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Broadway Malyan
Whitehaven is a town of about 27,000 people, situated on the Cumbrian coast, within the Borough of Copeland. It is the main centre of population in the borough and its administrative heart. It is a town with a long history but whose origins as a modern settlement are to be found in the period of expanding international sea trade and early industrial development of the 17th and 18th centuries. In its heyday, Whitehaven was one of the most important ports in the country with an economy based on coal production and diverse secondary manufacturing industries, as well as a sea trade which included slaves, tobacco, sugar and rum.

The town of today reflects this prosperous past as well as the long decline of its traditional industrial base over the last century. The large harbour, dating back to the 16th century, is Whitehaven’s most stunning attribute, and the historic core of the town centre is an exceptionally well conserved example of a rationally planned Georgian grid pattern, with numerous surviving fine buildings. The town is set against the backdrop of steep wooded slopes, just to the north of the St Bee’s Heritage Coast and within easy reach of the Lake District National Park.

Despite its many strengths however, Whitehaven today faces a wide range of social and economic problems, reflected in the extensive dereliction and poor quality development that surrounds the town centre. The imminent decommissioning of the nearby Sellafield Nuclear Power Station threatens to exacerbate these problems and a comprehensive regeneration programme for the town and wider region has been developed in response to the foreseeable difficulties ahead.
REGENERATION CONTEXT

The Whitehaven Town Centre Development Framework is part of comprehensive regeneration programme that aims to transform the town’s future and enable an effective response to the economic and social pressures arising from the restructuring of traditional manufacturing industries and the decommissioning process in the nuclear industries.

Partners in Whitehaven are embarking on an ambitious regeneration programme that will witness millions of pounds of investment in new buildings, public spaces, transport and access improvements and tourist attractions. West Lakes Renaissance is driving this wider programme in partnership with other local agencies.

The programme comprises four main elements:

- Town Centre Development Framework
- Coastal Fringe (including the former coalfield area around Haig, Saltom and Wellington Pits and the Rhodia/Marchon/Huntsman site)
- Pow Beck Valley (i.e. the mixed use commercial, sporting and residential areas behind the town centre)
- Housing & Community Regeneration (including the residential communities of Kells, Greenbank and Woodhouse).

A delivery body will be established comprising members drawn from the key public sector organisations, complemented by private sector expertise, to push forward the implementation of the various strands of the Regeneration Programme. This team will aim to proactively engage with private sector developers and investors, providing a clear line of communication with the planning authority and sources of public funding, to coordinate the many interests involved and pursue a coherent, high quality regeneration process.

This document sets out a Development Framework for the town centre, the first of these four elements, and will guide public investment and support for private development in the town centre over a 10–20 year period. In addition to this document, a Development Prospectus has been produced which provides individual site development briefs for strategic sites within the town centre area. Both documents have been produced within the context of a Baseline Study which provides a summary and analysis of the existing situation and outlines broad objectives which these documents aim to address.

PLANNING CONTEXT

The Copeland Local Plan 1991–2001 is now out of date, and at the time of producing this document, a replacement plan to cover the period 2001–2016 is being prepared. The replacement Local Plan is currently at the second deposit stage and the proposed changes to the first deposit draft were published in April 2005 for further consultation. Considerable weight can therefore be attached to these policies. A Sustainability Appraisal was also published alongside the second deposit version in order to ensure that the policies satisfy the requirements of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004. A Public Inquiry into outstanding objections was due to be held in September 2005. The Cumbria and Lake District Structure Plan is also under review and will be adopted shortly to cover the period between 2001–2016.
Under the transitional arrangements, once the Local Plan and Structure Plan policies are adopted they will be ‘saved’ for a period of three years, over time the Local Plan will be progressively replaced by a series of Local Development Documents (LDD’s), forming the Local Development Framework (LDF), under the new planning system.

**AREA ACTION PLAN**

The Whitehaven Town Centre Development Framework will inform the Area Action Plan for the town centre and harbourside to be prepared as part of Copeland Borough Council’s Local Development Framework.

The Area Action Plan will be subject to public consultation in compliance with the Council’s Statement of Community Involvement (SCI) and will be made available for inspection in order for representations to be integrated into the document production.

The Whitehaven Town Centre Development Framework provides recommendations for an integrated and comprehensive regeneration plan for Whitehaven. It sets out the regeneration and urban design principles for key development areas in the town, incorporating known prime development opportunities and strategies for the development of public realm. It also incorporates design coding for the streetscape and identified character areas in the town.
INTRODUCTION

This Development Framework has evolved out of an extensive baseline assessment and consultation process designed to provide a comprehensive understanding of Whitehaven today; the challenges it faces and the choices it has available. The Baseline Report provides an in-depth picture of the town as it is today and sets out objectives for its regeneration. This section provides a brief summary of the key points in the baseline analysis.

HISTORY

Whitehaven is a town built on sea trade and industry, founded initially on the drive and vision of successive generations of the Lowther family. After the decline of the sea trade with the Americas, in the 19th century, coal extraction remained its main industrial base until the closure of the last mine in the 1980’s. Other industries included ship building, fishing, chemical production and textiles.

Its period of greatest prosperity was during the 18th century when the town was one of the most important ports in the country, reflected in the impressive scale of its harbour. The rationally planned street pattern of the town centre and most of the town’s finest buildings also date from this period of splendour.

Due to the centuries of trade, Whitehaven has strong historical links to the USA, especially to towns on the Virginia and Maryland coasts. Two important American personalities: George Washington and John Paul Jones, are connected to the town. Another historical personality linked to the town is Jonathan Swift, who lived in Whitehaven for a short time in his childhood and whose vision of Lilliput may have been inspired by views to the town from his hilltop home.

In its heyday, Whitehaven was a dynamic, forward thinking, entrepreneurial and risk-taking town. Some of these qualities need to be recaptured if the town is to regain its pride and prosperity.
Whitehaven Town Centre and neighbouring communities
The town of today reflects Whitehaven’s glorious past as well as the long decline of its traditional industrial base over the last century. The town centre is set in a wide bowl where the Pow Beck and other secondary waterways, cut through the steep sandstone hills of the shore. This impressive setting frames the town centre and provides dramatic views from the hills above and back from the furthest extents of the harbour. The steep slopes however, also serve to isolate the peripheral communities on the hilltops and slopes, from the historic centre.

The large harbour, reflecting the significance of the town as a trading port, is Whitehaven’s most stunning attribute. The town, however, has historically tended to turn its back on the harbour, which must have been a noisy, smelly, crowded place in its heyday. The recent regeneration has done much to convert it from a run-down, industrial port into an attractive marina and seafront. However, it remains isolated from the main town centre and lacking in life or focus of activity except for the rare occasions when there is a tall ship in dock.

The historic core of the town centre is an exceptionally well conserved example of a rationally planned Georgian grid pattern, with numerous fine buildings. The urban grain and character, defined by the grid iron street pattern, laid out by Sir John and his son James Lowther during the 17th century, has survived to the present day and largely retains the coherence and appeal of its original conception, despite the many changes it has undergone since then. Much of the charm of the Whitehaven grid lies in the irregularities of blocks derived from its interaction with the topography and pre-existing street pattern. The urban grain is characterised by three-storey terraced streets with no front gardens, forming a series of irregular urban blocks. Many buildings have office or residential space above ground floor retail or leisure uses, creating a mixed use environment.

Around the periphery of the town, however, where most of the industrial activity took place, the clear urban grain of the centre blurs and fragments. Industrial buildings and the crowded blocks and terraces of workers housing have largely been cleared. In places, the remnants of these structures survive in a semi-ruinous state, while in others they have been replaced by piecemeal development, mainly of very poor quality, without any apparent long term planning or structure, consisting of car parking, distribution depots, large scale retail ‘sheds’ and blocks of flats. Apart from The Castle and grounds on the Lowther...
Street approach, these ‘degraded fringes’ form an almost unbroken ring around the town centre.

Some of the key issues which this Development Framework seeks to address in urban design terms are the following:

- The harbour remains poorly connected to the core of the town centre and blighted by car parking and low quality development.
- The use of The Strand—Tangier Street corridor as part of the one way system contributes to this severance and poor physical environment around the harbour fringes.
- The three main ‘gateways’ to the town centre are dominated by car parking, poor quality retail developments and derelict or vacant properties.
- The southern approach corridor, Newtown/Preston Street/The Ginns, is particularly fragmented, but the degree of vacancy and dereliction provides an opportunity for wholesale transformation of this area.
- The town has very few public squares and spaces and those that do exist are mainly poorly located, designed and maintained.
- Whitehaven has an abundance of greenspace but again this is mostly of poor quality, neglected and little used. The exceptions are the town centre gardens which are conventional but well maintained and used.
- The streetscape of the town centre is very mixed, with some high quality, well designed areas and interesting details contrasting with very neglected areas. Overall there is a sense of incoherence and clutter which detracts from the inherent qualities of the town’s architecture and urban grid.
- Outdoor recreation provision is extremely poor and facilities for children and young people in particular are very inadequate.

**ECONOMY**

The decommissioning of Sellafield and the imminent closure of Huntsman represent the end of dominant large scale manufacturing and industry in Whitehaven. Around 8,000 jobs will be lost over a ten year period but the relatively long timescale provides an opportunity to reinvest and restructure.

Low levels of self-employment and small business creation reflect the historic dominance of large employers that will require a significant cultural readjustment.

The town centre retail offer is limited and vulnerable to competition from out of town supermarkets and new retail developments currently underway in Workington. The potential strength of Whitehaven lies in the smaller scale and more specialist stores. The most dynamic area is concentrated around the market place and southern stretch of King Street. A survey of national retail outlets undertaken as part of the survey shows a reasonably strong underlying interest in being present in the town. However, this was subject to the availability of high quality space able to support modern retailing.

The range of cafes, restaurants and bars has improved significantly in recent years but remains limited. Most new development is concentrated around Tangier Street and Bransty Gate, an emerging leisure quarter.

The residential property market in the town centre remains poor despite price rises in the town as a whole over the last four years, due mainly to constraints on access, parking and amenity space.

Commercial property is also very limited and comparatively low in value. Westlakes Science and Technology Park attracts the major share of investor/developer interest and the only significant new office developments of recent years have needed substantial public financial support.

Despite the town’s obvious assets, the tourism and leisure sector is very little developed.
Investment in the harbour and new visitor attractions in recent years has begun to put the town on the map and the last biannual Maritime Festival attracted over 250,000 people and received wide ranging media coverage. The Maritime Festival is very popular locally and indicates the appetite for high quality well run events that bring energy and dynamism to the town.

However, a number of serious obstacles remain, including:

- Limited and poor quality accommodation in the town centre
- Insufficient range of visitor attractions
- A lack of good restaurants, cafes, bars and entertainments
- Few opportunities for active leisure, especially for family groups
- A rundown and poorly maintained physical environment
- Poor provision for walkers, cyclists and sailors

**COMMUNITY**

The population reflects an economic background dominated by large scale, primary industries and comprises a relatively low percentage of managerial and professional residents.

