITIES FOR COPELAND

The Council has undertaken a study of the infrastructure 'deficit' – that is, identifying types of infrastructure where there is a need for improvement which will have to be taken into account when development is considered in areas where deficits exist.

This work has been undertaken with the co-operation of infrastructure providers and the Infrastructure Delivery Plan is based on consultation with key providers.

A preliminary assessment of the infrastructure deficit as identified in the Infrastructure Deficit Plan suggest the following conclusions as to applicability of the various routes of planning contribution-based funding. In relation to the Core Strategy, this work has identified the following priority areas.

Transport

As a district in an area peripheral to main centres of development and economic activity, Copeland faces two significant challenges in attracting investment.

The first of these is its **connectivity by road**. The A66 to the north and A590 to the south connect the Borough to the motorway system. Though both containing single carriageway to a problematic extent, they have been improved to a reasonably high standard. However, the main road through the Borough, the A595, contains substantial lengths which are either subject to high levels of congestion (particularly between Whitehaven and Sellafield), although the most substandard sections of the A595, inhibiting connectivity with Barrow, and the

A5902 to the south east, are outside the borough.

However, to solve these shortcomings would require expenditure beyond the reach of the Borough Council or what could reasonably be achievable via normal developer funding. The Council is satisfied that the level of development anticipated in the Core Strategy can be accommodated without causing major deterioration in traffic conditions, though developers will be expected to contribute towards capacity improvement or amelioration, such as junction improvements or the encouragement of bus usage via Travel Plans.

(Major 'Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project' development, such as a nuclear power station, may be a different matter requiring larger scale off-site investment in infrastructure. We would expect that to be addressed in consideration by the Major Infrastructure Planning Unit of the application to them for development consent. The Borough Council will be proactive in negotiating and seeking common ground with developers regarding their making adequate provision to deal with transport and other infrastructure implications of the development.)

The second is **the railway**, which contains single line stretches to the north and south of Whitehaven. These inhibit the development of a passenger timetable regular enough to allow the line to increase its usefulness for commuting or realise its potential for tourism, and pose difficulties for the kind of bulk freight operation which may be needed for nuclear new build. The Council will continue to press for investment to

improve this. The need may become acute in the event of major infrastructure development requiring large scale movement of bulk goods or workers accommodated off site.

At a local level Whitehaven in particular suffers from road network shortcomings which hamper development in some central and inner areas; particularly, circulation around the town centre, and narrow roads and awkward junctions to the south of the centre.

Finally, as a mostly rural district with a less than optimal road system, Copeland has a continuing need for smaller scale schemes to improve road safety for cyclists and pedestrians.

Utilities: energy and water supply, drainage

The utility companies have provided information in connection with the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment and in discussion. In general we have not identified any major obstacles to the achievement of Core Strategy objectives in the short term, though restrictions may emerge during the Plan period, which must be addresses if development objectives are achieved. The water company (United Utilities) is aware of this, and it will be a matter of discussion as the company's Asset Management Plan is rolled forward.

There is a **water supply** shortfall across the West Cumbria Water Resource Zone, which includes Copeland. There are particular restraints in the Ehen catchment due to restrictions on abstraction for nature conservation reasons. Boreholes are proposed near Egremont to meet the shortfall.

Improvements to **sewerage capacity** are needed in various rural areas but only in one location – Cleator Moor – where significant development is proposed. Improvement of the Cleator treatment works is thus critical for that locality; United Utilities are aware of this and we will continue to press for it to be a priority. Failure to achieve that in the next Asset Management Plan (that is, by 2020) would be manageable by phasing greater house building in other settlements, particularly Egremont. In the longer term, realisation of development opportunities in Whitehaven is likely to require capacity improvement. Similarly, albeit on a smaller scale, it is advised that Kirkland/Ennerdale Bridge will not be able to support anticipated development unless the Ennerdale Bridge treatment works capacity is increased.

Assessment of the **energy supply** situation has not revealed any major network shortcomings and we anticipate that local improvements are capable of being dealt with within the normal scope of development financing. The projected upgrade of the National Grid may also be a factor but the implications of this for local supply are not known.

Flood risk has been examined as an infrastructure issue and the Environment Agency has commented on the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment. Flood risk in Whitehaven is considered to be a 'strategic' issue – that is, of Borough-wide importance – because of the importance of the town as a service centre for most of the Borough. In general it appears that flood risk can be managed by careful consideration of surface water drainage and the minimisation of run-off on newly developed sites.

Regarding coastal flood risk, the Shoreline Management Plan indicates holding the line primarily where there are settlements

or to maintain the West Cumbria railway. Elsewhere the approach is not to actively intervene in coastal processes, except that in the Eskmeals area, 'managed realignment' is proposed. Ultimately this will require a new route for the coastal road. In the short term, it is intended that the road will be protected from erosion, in particular, at Stubb Place.

The urban environment

(in particular, townscape especially in central Whitehaven).

The approach likely to be adopted will vary between the towns.

There is a clear need to continue to invest in the Whitehaven townscape. Despite major advances made in the last decade, there is still work to be done on the less attractive parts of the town centre, as well as ensuring that areas already improved do not deteriorate. The County Council's proposed work to improve traffic circulation will provide an opportunity for cross-funding, while at the same time making it important that we ensure traffic management work helps to make the town centre a more attractive place for pedestrians.

It is anticipated that the nuclear sector will have an influence here, if proposals to move some operations from Sellafield come to fruition and if operations related to nuclear new build (such as hotel provision) come about. The Council will additionally seek 'community benefit' input in Whitehaven, both to help cater for increased activity in the town and to offset any potential for additional nuclear activity to impact on public perceptions of the area as a tourist destination. This will be additional to developer funding sought in relation to large town centre developments such as the new superstore on the north side of the harbour.

The approach to townscape improvement in Cleator Moor, Millom and Egremont will similarly look to nuclear-related as well as general developer funding support. All three town centres have had improvement work in recent years, and Annex 1 makes a broad estimate of £250,000 each for continuing improvement.

