

Copeland LDF Progress

EXECUTIVE MEMBER: Councillor George Clements
LEAD OFFICER: Julie Betteridge
REPORT AUTHOR: John Hughes

PURPOSE OF REPORT: To consider the following:

1. Draft Strategy for Infrastructure
2. Open Space Assessment/Playing Pitch Study
3. Draft National Planning Policy Framework Consultation (and consultation on revised Local Planning Regulations)
4. Draft Core Strategy: Chapters 2 and 3 'Setting the Strategy' and 'Strategic Policies'

Plus additional verbal updates

RECOMMENDATION: That the items reported on are noted as regards their implications to LDF content and production.

1. STRATEGY FOR INFRASTRUCTURE

- 1.1 Notes on the requirement for this work, the process for preparation and a copy of the Draft Strategy itself are attached to this agenda report as Item 1 Appendix . The intention is to consult infrastructure providers and other stakeholders on the draft and make amendments accordingly before the document is formally incorporated into the Evidence Base. The Council's full Infrastructure Deficit Plan can be accessed via:

<http://www.copeland.gov.uk/Default.aspx?page=1476>

2. OPEN SPACE & PLAYING PITCH REPORTS

- 2.1 Copies of the full reports in paper form can be inspected in the Planning Policy section and are available via the following link:

<http://www.copeland.gov.uk/Default.aspx?page=2301>

- 2.2 The implications of supply are also incorporated in the Strategy for Infrastructure (see item 1) and a verbal presentation will be made at the meeting.
3. DRAFT NATIONAL PLANNING POLICY FRAMEWORK
 - 3.1 A note on this new government initiative to replace all national planning policy forms the item 3 Appendix along with a schedule of all the existing policy documents to be replaced. The note includes a link to the Communities and Local Government web site to see the full document and companion consultation report. Paper copies can be obtained in the Planning Policy section.
4. DRAFT CORE STRATEGY: EARLY CHAPTERS
 - 4.1 This is a work in progress with a number of areas to come back to but it will give Members an idea of how the Preferred Options version is being converted to the Submission Draft. There will be a read-through and discussion session at the meeting. There will also be a verbal update on progress with the "Blueprint" and other parallel commissions which have a direct bearing on the areas of the early chapters we have to return to.
5. LEGAL, FINANCIAL AND HUMAN RESOURCES IMPLICATIONS
 - 5.1 The LDF is a statutory requirement. Preparation is proceeding well within budget and a verbal update on the current position will be given at the meeting

List of Appendices

- Appendix Item 1: Copeland Draft Strategy for Infrastructure
- Appendix Item 3: Note on the Draft National Planning Policy Framework
- Appendix Item 4: Draft Chapters 2 and 3 of Submission Draft Core Strategy

interest. If you have a personal and prejudicial interest you must withdraw from the meeting room for that item, unless you are there to make representations and the public have the same opportunity to do so.

NB You **only** have a prejudicial interest if the matter affects your financial position or that of your family, close associate, employer etc or it relates to a regulatory matter

You will also have a prejudicial interest in any business before an overview and scrutiny committee or sub-committee where that business relates to a decision made (whether implemented or not) or action taken by your authorities executive or another of your authority's committees, joint committees or joint sub-committees; and at the time the decision was made or action was taken, you were a member of the executive, committee, sub-committee, joint committee or joint sub-committee mentioned in paragraph (a) above and you were present when that decision was taken.

A personal and prejudicial interest should be declared as follows:

I have a personal and prejudicial interest in agenda item [...] regarding the report on [.....] because I am [.....].

Advice on this can be sought from staff in the Member Services or Legal Services Unit. Members are requested to seek advice, wherever possible, before the meeting starts.

4. **Order of Agenda Items:** To consider the order in which agenda items will be taken.
5. **Items for which the Press and Public will be Excluded:** To consider whether any of the items listed on the agenda should be considered with the press and public excluded on the grounds that it is thought likely in a view of the business to be transacted that, there would be disclosure of confidential information in breach of an obligation of confidence or of exempt information as defined in the Local Government (Access to Information) Act 1985.
6. Strategy for Infrastructure
7. Open Space and Playing Pitches

8. Draft National Planning Policy Framework
9. Draft Core Strategy

**Membership: Councillors George Clements; Jon Downie; David Riley; Jon Fallows;
Stephen Haraldsen; Alistair Norwood and Graham Sunderland.**

Contacts:

Direct Dial:	01946 598528
E-mail:	<u>denise.james@copeland.gov.uk</u>
Website:	<u>www.copelandbc.gov.uk</u>

Copeland LDF Progress

EXECUTIVE MEMBER: Councillor George Clements
LEAD OFFICER: Julie Betteridge
REPORT AUTHOR: John Hughes

PURPOSE OF REPORT: To consider the following:

1. Draft Strategy for Infrastructure
2. Open Space Assessment/Playing Pitch Study
3. Draft National Planning Policy Framework Consultation (and consultation on revised Local Planning Regulations)
4. Draft Core Strategy: Chapters 2 and 3 'Setting the Strategy' and 'Strategic Policies'

Plus additional verbal updates

RECOMMENDATION: That the items reported on are noted as regards their implications to LDF content and production.

1. STRATEGY FOR INFRASTRUCTURE

- 1.1 Notes on the requirement for this work, the process for preparation and a copy of the Draft Strategy itself are attached to this agenda report as Item 1 Appendix . The intention is to consult infrastructure providers and other stakeholders on the draft and make amendments accordingly before the document is formally incorporated into the Evidence Base. The Council's full Infrastructure Deficit Plan can be accessed via:

<http://www.copeland.gov.uk/Default.aspx?page=1476>

2. OPEN SPACE & PLAYING PITCH REPORTS

- 2.1 Copies of the full reports in paper form can be inspected in the Planning Policy section and are available via the following link:

<http://www.copeland.gov.uk/Default.aspx?page=2301>

- 2.2 The implications of supply are also incorporated in the Strategy for Infrastructure (see item 1) and a verbal presentation will be made at the meeting.
3. DRAFT NATIONAL PLANNING POLICY FRAMEWORK
 - 3.1 A note on this new government initiative to replace all national planning policy forms the item 3 Appendix along with a schedule of all the existing policy documents to be replaced. The note includes a link to the Communities and Local Government web site to see the full document and companion consultation report. Paper copies can be obtained in the Planning Policy section.
4. DRAFT CORE STRATEGY: EARLY CHAPTERS
 - 4.1 This is a work in progress with a number of areas to come back to but it will give Members an idea of how the Preferred Options version is being converted to the Submission Draft. There will be a read-through and discussion session at the meeting. There will also be a verbal update on progress with the "Blueprint" and other parallel commissions which have a direct bearing on the areas of the early chapters we have to return to.
5. LEGAL, FINANCIAL AND HUMAN RESOURCES IMPLICATIONS
 - 5.1 The LDF is a statutory requirement. Preparation is proceeding well within budget and a verbal update on the current position will be given at the meeting

List of Appendices

Appendix Item 1: Copeland Draft Strategy for Infrastructure

Appendix Item 3: Note on the Draft National Planning Policy Framework

Appendix Item 4: Draft Chapters 2 and 3 of Submission Draft Core Strategy

LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK WORKING GROUP

August 3 2011

LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK: THE STRATEGY FOR INFRASTRUCTURE

The Core Strategy is required by regulations and Government guidance to be evidence-based and to show that it is deliverable. Infrastructure is a central part of the evidence base.

The Strategy for Infrastructure does two important jobs:

1. starting from an assessment of the infrastructure 'deficit' it puts forward the key elements where there is a need for improvement;
2. it will serve as the base for taking forward policy ST4 (developer contributions) into a more detailed strategy for securing contributions (via a Supplementary Planning Document), as well as defining the 'gap' that would help set a Community Infrastructure Levy.

The agencies responsible for supplying infrastructure have been involved in the process of developing an Infrastructure Deficit Report, which will also be part of the evidence base. They will also be consulted on this Strategy in the near future.

The Working Group is asked to agree that the Strategy (with any suggested changes) be the basis for this next stage of stakeholder consultation.

The production process

In 2009/10 major research was undertaken, involving consultation and discussion with those involved in providing social, environmental and physical infrastructure in Copeland. These include various Borough and County Council services, utility and transport companies, the Primary Care Trust and others.

The Infrastructure Deficit Report was completed early in 2011 and is available if members wish to see it (the main report runs to over 300 pages).

Following from that, the categories of provision where coverage needs to be improved, and which are suitable to be dealt with via the planning process (including policy for developer contributions) were identified.

The Strategy is not a 'delivery plan' as such, since the actual delivery of what is needed is generally not within the Council's power. It demonstrates what is needed, and assesses priorities (basically, whether each element is critical to achievement of the Core Strategy's objectives). It allows us to be confident that we can take to the Inspector a conclusion that, while all this is needed, there are no 'showstoppers'.

Content of the Strategy

The Strategy for Infrastructure does the following.