Current demographic trends show an ageing and declining population. The closure of Sellafield and loss of an estimated 8,000 jobs will reinforce this tendency.

The wider district has a relatively high concentration of highly skilled and well qualified residents, mainly associated with the Westlakes Science and Technology Park (WLSTP) and Sellafield. The decommissioning process and anticipated investment in the Science Park represent an opportunity to encourage a greater percentage of this social group to live in Whitehaven.

Levels of educational qualification are low and most of the district’s schools and colleges perform below the national average.

Cumbria is the only county with no university. There is a proposal for UCLAN to establish new facilities in West Cumbria and also for a new research and training facility within the WLSTP, which may help address the lack of training and educational opportunities.

Indices of deprivation and social exclusion are also high, and two wards are in the top 100 most deprived in the country.

Despite this there is a strong loyalty and sense of identity among the local population who are generally happy to live in Whitehaven despite a wide range of frustrations.
Whitehaven is at a turning point in its history. The town faces real challenges. However, its prosperous past has left a legacy of a stunning harbour and town centre with many fine 18th Century buildings. The long term decommissioning of Sellafield provides a window of opportunity in which to begin to address the challenges this presents and establish a foundation for renewed economic stability. The Town Centre Development Framework is a central part of the strategy to achieve sustainable regeneration. Its purpose is to influence the type and quality of investment in the town centre through the use of the planning system and by providing renewed investor confidence in the town.

The main objectives of the Town Centre Development Framework are:

- To improve links and re-establish connectivity between the Town Centre and the harbour
- To enhance key ‘gateway’ sites and approaches to the town centre.
- To create a series of new and improved public spaces as focal points for new life and activity and to establish stronger visual links between the town centre and harbour.
- To improve the integration of new and existing development into the urban grain and to set higher standards of architectural and landscape design for all town centre development.
- To identify priority zones for investment that will help to strengthen leisure and retail activity in the town.
- To diversify the range of residential accommodation in the town centre and provide opportunities for high quality contemporary urban living.
- To improve the integration and the prestige of public transport services in the town centre.
- To improve the quality of the town centre green-space and provide much better play and recreational facilities.
- To set high standards for design, materials and maintenance, which will reflect the raised aspirations of the town.
- To balance respect and conservation of the town’s heritage with a bolder, more forward-thinking approach to development which embraces the contemporary.
Birds eye view

Key Proposals

1. A new leisure and cultural quarter from Bransty Gate to Bulwark Quay.
2. An improved and extended retail quarter on the site of the original fishing village around Quay Street.
3. The extension of Catherine Street to Newtown and realignment of the one-way system away from The Strand and Tangier Street.
4. New public squares at the heart of development areas to improve links between the town centre and harbour and provide new focuses of life and dynamism.
5. Improvements to the town’s major greenscapes and the creation of a new park on the Mountpleasant terraces ‘The Hanging Gardens’.
6. Improvements to all major footpath links and the realignment of the C2C route through ‘the playground’.
7. New and modernised play and recreation facilities for children and teenagers.
8. Extensive improvements to the town’s ‘streetscape’ in particular along the major approach roads and one way system.
INTRODUCTION

The overall strategy for the development of Whitehaven town centre is based on creating clusters of development focussed on new public spaces of high quality. The aim is to reinforce and strengthen the existing or emerging character of these areas to create distinctive urban ‘quarters’. Individual development sites as well as improvements to public realm and infrastructure are seen as contributing to the redevelopment of a wider strategic zone. This approach has the potential to deliver a number of social, environmental and commercial benefits which could transform the image and appeal of the town. This overall vision is composed of three separate strategies which are described in detail below, although these should be seen as integrated parts of the whole rather than as separate aims to be pursued in isolation.

- Development Strategy: This deals with the key issues of proposed land use, clustering of sites, presentation to the market and the contribution of new development to wider environmental improvements. Specific proposals for development sites are dealt with in more detail in the Development Prospectus document;
• **Transport Strategy:** This covers the proposed alterations to the one way system, associated highways works, environmental improvements to road corridors, car parking provision, improvements to pedestrian and cycle routes, and public transport provision.

• **Public Realm Strategy:** This includes proposals for new and improved public spaces, improvements to existing greenspace, an enhanced streetscape, play and recreation facilities, public art and interpretation.

**DEVELOPMENT STRATEGY**

The regeneration strategy for the town centre proposes grouping sites into small ‘clusters’ as a means of linking individual development opportunities into a wider vision for the area in which they sit. This has the benefit of presenting sites in relation to public realm and infrastructure proposals, as part of a wider package of improvements, combining public and private sector investment. This should not only represent a much more appealing offer to the market, but also ensure that all new development contributes to the wider aim of improving the town’s physical environment and stimulating economic activity for the benefit of residents, visitors, local businesses and investors alike.

The key clusters are at both ends of the promenade and in the centre: Bransty Gate, Bulwark Quay and Quay Street. This approach is based on the overarching objective of improving links between the town centre and harbour and finding ways to revitalise and enhance both. All three areas are centred on major new public spaces which aim to create new focuses of life and dynamism, better links between the harbourfront and town centre areas and add value to sites around them. An additional cluster of sites is along the Newtown–Preston Street road corridor. The main aims here are to improve links to the proposed new developments within the Pow Beck Valley, to stimulate the creation of a far more attractive and high quality southern approach into the town centre, and provide more opportunities for small business relocation.

Key public realm and infrastructure proposals are described later in this chapter, but the overall aims for each area and the proposals for specific sites are described below.

**DEVELOPMENT PROSPECTUS AREA A**

**Bransty Gate & Harbour**

**Overall Aim**
This key arrival point deserves to become a far more attractive and dynamic gateway to the town centre. The aim here is to develop a ‘leisure quarter’ for the town, building on the existing concentration of bars, nightclubs and restaurants in the area. An exciting mix of nightlife, performing arts, training facilities, café bars, hotel and leisure facilities and living space will be developed around a new public square and transport interchange. Specific proposals are outlined below.

**Development Sites**

**Site 1: Tesco**
The idea here is to ensure that the proposed expansion of the Tesco site is carried out to a high quality to improve the surrounding area and remove car parking from this important gateway. The store should face onto the new ‘Bransty Square’ and include a café/bar to introduce some life and activity. Car Parking should be to the rear.

**Site 2: Bus Station and Garage**
Create a landmark building that, together with the Bus Depot site, forms a strong new visual ‘gateway’ to the town. This site should aim to provide a new centre for art and design activities and may include: workshop/living space, galleries and retail outlets, a performing arts venue, a youth centre and an educational and training facility. There is also an opportunity for a ground floor café/bar associated with the centre.

**Site 3: Bus Depot and Garage**
Hotel accommodation and leisure development, again within a landmark building that makes a real statement about Whitehaven’s quality, values and aspirations. Combined with the Bus depot site opposite, these two new buildings will create a strong and identifiable gateway to the town centre, echoing the Bransty Arch of bygone days.

**Site 4: Tyre Depot and Commissioner’s Office**
New contemporary office accommodation for Commissioner’s to be provided above a ground floor leisure facility (a bar, café or restaurant), facing onto the millennium promenade and new square.
Site 5: Mark House and Old Baths
A new development comprising a mixture of residential accommodation and a small, specialist leisure or retail facility at ground floor level facing onto the new square.

DEVELOPMENT PROSPECTUS AREA B

Swingpump & Newtown

Overall Aim
The Quay St/Swingpump area is already part of the main retail quarter of the town, closely linked to the market. Our proposals for the area aim to consolidate this use but to improve the quality of the buildings and public spaces to provide a much more diverse and attractive extension to the market square, linking better to the harbour. The aim would be to provide one or two larger scale ‘anchor’ stores and a range of specialist and independent retailers that will ensure the town provides a more interesting offer for visitors as well as improving facilities for locals.

Further south along Newtown and Preston Street, the aim is to provide a much improved arrival corridor to the town centre from the south and high quality linkage between the town centre and the new Pow Beck Development area. The number of vacant and semi-derelict sites provide the opportunity to transform this run down edge of town. It is important that new development is to the back of pavement and provides car parking to the rear. New buildings may be of a larger scale and more contemporary nature than would be appropriate within the town centre. Specific proposals are outlined below.

Development Sites

Site 6: Quay Street Car Parks (east and west)
The development of a mixed use area comprising harbour front residential accommodation and improved retail facilities around a new public space. The car parking spaces would be replaced within the development and as part of the extension of the adjacent multi-storey.

Site 7: Multi-Storey Car Park and Albion Street Scrap Yard
Redevelop the multi-storey car park to improve access, extend its capacity and improve its appearance, incorporating a renewed and expanded ground floor retail area. Replace the adjacent shops with a new, modernised extension overlooking the new Chapel Square.

Site 8: Wilkinson’s Store
Explore potential for relocation of Wilkinson’s to new premises in retail area around Chapel Square and redevelop this key town centre site as high quality apartments around a parking courtyard.

Site 9: Newtown
Serviced accommodation for temporary and part time workers and/or student residences associated with new specialist training courses at Westlakes Science Park. Opportunities to accommodate small businesses or services in ground floor premises should be encouraged.

Site 10: Preston Street
Provide high quality residential accommodation, with secure car parking to rear, and potentially incorporating premises for retail outlets, workshops and other professional services at ground floor level.

Site 11: Ginns & Former Corporation Yard
There is an existing proposal for a new Asda store on this large site. Any such development should avoid locating further seas of car parking along the road edge and should aim to provide a high quality landmark building at this important gateway to the town centre, with servicing and parking to the rear. A new store should also provide a vibrant and transparent frontage along the street itself, and contribute to the enhancement of this arrival corridor.
TRANSPORT STRATEGY

Transport related proposals are explained in more detail in Chapter 7 of this document. A summary of key proposals is provided here.

The town’s one way system currently takes through traffic along The Strand and Tangier Street, creating a major obstacle to pedestrian movement between the town centre and harbour. The volume of traffic itself and the associated safety measures along this road corridor, such as safety barriers, mini-roundabouts, loading bays, lights, signage, etc, makes it a very unfriendly and unappealing place to walk around. This has the effect of separating the town centre further from the harbour and is identified in the baseline as one of the main reasons why the harbour regeneration has not successfully spilled over into the rest of the town, and why the harbour itself has not become a livelier, more dynamic place. An important part of the strategy is the realignment of the one-way system to avoid The Strand/Tangier Street corridor and make this road a much more pedestrian-friendly environment. This aim may be achievable within the existing road network but a more radical and desirable option involves the extension of Catherine Street to a new junction with Newtown. This has the additional benefit of completing the grid pattern within the historic town centre and of improving the permeability of this section of the town.

Other proposals for improvements to the road network include:

- Realignment of the last section of Albion Street and creation of a new junction between Swingpump Lane/Albion Street/Irish Street to improve access from the Kells area and allow the introduction of a quality bus route for visitors to the Haig Mining Museum and Coastal Park.

- Realignment and extension of road network around Bransy Gate area associated with redevelopment of Tesco’s and the new transport interchange.