Community facilities

The Borough Council has involvement in the provision of that most fundamental of community facilities, the community or parish hall. The Infrastructure Deficit Report noted those areas and settlements where such provision is lacking (according to the adopted standard of 1 per 2500 people). It can be anticipated that some momentum to put this right will emerge as the locality Plans are finalised. This would help to fulfil the aim of the Sustainable Community Strategy that people should be able to play a full part in the life of their community.

It has also been noted that community minibus provision has some gaps.

The maintenance of rural facilities such as post offices, pubs and shops is not within the Council's gift, but Core Strategy policy (notably, SS4) promotes an approach which complements the intention to maintain and improve the network of community halls, as well as the County Council's policy of supporting continuing rural school provision, which the Borough Council supports. This is consistent with, and complementary to, the Lake District Core Strategy which covers a large proportion of rural Copeland.

One agency which does have relevant capital proposals is that of the Primary Care Trust. A new health centre for Cleator Moor is in their programme,

though its implementation is still not certain. Additionally, the proposal for a replacement community hospital for Millom is identified but not programmed. Both these schemes are included in Annex 1, as the Borough Council supports, and will press for, their implementation.

Education

In 2011, of 35 primary schools in the Borough, 8 were at or close to capacity. These are distributed around the Borough, with a particular concentration in Whitehaven. The number of schools which are full is expected to increase to 19 by 2014. Three of the four state secondary schools in Copeland have spare capacity.

The short- to medium-term future for capital investment in schools and colleges is uncertain at present owing to the future direction of the Building Schools for the Future funding stream being under review. A major programme of investment at the West Lakes Academy in Egremont is well advanced, but there are no major schemes programmed in the primary sector. In the tertiary sector, investment is proceeding at The Lakes College (just outside the Borough, at Lillyhall in Allerdale), and at Furness College in Barrow, which serves the Millom area. Lillyhall in particular can be anticipated to benefit from any programmes for local skill development which prove to be necessary to support the workforce at the proposed Sellafield power station.

The County Council is developing an approach to securing contributions from house builders to help fund school places needed as a result of the occupation of new homes; the Borough Council expects to be able to support this as part of the general framework for developer

contributions which will be developed as part of the Local Development Framework, via Section 106 contributions and/or a Community Infrastructure Levy.

It is likely that the background of education capital spending will change, and future provision for infrastructure support (including the approach to developer contributions) will adapt to that. At present, therefore, this Infrastructure Strategy notes the situation regarding schools but Annex 1 does not go beyond that.

Leisure and recreation facilities

An assessment of provision for recreation, both outdoors and indoors, formal and informal, has been carried out to comply with Planning Policy Guidance Note 17. As far as sports and recreation is concerned, it reveals a reasonable level of provision across the Borough, but with particular gaps to be filled. Chief among these is the provision of sports pitches of an adequate quality, existing pitches being in need of upgrading and there being a shortage of artificial turf pitches. There is also a borough-wide need for an adequate network of multi-use games areas, which can serve a wide range of age groups of both genders, and are a worthwhile focus for teenagers and young adults.

Although sports centre and swimming pool provision is, broadly speaking in borough-wide terms, up to agreed standards, the facilities that exist mostly need some degree of improvement, which may become more acute if an influx of construction workers leads to increased demand. (In particular, the only provision in South Copeland is at Millom School, which is substandard and has severely limited public availability; and Cleator Moor is without an adequate sports hall.)

This will be an important concern in the Borough Council's dealings with the Sellafield nuclear power station developer and the Major Infrastructure Unit.

Green infrastructure

The idea behind the term 'green infrastructure' is that open spaces, more natural areas such as woodlands and open countryside, bodies of water and the coast (including areas designated for nature conservation) are seen as a network that can be protected, enhanced and cherished as such. It also involves many leisure facilities (for instance, allotments and playing fields can be managed to provide habitat for wildlife), and 'townscape' (which includes relevant elements such as street trees).

Copeland is one of the best endowed districts in the country as far as countryside is concerned. However, it is important to make sure that the majority of our people, who live in towns, have good access to nature, including open space, close to their homes, as well as optimising access to what lies around the towns. The PPG17 assessment shows that these assets are mostly in reasonably good heart, but there are deficiencies against the recommended standards adopted by the study, notably in allotments, amenity green space and play areas.

Countryside access and Rights of Way

Copeland's green infrastructure is complemented by an extensive Rights of Way network, as befits its location within and adjoining a National Park. Whilst the protection of green infrastructure as a foundation of biodiversity is important, the benefits of enabling people to enjoy it should also be recognised.

The Core Strategy proposes that most development should be concentrated in the towns. The Borough Council will therefore consider the impacts of this in terms of increased pressure on, and demand for additional, access to green infrastructure within and near to towns, be it by statutory or permissive routes. This is likely to be of particular significance in and around Whitehaven.

We will also pursue the development of the accessibility of the Whitehaven – St. Bees coast, by pursuing opportunities to improve both the existing coastal footpath system and its connectivity to Rights of Way inland.

The Borough Council will use all the means at its disposal to make sure that developers contribute towards improvements needed to make sure that increases in usage are met by investment to maintain and enhance these valuable assets.

Local infrastructure and Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects

The Borough Council is mindful that contributions relating to a wider range of infrastructure, and potentially on a different scale, might be expected to arise from a new nuclear power station at Sellafield, which will generate its own infrastructural requirements and impacts.

It can be envisaged that compensatory financial or 'in kind' input might arise from a variety of sources, including

- infrastructure changes required to enable the development to be built and operate (a detailed assessment of which will be undertaken as part of the Development Consent Order process),

- developer contributions relating to the project itself or ancillary development, or
- additional funding for community-related projects to offset impacts of the development on the community, its economy, or environment. This last category will be referred to as 'community benefit', for which there is a precedent in the Borough from the Nuclear Decommissioning Authority in respect of the Low Level Waste Repository at Drigg.

The Council believes that Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects should contribute to local infrastructure on the same basis as other developers, in addition to investment that they may carry out for their own purposes to aid the construction of the project. It will therefore use Core Strategy policy ST4 and other relevant Core Strategy policies, as well as other Local Development Documents flowing from the Core Strategy, as the basis for its position when negotiating and seeking common ground with the developer, and in advising and making representations to the Major Infrastructure Unit.