- a) It sets the scene in terms of Core Strategy objectives and policies the Council wants to deliver (these are based on current drafts).
- b) It looks at the priorities and analyses how these elements of infrastructure relate and contribute to the plans set out in the Core Strategy.
- c) The table forming Annex 1 goes through these in detail relating to what is known about costs and timescales.
- d) This table also refers to the possible implications of nuclear new build and contributions arising from that.
- e) Annex 2 (not fully complete) breaks these projects down by locality.

Note

The Strategy for Infrastructure, although broadly complete, is not yet fully finished and consultation responses, it is hoped, will fill in some of the gaps as to detail.

COPELAND LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK

STRATEGY for INFRASTRUCTURE

Second draft (for stakeholder comment) August 2011



Proud of our past. Energised for our future.

Contents

	Page
1. Development and policy context; Copeland's development strategy	4
2. The baseline	6
3. Strategy inputs	7
4. Infrastructure priorities for Copeland	9
5. Developer contributions and the Community Infrastructure Levy	30
6. Taking the strategy forward	32
Annexes:	
Implementation table	33
Identified infrastructure needs by locality.	40

1. POLICY CONTEXT: COPELAND'S 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.

2. TAKING THE STRATEGY FORWARD: THE BASELINE

Growth and delivery

Copeland covers a large area but is, in numbers of people, a small district. Its 'baseline' position in terms of development is that, other things being equal, growth would be slow and its population might not grow at all. The amount of development it attracts is relatively small, and land prices and development yields are, at least in the north of the Borough where most people live, well below average.

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 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, the Council will in its dealings with the developer 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 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) or grossly substandard, especially the stretches in the south of the Borough where traffic, perhaps uniquely in England on a major 'A' road, has to stop if there is anything coming the other way.

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 infrastructure 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 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 largely outdated road system, Copeland has a considerable backlog of identified 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. There are restraints on water supply in the Ehen catchment due to restrictions on abstraction for nature conservation reasons, but these are being addressed via boreholes near Egremont. 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.

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 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, 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. 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 overlaps with 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 greenspace and play areas.

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,
- 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 Agency 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 likely to be more short term and less widespread than the impact of nuclear new build, 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 '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 in partnership with local committees and Borough Council.
Relevant strategies, plans or programmes	Local Transport Plan LTP3 County Council Capital Programme (central and Copeland Area budgets)
Baseline situation	A595, A5806 and A5083 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	Will lead to greater vehicle traffic including HGVs and buses, leading to greater congestion, if identified road improvements are not carried out.

Public transport improvements	
Implementation agencies responsible	County Council in partnership with local committees and Borough Council. National Rail Northern Rail
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.
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	Water; supply adequate to meet projected needs except in Ehen catchment where extraction from river must be produced. Boreholes in Egremont area are programmed to meet the shortfall. Drainage; improved waste water treatment works needed at Cleator , The Green and Drigg; sewer outfall improvements at Millom and Parton.
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.
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 <i>(Whitehaven town centre; flood risk will be looked at on a site specific basis elsewhere)</i>	
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
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).
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	
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.

Note: ‘strategic public realm improvement’ refers to the package of measures already developed in outline in co-operation with the County Council

Smaller Town Centre management and ‘strategic’ 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 <i>where development is substantial enough to generate demand for new or expanded facilities</i>	
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, Building Schools for Future 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</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).

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 and subject to being convinced that a CIL can be operated without compromising development viability.

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 2013-2028

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. 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 of 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 Annex 1:
 - 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.

ANTICIPATED INFRASTRUCTURE DELIVERY 2013-2028

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)	Egremont/ Mid Copeland	Not known	Programme status not confirmed	✓		High
	A595 improvements (Calder Bridge – Dalton-in-Furness)	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 Cockeremouth - Egremont	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	Whitehaven	3,000,000		3,000,000		High

Road safety schemes	County Council, CBC, Parish Councils	Borough-wide	320,000 largely complete			✓			
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 Programme largely complete			✓			
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)	Northern Rail Developer or external funding	Whitehaven	8,800,000 to 14,000,000	Identified as NNB-related project		(✓)		Medium (NNB: high)	
Egremont boreholes		Egremont	14,000,000	Programmed in UU plans 2010-2015		14,000,000		Critical for growth in Egremont	

Waste water treatment	Cleator Treatment Works improvement	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.	Cleator Moor	3,000,000	3,000,000	Candidates for UU asset management plan 2015-2020	3,000,000	Critical for growth in Cleator Moor
	The Green Treatment Works improvement		South Copeland	Not known	Not known		Inclusion in 2015-20 AMP will be sought	Medium (to reduce flooding/pollution)
	Drigg Treatment Works improvement		Mid Copeland	Not known	Not known		Inclusion in 2015-20 AMP will be sought	Medium (to reduce flooding/pollution)
	Millom sewer outfall		South Copeland	Not known	Not known		✓	High (to remove potential development constraint)
	Parton sewer outfall		Whitehaven	Not known	Not known		✓	High (to remove potential development constraint)
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	Not known	No work programmed.		High in Whitehaven Medium/low elsewhere
Waste management	Household waste recycling facility at Moresby Parks: Mechanical and biological treatment facility at Egremont	County Council/waste management contractor	Whitehaven Egremont	Not known	Not known	Minerals and Waste LDF and waste management PFI contract	✓ ✓	High
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 known	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
	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	Ten communities lacking provision (see Annex 2)	CBC with developer funding; other external funds could be sought	All localities	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
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.	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	Developer funding Other external funding	South Copeland	250,000	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 (resurface needed) and Egremont, and need for netball arena (Whitehaven assumed to be best location)	CBC Developer funding Other external funding	Whitehaven Cleator Moor Egremont	1,000,000	Not programmed	

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)	2,600,000	Not programmed				
Athletics Tracks					Nothing programmed				Low
Swimming Pools	Provision broadly up to standard but need for upgrading	No public funding available in short term.	Whitehaven Egremont Millom	Not known	Nothing programmed.				Low 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 Beckermet (Gosforth Bootle in National Park)		Not programmed				Medium
Natural & Semi-Natural Greenspace	No significant deficit identified.	Borough Council Developer funding			Not programmed				Medium
Outdoor Sport	See above	Borough Council Developer funding			See above				See above
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,	CBC Developer funding	Whitehaven Cleator Moor Egremont Millom	1,000,000	Not programmed				Medium

	<p>Egremont and Millom – 10 play areas altogether. The Lake District also proposes a play area for Bootle.</p>		<p>Bootle</p>					
--	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--	---------------	--	--	--	--	--

WHITEHAVEN	NORTH EAST (CLEATOR MOOR)	NORTH WEST (EGREMONT)	MID (FIVE RIVERS)	SOUTH (MILLOM)
Generally not in 'deficit' but can be subjected to contributions tariff to compensate for added demand / pressure by residents of new dwellings.				
Green infrastructure				
TOWNSCAPE/TOWN CENTRES				
Public transport interchange (CCC/Tesco funded?) Streetscape improvement £5,500,000 Flood protection	Cleator Moor town centre public realm (allowance – with justification - for augmentation of work already done, e.g. seats - £250,000?)	Egremont town centre public realm £250,000?		Millom town centre public realm £250,000?

NB Information contained above refers to the whole Borough, including part of the Lake District National park Authority which is a separate planning authority. It is not legitimate for developer funding acquired within the Copeland planning authority to be spent within the National Park boundary.

Draft National Planning Policy Framework Consultation (and consultation on revised Local Planning Regulations)

On 25th July 2011 the Government published its Draft National Planning Policy Framework for consultation. The consultation runs until 17th October 2011.

The its Draft National Planning Policy Framework is a 60 page document that is designed to replace all of the current Planning Policy Statements, Planning Policy Guidance Notes, Minerals Policy Statements, Minerals Planning Guidance Notes and Letters to Chief Planning Officers relating to planning policy. The full list of these documents can be found on the next two pages.

The consultation and its associated documents can be found at <http://www.communities.gov.uk/planningandbuilding/planningsystem/planningpolicy/planningpolicyframework/> and a summary that has been produced by DCLG can be found at the end of this report.

It has been proposed that the Cumbrian authorities work together to provide a joint, or at least consistent, response to the consultation. Copeland will be contributing to this work and it is expected that we will report our draft response to a future meeting of the LDF Working Party for approval before submitting it to Government.

It is proposed that the following policy documents should be cancelled by the National Planning Policy Framework when the document is published in its final form.