- Extensive environmental improvements to main access roads and one way system to include improved lighting, signage, bus stops, paving and main junctions, to emphasise the hierarchy of routes within the centre and improve the town’s image.
TRANSPORT INTERCHANGE

The existing station is a very poor quality building, hidden away behind a sea of car parking, a petrol station and a garage. This is an important arrival point to the town for many visitors and day trippers, as well as a vital link to nearby communities for non-drivers. The bus station and depot have closed down and a good bus/coach station is equally important for the promotion of Whitehaven’s obvious tourism potential, as well as in improving communications for residents. A new transport interchange is proposed on the site of the existing railway station, integrating these services at one, prominent location in a new building, and fronting the new square at Bransty Gate which will form the focus of an attractive and lively arrival point to the town. This will create a welcoming and impressive first impression for visitors and a much more user-friendly public transport system for residents.

FOOTPATHS

Most of Whitehaven’s residential areas are poorly connected to the town centre due to the steep surrounding hillsides. The distances are not great but the quality of footpaths and cycle routes linking the centre to the outlying areas is very poor on the whole, making these routes feel neglected, insecure and often dangerous for the less able-bodied. These routes are not only important for residents but also potentially a fantastic resource for visitors and tourists, providing stunning vantage points over the harbour and town. A number of improvements are proposed to the footpath network including:

1. Improved surfacing, lighting, signage and maintenance along all the main strategic footpath routes shown;
2. Creation of new footpath links along the perimeter of “the Playground” to improve pedestrian links through this area of town;
3. Creation of a new link across the railway between the North Shore promenade and the Cumbrian Coastal Path;
4. New and improved pedestrian signage to help orientation around the town centre and surrounding areas;
5. Provision of access for the less able bodied and wheelchair users wherever possible;
6. New and high quality seating/resting areas along the footpath network;
7. Use of public art to provide historical interpretation and visual interest at strategic points around the network, in particular at key viewpoints.

CYCLING

In addition, Whitehaven is the main starting point for the Sea to Sea cycle route (C2C). Cycling is one of the fastest growing leisure pursuits in the country and the route attracts 15,000 users annually. This is a potentially fantastic opportunity for the town to improve its image and attract more visitors. However, most of these visitors arrive and leave almost immediately, and the route takes them out along Swingpump Lane and Newtown, one of the busiest sections of road and one of the most rundown edges of the town centre, and hardly likely to attract them to come back for another look. Cycling is also potentially an excellent way to improve links between the town centre and its outlying communities, yet the existing network does little to encourage the use of bikes. Proposals include:

1. The realignment of the C2C, to avoid Swingpump Lane/Newtown and use the proposed new footpath link through the Playground to provide a much more attractive, safe, and direct link to the old railway line where the route properly starts.
2. In addition, the introduction of cycle paths on main access footpaths and roads should be studied, to create a network of safe, cycle friendly routes to promote the use of the bike around the town as a whole.
3 New facilities for cyclists including shower/toilet/washing facilities, bike and equipment hire, food and secure bike storage, should be provided along the harbour front, ideally near the starting point for the C2C.

4 Good quality cycle stands should be provided throughout the town centre at strategic locations.

PUBLIC REALM STRATEGY

Public Square and Spaces

Attractive public squares are important in a town as focuses of life and activity, meeting places and as recognisable locations which help newcomers find their way around. They help bring a more human feel to a town and can also bring a stronger sense of identity and civic pride. Whitehaven Town Centre is very dense and contains relatively few usable public spaces. The market place is the only part of town which really fulfils the function of a lively, traffic-free public space, but reverts to a normal street on non-market days. The harbour is surrounded by high quality public space but its scale is too large to act as a social gathering place in the same way as an urban square. For a historic town, Whitehaven lacks an important ingredient: a central civic square. Most of the existing spaces are out of the way, small and poorly designed and maintained. The strategy proposes the creation of a number of new public squares, as well as the improvement of existing spaces, to enhance important gateways, improve links between the town centre and harbour and create attractive places for people to shop, rest, have a coffee, or just to watch the world go by.

Major Squares

1 Bransty Gate A major new gateway space is proposed at this historic point of arrival to the town, at the heart of a new leisure and cultural quarter, forming an access point to the promenade and harbour.

2 Old Baths Square A small public space is proposed at this key ‘hub’ linking The Strand, Tangier Street and Duke Street to the harbour and providing a focus of life and activity along the Millennium Promenade. A restored Old Baths building, converted to use as a café/bar is proposed as a central feature of the new space.

3 Chapel Square A small square should be created around the restored Chapel on Quay Street, to act as a focus for an extension of the town’s main shopping area on the site of the original fishing village.
4 St. Nicholas Square  A fourth new public space is proposed on the Lowther Street frontage of St Nicholas Gardens. The historic town centre lacks a focal point which is usually provided in historic towns by a civic square. There is an opportunity to open up the front section of the gardens to create a more accessible and active public space around the church tower, while maintaining a very large garden area to the rear.

SECONDARY SPACES

While the major new squares described above will provide the main focuses of life and activity for the town, there are a number of smaller, secondary spaces which also contribute to the overall sense of place and provide important stopping points, as well as a range of opportunities for essential street furnishings such as signage, seating and cycle stands, and decorative elements such as public art and planting. In many cases, these spaces have become cluttered with a range of these elements with very little coordination, giving a poor impression and often acting as a virtual obstacle course for the pedestrian. The main aim in these areas should be to simplify the number of elements in each, to design their layout in a coordinated way so as to avoid cluttering up the space, and to use consistent, high quality materials which will establish a clear visual identity for the town. The proposed approach to the use of materials and their organisation is explained in more detail in Chapter 6, Streetscape, and indicative illustrations are provided for some of these spaces to provide a sense of how they might be altered, but a summary of the main spaces and key elements of each is provided below.

1 Queen Street Square Perhaps the only public space of any significance, apart from the church gardens, within the town centre, this small space is of historical importance but is neglected and little used. It needs improvements to its paving, furnishing and lighting to make it an attractive and lively urban space.

2 Civic Hall Frontage This wide space is at one of the main arrival points to the town centre and has the potential to become a much more attractive and better used location.

3 Wellington Row/George Street Junction Improvements to this area will be important as it will become a key point on the new one-way system, and a gateway to the High Street conservation area.

4 Albion Gate Creation of a new gateway space as part of a number of improvements to the junction of Albion Street with Swingpump Lane at its arrival point to the town centre.

5 Improvements to minor spaces There are a number of important junctions and corners in the town centre which provide small areas of public space that have become particularly cluttered and chaotic. Improvements to these areas should aim to simplify their layout and rationalise the number of streetscape elements. Some may provide good locations for signage and interpretation or for public art features. Key locations include:
   • Irish Street/Roper Street junction
   • Duke Street/King Street junction
   • The Strand/ Market Square junction

GREENSPACE

A town’s greenspaces play many roles. In contrast to the paved public squares, which are at the heart of the bustle and activity of urban life, they usually provide an oasis of calm, a place to get away from everyday activities. They are also important as freer areas, away from traffic and crowds, for play, sport, outdoor events and just as a frame and backdrop for the town itself. Many greenspaces also provide attractive pedestrian routes and links, away from busy streets. Greenspaces can be formal parks and gardens, mown recreation grounds or informal woodlands and grasslands. Recent studies increasingly emphasise the importance of greenspaces, plants and trees to people’s health and happiness. Ongoing research by CABE space also provides evidence that good quality greenspaces can raise property values and strength of community in residential areas, while poor quality or poorly maintained spaces can have the opposite effect.

Whitehaven has a large number of open spaces, but
relatively few which are widely usable, accessible and of high quality. The strategy proposes improvements and changes over time to most of the existing spaces and the creation of a new public park overlooking the harbour, as well as a significant number of new playgrounds, recreation facilities and viewpoints. More details of these proposals are provided in Chapters 4, 5 and 6, but a brief overall summary of key areas is provided below:

**Formal Greenspace**

1 **The Hanging Gardens** A new public park is proposed on the walls and terraces of Mountpleasant, enhancing this backdrop to the harbour and providing an unusual and attractive location to relax with panoramic views. Improvements to footpaths will also provide better links to southern residential communities.

2 **St Nicholas’ Gardens** A reduction in size of the formal gardens is proposed to provide a more open, accessible square at the Lowther Street end, but the majority of the gardens will be maintained as an attractive green oasis at the heart of the town.

3 **Trinity Gardens** Similar to St Nicholas Gardens, this is an attractive and generally well maintained formal garden, but it has the potential to be used by a wider range of people. Minor changes are proposed, maintaining and improving the existing character.

4 **St. James’s Gardens** In contrast to the church gardens in the town centre, the large grounds of St James’s Church on High Street are a bleak and unappealing setting for this listed church. Planting of trees and shrubs and provision of benches could provide a new and attractive public gardens for this neglected part of the town centre.

5 **Castle Park** This historic park is all that remains of the formal gardens within the Lowther estate. As one of the only expanses of fairly flat lawn it is a useful and popular resource, but is disappointing as a historic park and lacks the facilities usually associated with a town’s main park. A whole range of improvements to the landscape, furnishings and facilities is proposed to widen the appeal and variety of the park and to improve footpath links to surrounding areas.

6 **The Whitehaven Playground** This large green space is currently a bleak expanse of grassland providing a rugby training ground with some small stands for matches. Without compromising the use of the area for sports, it would be possible to provide lit footpaths and planting around the edges to make the ground a more attractive and accessible part of the town, and to improve pedestrian links between the town centre and the surrounding residential areas.

7 **St James’s Park** Similarly to the Playground, this large area of open greenspace is neglected and bleak. Improvements are proposed to the formal garden area along High Street, including a new high quality, enclosed play area. Tree planting and formal perimeter footpaths are proposed around the edges of the main space. A much improved viewing area is proposed for this fantastic vantage point over the town and the harbour. It will be important to involve the local community in the redesign of this facility which is at the heart of the High Street area.

**INFORMAL GREENSPACE**

Whitehaven is surrounded and framed by steep wooded slopes and cliffs which are an important part of its appeal and character. Parts are inaccessible due to their steepness, but these areas also provide crucial pedestrian links to surrounding areas of Whitehaven and often offer stunning viewpoints over the town and harbour. Despite their importance, most of these areas are poorly maintained and little advantage is taken of their potential. Footpaths are mainly in a very poor state of repair and poorly lit. These should be maintained and improved. Improvements should aim to achieve the following:

- Make these areas more attractive and accessible to the public where possible;
- Make sure that footpaths are well lit, well maintained and accessible to all;
- Use, where possible, to exploit vantage points over the town;
• Over time, aim to remove inappropriate development or structures from these areas and protect from future development;

• Diversify planting and habitats and remove unwanted or invasive species.