The following have been identified as likely to arise as infrastructure needs flowing from the development of a new nuclear power station at Sellafield.

- Road capacity and safety improvements identified by Capita (up to £73 m. on roads currently used for access, including commuter journeys, to and from Sellafield This includes about £40 m. on main 'A' roads. £30-40m. of the total would be in Copeland).
- Bus service improvements where relevant.

- Rail capacity improvements (£8.8m. – £14m.) identified by Network Rail.
- Whitehaven public realm including station ('community benefit' mitigation could be ascribed to compensation for perceived negative impacts on local competitiveness; also relating to increased usage of Whitehaven town centre facilities by site workers living in accommodation in or close to Whitehaven).
- Town centre public realm and facilities improvements in other towns where substantial workforce accommodation is built.
- Training and skills development via existing further/higher education facilities.
- Community halls ('community benefit').
- Sports facilities ('community benefit' but also as provision, or enhancements to existing facilities, catering for NNB workforce).

In addition there may be some more localised impacts for which the Council might seek contributions on a mitigation or compensation basis, or because the workforce will be using them, such as historic environment and green infrastructure – with concentration perhaps on mid Copeland.

Some or all of the above may also be relevant to other nuclear-related investment, notably geological high level waste storage, if this goes ahead.

The Council is additionally involved in early discussions relating to enhancement of the National Grid. Though at present it is impossible to predict with certainty the ramifications of this project on local communities, the construction of new 400kv power lines, whether overhead or underground, will have some impacts

which may require developer contributions to be negotiated, and others the Council believes should be compensated for by mitigation including 'community benefit' inputs.

Copeland's infrastructure priorities in their context

Local road improvements; road safety schemes; cycle ways; pedestrian access improvements	
Implementation agencies responsible	County Council local committee and Borough Council.
Relevant strategies, plans or programmes	Local Transport Plan LTP3 County Council Capital Programme (central and Copeland Area budgets)
Baseline situation	A595, A5086 and A5093 in need of capacity improvement. Continuing programme of local projects to deal with road safety, cycle and pedestrian accessibility.
Current plans and proposals	A595 Egremont-Sellafield (LTP3) Gosforth-Seascale cycle route (LTP3) Locally administered County Council programmes for road safety, pedestrian access improvements, access to schools.
Relevance to Core Strategy implementation	Improved road capacity will support inward investment and possibly reduce relocations outside the Borough. Smaller schemes contribute to quality of life objectives.
Role of the Core Strategy and other Local Development Framework planning documents	Core Strategy provides background priorities to inform future spending.
Consequences of needs not being met	Failure to improve road capacity may compromise Copeland's ability to attract investment in longer term, but would not compromise development in the shorter term. Not continuing with smaller projects is not expected to impact on strategy implementation but is likely to lead to avoidable road casualties especially among cyclists and pedestrians.
Implications of nuclear new build	Likely to generate greater vehicle traffic including HGVs and buses, with risk of greater congestion, if identified road improvements are not carried out.

Public transport improvements	
Implementation agencies responsible	County Council local committee and Borough Council. Network Rail. Northern Rail. Bus operators.
Relevant strategies, plans or programmes	Local Transport Plan LTP3 Rail company capital programmes
Baseline situation	West Cumbria Line substandard with single track working north and south of Whitehaven. Irregular passenger schedules are a disincentive to rail use especially south of Whitehaven, and in evenings. Whitehaven station is substandard and some rural stations need accessibility upgrading. Bus service schedules, especially in rural areas, fall short of community needs.
Current plans and proposals	None known
Relevance to Core Strategy implementation	Improved rail capacity, and a better station at Whitehaven, will support inward investment, be more of an incentive to tourism and possibly reduce road commuting. Service improvements and better stations contribute to quality of life objectives.
Role of the Core Strategy and other Local Development Framework planning documents	Core Strategy provides background priorities to inform future spending.
Consequences of needs not being met	No direct consequences identified.
Implications of nuclear new build	Capacity improvement may be needed to facilitate bulk freight movement. New crossovers north of Whitehaven will assist.

Water and drainage	
Implementation agencies responsible	United Utilities
Relevant strategies, plans or programmes	United Utilities Asset Management Plans (currently 2012-2015; 2015-2020 in preparation).
Baseline situation	<p>Water; there is a shortfall against projected needs, and in the Ehen catchment extraction from the river must be reduced. Boreholes in Egremont area are programmed to meet the shortfall, but in the long term supply may need to be further extended to cater for growth..</p> <p>Drainage; improved waste water treatment works needed at Cleator, The Green and Drigg; sewer outfall improvements at Millom and Parton.</p>
Current plans and proposals	Boreholes in current programme; others are candidates for the next.
Relevance to Core Strategy implementation	Improvement of Cleator waste water treatment plant is critical to achievement of plan aims for Cleator Moor. In the longer term capacity constraints may inhibit growth at Whitehaven and development at Ennerdale Bridge and Kirkland.
Role of the Core Strategy and other Local Development Framework planning documents	Identification of areas where investment is needed.
Consequences of needs not being met	Regeneration of Cleator Moor could be delayed.
Implications of nuclear new build	None identified unless Cleator Moor emerges as a preference for construction worker 'campus' accommodation.

Energy supply	
Implementation agencies responsible	North West Electricity British Gas/Centrica
Relevant strategies, plans or programmes	Company investment programmes.
Baseline situation	Network assessed as adequate subject to need for development-led local strengthening.
Current plans and proposals	Not known.
Relevance to Core Strategy implementation	Development and regeneration should not be compromised by inadequacies in supply networks. Thus energy relates to all development-related objectives, particularly 2 (diversify the economic base), 3 and 6, (range of employment sites), 7 and 8 (sustainable settlements), 11 (rural sustainability).
Role of the Core Strategy and other Local Development Framework planning documents	Identifying locations for development as a basis for suppliers locating areas where network needs strengthening.
Consequences of needs not being met	Development and regeneration delayed or prevented.
Implications of nuclear new build	None identified as far as Core Strategy concerned. National Grid are committed to upgrade their network.