Documents to be cancelled	Date of publication
Planning Policy Statement: <i>Delivering Sustainable Development</i>	31 January 2005
Planning Policy Statement: <i>Planning and Climate Change – Supplement to Planning Policy Statement 1</i>	17 December 2007
Planning Policy Guidance 2: <i>Green Belts</i>	24 January 1995
Planning Policy Statement 3: <i>Housing</i>	9 June 2010
Planning Policy Statement 4: <i>Planning for Sustainable Economic Growth</i>	29 December 2009
Planning Policy Statement 5: <i>Planning for the Historic Environment</i>	23 March 2010
Planning Policy Statement 7: <i>Sustainable Development in Rural Areas</i>	3 August 2004
Planning Policy Guidance 8: <i>Telecommunications</i>	23 August 2001
Planning Policy Statement 9: <i>Biodiversity and Geological Conservation</i>	16 August 2005
Planning Policy Statement 12: <i>Local Spatial Planning</i>	4 June 2008
Planning Policy Guidance 13: <i>Transport</i>	3 January 2011
Planning Policy Guidance 14: <i>Development on Unstable Land</i>	30 April 1990
Planning Policy Guidance 17: <i>Planning for Open Space, Sport and Recreation</i>	24 July 2002
Planning Policy Guidance 18: <i>Enforcing Planning Control</i>	20 December 1991
Planning Policy Guidance 19: <i>Outdoor Advertisement Control</i>	23 March 1992
Planning Policy Guidance 20: <i>Coastal Planning</i>	1 October 1992
Planning Policy Statement 22: <i>Renewable Energy</i>	10 August 2004
Planning Policy Statement 23: <i>Planning and Pollution Control</i>	3 November 2004
Planning Policy Guidance 24: <i>Planning and Noise</i>	3 October 1994
Planning Policy Statement 25: <i>Development and Flood Risk</i>	29 March 2010
Planning Policy Statement 25 Supplement: <i>Development and Coastal Change</i>	9 March 2010
Minerals Policy Statement 1: <i>Planning and Minerals</i>	13 November 2006
Minerals Policy Statement 2: <i>Controlling and Mitigating the Environmental Effects of Minerals Extraction In England.</i> (This includes its Annex 1: Dust and Annex 2: Noise)	23 March 2005 (Annex 1: 23 March 2005 and Annex 2: 23 May 2005)
Minerals Planning Guidance 2: <i>Applications, permissions and conditions</i>	10 July 1998
Minerals Planning Guidance 3: <i>Coal Mining and Colliery Spoil Disposal</i>	30 March 1999

Documents to be cancelled	Date of publication
Minerals Planning Guidance 5: <i>Stability in surface mineral workings and tips</i>	28 January 2000
Minerals Planning Guidance 7: <i>Reclamation of minerals workings</i>	29 November 1996
Minerals Planning Guidance 10: <i>Provision of raw material for the cement industry</i>	20 November 1991
Minerals Planning Guidance 13: <i>Guidance for peat provision in England</i>	13 July 1995
Minerals Planning Guidance 15: <i>Provision of silica sand in England</i>	23 September 1996
Circular 05/2005: <i>Planning Obligations</i>	18 July 2005
Government Office London Circular 1/2008: <i>Strategic Planning in London</i>	4 April 2008
Letter to Chief Planning Officers: <i>Addition of the Forestry Commission to the List of Non-Statutory Consultees</i>	15 March 1999
Letter to Chief Planning Officers: <i>Town and Country Planning (Electronic Communications) (England) Order 2003</i>	2 April 2003
Letter to Chief Planning Officers: <i>Planning Obligations and Planning Registers</i>	3 April 2002
Letter to Chief Planning Officers: <i>Model Planning Conditions for development on land affected by contamination</i>	30 May 2008
Letter to Chief Planning Officers: <i>National Policy Statements</i>	9 November 2009
Letter to Chief Planning Officers: <i>Local authorities' role in new consenting process for nationally significant infrastructure projects</i>	16 July 2009
Letter to Chief Planning Officers: <i>Planning for Housing and Economic Recovery</i>	12 May 2009
Letter to Chief Planning Officers: <i>Development and Flood Risk – Update to the Practice Guide to Planning Policy Statement 25</i>	14 December 2009
Letter to Chief Planning Officers: <i>Implementation of Planning Policy Statement 25 (PPS25) – Development and Flood Risk</i>	7 May 2009
Letter to Chief Planning Officers: <i>The Planning Bill – delivering well designed homes and high quality places</i>	23 February 2009
Letter to Chief Planning Officers: <i>Planning and Climate Change – Update</i>	20 January 2009
Letter to Chief Planning Officers: <i>New powers for local authorities to stop 'garden-grabbing'</i>	15 June 2010
Letter to Chief Planning Officer: <i>Area Based Grant: Climate Change New Burdens</i>	14 January 2010
Letter to Chief Planning Officers: <i>The Localism Bill</i>	15 December 2010
Letter to Chief Planning Officers: <i>Planning policy on residential parking standards, parking charges, and electric vehicle charging infrastructure</i>	14 January 2011



Media summary - Draft National Planning Policy Framework

In order for the planning system to work properly and fairly, it is important for there to be national policies. Over recent years, however, the amount of central direction has increased dramatically: there are now more than 1,000 pages of national planning policy. The system has become unwieldy and complex, so that it is sometimes hard for experts, let alone communities, to interpret the policy.

In the Coalition Agreement, the Government committed to turning this thicket of documents into a clearer, simpler, more coherent framework, easier to understand and easier to put in practice.

A new framework for planning

The Government is launching for consultation the draft National Planning Policy Framework. It streamlines national planning policy into a consolidated set of priorities to consider when planning for and deciding on new development. These important principles will help communities enjoy a better quality of life, both now and in the future.

The draft Framework sets national priorities and rules only where it is necessary to do so. It will help ensure that planning decisions reflect genuine national objectives - such as the need to safeguard the natural environment, combat climate change, and to support sustainable local growth - while allowing for local authorities and communities to produce their own plans, reflecting the distinctive needs and priorities of different parts of the country.

The principle of sustainable development permeates the draft of the new Framework; that the actions we take to meet our needs today must not compromise the ability of future generations to meet their own. And that planning decisions should not only protect, but, wherever possible, enhance biodiversity and improve people's access to our natural heritage.

Below are some of the main points in the draft Framework.

Protecting and enhancing the environment

Green Belt and natural environment

The Framework re-affirms the Government's commitment to maintaining Green Belt protections to prevent urban sprawl, as pledged in the Coalition Agreement. All inappropriate development harmful to Green Belt remains prohibited. Local authorities are encouraged to positively enhance the use of

Green Belt, including by opening up walking routes, and improving biodiversity and damaged landscapes for the enjoyment of all.

The Framework also retains protection for Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty, National Parks, Sites of Special Scientific Interest and other environmental designations which protect the character of our country's landscape, stop unsustainable urban sprawl and preserve wildlife.

The Framework takes forward the Natural Environment White Paper's aims to improve the quality of the natural environment across England, halt the decline in habitats and species, and strengthen the connection between people and nature.

Green space designation

The Framework sets out a new right for local communities to protect green areas of particular importance to them. They will be able to earmark for special protection local green space land that is important to local life - whether its value is in its natural beauty, its historic resonances, its recreational value, its tranquility or its richness in wildlife. These sites will be planned so they complement and do not undermine investment in homes, jobs and other essential services.

Sustainable transport

The Government is committed to cutting down pollution and congestion through the use of public transport. The Framework makes clear that local authorities should seek to ensure good access to high quality local public transport for new developments, with priority given to cyclists and pedestrians. It encourages decision-makers to provide charging points for electric cars and other low emission vehicles. Wherever possible, key facilities essential to local life such as schools and shops should be within walking distance of most properties.

Biodiversity

A healthy and diverse natural environment is crucial to our sense of wellbeing. The Framework underlines that the planning system should seek not just to protect, but, where possible, to enhance biodiversity – making sure we don't just have isolated pockets of wildlife, but rich and connected green spaces for all kinds of species to thrive. Planning permission should be refused for development resulting in the loss or deterioration of irreplaceable habitats, including ancient woodland.

Noise and light pollution

Noise and light pollution impacts negatively on people's quality of life. The Framework makes clear that planners must seek to avoid noise pollution as a result of new developments, and to protect tranquil areas prized for their

peace and quiet. By encouraging good design, planning decisions should limit the impact of light pollution.

Climate change

The Framework confirms planning's important role in tackling climate change and making the transition to a low carbon economy. Planning can help secure radical reductions in carbon emissions through the appropriate location and layout of new development, support for energy efficiency improvements to existing buildings and backing the delivery of renewable and low carbon energy including community-led initiatives. The framework paves the way for green transport of the future – the electric car- by encouraging decision makers to provide charging points;

We also want planning to ensure new development is future proofed against climate change through getting its location and design right (for example making sure that new housing estates are not at risk of flooding and have good flood storage capacity to reduce flooding elsewhere).

The Framework also meets the Coalition's commitment to preventing unnecessary building in areas of high flood risk.

Access to the coast

The Framework highlights the Government's ambition not only to protect our extraordinary coastline, but also to ensure people have access to it; it states that development should not curtail a continuous signed and managed route around the coast for all to enjoy.

Communications infrastructure

The Framework promotes growth for the telecoms industry, but reiterates that this growth should be sensitive to local areas. The policy supports the industry policy of sharing masts and using existing buildings, and well designed and camouflaged equipment.