PLAY AND RECREATION

Provision of outdoor play and recreation facilities for children and young people in Whitehaven town centre is very poor. The two existing playgrounds are small and neglected and the only facility for teenagers is a small, isolated skatepark, to the north west of Bransty Station, which is poorly located and ill equipped. For the town to succeed, improved facilities for families and young people are vital. Well-designed play equipment can fit in with historic settings, can provide an attractive feature and will help to enliven the town’s parks and gardens. The strategy proposes a number of new and improved play areas at strategic locations around the town centre, including a new skatepark in a more secure and central location. The location and design of these facilities will need to be carefully considered through consultation with local communities but suggested locations are:

• Castle Park: improvements and extension of the existing play area and possible use as location for new skatepark

• St James’s Park (The Recreation Ground): relocation and replacement of existing play facilities to enclosed garden on High Street

• The Hanging Gardens: provision of an exciting new playground on a Gulliver’s Travels theme

• Trinity Gardens: Potential location for a small toddlers’ play area

VIEWING PLATFORMS

One of the most appealing aspects of Whitehaven’s setting is the steep slopes surrounding the town centre, providing stunning panoramic views over the town, harbour and sea from many points. Most of these viewpoints are also highly visible from the town below. As part of the longer term strategy to attract more tourism to Whitehaven, it is proposed to create a number of sculptural viewing platforms which are eye-catching, landmark features in themselves, designed to see from and to be seen. More details are provided in Chapter 6, but the key locations proposed are:

• St James’s Park (The Recreation Ground)

• A suitable location along the Loop Road

• The Hanging Gardens

• A suitable viewpoint on the footpath to Kells, above Newtown

• The lighthouse at the tip of the outer harbour
PUBLIC ART AND INTERPRETATION

An important part of the experience of visiting a town is to get a sense of its history and identity. While the buildings, structures and spaces will provide many clues to the careful observer, the use of art and design can help to ‘tell the story’ and provide added interest. Interpretation boards have their place but often give a sense of being in an outdoor museum. The use of well designed sculptural features or integration of locally relevant themes into the design of functional items and furnishings, while less detailed and direct, can be a more interesting way to convey messages. Public Art should not be seen as an ‘add on’ but as an integral part of the design of spaces and routes. New squares and parks should aim to surprise and entertain, to convey a sense of local distinctiveness, as well as to provide functional places to be. Whitehaven already has many good examples of the use of public art to tell stories: sculpture, mosaics, ‘Whaletail’ benches and canons all give the first time visitor a strong sense of place and past. This tradition should be built on and integrated into the design of all new public spaces in imaginative ways. Chapter 6 provides further details and examples of how this might be achieved but potential locations for specific sculptural or public art commissions are suggested here:

- A major landmark feature should be commissioned as a central focus at the main junction from the Loop Road into the town centre

- A similar landmark sculpture may be considered at the new junction between Coach Road and The Ginns

- Smaller sculptural features should be considered as focuses for a number of public spaces such as: St Nicholas’ Square, Castle Park, Queen Square and Trinity Gardens

- ‘Heritage Trails’ could be created along strategic routes such as the C2C or the Cumbrian Coastal Path, incorporating reclaimed industrial artifacts and materials.

LANDMARKS

Every town has its recognisable features which help people to find their way around and provide memorable visual symbols. Whitehaven has many landmark features, which reflect its interesting historical origins. In some cases these are already prominent and well known, but in others little is made of them. While in some cases physical enhancements may be needed to the structures themselves, in most cases it is more a matter of drawing attention to their presence. The use of illumination at night is a particularly effective way of achieving this and as part of this strategy it is proposed to install feature lighting to a number of the town’s landmark buildings and structures. These should include:

- The lighthouses in the harbour
- The Candlestick and Beacon
- St Nicholas Tower and St James’s Church frontage
- The Castle
- The Old Town Hall
INTRODUCTION

The Baseline Study identified 8 discrete character areas within the town centre study area and provided a detailed appraisal of the key issues and objectives for each of these areas. This chapter provides a larger scale plan for each area and describes objectives for their future development, set within the context of the strategic framework described in Chapter 3. The aims identified vary from short term, high priority proposals, which are seen as central to the wider objectives of the development strategy, and more general aspirations which establish the main considerations for the longer term development of specific sites or areas which are not currently under consideration. Proposals which relate to the broad public realm and infrastructure strategies described in the previous chapter are seen as high priority aims to be pursued in the short to medium term. An outline indication of priority for the projects described is included at the end of this chapter but the costs, funding, prioritisation and phasing of these proposals will be dealt with in more detail in a separate ‘Implementation Strategy’.
THE BRANSTY APPROACH

This character area consists of a steep-sided, wooded valley through which runs New Road, the principal access corridor into the town centre from the north. The main access from the Loop Road is from a poorly designed junction which gives no sense of arrival at a destination of importance and is dominated by a petrol station. The green corridor is a potentially attractive route into the town centre and its densely wooded character contrasts sharply with the very urban character of the Bransty Gate area. This makes for a potentially dramatic arrival to the town centre on turning the corner at the northern end of New Road. However, the overgrown, unmanaged condition of the wooded slopes and the very poor quality of the streetscape along the route have the effect of providing a gloomy, run down feel to the road. The main objective for this area is to provide a high quality arrival corridor to the town centre from the Loop Road.

Key urban design aims include:

- Provide a strong, recognisable gateway to the town from the Loop Road by means of improved signage and the use of bold public art;
- Provide an attractive green corridor, with a naturalistic, wooded character but more open and light than is currently the case. This will involve the removal of self seeded and undesirable species and most of the shrub layer;
- Improve pedestrian links both along the main road corridor and across by providing well surfaced and lit footpaths;
- Establish a consistent and high quality design language for paving, furnishings, signage and illumination.
Bransty Approach Proposals

Key Strategic Aims

1. Footpath improvements to include restored / repainted fencing and gates, new lighting and resurfacing
2. New surfaced footpath to replace rough track
3. Improvements to road corridor to include new lighting, signage and paving
4. New pavement to Western side of road.
5. Arboricultural works to improve wooded slopes (and long term management plan).
6a. New landmark ‘gateway’ feature to Whitehaven on island of existing junction
6b. Potential site for secondary ‘gateway’ feature on grassed bank
7. Improvements to walls and hoardings

Long Term Aspirations

2. Long term removal of motorbike showrooms to more suitable location
9. Possible long-term residential development sites to improve and consolidate urban character of gateway.
BRANSTY GATE & NORTH SHORE

The Bransty Gate area is so-called after the massive monumental arch that once dominated this gateway to Whitehaven town centre and, despite its functional role in carrying coal from the higher slopes to the harbour, was a good reflection of the pride and prosperity of the town in the 18th and 19th centuries. The area today is still the main gateway to the town centre but now gives a very poor first impression. The proposed improvements to this main gateway are one of the principal aims of the Development Strategy and these are described in more detail in Chapters 3 and 5. The aim is to consolidate the emerging identity of this end of the centre as a focus for nightlife, food and drink outlets and create a vibrant ‘leisure and cultural quarter’, with a major new public space at its heart. The physical separation of the area from the Georgian buildings of the Old Town and the very poor quality of existing development should be seen as an opportunity to create a more contemporary arrival statement in terms of the style and scale of buildings and the quality of public space. Key to the transformation of this area are the provision of a new transport interchange, a landmark hotel building, and a cultural centre, providing workshops, galleries and retail outlets for local artists and designers, linked to an educational and youth centre.

The adjacent North Shore area has historically been dominated by mining and related industrial activities. Today the area still reflects these origins and comprises a number of functional industrial and commercial sheds within a landscape of grassed spoil heaps. The area is split down the middle by the coastal railway line. The main objective of the strategy for this area is to improve its visual quality by screening unsightly developments and improve the linkages from the harbour to the north shore promenade and to the Cumbrian Coastal Footpath and Cycleway.

Key urban design aims include:

- Provide a new public space as the focus for a lively, attractive main gateway to the town centre
- New and improved developments should provide active frontage onto this central space
- Opportunities to extend and re-establish the urban grid pattern of the town centre should be sought in this area
- The bus depot site provides an opportunity for a major new landmark building of a significant height which will act as a visual reference point for the whole town
- Promote redevelopment of Tesco store to provide enclosure and high quality frontage to the northern end of the harbourside.
- The north shore promenade should be seen as an extension to the harbour area and the redevelopment of the boatyard will provide an opportunity to improve the physical connection between the two.
- The Cumbrian Coastal Path should be improved and linked to the North Shore Promenade to create a circular route and reclaimed industrial materials used to create a ‘Heritage Trail’.
- Improve general appearance and appeal of North Shore area and Bransty Slopes by means of improved maintenance of existing vegetation and additional tree planting.
Bransty Gate and North Shore

1. New public space at main gateway to town centre.
2. Landmark building at main access to town to create new ‘Bransty Gate’.
3. Existing vehicular access removed.
4. Main vehicular access to area with signals at junction.
5. Improved petrol station at arrival point.
7. Improvements to Tesco site to provide new layout, car parking at rear, tree planting to boundaries store on harbour front. Car park to include public car parking.
8. Redevelopment of boatyard to include improved boundary treatments.
10. Improved access and signage to North Shore.
11. Potential site for coach park.
12. Skatepark removed and replaced in more central location.
13. Woodland planting on slagheap.
14. Improvements to Cumbrian Coastal Path to include resurfacing lighting signage and use of reclaimed industrial materials to create heritage trail.
15. Woodland planting to screen Industrial Estate.
16. Improved management of grassed and wooded slopes.
17. Tree planting to Vertex site and boatyard boundaries to screen.
18. Improvements to North Shore promenade to make more consistent with harbour.
19. New pedestrian link across the railway between the north shore promenade and the Cumbrian Coastal Path.
HIGH STREET

This is a mainly residential area built on the steep northern slopes on the edge of the town centre. Buildings on Wellington Row and High Street form part of a Conservation Area which includes the listed St James’s Church. However, most of the area is dominated by four storey, 1960’s apartment blocks which are completely out of character with the terraced housing they replaced and break the otherwise well conserved block structure of much of the historic centre. The short term aims for the area are focussed on improvements to the Recreation Ground, a large greenspace at its heart, to make it into more of an attractive community park, as well as to the frontage along George Street, which forms an important part of the reconfigured one way system. Over the longer term, however, opportunities should be explored for a wholesale redevelopment of the 1960’s housing to re-establish the original urban block structure in a modern idiom, as has been successfully done in a number of major urban regeneration projects of recent years.

Key urban design aims include:

- Improve links to High Street area by means of better street frontage and ‘gateway’ sites from George Street, and improved signage;
- Enhance St James Park with new tree planting, fenced play area, seating and lighting to create a community park as a focus for the area;
- Improve St James’s churchyard to create a peaceful garden area more appropriate to the historic character and value of the church;
- Take better advantage of panoramic views from the area—provide viewing platform in park;
- New developments should aim to progressively re-establish the town’s traditional block structure, restoring a built street frontage to north-south roads. Buildings should generally be between 2 and 3 storeys in height, with pitched roofs and should retain the predominantly residential character of the area. Corner sites, however, may incorporate an additional storey and provide opportunities for small community retail and service uses at ground floor level. Site C in particular, may provide an opportunity for a 4 or 5 storey building incorporating additional uses such as office space or ground floor retail;
- Improve links to Castle Park
High Street Proposals

Key strategic aims
1 New Performing Arts and Youth Centre to provide new gateway building to area.
2 Improvements to spaces around George Street / Wellington Row junction to create attractive secondary gateway.
3 Extensive improvements to ‘Recreation Ground’ to create St. James’ Park—Tree/Woodland planting, new viewing platform and enclosed play garden.
4 Improvements to St. James’ churchyard to create restful, attractive garden.
5 Lighting to church frontage to emphasise key visual landmark.
6 Improve links to park.