‘Strategic’ flood protection measures

(Whitehaven town centre; flood risk will be looked at on a site specific basis elsewhere)

Implementation agencies responsible	Environment Agency working with developers.
Relevant strategies, plans or programmes	Shoreline Management Plan
Baseline situation	South (primarily Pow Beck) and parts of central Whitehaven vulnerable to combination of sea and surface water flooding.
Current plans and proposals	Various sites around harbour, south side of town centre and Pow Beck valley.
Relevance to Core Strategy implementation	Regeneration and development in central Whitehaven is not inhibited.
Role of the Core Strategy and other Local Development Framework planning documents	Policy framework to ensure that development pays proper attention to flood risk avoidance and mitigation.
Consequences of needs not being met	Development may be unduly delayed or prevented where flood prevention measures could legitimately have enabled it, hindering achievement of a range of Core Strategy objectives and policies. However, in general it is believed that site-specific measures paid for by developers will deal with the problem as far as practicable.
Implications of nuclear new build	Development for off-site residential accommodation or business operations may seek sites in areas of inner and town centre Whitehaven recorded as vulnerable to sea, river or surface water flooding.

Other flood protection measures	
Implementation agencies responsible	Environment Agency working with developers.
Relevant strategies, plans or programmes	Strategic Flood Risk Assessment EA Catchment Plan Surface Water Management Plan Shoreline Management Plan
Baseline situation	Desirability of flood protection measures has been identified to protect properties near River Ehen at Egremont. Flood plain constraint on fringe of Cleator Moor (Leconfield industrial estate extension site). Road at Eskmeals may need reinforcement and eventual realignment.
Current plans and proposals	The Environment Agency does not have funding for this work.
Relevance to Core Strategy implementation	Regeneration and development in Egremont and Cleator Moor should not be inhibited (policy ER8, Key Service Centres).
Role of the Core Strategy and other Local Development Framework planning documents	Possibility of using Community Infrastructure Levy to assist work if flood protection work is identified as qualifying for CIL funding. Not likely that funds could be generated via s.106 agreements.
Consequences of needs not being met	It is not anticipated that the absence of this work will inhibit implementation of any policies or current proposals; development that would affect flood risk in Egremont would be resisted. However, if the work is not carried out properties remain at risk. Leconfield extension may be ruled out if flood risk cannot satisfactorily be mitigated.
Implications of nuclear new build	No direct implications identified. Finance could be sought via 'community benefit' if such a package is set up.

Whitehaven Town Centre management and 'strategic' public realm improvement	
Implementation agencies responsible	County Council in partnership with Borough Council and Whitehaven locality committee.
Relevant strategies, plans or programmes	'Sea Change' development framework Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Plan Supplementary Planning Document
Baseline situation	Substandard or deteriorating condition of highway, pedestrian areas and amenity planting in town centre, especially on main thoroughfares such as main one-way circulation route and Lowther Street.
Current plans and proposals	Town Centre public transport interchange and traffic management scheme (both County Council projects) are relevant to 'strategic public realm improvement'.
Relevance to Core Strategy implementation	Objectives 4 (town centre vitality), 9 (enhancing public realm) and 18 (enhancing historic settings).
Role of the Core Strategy and other Local Development Framework planning documents	ER8 Whitehaven Town Centre underpins this issue. Policy ER10, Renaissance through Tourism, is also relevant; and 'quality places' aims of ST1.
Consequences of needs not being met	Perceptions of the attractiveness and vitality become less favourable, jeopardising the vitality of Whitehaven and consequently compromising the future prosperity of the borough. In compensation, more effort might be put into the promotion of Whitehaven as a historic town worth visiting or investing in would continue but perhaps with lower productivity (levels of visits or investment) resulting.
Implications of nuclear new build	Land and buildings in Whitehaven are likely to be required for a number of purposes, including potentially residential accommodation, hotel space, office space and leisure facilities. Some development may be funded by the developer or contractors attracting planning obligations; other improvements may be relevant for 'offset' or community benefit support.

Smaller Town Centre management and public realm improvement	
Implementation agencies responsible	County Council in partnership with Borough Council and locality committees for Cleator Moor, Egremont and South Copeland (Millom).
Relevant strategies, plans or programmes	Locality Plans. Market Town Initiatives in Millom, Egremont
Baseline situation	Locality Plans will identify baseline in detail. Infrastructure Deficit assessment is that each town may need public realm improvement to take forward work already done in recent years.
Current plans and proposals	Not identified yet.
Relevance to Core Strategy implementation	Townscape improvement will aid achievement of economic development (employment investment and tourism) objectives as well as protecting heritage and contributing to a better quality of life.
Role of the Core Strategy and other Local Development Framework planning documents	Policy ER7 sets the framework for town centre vitality and viability; ER9 addresses the needs of the Key Service Centres.
Consequences of needs not being met	Continuing effect on vitality of insufficient outside interest or investment of the towns, including high levels of shop vacancy and possible 'spiral' of decline. It might only be possible to offset this by public sector investment, the availability of which is declining at present.
Implications of nuclear new build	Potential for influx of workers to improve trade. Council will seek 'community benefit' investment in environment and community facilities.

Historic environment	
Implementation agencies responsible	Borough Council working with English Heritage, locality committees and developers.
Relevant strategies, plans or programmes	National policy guidance and English Heritage data.
Baseline situation	Conservation Areas in need of attention, Listed Buildings and Ancient Monuments at Risk identified (see Annex 1).
Current plans and proposals	No work programmed at present.
Relevance to Core Strategy implementation	Strategic objective 18, protect and enhance places, landscapes, buildings of historical, cultural or archaeological importance. Policy ENV4 Built Environment and heritage.
Role of the Core Strategy and other Local Development Framework planning documents	Policy basis for heritage protection in ENV4 and relevant Development Management policies. ST4 governing developer contributions.
Consequences of needs not being met	Deterioration or loss of heritage assets may impact on Copeland's ability to attract tourists.
Implications of nuclear new build	Nuclear new build (and, potentially even more, geological waste disposal) might impact on the Borough's attractiveness to tourists. Compensatory funds to invest in heritage may be sought.