Minerals

Minerals are essential to meeting society's needs. The Framework reaffirms the Government's objective of securing an adequate and steady supply of indigenous minerals needed to support sustainable growth, whilst limiting any impact on the natural and local environment.

Promoting Sustainable Growth and Prosperity

Sustainable growth

The Framework makes clear that local councils should be positive and proactive in encouraging sustainable growth and addressing barriers to

investment. They should set a clear economic vision and strategy for their area based on understanding of business needs across their areas.

Presumption in favour of sustainable development

The presumption is designed to help turn the planning system round - from one focused on barriers to one that prioritises opportunities. It requires councils to work closely with businesses and communities to plan positively for the needs of each area. And it makes clear that where plans are not in place or up-to-date, development should be allowed unless this would compromise the key principles for sustainability in the Framework, including protecting the Green Belt and Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty.

The presumption will encourage plan-making by councils and communities, giving them a greater say in how they meet their development needs. It will also give communities, developers and investors greater certainty about the types of applications that are likely to be approved, and will help to speed up the planning process.

Duty to Co-operate

It is important for councils and other public bodies to work together across administrative boundaries to plan for the housing, transport and infrastructure that local people need. For example, if a significant number of people living in one council travel to work in a neighbouring city, then it is self-evident that the two councils should be working together.

For much of the last decade, the Government sought to make councils work together by setting regional strategies, prescribing where and how they should join forces. This Government thinks that this top-down approach was ineffective, and that it is better for councils to work together in ways and in structures that are designed from the bottom up. The Localism Bill will place a new Duty to Co-operate on councils to work together to address planning issues that impact beyond local boundaries. The Framework supports the implementation of the Duty to Co-operate.

Planning for strong, vibrant and healthy communities

Housing

Councils must be ambitious in delivering the much needed new homes that their communities need. Together with incentives for communities to accept growth, the Framework makes clear councils should ensure their Local Plan meets the full demand for market and affordable housing in their areas.

The Framework maintains the expectation that councils should have a rolling five year supply of deliverable sites to meet their housing needs with at least a 20% additional allowance to create competition and choice in the land market.

They should also bring back into use empty homes and buildings wherever possible.

The Framework will remove the Whitehall target specifying the levels of housing development that should take place on previously developed land. It will put decision making power back into the hands of local people, rather than imposed upon by central directives. As has been evident in the debate over 'garden grabbing', the definition of previously developed land has become discredited. In some areas, the cocktail of centrally imposed targets have had perverse outcomes - resulting in imbalances in provision such as between blocks of flats and family homes with gardens.

Town centres

The Government is fully committed to supporting town centres and protecting the local high street. The Framework makes clear that town centres should be recognised by councils as being at the heart of communities. Local authorities should pursue policies that support the viability and vitality of town centres. The Framework maintains the 'town centres first' policy approach which means that retail and leisure development should look for locations in town centres first, and only if suitable sites are not available look for edge of centre and then out of centre sites.

Neighbourhood planning

The Framework supports the implementation of neighbourhood planning - a radical new right being introduced in the Localism Bill. It will allow communities to create their vision of what their area should look like: where new shops, offices or homes should go. Local people will be able to define types of development which will be given planning permission through a Neighbourhood Development Order. If approved by a local referendum, the neighbourhood plan will need to be put into force by the local council.

Historic environment

The framework reaffirms protections for the historic environment and heritage. Development causing substantial harm or loss to an important heritage asset remains prohibited, unless in wholly exceptional circumstances. Similar protections should be given to unofficial sites of archaeological interest if it can be demonstrated they are of substantial significance. Local councils are encouraged to set out how they will protect and improve heritage most at risk through neglect or decay, for the enjoyment for communities now and in the future. They should have up to date evidence about the historic environment in their areas and use it to assess the significance of heritage assets and contribution they make to the environment.

Design

Good design is an essential part of sustainable development. The planning system should promote high quality design for all development - whether

individual buildings or whole estates, municipal facilities or parks, and public or private spaces. Local Plans, including any neighbourhood plans, should set out the quality of development expected for an area, ensuring development that reflects the character and identity of local surrounding areas.

Developers will be expected to work closely with those directly affected by their proposals to evolve design proposals that take account of the views of the community.

Copeland Local Development Framework Publication Document

**Core Strategy Vision, Objectives and Strategic Policies for
Consideration by the LDF Working Party**

August 2011



Proud of our past. Energised for our future.

Introduction

This paper is a working draft of Chapters 2 and 3 of the final Core Strategy. It comprises:

- A Spatial Portrait of Copeland
- A Context that Sets the Strategy
- The Vision and Objectives for the Core Strategy
- The Strategic Policies

It should be noted that the different members of the team have drafted different parts of the text and there may be areas of overlap or duplication. We intend to edit the document as a whole once all of the different chapters have been updated.

1 Spatial Portrait for Copeland

Context and Background

Copeland is on the west coast of Cumbria. It extends over 737km² and has a population of about 69,700. The population of the Borough is expected to increase over the next 20 – 25 years, and the age structure is projected to change with fewer people in younger age groups and increasing numbers of people aged over 60.

It is a predominantly rural borough, much of which falls within the Lake District National Park. The Local Development Framework area has around 47 km of coastline, and this contrasts dramatically with the high fells of the Lake District further inland. The main towns and settlements are located predominantly to the north and west of the Borough, with the exception of Millom, which lies at the southernmost point, on the Duddon estuary.

Economic Opportunity and Regeneration

The traditional industries which drove the growth of the main settlements declined during the 20th century, but the nuclear sector became established in the 1950s with the development of the Sellafield complex. Today around 12,500 (about 40% of all employees in Copeland) work at the plant (one of the highest proportions of people employed in knowledge based industry in the country) but this is set to decline as decommissioning is progressed. The site is also host to over 60% of the UK's nuclear waste; decisions are needed to deal with this legacy and to consider the implications of a proposal for a new nuclear power station adjacent to the site. The Britain's Energy Coast West Cumbria (or BECWC) initiative aims to build on Copeland's nuclear and engineering strengths and to create further knowledge and energy based opportunities, as well as to diversify the economic base.

Elsewhere, the agricultural sector remains an important contributor to the local economy, maintaining the countryside and landscapes valued and enjoyed by residents and visitors alike. New approaches to development in rural areas are needed to support farm enterprises and other rural businesses. Tourism is an important opportunity, especially given the overlap with the Lake District National Park and the presence of the Coast to Coast footpath and C2C cycle path. There is potential to grow this sector from the current 1.8 million visitors a year and £95 million expenditure by 5% pa. This will require new and improved attractions, facilities and accommodation throughout the Borough.

Sustainable Settlements

The Borough's largest settlements are clustered mainly towards the north. They include the principal town of Whitehaven, a historic port with an industrial past, and the towns of Egremont and Cleator Moor which developed as a result of coal, iron ore and limestone mining. Millom lies to the south of the Borough, and grew up around the iron ore and steel industry. The rest of the Borough is largely rural.

Although the housing market is considered to be broadly in balance, there are gaps in provision, including detached properties across the Borough and particularly in Whitehaven, semi-detached properties in Millom and bungalows in the Whitehaven and West Lakes areas. There is a need to target new development to existing centres as the most sustainable locations and to support population and economic growth. In areas in and close to the Lake District National Park, residents face the challenge of a lack of affordable housing as a result of high demand for retirement and second homes.

Copeland has economic and social problems similar to those associated with much larger urban areas. Some communities are amongst the most disadvantaged in the country, with pockets of deprivation in health, employment, income, access to housing and other services.

Accessibility and Transport

Copeland is a relatively remote part of the North West, and the mountains and lakes of the Lake District form a natural barrier to communication, migration and investment. Key routes into the Borough are indirect; the A595 connects with the A66 and M6 North to Carlisle and Penrith, and the circuitous Cumbrian coastal route connects to the M6 to the South. The Cumbrian coastal railway connects to services on the West Coast mainline but trains run infrequently, and off peak services are very poor.

Environmental Protection and Enhancement

Copeland has a range of distinctive landscapes which require special protection, from shingle beaches, sand dunes, high cliffs and tidal estuaries along the coastal fringe to the high mountains and deep lakes of the Western Lake District. The area hosts a large number of SSSI's as well as SAC's, Ramsar sites and areas of county and local significance for wildlife. Some areas are at particular risk of coastal, fluvial and surface water flooding and there is a need to ensure that new development does not contribute to increased surface water runoff, and to locate and design development to ameliorate the impacts of flooding on people and property when it does occur.

Much of Copeland's built heritage is of significant historic interest, and the Borough has Conservation Areas in Whitehaven, Cleator Moor, Egremont, Beckermeth and Millom, as well as many Listed Buildings and a number of scheduled ancient monuments. The Georgian town centre and harbour area of Whitehaven are considered to be of national significance and offer major opportunities for heritage led regeneration based around tourism and the consolidation of independent, niche retailing and service industries set within an attractive historic environment.