Long term aspirations
A Long term redevelopment to improve corner site.
B Long term redevelopment to improve road frontage.
C Long term redevelopment to create key corner site.
GEORGIAN HEART

This character area comprises the historic heart of Whitehaven, based on a grid pattern laid out in the 17th century by the Lowther family. The town’s distinctiveness is based to a large extent on the unique urban design qualities of this area. There are a number of very fine Georgian buildings within the area but it is largely the well conserved coherence of its block structure, scale and detailing that provide its special charm and character. The mixed use character of a large part of this central area, with businesses or residences above shops and cafes at ground floor is also an important ingredient in its appeal. Much of the streetscape of the area is of good quality materials but there is a lack of consistency and, in particular, many areas are poorly designed and cluttered with a mish mash of elements, which often act as obstacles to free movement as well as detracting from the potential appeal of the streets. The principal aims of the strategy are to conserve and reinforce the urban design principles of the area, and to rationalise and simplify the streetscape to remove clutter and establish a consistent, high quality palette of materials for use throughout the area. A higher standard of design and implementation will be required in this area for all new developments.

Key urban design principles that should be observed in any redevelopment within this character area include:

- Maintain or re-establish the building line to street frontages;
- Limit the height of new development to 3 storeys on the main roads and 2 or 3 storeys on side roads, consistent with the character of the adjoining buildings in the street;
- Corner plots are particularly critical. Additional height of up to 2.5m may be permitted on key corner sites at main junctions but must provide frontage on both street faces and a higher quality of design and materials is to be required of such developments;
- New developments or redevelopments of property in the retail areas of Lowther Street, Duke Street, King Street and Roper Street should maintain the mixed use character of these roads, with retail, leisure or business premises at ground floor and living space or office space above. This is also to be encouraged where appropriate in other areas;
- The rear of developments should be designed in proportion to the visual impact for the public. In many cases, properties back onto public or communal car parks. A higher standard of design will be required in these cases to conserve—or contribute to—an attractive public realm in these areas;
- Where properties back onto a public street, such as the Strand, opportunities should be sought, or incentives offered, to provide active frontage or commercial premises to the rear of properties. Servicing requirements must be met but imaginative ways should be developed to minimise the visual impact of bins and service accesses on the streetscape;
- The use of materials and detailing should be consistent with local vernacular, combining local stone window and door frames with painted render walls and slate roofs. Window heights are a particularly important element in defining the overall character of a street elevation. In most of the principal streets, a hierarchy of heights from ground to upper storeys is observed. In some side streets the proportions are consistent from ground to upper storeys. New developments should reflect an awareness of such subtle but critical elements in order to conserve the coherence of the historic streetscape;
- However, imaginative and contemporary design is to be encouraged within these strict urban design principles. A well-designed contemporary building can sit happily within a historical context and will often improve the interest and appeal of the street, whereas poorly considered pastiches of historical styles only succeed in diluting the attractiveness of the wider whole.
Georgian Heart Proposals

Key strategic aims

1. Improvements to Strand Street frontage:
   Encourage King Street premises to provide active frontage or retail outlets along Strand Street.

2. Explore opportunities to remove bins from street or provide bin stores at suitable locations.

3. Seek opportunities to improve frontage of Waverley Hotel and Opera Bingo.


5. Create new square on Lowther Street frontage of St. Nicholas Gardens.

6. Improvements to minor public spaces.

7. Seek opportunities to provide more open / active frontage to rear of Wilkinson’s store.

8. Improve footpath to include wall repairs, surfacing and lighting.

Long term aspirations

A. Long term redevelopment opportunities should be explored to re-establish urban block structure.

Left to right
Lowther St/Irish St junction
Cluttered space at King St/Duke St junction
Attractive narrow back streets
Wider main shopping streets
THE CIVIC QUARTER

While closely linked to the Old Town, the Civic Quarter forms a strip around the outer edge of the original Lowther grid pattern, of a markedly different character. The strip between Irish Street and Catherine Street contains the vast majority of the civic and administrative buildings, and other related professional services. The scale of buildings is generally larger and their grandeur is more marked. Buildings such as the Library, the Records Office and the Old Town Hall building reflect this character. However, the quality of the architecture in the area is also less consistent and its overall coherence has been much undermined by a number of poor quality developments in the latter half of the 20th century, such as the Civic Hall, the Police and Fire Stations and the Telecom building. The recent redevelopment of the Council Offices on Catherine Street has done little to improve this tendency. New development should seek to re-establish a scale and quality commensurate with the Civic character and function of the area. The severance of Catherine Street at the western end creates a curious break in the consistency of the urban grid pattern and a blockage in the permeability of this part of the town centre.

Key urban design aims include the following:

- The extension of Catherine Street to Newtown, enabling the realignment of the one way system;
- Junction and streetscape improvements along Irish Street and Scotch Street associated with improvements to the one way system;
- Provide an improved street frontage at key locations such as the Civic Hall on Lowther Street, and the frontage of Newtown;
- A similarly high standard of architectural design should be sought for new developments in this area as for the Georgian Heart. Design principles described in detail for the previous character area should also be considered as applicable here. The exception is that developments within this area should reflect the larger scale and grandeur of original buildings and that in some cases 4 storey building heights may be acceptable.

1. The telecom building
2. Secondary access to Castle Park
3. Civic Hall and Street Frontage
4. The Old Town Hall
THE FLATTS

The Flatts is a large area outside the historic town centre, which has developed gradually on what was once the grounds of the Lowther Estate. The area has developed in a piecemeal fashion, which has created a very large and completely impermeable block consisting of a number of isolated and unconnected sites. Most of the development within the area but has also been of a very low quality. The area includes two important greenspaces: the ‘Whitehaven Playground’, which is the largest single greenspace in the town but is currently an unattractive and impassable expanse of grass; and Castle Park, which is the town’s main outdoor recreational facility but is potentially a much more attractive space. The main short term objectives

Civic Quarter
Proposals

Key strategic aims
1. Major public realm improvements to key junctions associated with realignment of one-way system.
2. Junction improvements associated with realignment of one-way system.
3. Possible new access to Castle Park.
4. Improved access to Castle Park.
5. Major improvements to public realm to frontage of Civic Hall.
6. Improvements to Trinity Gardens to include lighting, seating, benches, interpretation and possible toddlers play area.
7. Extension of Catherine Street to New Town to realign one-way system.

Long term aspirations
A. Redevelopment of Church—possibly as youth centre (or redevelopment of site).
B. Long term redevelopment opportunities—Tel, Exchange, Magistrates Court, Police Station.
for the area are to create new pedestrian links utilising the edges of the Playground, one of which will also form a new stretch in the redirected C2C cycle route. Improvements to the main road frontages of the Morrison’s retail park to enhance the main approach to the town centre are also proposed, although these will be largely cosmetic. In the long term, opportunities should be sought for the wholesale redevelopment of this site, perhaps in association with the sports centre to the rear. Other major sites are also available for redevelopment along Coach Road. Such major developments should aim to re-establish vehicular as well as pedestrian linkages across the area and significantly raise the quality of design, especially along the road frontages. Ideally, such redevelopments should be based on a masterplan for the restructuring of the whole area, in order to tie it back into the town centre, and extend the urban design principles of the Georgian Heart out to the edges of the town centre.

Key urban design aims include the following:

- Improve permeability through area by creation of footpaths and cyclepaths along edges of The Playground
- Convert the Playground into a more attractive and accessible urban greenspace by tree planting and perimeter furnishings
- Improvements to Castle Park to create a more attractive and lively main park for the town with improved play and recreation facilities
- Improve the car park and street frontage to the Morrisons site in the short term and seek opportunities in the long term to redevelop whole retail park area to improve urban design and permeability.
Key strategic aims

1. Improvements to the Playground to provide new footpath and cyclepath links, and tree planting to enclose central space.
2. New cyclepath as part of C2C realignment.
3. Potential location for new skatepark.
4. Environmental improvements to car park.
5. Tree planting to improve street frontage of Morrisons site.
6. General improvements to park to include lighting, furnishing, and planting.
7. Improved secondary park entrance.
9. Remove existing bandstand and replace.
10. Rebuild / improve toilet block.
11. Build new bandstand at focal point of park with paved area adjacent.
12. Improved play area.
13. Improvements to footpath to include lighting and benches.

Long term aspirations

A. Potential long term redevelopment of site to upgrade key approach to town centre.
B. Potential longer term development opportunities along Coach Road should ensure high quality street frontage.
THE SOUTHERN APPROACH

This area forms a wide corridor on either side of the third major approach to the town centre, formed by The Ginns, Preston Street, Newtown and Swingpump Lane. Historically, this road was dominated by industrial installations and related infrastructure. Consequently, with the decline of these industries the road corridor has become very run down and lined with vacant sites, derelict buildings or poor quality recent developments, mainly large scale retail outlets. The road corridor suffers from a high degree of fragmentation and lack of active street frontage. These sites provide an unprecedented opportunity for the wholesale redevelopment of large parts of the road corridor. The area is outside the conservation area and offers significant advantages in terms of space. The main objective here is to create an attractive, high quality, urbanised approach to the town centre through a programme of environmental improvements and extensive redevelopment of poor quality or vacant sites.

Key urban design aims include the following:

- High quality development at The Ginns to create landmark ‘gateway’ arrival statement
- Extensive environmental improvements to road corridor to include tree planting, lighting and paving
- Extension of Catherine Street to Newtown and realignment of Albion Street to improve junctions, make more pedestrian friendly and realign one way system;
- Realignment and improvement of C2C cycle route through the Playground to create high quality footpath/cyclepath into town centre;
- New developments of a more contemporary character should be encouraged along this corridor, and in particular at key junction and gateways sites;
- Building heights should generally be 3–4 storeys, with the greater height focussed especially at key locations such as the Ginns ‘gateway’ and other corner sites overlooking new and improved junctions;
- New developments should aim to create a clear and consistent building line providing a strong street frontage. Wherever practical retail, commercial and community service uses should be sought at ground floor level to provide an active street scene;
- Roofscape is an important element in views from above and should be considered carefully. Pitched roofs and slate tiling will provide consistency with local vernacular but other creative solutions, such as green roofs and roof gardens, should also be encouraged;
- Car parking and service yards should be kept to the rear of developments and screened from the main road. However, the impact of these areas in views from above should also be considered. Hard and soft landscape treatments should be used to mitigate the potentially negative impact of such areas on visual amenity.
Key strategic aims
1 Albion Street realigned to form junction with Irish Street and Swingpump Lane.
2 Potential location for panoramic viewing platform with interpretation, etc.
3 Improvements to Kell's footpath to include resurfacing, lighting and sealing.
4 Extensive environmental improvements to road corridor to include pavements, lighting, tree planting to create attractive avenue.
5 Opportunity for new footpath link between Preston Street and Flatt Walks.
6 Landmark buildings at corner sites to mark major gateway to town centre.
7 Extension of multi-storey Car Park over new ground floor retail space.
8 Improvements to public realm around new junction to create coherent 'gateway space'.
9 New section of road to extend Catherine Street to Newtown. Associated environmental improvements to road corridor.
10 New cyclepath / footpath along edge of 'The Playground' to improve pedestrian links to centre and realign C2C.
11 Major improvements to this stretch of footpath / cyclepath to include lighting, resurfacing, improved fencing, planting.