Health care - medical facilities*where development is substantial enough to generate demand for new or expanded facilities*

Implementation agencies responsible	Primary Care Trust, other health care provider where relevant, and/or successor bodies.
Relevant strategies, plans or programmes	Currently under review due to impending NHS reorganisation.
Baseline situation	Facilities adequate overall, subject to accessibility difficulties in the most rural areas.
Current plans and proposals	PCT programme: new health centre for Cleator Moor, replacement community hospital for Millom.
Relevance to Core Strategy implementation	Strategic objective 12 – improving accessibility of services.
Role of the Core Strategy and other Local Development Framework planning documents	Core Strategy and Site Allocations Development Plan Document set the scene for future demand assessment by determining location of development for next 15 years.
Consequences of needs not being met	May impact on health outcomes in Cleator Moor and South Copeland localities. Achievement of quality of life objectives hindered.
Implications of nuclear new build	Some impact on acute facilities possible but it is expected that the contractor will provide for workforce day-to-day healthcare needs. Otherwise arrangements to mitigate pressure on existing facilities would have to be negotiated.

Community halls	
Implementation agencies responsible	Borough Council in partnership with locality committees and/or parish councils.
Relevant strategies, plans or programmes	Locality Plans
Baseline situation	Identified lack of community halls in various locations (see Annex 1). Also community minibuses lacking in three areas.
Current plans and proposals	No improvements currently programmed.
Relevance to Core Strategy implementation	Strategic objective 8 – sustainability of settlements; ‘social infrastructure, sports and leisure’. Strategic objective 10 – support increased sustainability of rural communities.
Role of the Core Strategy and other Local Development Framework planning documents	Policy support for maintenance of community facilities (SS4); locality profiles identifying needs; basis for securing developer contributions.
Consequences of needs not being met	Quality of life objectives not fully met.
Implications of nuclear new build	No direct consequences identified but this will be a focus of Borough Council efforts to secure ‘community benefit’.

Education; funding schools and school places	
Implementation agencies responsible	County Council
Relevant strategies, plans or programmes	Strategy for Cumbria's Primary Schools
Baseline situation	Areas where schools have capacity issues have been identified. At present only 8 of 35 primary, and 1 of 4 secondary, are full. But projected that 19 primary, plus Westlakes Academy, will be full by 2014.
Current plans and proposals	Expansion/improvement work in progress at Lakes and Furness Colleges (over 16, serving Borough though not in it) and Westlakes Academy. No primary schools improvements currently programmed, former 'Building Schools for Future' projects being under review.
Relevance to Core Strategy implementation	Strategic objective 5 – support the borough's schools.
Role of the Core Strategy and other Local Development Framework planning documents	Policy ST4 will be the base for securing developer contributions; subsequent SPD and CIL if adopted will provide for educational contributions as part of the overall framework.
Consequences of needs not being met	Quality of education may suffer if schools become overcrowded, impacting on quality of life and economic competitiveness of workforce.
Implications of nuclear new build	Anticipated that children of the small proportion of workforce settling here permanently can be absorbed by schools.

Sports facilities	
Implementation agencies responsible	Borough Council, leisure facility providers.
Relevant strategies, plans or programmes	PPG17 Study and Leisure Strategy Copeland Playing Pitch Study
Baseline situation	PPG17 has identified enhancement needs, viz. improvements to pitches and additional artificial turf pitches; multi-use games areas across the borough; meeting shortfalls of play spaces in some localities (see Annexes 1 and 2). Built facilities are broadly up to standard but need enhancement.
Current plans and proposals	Strategic objective 9 – sustainability of settlements; ‘social infrastructure, sports and leisure’.
Relevance to Core Strategy implementation	Policy SS4 ‘Community facilities and services’ stresses need for accessible provision of a scale appropriate to the host community.
Role of the Core Strategy and other Local Development Framework planning documents	ST4 provides basis for securing developer contributions. Locality profiles identify local needs.
Consequences of needs not being met	Community sustainability and quality of life objectives not met.
Implications of nuclear new build	Opportunities for sharing of facilities provided for workforce, ‘community benefit’ funded improvements, ‘legacy’ if workforce facilities remain after power station complete.

<p>Green infrastructure <i>including informal and formal open space, allotments as well as natural and semi-natural open spaces.</i></p>	
Implementation agencies responsible	Borough Council in partnership with locality committees and parish councils.
Relevant strategies, plans or programmes	PPG17 Study and Leisure Strategy Copeland Play Strategy
Baseline situation	Reasonable provision of natural and semi-natural open space. Likewise for playing fields though quality is an issue. Localised deficiencies in play space (South Copealnd, Cleator Moor, Egremont and parts of Whitehaven) and allotments (primarily Whitehaven and South Copeland). Amenity green space deficient in Cleator Moor, Egremont and Millom; lack of park provision in Egremont and Cleator Moor.
Current plans and proposals	No current programme to rectify deficiencies.
Relevance to Core Strategy implementation	Objectives 9 and 10 (sustainable and high quality places) refer; Objective 7 (focusing development in towns) is also relevant.
Role of the Core Strategy and other Local Development Framework planning documents	Policy support for developer contributions for green infrastructure, in line with Policy ENV6 and development management policy DM12.
Consequences of needs not being met	No direct unfavourable consequences identified; but shortages of recreation opportunities may make public health improvement harder to achieve.
Implications of nuclear new build	No direct implications except for possible pressure on playing fields (see 'sport and recreation' above).

Countryside access and Rights of Way	
Implementation agencies responsible	Borough Council, County Council, Natural England, National Trust
Relevant strategies, plans or programmes	Development of England Coastal Path (Marine and Coastal Access Act 2009) Whitehaven Coast Project
Baseline situation	
Current plans and proposals	No current detailed programme. Policy intention to review and improve Rights of Way network and connectivity to coastal path.
Relevance to Core Strategy implementation	Relevant to broader objectives: promoting economic diversification by developing tourism (Objective 2); settlement sustainability including green infrastructure (Objective 8); and promoting accessibility (Objectives 9 and 12)
Role of the Core Strategy and other Local Development Framework planning documents	Policy support for developer contributions promoting this in ST4,
Consequences of needs not being met	Quality of life in settlements impaired. Opportunity missed to improve the Borough's tourism potential. Harder to promote mobility as a means of improving health
Implications of nuclear new build	Influx of workers likely to increase recreational activity causing pressure on existing resources. Opportunity for workers to act as 'ambassadors' for Copeland as a leisure destination, which would be compromised if facilities and resources fall short.