2 Setting the Strategy

2.1 Context

2.1.1 Copeland is on the west coast of Cumbria. It has an area of 737 km², and a population of about 69,700. It is a predominantly rural Borough, much of whose area falls within the separate planning jurisdiction of the Lake District National Park.

2.1.2 From a strategic planning point of view Copeland's main characteristics are:

- a population which stabilised in the last decade after declining;
- a legacy of decline of traditional industries in the north and south, with rural areas between;
- correspondingly, a need for regeneration and better quality housing in the northern settlements, and Millom in the south, whilst in rural areas housing affordability is a challenge;
- relative remoteness from main national transport routes, and accessibility within the Borough compromised by limited road and rail capacity;
- major assets in the nuclear industry, its skill base and economic potential, along with the Borough's outstanding coastal and mountain landscape with its potential for tourism development.

2.2 The Sustainable Community Strategy

2.2.1 The Sustainable Community Strategy for West Cumbria (Copeland and Allerdale) – 'Future Generation' looks forward to 2027. It has three overarching aims, set out as follows.

WE WILL	WE WANT TO SEE
Make West Cumbria a better place for successive generations	An enhanced experience of living in West Cumbria Easy access into, out of and within West Cumbria Distinctive local landscapes and biodiversity conserved and enhanced
Make West Cumbria prosperous	Dynamism, entrepreneurship and centres of excellence for developing technology Higher incomes Larger local economy High value services and products High basic and higher skills levels
Raise people's aspirations for themselves and for West Cumbria	People work together with a common purpose People believe that they can make a difference People believe that they can do better People believe that West Cumbria will become an even better place A healthy community Young people see a future for themselves in West Cumbria

2.2.2 In essence, the Core Strategy addresses the first two of these aims; progress towards the third will flow from action on the ground fulfilling the first and second.

Sustainable Community Strategy themes

2.2.3 The West Cumbria SCS has 8 themes to guide its action plan, as follows:

- Advantage through knowledge – Managing Transition;
- Lifestyle Choice;
- Coastal Renaissance;
- Making Better Connections;
- Networks and Leadership;
- Quality Public Services;
- Respect for Rights and Responsibilities.

2.2.4 Core Strategy policies have been linked to those themes which are capable of being realised 'on the ground', namely the first four themes.

2.3 Drivers of Change and the Growth Agenda

2.3.1 Along with the aspirations of the Sustainable Community Strategy, certain forces or 'drivers of change' have influenced the development of a Spatial Vision for Copeland. The principal ones are:

- Climate change and the drive for greater sustainability
- The 'Energy Coast' concept and economic growth
- Household change and housing growth
- Change in the Nuclear industry

Climate and Sustainability

2.3.2 The most important environmental issue shaping our future - in Copeland as in the country as a whole - is climate change, which will result in changes to our natural environment, and hence our future prosperity and social cohesion. Flooding, coastal protection, building design, energy generation, water supply and biodiversity are all issues where the decisions we take about development planning will affect how we respond to climate change.

2.3.3 Climate change is also linked into the wider issue of sustainability. Since the mid-1990s, sustainability and development have become increasingly integrated. There has been a consistent thrust, largely irrespective of political party, towards urban concentration rather than sprawl, prioritising the use of brownfield land over greenfield sites, locating the more intensive activities near hubs of public transport, and an insistence on quality of development in both town and country. This is broadening out further towards the use of sustainable building materials in development, alongside new and tougher targets for energy efficiency and for generating renewable energy. Where development is located, and how efficiently it

uses energy and land, are things that the planning system - including the Core Strategy - can influence.

- 2.3.4 Other important issues which are relevant to sustainability are the conservation of natural features such as biodiversity, geology, natural habitats and landscapes. We also need to consider access to the open countryside, and how to deal with the negative impacts of development on the natural environment. These are of course 'national' issues too, in Copeland, in that over half the Borough forms part of one of the UK's most celebrated National Parks.

The 'Energy Coast' and economic change

- 2.3.5 There is a strong connection in Copeland - stronger than in most places - between the issue of climate change and the issue of economic change. This reflects the importance of the energy sector in the local economy; and its potential to respond to climate change and a low-carbon strategy. The 'Britain's Energy Coast' Master Plan sets out how Copeland and Allerdale could take advantage of the potential of nuclear, wind, and water energy to become a very important player in this strategy.
- 2.3.6 It is a strategy both for energy generation and for economic growth. The energy sector is clearly the key driver in economic terms, and is likely to become more so. Sellafield's 10,000 employees - the great majority of them West Cumbria residents - are predominant in an economy with about 66,500 jobs (Copeland and Allerdale Boroughs). Projections carried out in the 'Energy Coast' analyses vary from a pessimistic scenario based on a now outdated assumption of 7,800 job losses at Sellafield, to a 'golden' scenario of a growth of 4,000 jobs with nuclear growth plus other successful sectors. Appendix 1 (Economic Scenarios) explains the analysis somewhat more fully.
- 2.3.7 The Council's view is that we should "plan for success", in the sense of making plans which allow for the growth potential of the 'Energy Coast' to be realised; and that whilst the most optimistic numbers may not be reached, it is sensible to plan to allow for a future where the new potential employment replaces that which is inevitably going to go from manufacturing - so leaving us with about the same number of jobs as today, but with substantial economic growth as well.

Household change and housing growth

- 2.3.8 Another key 'driver' is change in household and population. The economic growth of course has implications for housing needs and the supporting infrastructure of community services, transport and so on. But a future Copeland with about the same number of jobs as today will nonetheless need more homes and services, because of other changes in society, such as falling average household size, and rising expectations.
- 2.3.9 Analyses from Cumbria Vision and the County Council suggest that the 'jobs driver' of growth in households and population is only part of the story: about half the requirement is accounted for by the population and

household growth which is expected to occur almost irrespective of the economic / employment scenario chosen.

- 2.3.10 Much of the growing need will come from demographic change: that is, change in population characteristics. In particular, people are living longer, and they are living on their own more and for longer. Cumbria County Council's population scenarios suggest that Copeland's population could grow by some 5,000 (about 7%) over the next 25 years - but within that, the oldest two groups (over-60s) would be growing by over 80%, whilst the numbers in the middle age-groups (30-59) could be falling by some 18%. Combined with people's lifestyle changes, this indicates that - as with the rest of the country - the average size of households could be falling: in Copeland's case from about 2.2 people per household to 2.08 over the next decade, and possibly even lower beyond that. So, it is likely that much of the additional housing requirement will occur however the economy performs.
- 2.3.11 'Energy Coast' scenarios project housing need varying from 192 to 735 dwellings per annum.
- 2.3.12 The Council's view is that it is more sensible to start from what the market has proved itself capable of producing upwards of 200 dwellings per annum – whilst allowing for faster growth than the RSS requirement, by about +10%; with a provision to review performance and needs after the first five years – if more capacity was deemed to be needed, a higher margin (say +30%) could be allocated. These are tabulated as a range in Figure 2.6.

Figure 2.6: Range of Potential Housebuilding Rates

	Annual net new housing
Recent actual rate	192 dwellings
RSS base requirement	230
RSS +10%	253
RSS +30%	299

Change in the Nuclear Industry

- 2.3.13 The fourth major driver is the nuclear sector development. Sellafield is one of the locations selected by the Government for a new nuclear power station. Additionally, the Borough has expressed an interest in hosting a long-term High Level Waste Repository. Decisions on such matters are some way off and will be taken on grounds of national policy by the Infrastructure Planning Commission rather than the Council.
- 2.3.14 The development of any of these types of facilities would have a major effect on general development pressures in surrounding settlements and local infrastructure. The Council is keen to ensure that any impacts arising from these schemes are addressed adequately by their developers. The

aim is that the outcomes of this process should be positive and should benefit residents and businesses, including with improved infrastructure.

2.4 Note on the North West Regional Spatial Strategy (RSS)

- 2.4.1 Although the Government has signalled its intention to revoke the Regional Spatial Strategy, the Borough Council is mindful of the judgement in *Cala Homes (South) Ltd v Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government (No. 2)* that it remains unlawful for the Local Development Framework not to have regard to the RSS.
- 2.4.2 The foundations of the production of this Core Strategy have been based on conformity with the North West RSS, the Borough Council being satisfied that what RSS proposed was appropriate for Copeland. We are additionally satisfied that the Core Strategy is based on robust evidence that it responds adequately and effectively to the Borough's needs and aspirations, independently of what the RSS prescribed. The main text of the Core Strategy is self-justifying and does not refer to RSS; but Annex n. contains an analysis of how this strategy conforms to it.

2.5 The Spatial Vision for Copeland

- 2.5.1 We have developed an exciting vision for the Borough to 2027 which clearly defines and reflects the priorities and key 'drivers for change' likely to shape the future of Copeland.

By 2027, Copeland will be an economically and socially sustainable, well-connected and environmentally responsible place of choice.