Long term aspirations
A Indicative redevelopment around Catherine Street extension.
B Potential longer term development opportunities should ensure high quality street frontage.
THE HARBOUR & SOUTH SHORE

The large harbour dating from the 17th century is the most impressive single feature of Whitehaven. Historically, however, it was the main focus of industrial activity and consequently the town turned its back on the harbour area. The Strand and Tangier Street have always formed a boundary between the two. The recent wholesale regeneration of the harbour area has been carried out to a very high quality and has created an exceptionally attractive area of public realm, dramatically improving the image of the town. However, the built frontage of the harbour remains by and large very poor, with a number of vacant and derelict sites, and a total absence of the cafes, restaurants and bars usually found along the seafront of any coastal town. The revitalisation of the area requires radical change to improve linkages with the town centre and bring new vitality. The realignment of the one-way system allows for the downgrading of the Strand-Tangier Street corridor and provides the opportunity to achieve this by creating a much more pedestrian friendly area in which exciting new public spaces will form the focus for clusters of new development.

Key urban design aims include the following:

- Creation of new mixed use retail focus around new public space on Quay Street car park site;
- New public space on site of Old Baths to improve links to harbour at key junction as focus for new development;
- Exciting contemporary architecture should be encouraged on new development sites with building heights of between 4 and 5 storeys;
- Retail or leisure uses must be achieved at ground floor level to bring life to new spaces;
- Developments should create quality frontage to both the harbour and The Strand with car parking integrated into the buildings at basement or ground floor level;
- New public park on Mountpleasant: ‘The Hanging Gardens’;
- Improvements to The Strand to create pedestrian priority zone with good links between town centre and harbour.
Key strategic aims

1. New play area possibly on a Gulliver’s Travels theme.
2. Sculptural viewing platform.
3. Major environmental improvements to road corridor to create pedestrian priority zone linked to harbour.
4. Improve frontage of Waverley Hotel and Gaity cinema.
5. ‘Old Baths Square’—new public space with converted old baths building at its heart.
6. Shared surface area.
7. Improve frontage by incentives to owners to develop outlets facing onto The Strand.
8. Opportunity for additional market stalls.
9. Chapel Square new public space: At heart of new retail quarter on site of old fishing village.
10. ‘The Hanging Gardens’—new public park on existing terraces.
11. Improved and realigned C2C cycle route.
12. Replace palisade fencing to marina with bespoke design in keeping with harbour style.

Long term aspirations

A. Longer-term development opportunity—should improve harbour and street frontage.
CONCLUSION

The projects illustrated above for each of the Character Areas should be seen in the context of the overall strategic aims described in the previous chapter. In addition, the following chapter, ‘Streetscape’ provides further design guidelines for the implementation of these proposals. The strategy anticipates the implementation of these aims over a 10 year period and certain aspects of the proposals will clearly take priority over others. The following list provides an outline indication of the prioritisation of projects, although full details of costs, phasing and potential sources of funding will be described in a separate Implementation Plan. The actual order of implementation of projects will, however, depend to a large extent on availability of funding, the nature of development proposals and political decision making. All aims should be taken into consideration for any public or private investment decisions and objectives should be pursued as appropriate opportunities arise regardless of their priority:

High Priority:

- Strategic highways works including:
  - New road links
  - Realignment of one-way system
  - Associated junction improvements

- Environmental improvements to major road corridors, including:
  - Lighting
  - Paving
  - Tree planting & woodland management
  - Junction improvements
  - Signage

- Environmental improvements to Strand St-Tangier St. corridor

- Major new public spaces related to development sites

- Major public art commission at gateway junction from Loop Road

- Improvements and additions to network of footpaths and cyclepaths

- Streetscape improvements to strategic locations including:
  - Civic Hall frontage
  - Morrisons frontage
  - Duke St/King St junction
  - Square off Queen Street
  - George Street/Wellington Row junction
Medium Priority

- New public park ‘The Hanging Gardens’
- Improvements to existing parks and gardens
- New and improved access to parks and gardens
- New or replacement play and recreation areas
- Secondary public art and interpretation installations
- Footpath improvements to secondary footpaths (non-strategic)
- Signage & interpretation strategy

Low Priority

- Improvements to building frontages at key locations
- Redevelopment of poor quality sites
- Improved landscape management of secondary green spaces around town centre
- View points and viewing platforms
- Wider streetscape improvements to other areas of town centre and periphery
INTRODUCTION

As described in Chapter 3, a number of major new public spaces are proposed as central to the Town Centre Development Framework. This chapter provides an illustration of the proposed character and key design principles of the main new squares and green spaces as well as the relationship of surrounding development to these spaces. Details of development proposals for surrounding sites are provided within the Development Prospectus. The graphics are intended as an indication of the quality and character which should be pursued in these projects, rather than as prescriptive designs. The following chapter, ‘Streetscape’ provides more details of the approach to features and furnishings within these spaces.

BRANSTY GATE

- A major new gateway space is proposed at this historic point of arrival to the town, at the heart of a new leisure and cultural quarter, forming an access point to the promenade and harbour. Details of materials are provided in Chapter 6, Streetscape. The key characteristics and design principles are:
  - The public square should be defined by the frontages of surrounding buildings;
  - These buildings should provide active frontage facing onto the square and wherever possible, outdoor seating areas for cafes and bars, around the edges;
  - The square should be linked by a continuous paved surface to the promenade;
  - A good quality, direct pedestrian route should be provided linking the promenade to the transport interchange across the square;
  - The central space should include a high quality water feature as a focal point, surrounded by informal seating opportunities;
  - The square should be well lit to ensure it provides a safe and attractive night time focus of life.

Left  Bransky Gate. Birds eye view of proposed new gateway to Town Centre
Right  View from harbour
OLD BATHS SQUARE

A small public space is proposed at this key ‘hub’ linking The Strand, Tangier Street and Duke Street to the harbour and providing a focus of life and activity along the Millennium Promenade. A restored Old Baths building, converted to use as a café/bar is proposed as a central feature of the new space. Details of materials are provided in Chapter 6, Streetscape. The key characteristics and design principles are:

- New developments on the adjoining sites should provide retail and leisure opportunities at ground floor level facing onto the square to bring life and activity to the space;
- The vehicular access to Bulwark Quay should be maintained but integrated into a continuous shared paved surface for the space as a whole;
- The space should provide opportunities for outdoor café/bar seating and should also provide more informal seating around the fringes;
- The adjoining section of road should be raised and repaved as a shared surface area, allowing vehicular access but providing a clear pedestrian priority, with easy and direct links between The Duke Street/King Street junction to the harbour.
- The square should be well lit to ensure it provides a safe and attractive night time focus of life.
CHAPEL SQUARE

A small square should be created around the restored Chapel on Quay Street, to act as a focus for an extension of the town’s main shopping area on the site of the original fishing village. The square would be linked to a small network of pedestrian streets with shops and services at ground floor level, forming a link to The Beacon and south shore, as well as to the new Hanging Gardens and pedestrian routes up to the Haig Mining Museum and Kells area. Details of materials are provided in Chapter 6, Streetscape. The key characteristics and design principles are:

- Developments around the square should provide active shop frontages facing onto the central space;

- The square should be a pedestrian priority area with access strictly limited to service vehicles at specified times of day;

- The square should provide informal seating areas but these should avoid obstructing shop frontages;

- The adjoining pedestrian links to the harbour and Hanging Gardens should be designed as part of a coherent whole with the square;

- Reference should be made in the detailing or features to the history of the site as the original fishing village that predated modern, industrial Whitehaven;

- The square and pedestrian routes should be well lit.
ST. NICHOLAS SQUARE

A fourth new public space is proposed on the Lowther Street frontage of St Nicholas Gardens. The historic town centre lacks a focal point which is usually provided in historic towns by a civic square. The gardens, while an attractive and popular feature, do not currently provide this and occupy a very large area at the heart of the town. There is an opportunity to open up the front section of St Nicholas Gardens to create a more accessible and active public space around the church tower, whilst maintaining a very large garden area to the rear. Details of materials are provided in Chapter 6, Streetscape. The key characteristics and design principles are:

- The square should be predominantly a paved area with tree planting;
- The paved area should be open and accessible from three sides and separated from the gardens by a hedge or railing with gated access;
- The level difference between the road and the church surrounds provides an opportunity for stepped boundaries which will provide informal seating areas, although ramped access should be provided from pavement to square;
- The space should also provide opportunities for outdoor café seating;
- The space may also provide a good location for a major piece of public art related to a historical figure, such as the early Lowthers, or theme, such as mining or sea trade, which would provide a suitable sense of civic identity and dignity.
THE HANGING GARDENS

The walls and terraces of Mountpleasant are the remains of mining buildings and structures and terraced housing for workers, which once dominated the south shore of the harbour. Today, although overgrown and unkempt, the network of walls, steps, terraces and lawns is an impressive backdrop to the harbour and an important pedestrian link between the town centre and the Kells area. A new public park is proposed for this area, formed by a series of garden areas on different levels, linked by the network of footpaths and steps. This has the potential to be a very attractive and unusual feature of the town. Key elements of the proposed park should include:

- Improvements to existing steps and paths to provide a well surfaced, safe pedestrian network;

- Improved lighting to ensure the park is safe and attractive at all times;

- New seating and viewing areas at various levels, but in particular the upper lawn provides a stunning opportunity for a panoramic viewing platform (see Chapter 6);

- Planting on the different sections of terraces should provide a range of characters from a more formal, gardenesque style, using shrubs and herbs in the more accessible areas, to a more naturalistic style in the less accessible sections, including use of birch, gorse and pine planting to provide visual interest an contrast in views from the harbour;

- A high quality play area is proposed which should be seen as a feature in itself. This could be designed on a Gulliver’s travels theme to tie in with the aspirations to improve the Jonathan Swift House higher up on the hillside. This would present opportunities to incorporate giant furniture, historic maps, shipwrecks, islands and other related themes into the design of an exciting and visually original playground.