5. THE ROLE OF DEVELOPER CONTRIBUTIONS AND THE COMMUNITY INFRASTRUCTURE LEVY

The Council has not as yet decided whether it will adopt a charging schedule for the purposes of charging a Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL). It may proceed to a CIL, in consultation with the community and developers. A key consideration will be that a CIL, or any Borough-wide approach to developer funding must be capable of being operated without compromising development viability. This will be especially important in those parts of the Borough where there is most need to encourage development for regeneration and sustainable growth.

A Community Infrastructure Levy for Copeland would be based on the infrastructure needs and priorities identified in the Infrastructure Deficit Report and this Infrastructure Delivery Plan, and in accordance with the policies of the Core Strategy and other documents of the Local Development Framework.

Pending the adoption of a Levy, developer contributions will be sought in accordance with planning law and national planning policy, in particular Communities and Local Government (originally Office of the Deputy Prime Minister) Circular 05/2005. In other words, contributions will be sought on the basis that they are

- necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms;
- directly related to the development, and
- fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development.

'Pooled' contributions, that is, contributions from a number of developments to mitigate the cumulative impacts of those developments, may be sought, but this will tend to be on a localised basis in keeping with the stipulation of ... that pooled contributions may be sought from no more than five developments for any item of infrastructure.

The Council will retain the right, if a Levy is set, to seek contributions via Section 106 agreement for items not eligible for the CIL. These include affordable housing and maintenance payments (for instance for open space or 'green infrastructure')?

Section 106 contributions or CIL?

Further work will be undertaken to take forward the implication of Policy ST4 via a Supplementary Planning Document on developer contributions. During this process the Borough Council will decide whether it wants to proceed further and develop, consult upon and adopt a Community Infrastructure Levy.

NB it can be expected that a tariff under s.106 would only have a two year 'life' (to 2014) under the CIL Regulations. The Council is therefore not pursuing that option.

Based on the deficit work undertaken, and the analysis and consultation underlying this strategy, it is expected that the following matters are likely to be covered:

by negotiated Section 106 contributions, or CIL if adopted

- Local road improvements; road safety schemes; cycle ways; pedestrian access improvements
- Whitehaven Town Centre management and 'strategic' public realm improvement (Whitehaven has been identified as the centre most in need of public realm refurbishment at present, though the state of the townscape in Millom, Egremont and Cleator Moor will also be reviewed during the Plan period).
- 'Strategic' flood protection measures (Whitehaven town centre; flood risk will be looked at on a site specific basis elsewhere).
- On site recycling facilities
- Historic environment
- Green infrastructure including informal and formal open space, allotments*

- School places
- Medical centres where development is substantial enough to generate demand for new or expanded facilities
- Community halls
- Some sports facilities
- Affordable housing (s. 106 only)
- Maintenance payments including by commuted lump sum (s.106 only)

by Section 106 negotiations if CIL adopted

(on Circular 05/2005 criteria as modified on the onset of the Community Infrastructure Regulations)

- Affordable housing
- Maintenance payments including by commuted lump sum
- Other matters not eligible for CIL, or on which the Council decides that CIL will not be levied.

6. TAKING THE STRATEGY FORWARD

The Infrastructure Strategy is not a delivery programme. It is not likely that capital funds will be forthcoming to meet the needs identified, nor is it likely, given the state of development economics in West Cumbria, that they could be met through developer funding or a Community Infrastructure Levy.

The Infrastructure Strategy thus represents a statement of what infrastructure is lacking, and the priorities which will guide the Council in its negotiations with developers, discussions with infrastructure providers and external funding agencies, and dealings with nuclear power station developers and other nuclear investors.

It is not considered that the levels and location of development provided for in the Core Strategy will be compromised by infrastructure shortcomings. In particular the following factors apply -

1. levels of traffic congestion, nuisance though they may already

be, will only become seriously problematic if a nuclear power station goes ahead. This will be dealt with

- in the delivery programme for the power station, including a Supplementary Planning Document if necessary, and
 - by measures which we would expect to be provided for in the power station construction budget, for infrastructure spending necessary for the development to go ahead;
2. the choice of development sites available is such that service constraints (especially drainage) can be dealt with either by normal development funding as directed by the utility provider, or by phasing sites so that constraints can be relieved in utility company asset management plans. This will be addressed in more detail in the Site Allocation Development Plan Document.

INFRASTRUCTURE DELIVERY 2012-2027

The Table starting on the following page is intended to serve the following purposes.

1. A list of known infrastructure elements where, either because a deficit has been identified which the occupiers of new development would exacerbate, or because new development will place stress on existing resources, the Council is seeking investment;
2. Costs and programming where known. **All cost estimates are based on the best information available at the time of publication, and should be regarded as provisional.** The current absence of such information does not preclude the Council seeking developer or other funding towards satisfaction of those needs, or the acceleration of those elements above others of similar or higher priority.
3. A statement of priority status, as follows:
 - critical – achievement of Core Strategy aims is likely to be jeopardised if that element is not provided;
 - high – important to the achievement of Core Strategy aims – however, any unfavourable consequences of the measure not happening may hinder but will not fully jeopardise fulfilment of the strategy;
 - medium – desirable if the strategy is to be fully realised, and funding will be actively sought whenever appropriate;
 - low- desirable but funding may not actively be sought.

The advent of a new nuclear power station or other major infrastructure project will impact on this plan as follows.