Economically sustainable: a place that boasts a highly-skilled workforce and a varied and sustainable economic base that builds on opportunities, including those presented by the low-carbon and renewable energy sectors, knowledge-based industries and tourist attractions;

Socially sustainable: a place that meets the needs of the whole community, where geography is not a barrier to achievement, and where social infrastructure, health and well-being, equality and social mobility are improved.

Well-connected: a place that has enhanced transport networks providing improved access to sustainable modes of transport, both within and between its key settlements and out towards neighbouring areas;

Environmentally responsible: a place that adapts to climate change whilst minimising its carbon footprint, making the most of its abundant natural resources and protecting and enhancing its green infrastructure and valued landscapes, heritage and biodiversity.

Objectives for Economic Opportunity and Regeneration

- 2.5.2 These objectives cover growth and diversification of the local economy, generating good employment opportunities, improving education and skill levels in the borough, increasing revenue from tourism, and responding to the decommissioning of Sellafield.

Strategic Objective 1

Support future renewable and low carbon energy generating capacity in Copeland in line with Britain's Energy Coast: A Masterplan for West Cumbria.

Strategic Objective 2

Promote the diversification of the borough's rural and urban economic base to enable a prosperous mixed economy, including creative and knowledge based industries, specialist engineering and the energy sector, building on Copeland's nuclear skills base, and tourism, exploiting heritage, the potential of the unspoiled coast and the quiet of the western lakes.

Strategic Objective 3

Provide a wide range of modern, high-quality employment sites and premises and promote the creation of a high-end knowledge based employment cluster at West Lakes Science and Technology Park.

Strategic Objective 4

Promote the vitality and viability of town and local centres, taking advantage of the built heritage that exists in Copeland's towns and villages (notably Whitehaven and Egremont) to enhance the shopping experience for residents and visitors.

Strategic Objective 5

Support the Nuclear Skills Academy, higher education at Westlakes, and the borough's other educational establishments in improving educational attainment and skills to meet business needs.

Objectives for Sustainable Settlements

- 2.5.3 These objectives relate to the quality of life for local people, and to ensuring that settlements meet the needs of all: in terms of access to housing, community services and facilities, leisure and employment.

Strategic Objective 6

Focus major development in Whitehaven, and encourage complementary and additional development in Cleator Moor, Millom and Egremont and local centres where opportunities exist, in line with strategic infrastructure provision.

Strategic Objective 7

Enable a 'balanced housing market' ensuring that all housing is of good quality, affordable, responds to differing needs from deprived industrial communities to the more prosperous rural areas, and is provided in places where people want to live.

Strategic Objective 8

Ensure that settlements are sustainable and meet the range of needs of their communities by, as far as possible, protecting the facilities that are already present and supporting appropriate new provision, especially in Millom which is the main settlement serving the more remote locality of South Copeland .

Strategic Objective 9

Ensure that all new development meets high standards in terms of energy efficiency, provision for biodiversity, safety, security and accessibility, relates well to existing development, enhances the public realm and develops quality places reflecting their distinctive west and south west Cumbrian character.

Strategic Objective 10

Support the increased sustainability of communities in rural environments varying from former mining settlements in the north and south, to the villages of mid Copeland.

Objectives for Accessibility and Transport

- 2.5.4 These objectives relate to accessibility to services, reducing the impacts of journeys on the environment and ensuring that transport networks address the geographical constraints in terms of moving around the Borough, and also in terms of accessing the Borough from beyond its boundaries.

Strategic Objective 11

Reduce the need to travel by supporting improved telephone and rural broadband access.

Strategic Objective 12

Improve access to employment, services, education/training facilities and the leisure opportunities of the coast and Lakeland fringe, by foot, cycle and public transport.

Strategic Objective 13

Develop and maintain safe, efficient, high quality, modern and integrated transport networks with good internal links and connections to key routes, including the West Coast Main Line via both Carlisle and Barrow, and the M6 via both the A66 and A590.

Objectives for Environmental Protection and Enhancement

- 2.5.5 These objectives relate to the natural and historic assets of Copeland; to the need to ensure that they are protected and enhanced; and to ensure that local development acknowledges global imperatives.

Strategic Objective 14

Adapt to the impacts of climate change by minimising development in flood risk areas and by improving the extent of tree cover and connectivity of wildlife corridors.

Strategic Objective 15

Promote recycling and waste minimisation.

Strategic Objective 16

Protect and enhance all landscapes in the borough, as well as the St Bees Heritage Coast site and areas of County Landscape Importance.

Strategic Objective 17

Protect and enhance the many places and buildings of historical, cultural and archaeological importance and their settings.

Strategic Objective 18

Protect and enhance the rich biodiversity both within and outside of the borough's many nationally and internationally designated sites, ensuring that habitats are extended, connected by effective wildlife corridors and that lost habitats are restored.

Strategic Objective 19

Safeguard and where possible enhance the natural resources in the Borough whilst addressing the impacts of mining, iron working, nuclear energy and other former land uses.

3 Strategic Policies

3.1 Principles for Development

- 3.1.1 The whole development strategy must be informed and underpinned by principles which move the borough towards greater sustainability in environmental, economic and social terms.

Policy ST1 – Strategic Development Principles

The Strategic Development Principles that inform and underpin the borough's planning policies are:

A Environmental Sustainability

- i) Encourage development that minimises carbon emissions, maximises energy efficiency and helps us to adapt to the effects of climate change
- ii) Focus development on sites that are at least risk from flooding and where development in areas of flood risk is unavoidable, ensure that the risk is minimised or mitigated through appropriate design
- iii) Protect, enhance and encourage the creation of new areas green infrastructure, recognising the important role that the natural environment and healthy ecosystems have to play in the future social and economic, as well as environmental sustainability of Copeland.
- iv) Reuse existing buildings and previously developed land wherever possible, directing development away from greenfield sites, where this is consistent with wider sustainability objectives
- v) Ensure that new development minimises waste and maximises opportunities for recycling
- vi) Minimise the need to travel, support the provision of sustainable transport infrastructure and measures that encourage its use
- vii) Prioritise development in the main towns where there is land and infrastructure capacity

B Economic & Social Sustainability

- i) Support the development of energy infrastructure, related economic clusters, rural diversification and tourism
- ii) Support diversity in jobs, and investment in education and training which creates and attracts business

- iii) **Ensure development creates a residential offer which meets the needs and aspirations of the borough's housing markets**
- iv) **Support development that provides or contributes to the Borough's social and community infrastructure enabling everyone to have good access to jobs, shops, services and recreational facilities**

C Protect, enhance and restore the borough's valued assets

- i) **Protect and enhance areas, sites, species and features of nature conservation and biodiversity value, landscapes and the undeveloped coast**
- ii) **Protect and enhance the borough's cultural and historic features and their settings**
- iii) **Provide and enhance recreational opportunities for the borough's residents and its visitors, protecting existing provision and ensuring that future development meets appropriate standards in terms of quantity and quality.**
- iv) **Manage development pressures to protect the borough's agricultural assets**
- v) **Support the reclamation and redevelopment or restoration of the borough's vacant or derelict sites, whilst remaining mindful of landscape, biodiversity and historic environment objectives**
- vi) **Ensure development minimises air, ground and water pollution.**

D Ensure the creation and retention of quality places

- i) **Apply rigorous design standards that retain and enhance locally distinctive places, improve build quality and achieve efficient use of land**
- ii) **Ensure development provides or safeguards good levels of residential amenity and security**
- iii) **Accommodate traffic and access arrangements in ways that make it safe and convenient for pedestrians and cyclists to move around**
- iv) **Ensure new development addresses land contamination with appropriate remediation measures**

3.1.2 ST1 sets out the fundamental principles that will guide development management in the Borough, in a way that achieves the Objectives and ultimately the Vision set out in Chapter 2. All development proposals will be judged against these principles and the policies set out in this Core Strategy and the accompanying Development Management Policies DPD.

3.1.3 Most of these principles are a local expression of national policies that are a requirement on all planning authorities – particularly the key themes laid out in the Government's planning policy statement on sustainable

development (PPS1). The themed policies in later chapters of this document build on these principles and in doing so demonstrate how the Council intends to ensure that they are reflected in all development in Copeland during the plan period.

Key Policy Context/Framework/References

- PPS1: Delivering Sustainable Development (2005)
- PPS6: Planning & Town Centres (2005) (Should be PPS4?)
- North West Regional Spatial Strategy (RSS) Policies DP4 and EM2 (2008)
- Copeland Local Plan Policies DEV1, DEV4, 5 & 6 and ENV17-22 (2006)

3.2 Spatial Development Strategy

3.2.1 The spatial development strategy will be crucial in structuring the Borough's locational planning up to 2027. It seeks to direct development to the most sustainable locations, whilst indicating the scale of development that will be encouraged in other areas of the Borough.