Right Potential layout of new park
Previous chapters have dealt with the overall strategic aims of the Development Framework and more detailed proposals for specific areas of the town. Streetscape refers to all the many elements which make up the quality of the streets themselves, from building frontages to benches and bins. A detailed assessment of the main components and quality of the Whitehaven streetscape is provided in the Baseline Study. This chapter aims to provide the basis of a coherent long term strategy for the adoption of materials and design principles for any development within the town centre over the next 10–20 years. The aim is to establish a consistent visual identity and high quality public realm, which will complement and reinforce the architectural character of the town.

Streetscape

6

The streetscape of Whitehaven town centre is of very mixed quality. In many areas, high quality materials have already been adopted or have been conserved from the past. The recent refurbishment of the harbour and pedestrianisation around the market and King Street area, have both been implemented to a high quality in recent years and remain largely in excellent condition. The harbour in particular demonstrates the effectiveness of well-chosen materials within a well-designed scheme in enhancing the physical environment. However, there are many examples of poor or non-existent design sense, of the use of poor quality materials, or of inadequate maintenance both within and around the periphery of the town centre. The wide range of materials used and inconsistent standard of maintenance creates a poor overall impression and reflects a lack of clear strategy or indeed of a clear sense of visual identity for the town centre.
KEY CONSIDERATIONS AND PRINCIPLES

A design strategy for streetscape and public realm must bear in mind a number of key factors which include the perceptions and usage of local residents as well as visitors, the durability of materials and designs, the capital cost of materials and their implementation, the revenue implications of maintaining the public realm, and the economic, environmental and social benefits of the investment. On this basis, the following design guidelines are based on a number of general principles:

- Base proposals on existing strengths: extend the good and replace the bad;
- Avoid clutter and an excess of variety. Aim for simplicity and consistency;
- Spend now to save later: robust materials may cost more in the short term but will save a great deal in the long term;
- Seek to reinforce the sense of place and to strengthen the legibility of both the town and its distinct ‘quarters’;
- Elements of streetscape should reflect the hierarchy of importance of the area they are in;
- Consider the context—materials should be sympathetic to existing or traditional materials in a historic setting.
- This is not to say that traditional materials cannot be used in a contemporary fashion or that contemporary materials are necessarily inappropriate to a historic setting;
- Use local materials and craftsmanship wherever possible;
- Consider the needs and right to access of all potential users.

OVERALL STRATEGY

The streetscape zoning plan illustrates the broad approach to the use of different palettes of materials. This approach simplifies the eight character areas into three distinct zones, based to a large degree on existing tendencies already operating within the town centre. A distinct palette of materials is proposed for each area, although there are elements which provide continuity across the three zones. The principal road network, including the main approach roads and the one-way system, is treated separately as a further category. The guiding principles for each of the zones and the road network are outlined below. This is followed by a series of more detailed recommendations for particular categories of materials.

1. Harbour and Surrounds The harbour itself has been recently transformed and the materials and design are generally of a very high quality. These materials have been successfully adopted and maintained to a high standard. The aim is to extend the harbour zone inland to the edges of the Georgian core, providing a stronger sense of approaching the harbourfront area. The realignment of the one-way system will enable the Strand-Tangier Street corridor to be converted into a far more pedestrian-friendly area. This road currently sits uneasily between the town centre and the harbour and combines elements of both. Redevelopment along this corridor should seek to achieve greater consistency with the harbour. The three new squares proposed as part of the redevelopment ‘clusters’ should also incorporate elements of the harbourfront streetscape, although their location, character and design will define distinctive characters for each.

2. Town Centre This area comprises both the Georgian Heart and Civic Quarters, which form the majority of the original grid-iron street pattern, but also a section of the High Street area, in acknowledgement of its consistency with the town centre. The area currently includes a very wide range of materials and treatments and the aim is to achieve a far greater consistency based on a number of existing precedents. The overall character will have a significant ‘heritage’ theme to it. The adoption of a high quality of design and materials—as well as a consistently high standard
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of maintenance—is crucial to reflect the significance of this area in architectural and urban design terms. Some of the main problems within this area are of clutter and confusion at a number of key locations. The simplification and rationalisation of materials in these areas will go a long way to achieving these aims.

3. The Periphery Beyond the harbour and the town centre are peripheral areas, where the quality of streetscape deteriorates significantly relative to the town centre and harbour. The lesser historical significance and architectural interest of most of these areas justifies the adoption of a lower quality of materials but there is no reason why more functional materials cannot be laid and maintained to a high standard. Again, consistency should be the aim, and the use of small design details throughout can lend a sense of continuity and again, emphasise the hierarchy within the town centre as a whole. The peripheral areas also include the majority of the main footpaths and greenspaces.

4. The Main Road Network The main approach roads and one-way system are treated as a separate category, on the basis that this will provide a sense of quality, coherence and recognisability for those arriving at the town from the outside and emphasises the hierarchy of importance of the main routes, improving legibility. The substantial redevelopment of large parts of the road network due to the realignment of the one-way system represents an opportunity to undertake extensive environmental improvements in association with the highways works.

DESIGN GUIDELINES

Paving and Surfacing

1. Harbour The harbour paving is of high quality and laid to a high standard. It consists largely of two contrasting types of natural stone paving: Flame finished ‘Green Moor’ Yorkstone in flags, blocks and strips, with bands of local red St Bees sandstone (P1/P2). The smaller block sizes are used in the more trafficked areas while the larger flags tend to emphasise the linear pedestrian routes. Along The Strand and Tangier Street, the long rectangular strips are used to define pavement edges (P3) and small granite setts to define vehicular accesses (P4). In places, irregular cobbles are used to define transitional areas (P5). This palette of paving materials is very effective and should be adopted throughout the harbour area. The use of varying sized blocks, flags and strips of ‘Green Moor’ with the St Bees red sandstone used to define borders and edges, provides flexibility and clear design principles, which can easily be adapted to a range of situations.

2. Town Centre There are a number of contrasting approaches within this area, reflecting its greater complexity. Traditionally, a combination of yorkstone flags with small granite setts in strips or bands has been widely used and is still in evidence (P6/P7). The recent alterations to Lowther Street have adopted a similar high quality material to the harbour paving, with some similarities in the detailing. Around the King Street and market area a combination of ‘Red Lazenby’ sandstone flags and tegula type block paving is a relatively recent introduction (P8/P9). Tegula paving is also used for bus and delivery lay-bys (P10). The three approaches reflect a clear hierarchy in the streets which reinforces their character well. The guidelines for this area propose the extension of these three main treatments in the following circumstances:

- Green Moor or a similar Yorkstone should be adopted throughout for flag paving on pavements of vehicular streets;
- Duke Street should emulate Lowther Street in its use of rectangular strips of Green Moor along kerb edges;
• On secondary roads, granite setts should be used in wide bands along kerb edges or at vehicular accesses;

• Pedestrianised streets should adopt a combination of Red Lazenby flags as the predominant material with Tegula blocks for the more heavily trafficked areas.

• Tegula should be used for parking strips, bus pull-in areas and servicing areas along road sides;

• Small public spaces should use smaller block sizes of Green Moor with bands of St Bees sandstone similar to the harbour area for definition;

• Footpaths and ginnels should be paved to the same quality with Green Moor flags and double strips of granite setts to mark edges.

• Car Parks should be surfaced in a hawarden red aggregate wearing course with tegula block paving to distinguish parking bays.

3. Periphery
Within these areas an asphalt with a Hawarden red aggregate wearing course should be used for footpaths, with a double strip of granite setts against the kerb edge along pavements. Main strategic footpaths and cycle paths should adopt the same approach. Granite setts should be used to mark vehicular accesses.

4. Main Road Network
No strong precedent exists within Whitehaven for the main road network. Currently all approach roads and one way system combine a range of generally poor quality, piecemeal treatments. In terms of paving, it is proposed to treat these roads in the same way as the rest of the zone within which they fall. It is the more prominent vertical elements that will establish the continuity and character of these routes to a greater extent. Within the town centre area the main roads should be treated similarly to Lowther Street and Duke Street.

Street Furnishings

1. Harbour
Around the harbour itself, most of the furnishings are of a high quality and, in the case of the ‘whaleback’ seats, beautifully designed (S1). The exception seems to be the litter bins, which appear to be an afterthought and do not match the general aesthetic adopted in the area (LB2). Along the Strand and Tangier Street the quality is far more mixed. Proposals:

• The same seat should be used throughout the Harbour Zone, and a backless, bench version commissioned from the same artist, employing the same materials.

• A new, more contemporary bin should be adopted, in a similar ‘gunmetal grey’ to the bollards and bench backs, such as that shown (LB3). It should side accessed, easily opened and emptied and with a fireproof interior.

• The traditional tapering, cylindrical bollard, with vertically grooved sides, should be used throughout this zone (B1).

• Although the fish design cycle stands (CS1) are an attractive feature they would be expensive to replicate. Additional cycle stands should be provided at appropriate locations, similar to that shown (CS2).

2. Town Centre
The furnishings in the town centre vary widely. The seats in King Street are of very good quality and have been installed relatively recently (S2). These ‘heritage’ benches are, however, not necessarily appropriate to the Whitehaven context, and tend to reinforce a rather old-fashioned image of the town. Elsewhere, very few benches are worthy of retention outside the St Nicholas and Trinity Gardens. A black, square section litter bin has been adopted consistently through most of the town centre (LB1). Although often placed poorly, these are practical, hard-wearing and not inappropriate. Bollards are very mixed, and include outdated timber and concrete varieties. The same style is used around the market as has been adopted for the harbour, and seems to have originated here. Otherwise, a simple and reasonably elegant black iron ‘heritage’ type bollard has been widely adopted (B2). Proposals:
• Retain the recent seating in King Street, for use exclusively along that road.

• Adopt a similar, sturdy style of seat, in a less fussy style, with cast iron stand and hardwood seating (from sustainably managed sources), for installation throughout the rest of the town centre (S3/S4). A matching bench should be adopted. These should only be installed in public spaces, parks and gardens within the town centre.

• Maintain the same litter bin but rationalise locations to avoid cluttering pavements and spaces.

• Adopt bollard B2 throughout the town centre and progressively replace all other types. The exception should be in the market square where type B1 has traditionally been used, and helps to link this area better back to the harbour and Quay Street shopping area.

• Cycle Stand CS2 should progressively be adopted and located within convenient spaces around the town to avoid cluttering pavements.
3. Periphery  Relatively few street furnishing are required outside the busier retail and service area of the town centre. A simple, but more contemporary style is proposed, with elements of continuity linking these areas to the rest of the town. Proposals:

- The same town centre seat and bench should be used (S3/S4)
- The same more contemporary litter bin as proposed in the harbour should be used here as well (LB3)
- A more contemporary bollard should be used (B3)
- Cycle Stands should be the same as throughout the rest of the town (CS2)

4. Main Road Network  As for The Periphery.
Lighting

1. Harbour The lighting is one of the most distinctive features of the harbour regeneration. Bespoke white lighting columns have been created which give a strong visual identity to the promenade. The same distinctive white lighting columns should be adopted throughout the harbour area (LC1). Within public spaces and squares, or smaller routes between the Strand and Promenade, where a lower lighting level may be required, a simple, cylindrical lighting column should be used to complement the main lighting standards (LC6).