1. It may give elements of infrastructure a higher priority ('NNB' in the table refers to Nuclear New Build – that is, a power station).
2. The Council may seek funding towards any element of infrastructure represented in this Annex:
 - as appropriate within the terms of Section 106 and Circular 05/2005, and in accordance with Policy ST4 and subsequent Local Development Documents flowing from it; or
 - as part of any community benefit package which may be negotiated.
3. Further unforeseen infrastructural needs related to major infrastructure projects will be dealt with by negotiation and/or a Local Development Document relating to the impacts of that project.
4. Conclusions and costings relating to elements which it is anticipated may arise or be exacerbated as a result of the power station project are based on a preliminary assessment only

±

ANTICIPATED INFRASTRUCTURE DELIVERY 2012-2027

Note: (1) 'Developer funding' encompasses s.106 contributions where this can be justified within the terms of Circular 05/2005; where funds are voluntarily offered by developers; and potential for support using funds generated by Community Infrastructure Levy when the Borough Council adopts this.

(2) 'Other external funding' relates to finance being sought by the County Council or other stakeholders from known sources which may be applicable, such as Britain's Energy Coast, or other sources not at this stage identified.

	Project	Implementation /funding	Locality	Est. cost £	Programmed	Expected Before 2020	After 2020	Priority status
PHYSICAL INFRASTRUCTURE								
Transport and accessibility	A595 capacity improvement (Egremont to Sellafield)	LTP3 project	Egremont/ Mid Copeland	Not known	Programme status not confirmed	✓		High
	A595 improvements (Calder Bridge – Dalton-in-Furness)	County Council/LTP	Mid/South Copeland (in or on boundary of National Park): (and partly in Barrow)	£24.6 – 34.6 million	Identified as NNB-related project	(✓)		High
	A5086 Cockermouth - Egremont	External or developer funding may be appropriate to offset impacts of traffic caused by nationally significant infrastructure projects.	Egremont/ Cleator Moor	7,900,000 (not all in Copeland)	Identified as NNB-related project	(✓)		Medium (NNB; high)
	A5093 Millom capacity improvement		South Copeland	3,700,000				Medium
	Cold Fell road upgrade		Egremont/ Mid Copeland	2,000,000	Identified as NNB-related project			Low
	Corney Fell road upgrade		South Copeland (within National Park)	2,000,000	Identified as NNB-related project			Low
	Pow Beck spine road	External funding (Britain's Energy Coast)	Whitehaven	3,000,000		3,000,000		High

	Project	Implementation /funding	Locality	Est. cost £	Programmed	Expected Before 2020	After 2020	Priority status
	Road safety schemes	County Council, CBC, Parish Councils	Borough-wide	320,000 <i>largely complete</i>		✓		
	Urban cycleways	County Council, CBC, parish Councils, developer	Whitehaven South Copeland	625,000	Not budgeted			Medium/low depending on location
	School Travel Plan schemes	County Council, CBC, parish Councils, developer	Borough-wide	162,000 <i>Programme largely complete</i>		✓		
	Rights of Way; Seascale-Gosforth cycle route plus other schemes	County Council, CBC, parish Councils, developer	Seascale – Gosforth and Borough-wide	£300,000	Seascale-Gosforth programmed (LTP3)	300,000		Medium/low depending on location
	Whitehaven Transport Interchange	County Council Energy Coast	Whitehaven	2,500,000	Expected 2012-13 (LTP3)	2,500,000		High
	Whitehaven town centre traffic management scheme	County Council, CBC	Whitehaven	5,500,000	Programming under discussion	5,500,000		High
	Rail station improvements Identified: (a) Whitehaven ('gateway' enhancement; station approach part of transport interchange), (b) Bootle, Silecroft (accessibility via 'Harrington hump' raised platform)	Northern Rail Developer contributions Other external funding CBC/County Council/Parish Councils	Whitehaven Mid Copeland South Copeland (both in National Park)	(a) unknown (b) £150,000	(a) Identified as NNB-related project (b) identified in Locality Plan preparation	(✓)		(a) High (b) Medium
	Rail capacity improvements (crossings at Whitehaven)	Network Rail Northern Rail Developer or external funding	Whitehaven	8,800,000 to 14,000,000	Identified as NNB-related project	(✓)		Medium (NNB: high)

	Project	Implementation /funding	Locality	Est. cost £	Programmed	Expected Before 2020	After 2020	Priority status
High speed broadband	To maximise connectivity across Cumbria	Cumbria County Council leading; private sector partners not settled. External funding support. Devr. contributions possible.	Borough wide with stress on rural areas	Not finalised	£17 million (county-wide) secured from BDUK	✓		High
Water supply	Egremont boreholes	Developer funding may be sought if appropriate (such as, from large scale development) but at present it is assumed that inclusion in United Utilities' Integrated Asset Plan is required.	Egremont	14,000,000	No start date	14,000,000		Critical for growth in Egremont
Waste water treatment	Cleator Treatment Works improvement (maintenance project)		Cleator Moor	3,000,000	Programmed in UU plans 2010-2015	3,000,000		Critical for growth in Cleator Moor
	The Green Treatment Works improvement		South Copeland	Not known	Candidates for UU asset management plan 2015-2020	Inclusion in 2015-20 AMP will be sought		Medium (to reduce flooding/pollution)
	Drigg Treatment Works improvement		Mid Copeland	Not known		Inclusion in 2015-20 AMP will be sought		Medium (to reduce flooding/pollution)
	Millom sewer outfall		South Copeland	Not known		✓		High (to remove potential development constraint)
	Parton sewer outfall		Whitehaven	Not known		✓		High (to remove potential development constraint)
	Whitehaven WwTW		Whitehaven	Not known				High (to remove potential development constraint)
	Ennerdale Bridge WwTW		Cleator Moor	Not known				Medium