Policy ST2 – Spatial Development Strategy

Development in the Borough should be distributed in accordance with the following principles:

- A Growth providing for and facilitating growth in the local economy, particularly in the energy sector, accompanied by net growth in jobs and an associated increase in demand for housing and services**
- B Concentration: development will be located in the Borough's settlements at an appropriate scale, within defined settlement boundaries, in accordance with the Borough's preferred settlement hierarchy as set out in Figure 3.1:**
 - i) Focussing the largest scale development and regeneration on Whitehaven and the important development opportunities there**
 - ii) Supporting moderate levels of development reflecting the respective scale and functions of the smaller towns (Cleator Moor, Egremont and Millom), and contributing to the regeneration of the town centres**
 - iii) Permitting appropriately scaled development in defined Local Centres which helps to sustain services and facilities for local communities**
- C Restricting development outside the defined settlement boundaries to that which has a proven requirement for such a location, including:**

- i) **Energy - nuclear: support for the development of new nuclear generating capacity at Sellafield, and a willingness to discuss a potential Geological Disposal Facility for higher level radioactive waste in the Borough**
 - ii) **Energy - renewable: support for renewable energy generating capacity at sites which best maximise renewable resources and which minimise environmental and amenity impacts**
 - iii) **Essential infrastructure to support energy development and other infrastructure that requires locating outside settlement limits**
 - iv) **Existing major employment locations, especially Westlakes Science and Technology Park, and the completion of defined allocated or safeguarded employment sites**
 - v) **Land uses characteristically located outside settlements, such as agriculture or forestry, farm diversification schemes or tourism activities requiring location in the countryside, or prisons**
 - vi) **Housing that meets proven specific and local needs including provision for agricultural workers, replacement dwellings, replacement of residential caravans, affordable housing and the conversion of rural buildings to residential use**
- D Proportions: the four towns are expected to accommodate approximately 80% of all (non-nuclear) development over the plan period.**

Figure 3.1: Preferred Option Settlement Hierarchy

Classification	Type and Scale of Development		
	Retail & Services	Employment	Housing
Principal Town: Whitehaven	Convenience goods, large supermarkets and comparison goods provision. Supporting a range of provision to meet the needs of Copeland and support Whitehaven's role as a tourist centre.	A range of employment types. Provide opportunities both for expansion and start up and encourage clusters of new business types. Support opportunities to improve and expand on the existing tourism offer in this area.	Allocations in the form of estate-scale development where appropriate and continuing initiatives for large scale housing renewal. This could involve extensions to the town's settlement boundary. Infill & windfall housing. Larger sites will require a proportion of affordable housing.

Classification	Type and Scale of Development		
	Retail & Services	Employment	Housing
Key Service Centre: Cleator Moor; Egremont & Millom	Range of comparison and convenience shopping. Emphasis will be on retention of existing provision. Mixed-use development will be supported in principle.	Small and medium enterprises will be encouraged to set up and grow. Provide opportunities for expansion and start up, with focus on linkages to nuclear sector, and tourism.	Moderate allocations in the form of extensions to the towns to meet general needs. Infill & windfall housing. Larger sites will require a proportion of affordable housing.
Local Centre: Arlecdon/Rowrah; Beckermest; Bigrigg; Cleator; Distington; Frizington; Haverigg; Kirkland / Ennerdale Bridge; Lowca/Parton; Moor Row; Moresby Parks; Seascale; St Bees	Convenience shopping to meet day-to-day needs, which could include farm shops or similar. Emphasis will be on retention of existing provision.	Few employment opportunities. Emphasis will be on retention. Expansion potential may include tourism in some places, generally limited by environmental constraints. New provision most likely to be provided through conversion/re-use of existing buildings.	Within the defined physical limits of development as appropriate. Possible small extension sites on the edges of settlements. Housing to meet general and local needs. Affordable housing and windfall sites.
Outside settlement boundaries: All other parts of the Borough, including small villages and settlements and open countryside	Proposals involving small retail and service businesses appropriate to villages, and strengthening local community safety, will be considered sympathetically.	Employment predominantly linked to agriculture or forestry. Farm diversification schemes and tourism uses may be appropriate.	Development providing homes to meet the defined needs of the population, with need for rural / non-settlement location to be proven in each case (see 3.3.10-15)

- 3.2.2 The spatial strategy reflects the Council's determination to be ambitious in promoting higher levels of economic growth with supportive planning policies.
- 3.2.3 The distribution of development outlined here reflects the Council's vision and objectives as set out spatially in the Core Strategy. The strategy promotes sustainable growth in the main settlements and other key development locations, rather than spreading development more thinly, to maximise the sustainable development and competitiveness of Copeland as a whole.
- 3.2.4 Copeland will not flourish without thriving towns. This focussing of development is seen as the way that best exploits opportunities for

regeneration, makes the best use of existing development and infrastructure in settlements, and gives opportunities for the enhancement of the quantity, quality and accessibility of new services and facilities. It also helps to promote a more sustainable form of development which can help reduce the need to travel and thus accord with the strategic principle (see Policy ST1) of responding to and mitigating the effects of climate change.

Excluding nuclear-related development at or adjacent to Sellafield (and any other appropriate and acceptable locations which may emerge in accordance with the Core Strategy), it is expected that development should be distributed broadly as follows:

Whitehaven – at least 45%

Cleator Moor – at least 10%

Egremont – at least 10%

Millom – at least 10%

Local Centres – not more than 20%

- 3.2.5 In recent years many of the smaller settlements in the Borough have grown rapidly. As well as increasing the risk that the environment of some at least of these villages, it is arguable that such dispersal of developments is not in the interest of regeneration and growth in the towns. With an overall strategy of increasing concentration rather than dispersal Whitehaven could be the location for at least a half of all new (non-nuclear) development. The three other main towns in the Borough would account for at least 30% more between them, although specific attention will be given to the separate role and function of Millom in its role in serving south Copeland.
- 3.2.6 At least half of new employment and commercial floorspace (excluding nuclear energy generation and waste management) should be in Whitehaven. (For the purposes of this calculation commercial and industrial development will be monitored in terms of site area and floorspace; and Westlakes Science Park is seen as being part of Whitehaven.) However, pursuit of that target will not be seen as a reason to restrict development above the targets in the other towns, the preferred adjustment being to boost the attractiveness of Whitehaven, if it falls short, by greater promotion and facilitation of development there.
- 3.2.7 An indication of what these preferred proportions would mean in terms of annual house building numbers for different settlements in the Borough is shown in Figure 3.2. These figures also show the range of growth the Local Development Framework will provide for. The figures for the towns are not ceilings. (It is recognised in particular that Egremont may have the potential to accommodate a larger share of house building, whilst in the short term the supply of quality land may be restricted in Cleator Moor and, to a lesser extent, Millom.) This will be assessed in the production of, and consultation about, the Site Allocations Plan, and also in the light of any needs that may arise as proposals develop for a new nuclear power station at Sellafield.

3.2.8 It is not expected that the Local Centre villages will attract more than 20% of house building. If this proves to be the case, the Council will consider whether there is any detriment to the towns and consider action to redress the balance in favour of the towns. This will be considered further under detailed arrangements for the management of the housing and supply, in the Site Allocations Plan.

Figure 3.2: Housing Numbers based on the preferred spread of development in the Borough

Settlement		Annual Housing Requirement Based on		
		RSS	RSS plus 10%	RSS plus 30%
Whitehaven (45%)	At least	105	115	135
Cleator Moor (10%)		23	25	30
Egremont (10%)		23	25	30
Millom (10%)		23	25	30
Local Centres (20%)	Not more than	45	50	60
Total		230	253	299

Note: figures may not exactly equal the total due to rounding.

3.2.9 **Settlement boundaries:** These denote the existing and permissible built-up area of each town and local centre village. They thus indicate where development is encouraged (within the framework of Policy ST2 and Table 3.2).

3.2.10 The Council will review these boundaries, the outcome to be subject to public consultation as part of the preparation of the Site Allocation Plan Development Plan Document. The review will take into consideration the following factors

- This spatial strategy and other Core Strategy and Development Management policies.
- The amount of land required to be allocated for development in order for the towns to be able to meet the targets set out in the Core Strategy.
- Land next to settlements revealed in the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) as being suitable for development, either now or in the future, to meet the demands of growth.