	Project	Implementation /funding	Locality	Est. cost £	Programmed	Expected Before 2020	After 2020	Priority status
Flood protection	Development sites potentially at risk in Whitehaven (town centre and Pow Beck valley) and Cleator Moor. Environment Agency considers work to be desirable on River Ehen at Egremont.	Environment Agency assisted by developer funding as appropriate.	Whitehaven/ Cleator Moor Egremont	Not known	No work programmed; main need is for development to minimise run-off.			High in Whitehaven Medium/low elsewhere
Waste management	Household waste recycling needs to be met at Lillyhall: Small site identified at Egremont but no firm proposals	County Council/waste management contractor	Outside Borough Egremont		Minerals and Waste LDF and waste management PFI contract			
Built environment – townscape	Town centre streetscape improvements	Borough Council County Council Developers	Whitehaven Egremont Cleator Moor Millom	See town centre traffic management above 250,000 250,000 250,000	Not programmed			High Medium
Built environment – historic heritage	Conservation Areas	CBC English Heritage Developer funding	Whitehaven (Town Centre and High Street CAs) identified as needing attention	Not known (Though traffic management scheme will have streetscape elements in Conservation Area)	No programme identified. Likely to be funded on project basis			Medium
	Listed Buildings At Risk – (a) Gale Mansion, (b) Millom Castle	CBC English Heritage Developer funding Other external	(a) Whitehaven (b) South Copeland	Not known				Medium

	Project	Implementation /funding	Locality	Est. cost £	Programmed	Expected Before 2020	After 2020	Priority status
	Ancient Monuments At Risk – (a) Barrowmouth Mine (b) Settlement at Lamplugh	CBC English Heritage Developer funding Other external	(a) Whitehaven (b) Cleator Moor	Not known				Medium
SOCIAL INFRASTRUCTURE								
Primary Health Care	Millom new Community Hospital	Cumbria Primary Care Trust (currently not being progressed)	South Copeland	20,000,000	No programme date		20,000,000	Medium
	Cleator Moor Health Centre	Cumbria Primary Care Trust (programmed for 2012 but finance not yet confirmed)	Cleator Moor	4,100,000	2011/12 (under review)	4,100,000		Medium
Community halls	Nine communities lacking provision; Bransty, Sandwith, Hensingham, Moresby Parks, Cleator Moor, Moor Row, Egremont, Haverigg and Bootle	CBC with developer funding; other external funds could be sought	All localities except mid Copeland.	3,500,000	Not programmed			Medium
Community transport	Three areas identified as lacking such provision.	CBC Developer funding Other external funds as applicable.	Whitehaven Egremont South Copeland	120,000	Not programmed			Medium
Primary Schools	No specific deficit identified but number of schools at capacity is increasing.	County Council Developer contributions	Full schools in all locality areas	Not known	Further school provision likely to be aided by developer input.			High

	Project	Implementation /funding	Locality	Est. cost £	Programmed	Expected Before 2020	After 2020	Priority status
Secondary Schools	No specific deficit identified. Millom and Whitehaven Schools and West Lakes Academy have spare capacity.	County Council Developer contributions	Whitehaven Egremont Millom (South Copeland)	West Lakes Academy 26,552,000 (19,900,000 to 2012)	West Lakes Academy on site; no other major capital works programmed.	6,652,000 (2012/13)		Medium
Tertiary education	No specific deficit identified.	County Council with central government input	Colleges outside the borough (Lakes College, Lillyhall, Allerdale, Furness Coll. Barrow)	Not known	Lakes College extension on site. Furness College rebuilding in progress.	(✓)		High if Copeland is to support nuclear new build workforce. Anticipated that NNB-related skills development will lead to investment in colleges.
Sports Halls	Millom Leisure Centre has proposals for extension to enhance its community role. Cleator Moor needs replacement sports hall	Developer funding Other external funding	South Copeland Cleator Moor	250,000 700,000	Not programmed			Medium. Likelihood of increased demand, dependent on size, location and nature of contractor-provided provision for NNB workers
Synthetic Turf and other Pitches	Open Space/Sports/ Recreation need ('PPG17') study identifies shortfall in Whitehaven, Cleator Moor (upgrade of existing pitch) and Egremont, and need for netball arena (Whitehaven assumed to be best location)	CBC Developer funding Other external funding	Whitehaven Cleator Moor Egremont	2,000,000	Not programmed			

	Project	Implementation /funding	Locality	Est. cost £	Programmed	Expected Before 2020	After 2020	Priority status
Multi-use games areas	Open Space/Sports/ Recreation need ('PPG17') study identifies borough-wide absence	CBC Developer contributions External funding as obtainable	All (priority for public funding in towns in keeping with spatial strategy)	3,500,000	Not programmed			
Swimming Pools	Borough provision almost up to standard but need for upgrading at Egremont and public pool for Millom	No public funding available in short term.	Egremont Millom	Not known 4,000,000	Nothing programmed.			Medium but demand may increase due to NNB
Tennis courts	Floodlights needed to maximise use of courts in St Bees and Seascale	CBC Developer funding Other external funding	Egremont Mid Copeland	100,000	Not programmed			Low
GREEN INFRASTRUCTURE								
Allotments	Deficiency against standard in parts of Whitehaven, Millom and some villages.	Borough Council Developer funding	Whitehaven		Not programmed			Low
Amenity Greenspace	Deficient in parts of Whitehaven, Millom and some villages	Generally likely to be provided as part of development	Whitehaven Millom Frizington Beckermest (plus Gosforth, Bootle in National Park)		Not programmed			Medium
Natural & Semi-Natural Greenspace	No significant deficit identified.	Borough Council Developer funding			Not programmed			Medium
Countryside access and Rights of Way (general)	County Council has programme of improvements	County Council/developer funding	Borough wide		Not programmed			Generally low, dependent on local factors

Countryside access and Rights of Way (strategic routes)	Sections of C2C need improving south of Whitehaven. Coastal Way sections with potential for improvement.	County Council/developer/external funding	Whitehaven, Egremont, Mid- and South Copeland		Not programmed			Medium
Outdoor Sport	See above; but grass pitches heavily used and some need better drainage.	Borough Council Developer funding	Borough-wide	Not known	Not programmed			Medium (possible demand from NNB workers?)
Parks & Gardens	Park provision is highly localised. May not be realistic to create additional formal park areas.	Borough Council Developer funding may be appropriate for enhancement of existing parks	Whitehaven Millom		No action proposed			Low
Play Space	Survey work identifies deficiency in 5 areas of Whitehaven, and in Cleator Moor, Egremont and Millom – 10 play areas altogether. The Lake District also proposes a play area for Bootle.	CBC Developer funding	Whitehaven Cleator Moor Egremont Millom Bootle	1,000,000	Not programmed			Medium