- The need to ensure that development in Local Centre villages is at levels which do not damage the environment of those villages or compromise the prospects of the towns.
 - Other constraints such as the landscape, the natural environment, the historic environment, the legacy of former mineral working and the safeguarding of mineral resources.
- 3.2.11 At present the Council concludes that the following areas should be considered for boundary reviews: Whitehaven (north and south), Egremont (to the south and south west), Millom (to the south west) Cleator (north side), Moor Row (west and south), and small changes at Arlecdon, Beckermeth, Bigrigg, Ennerdale Bridge and Seascale. The land which may be involved is identified in the SHLAA.
- 3.2.12 **Outside settlement boundaries:** in the countryside and small villages which do not have their own defined settlement limits, development will generally be resisted in principle, in accordance with national planning policy and the Council's intention to promote sustainable development in the most accessible settlements.
- 3.2.13 Exceptions would be considered where housing is required to respond to proven specific and local needs that may arise in settlements with non-defined boundaries (see Policy SS2 and Policy SS3); or for agricultural workers, where there is a proven specific need (see Policy SS3); or as a replacement of existing dwellings for which there is a specific and local needs (See Policy SS1); or as conversion of rural buildings to residential use (subject to Policy DM13), or in the case of replacement of residential caravans (subject to Policy DM19). In all cases the Council would ensure that any development allowed in these circumstances is retained as such through appropriate occupancy restrictions secured by Section 106 agreements.
- 3.2.14 At the same time, it is recognised that over and above the general policy approach set out in the table at Figure 3.1 will be a category of proposals - whether new power plants or rural tourism - which will by their nature inevitably require a location outside the settlements. Some are in this category because they are "place-bound": they can only function in these places; others because their characteristics make them unsuitable for an urban setting; and a few because they are needed to help local communities to function.
- 3.2.15 Activities of these kinds include:
- wind farms, which need clear and open settings
 - those renewables which rely on a specific location (e.g. hydro, tidal, wave)
 - essential agricultural and forestry development
 - countryside tourism
 - affordable housing and local infrastructure
 - development to complete existing major employment sites outwith the settlements

- prisons
- nuclear energy generation, treatment and storage

Key Policy Context/Framework/References

The settlement hierarchy has been based upon that prescribed in the following:

North West Regional Spatial Strategy (RSS) Policies RDF1, RDF2, DP2, CNL1 & CNL2 (2008)

Cumbria and the Lake District Joint Structure Plan Policy ST5 (2006)

Copeland Local Plan Policies Dev 1-5 & SVC12 (2006)

Strategic Housing Market Assessment 2009 (Whitehaven Housing Market Area): Cumbria Sub-Regional Housing Group

3.3 Strategic Regeneration Priorities

- 3.3.1 The Local Development Framework, and the planning policies it will set out, is one of the important elements in implementing *Britain's Energy Coast: A Masterplan for West Cumbria* and releasing the economic potential of West Cumbria. This focus has resulted in a short list of locations being identified as strategic regeneration priorities for the Borough.

Policy ST3 – Strategic Development Priorities

In pursuit of economic regeneration and growth to fulfil strategic objectives for Copeland and West Cumbria, the following locations are priorities for development.

- A The site adjacent to Sellafield selected in National Policy Statement 1-EN6 as the location for a nuclear power station.**
- B Regeneration sites in south and central Whitehaven— the town centre and harbourside, Pow Beck Valley, Coastal Fringe and the Woodhouse/Kells Housing Market Renewal Area**
- C Town centre renewal in Cleator Moor, Egremont and Millom**
- D The sites prioritised for development in the Energy Coast Master Plan (see Chapter 8: Localities for details)**

Other sites that may emerge, which reflect the above priorities and/or other Core Strategy or agreed sub-regional growth objectives, will be similarly supported.

- 3.3.2 This policy sets out the key locations that the Council sees as its strategic development priorities, the development of which is considered to be

essential for realising the key objectives for growth and regeneration in the Borough. They reflect a range of influences; national (the National Policy Statement which is the basis for the proposed nuclear power station), locally determined (an expression of the priority given to the towns in Policy ST2) and sub-regional (the Energy Coast Master Plan.

- 3.3.3 Our emphasis on growth and regeneration does not mean that development will be directed exclusively to these priority locations. Development will also be accommodated on other sites consistent with the broader development strategy and settlement hierarchy in Policy ST2.
- 3.3.4 As the work on economic regeneration proceeds other sites may be identified for inclusion under this policy in the Core Strategy. This may involve proposals for energy production and associated works (renewables as well as nuclear) or for further diversification of the local economy through knowledge-transfer and other spin-offs from the energy industry or new sector initiatives.

Key Policy Context/Framework/References

PPS1: Delivering Sustainable Development (2005)
PPG4: Industrial, commercial development and small firms (1992)
PPS6: Planning for Town Centres (2005)
Britain's Energy Coast: A Masterplan for West Cumbria (2007)
Whitehaven Town Centre and High Street Conservation Areas Character Appraisal (2009)
West Cumbria Employment Land & Premises Study (2008)
A Sea Change: Whitehaven Town Centre Development Framework (2006)

3.4 Providing Infrastructure

Policy ST4 –Providing Infrastructure

- A** Development that generates a demand for physical, social or environmental infrastructure will only be permitted if the relevant infrastructure is either already in place or there is a reliable mechanism in place to ensure that it will be provided when and where required.
- B** In the specific case of major development, particularly in the energy sector, where the Council is not the determining authority, we will work with developers, Government and the Infrastructure Planning Commission to agree an 'offset package' which ensures that such development contributes fully to the Borough's needs
- C** The Council will, until a Community Infrastructure Levy is adopted, apply the following principles in securing developer contributions:

- i) **Development proposals should provide, or contribute to the provision of facilities, infrastructure, services, and other environmental and social requirements either on or off site, as is reasonable and necessary to support and mitigate the impact of the development**
- ii) **The nature and scale of any planning requirements sought for this purpose should be related to the type of development, its potential impact upon the surrounding area and, in the case of residential proposals, the need for developer contributions to the provision of affordable housing (see Policy SS3)**
- iii) **Contributions for the initial running costs of services and facilities to secure their medium and long-term viability will be agreed through appropriate conditions or obligations, where such costs cannot be sustained in the short term**

D The Council will expect utility and other infrastructure providers to rectify as soon as possible any network shortcomings which risk preventing or delaying development.

E A Supplementary Planning Document on Developer Contributions for Infrastructure will set out the appropriate range and level of contributions, and matters for which they will be sought. This, supported by data from the Infrastructure Plan, may form the basis for a future Community Infrastructure Levy.

3.4.1 Planning for the right infrastructure brings its own key challenges:

- How to **accommodate** growth - meeting the additional demand on existing infrastructure, services and facilities which development brings
- How to **assist** this growth - ensuring development improves existing infrastructure or puts in place new infrastructure to ensure sustainable communities
- How to **meet the costs** of sustaining the infrastructure provided, at least in the short term, until such infrastructure becomes viable or where such liabilities can be adopted as part of a formal agreement

3.4.2 An Infrastructure Plan has been prepared and is available as an Evidence Base document. This takes the conclusions of the Infrastructure Deficit report (also available as an evidence base document) and sets out what is needed to fulfil Core Strategy objectives. Coupled with conditions on planning consents, Planning Obligations form a significant tool for ensuring that infrastructure is provided and adequately sustained to support new development. They can ensure that development is delivered with adequate infrastructure in place and also that any negative impacts of development can be mitigated.

3.4.3 Contributions may be either through on- or off-site provision of facilities, or through financial means, where this is more appropriate. Planning obligations (developer contributions) are normally secured under Section

106 of the Town & Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended). The Council will take care to strike the right balance between maximising community benefit and the risk of the development being inhibited by undue constraints on viability.

- 3.4.4 In some cases infrastructure that is provided will require running costs and / or maintenance which may be difficult to sustain in the short term without developer support: say for the initial maintenance of new open space, or to support a bus service in a new development where the critical mass of passenger catchment is yet to be reached. In these types of cases an agreement on an appropriate level of contribution would be sought. Where a commitment is needed in the longer term, for instance when related to biodiversity, a commuted sum may be sought for maintenance beyond the initial short term period.
- 3.4.5 Where strategic infrastructure investment is needed and developer contributions cannot realistically pay for it, the Council will work with providers to make sure that the provision required is given maximum priority in their investment programmes. This applies particularly to utilities. It is recognised that substantial transportation investment may require a longer time frame; in these cases the Council will work in partnership with developers and others to pursue external funding, or, where appropriate, to incorporate such investment in the plans of major infrastructure developers including the constructors of a new nuclear power station.
- 3.4.6 The development of major energy infrastructure, which is to be determined by the Government and the Infrastructure Planning Commission, will also have significant infrastructure implications on the Borough, particularly during the construction of new energy facilities and also to deal with the potential impacts of developments and their operation. The Council will seek to ensure that any such development will be necessary and carried out as far as practicable within the terms of Local Development Framework strategy and policies. We will also work in partnership with the Government, Infrastructure Planning Commission or successor body, and the operators involved, to agree a "Community Offset Package" to ensure that any development related to major new energy infrastructure benefits the Borough by contributing to its overall regeneration programme. We will also endeavour to ensure that major developers include in their plans any investment needed to minimise the impact of construction and completed development on the satisfactory operation of the Borough's transport and other infrastructure.
- 3.4.7 In the short to medium term we will continue the practice of negotiating planning obligations case by case. A Supplementary Planning Document on Planning Contributions is in preparation and will be adopted after Core Strategy adoption. It is intended that the Infrastructure Plan will provide a base not only for the SPD but also for the introduction of a Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL). The Council will not adopt a CIL unless it is satisfied that this can be done without compromising development viability, and will go through the due process of public consultation and independent examination.