2. Town Centre Again, this area is the most inconsistent in terms of existing installations. The heritage columns and lanterns installed throughout most of the main shopping area are recent and in good condition (LC2/LC3). These should be extended throughout the town centre area, with the taller columns emphasising the major roads while the smaller lanterns are used within the secondary roads and lanes, car parks and gardens.

3. Periphery A more contemporary style of column should be adopted throughout the roads within the peripheral areas (LC4). This should be available in two sizes and adapted to the highways requirements of the roads. The column and luminaire should be to adoptable standards. Along footpaths and within the main parks and greenspaces outside the town centre, a more contemporary lantern should be adopted and used consistently throughout (LC5). The main footpaths linking the town centre to the outer neighbourhoods in particular require improved lighting for security reasons.

4. Main Road Network Lighting can be one of the most distinguishing elements of the streetscape. The inconsistency and often poor condition of the lighting along the main approach roads and one way system give a very poor impression. A single, contemporary lighting standard is proposed for the whole main road network as for the remaining peripheral areas above (LC4).
Planting

This is one of the most inconsistent and poor quality elements of the Whitehaven streetscape. There are relatively few street trees in the town centre, but an abundance of planters of very varying quality, as illustrated below. In certain places these have been placed chaotically around any available space and contribute greatly to the cluttering of the streetscape and in some cases act as significant obstacles to pedestrians. Plants in planters require very intensive maintenance to remain healthy and attractive. The level of maintenance of most of the town centre planters is poor and in many cases, rather than contributing to the attractiveness of the streets they detract from it. Street trees in contrast, if carefully chosen and well-planted, are relatively easily maintained and minimise clutter. Proposals:

- Remove all temporary planters from town centre.
- Limit herbaceous and shrub planting to grassed areas or constructed planting beds.
- Improve the planting and maintenance of these beds.
- Carry out extensive planting of street trees where appropriate, in particular along main approach roads, the George Street frontage and The Strand-Tangier Street corridor.
- Recommended species include:
  - Alnus cordata (The Strand-Tangier Street)
  - Pinus nigra (harbour and surrounds)
  - Pyrus calleryana ‘Chanticleer’ (upright formal tree for narrower or residential roads)
  - Carpinus betulus ‘Fastigiata’ (similar to above)
  - Acer ‘Deborah’ (larger species for main road approaches)
  - Sorbus aria (medium size, round headed flowering species suitable for small open spaces, parks and gardens)

*Examples of poor use of planters within Whitehaven Town Centre*
Signage

Signage is a vital part of a town’s streetscape for visitors. It can also make a significant contribution to the image and legibility of a place. As in many towns, the wide range of signs in Whitehaven tends to contribute more to the overall clutter and confusion in the streetscape. Signage includes a wide range of elements of the streetscape, controlled by different authorities and therefore often subject to little co-ordination. The main categories which affect the streetscape include:

1. Highways signage, including directional signage, information signs and statutory signage;
2. Pedestrian wayfinding signs;
3. Interpretation and local information signs;
4. By-law signage.

These are dealt with by category rather than by zone.

1. Highways Signage

Major road signs in and around Whitehaven are often poorly placed and confusing. A much greater prominence should be given to the town in signage along the approach roads from the A66 and much clearer indications should be given to drivers at the main town centre junction from the A595. Within the town, there are numerous examples of signs in poor condition or locations, some of the worst examples of which are on the main approach roads, and a large sign which straddles the pavement at the turning from Morrison’s onto Lowther Street, blocking the first views to the town centre (S1). Proposals:

- This signage is outside the jurisdiction of the Local Authority but greater coordination is required between the County Council Highways section and the Local Authority to minimise the visual intrusion of signs and maximise their clarity.
- Greater rationalisation of their locations is also important to avoid excessive clutter and obstacles on pavements. A full audit should be carried out by the two authorities to establish the need for, and condition of, existing signs, and identify opportunities to move, replace or remove signs.

2. Pedestrian Signage & Interpretation

The pedestrian wayfinding signs within the town centre are of a generic ‘heritage’ style common to many town centres, but clear and in reasonably good condition. They too, however, are often combined with other elements of the streetscape to create very cluttered spaces (S2). The recently installed signs around the harbour are more distinctive and attractive, but are virtually illegible. Interpretation within the town, other than the more imaginative use of sculpture and art to convey historical information, is minimal and of poor quality. Proposals:

- Commission the design of a bespoke signage system incorporating wayfinding signs with orientational maps and interpretational information. A single system which supports a wide range of information, clearly communicated, will help minimise clutter throughout the streets and give people an
easily identifiable source of basic information. It should be used throughout the town in key public spaces, outside key buildings, and along footpaths and cyclepaths. This is one of the most effective means of creating a coherent and distinctive image for the town as a whole. This should aim to be distinctive and identifiable with Whitehaven. A contemporary image is not necessarily inappropriate in a historic context. A good recent example is Bristol, which has installed an award winning signage system in the last few years, used within its Georgian areas and around the historic docks with great success (S6).

3. By law signage This category includes universal messages, such as ‘Keep off the grass’ or ‘No skateboarding’ (S4/S5). These signs should be kept to a minimum and often reflect poor design or use of materials in the first place. Where absolutely necessary, opportunities to integrate signage into walls, railings or other structures should be taken in order to minimise the number of free-standing elements. Again, such signage should be part of an overall signage design strategy.
Play and Recreation

Provision of outdoor play and recreation facilities for children and young people in Whitehaven town centre is very poor. The two existing playgrounds are small and neglected (PG1/PG2) and the only facility for teenagers is a small, isolated skatepark, which is unsafe and ill equipped. Well-designed play equipment can fit in with historic settings, can provide an attractive feature and will help to enliven the town’s parks and gardens. The strategy proposes a number of new and improved play areas at strategic locations around the town centre, including a new skatepark in a more secure and central location. The location and design of these facilities will need to be carefully considered through consultation with local communities but suggested locations are:

- Castle Park: Improvements and extension of the existing play area and possible use as location for new skatepark (see below)

- The Playground: The redevelopment of this area may also include a skatepark and wider teenage recreation area that could also include climbing walls, BMX facilities and a kickabout all weather pitch. This location would be ideal if such uses are compatible with current requirements.

- St James’s Park (The Recreation Ground): Relocation and replacement of existing play facilities to enclosed garden on High Street. This play area should become a central feature of a more formal seating area which could also include shrub planting, seating and lighting.

- The Hanging Gardens: Provision of an exciting new playground on a Gulliver’s Travels theme. This play area should be seen as a feature of the park and part of the wider aim of interpreting the town’s historic themes in new ways.

- Trinity Gardens: Potential location for a small toddlers play area
Design and choice of equipment should consider the town’s historical context. The use of predominantly timber equipment and avoidance of bright, primary colours can ensure that playgrounds are discrete and well integrated into their surroundings. Informal play areas, comprising elements such as mounding, logs, stumps and tunnels can also provide popular facilities which do not require great expenditure and blend well with historic or parkland settings. Play equipment can also be designed into an area as an integrated part of its conception, providing unusual and imaginative visual features as well as a popular resource. The proposed play area within the Hanging Gardens could make use of brighter colours and bolder installations as part of the Gulliver’s Travels theme suggested for this space. See Chapter 5.

A recreation facility for teenagers is urgently required in Whitehaven as the town’s 14–18 year olds are poorly catered for and have a strong sense of frustration at the town’s apparent disregard for their needs. The existing skatepark is in an isolated location which is poorly maintained and insecure. A skatepark should be created in a more central location (see above) which is overlooked and can be properly maintained.

The images below illustrate some imaginative approaches to the design of these facilities.
Public Art

Public art is a broad term which includes wide range of features under its umbrella. Whitehaven already has many good examples of the use of public art which helps to tell stories and give the first time visitor a strong sense of place: sculpture (PA4), mosaics (PA1, PA2, PA12), ‘Whaletail’ benches (S1) and canons (PA5). This tradition should be built on and integrated into the design of all new public spaces in imaginative ways. It should not be seen simply as something to be tacked onto spaces but as an integral part of their design. As suggested above, play equipment can be designed as an ‘artistic’ feature and the design of public squares or parks should aim to be ‘artistic’, not simply to meet a series of functional requirements.

The town is rich in thematic material which could be exploited in the design of artwork, including:

**Maritime themes:** ships, sea, fish, sailors, trade and merchandise, compasses, winds, etc

**Topographical and natural features:** rivers, strata, stones, fossils, rare species, etc

**Industrial & economic activities:** mining, trade, railways, ship building, machinery, slavery, rope making, chemicals, nuclear fission

**Historical and fictional figures:** The Lowthers, Jonathan Swift, Gulliver, George Washington, John Paul Jones, miners, sailors, etc

Potential locations for specific sculptural or public art commissions are suggested here:

- A major landmark feature should be commissioned as a central focus of the main junction from the Loop Road into the town centre. The sketch impression on page 91 indicates the scale and boldness of design which would be required to create a strong and memorable statement at this main gateway;
Public art. Existing examples.
• A similar landmark sculpture may be considered at the new junction between Coach Road and The Ginns, although the preference would be for the building on this junction to be designed as an architectural landmark, which would remove the need for a separate artwork.

• Smaller sculptural features, potentially relating to local themes or personalities should be considered as focuses for a number of public spaces such as: St Nicholas’ Square, Castle Park, Queen Square and Trinity Gardens.

There are also a number of industrial ‘heritage’ objects within the town which in themselves provide interesting visual features and a sense of the town’s past (PA11). The use of reclaimed industrial materials and objects as features along major footpaths/cyclepaths has been successfully pioneered by Sustrans on their millennium cycle network. A similar approach is proposed along the stretches of the Cumbrian coastal path and Sea to Sea cycle routes within the town centre area, in particular the footpath leading up to the Kells area, as a means of reinforcing the industrial heritage attraction of this area and linking the town centre to the Haig mining museum.
Viewing Platforms

As part of the wider public art strategy it is proposed to create a number of sculptural viewing platforms at key locations on footpaths and hillsides around the town with panoramic views. Most of these viewpoints are also highly visible from the town below and these platforms will become landmark features in their own right. As part of the longer term strategy to attract more tourism to Whitehaven, it is proposed to create a number of sculptural viewing platforms which are eye-catching, landmark features in themselves, designed to see from and to be seen. They may also include interpretative information on key features within the views, and could also incorporate small cafes, ice cream vendors. Key locations proposed are:

- St James’s Park (The Recreation Ground)
- A suitable location along the Loop Road
- The Hanging Gardens
- A suitable viewpoint on the footpath to Kells, above Newtown
- The lighthouse at the tip of the outer harbour

The Panopticons competition held for a number of sites in Lancashire may provide a model for how such viewing platforms may be procured and good examples of what may be achieved.
TYPICAL ILLUSTRATIONS

The following section provides some illustrations of potential improvements to key locations. These are not intended to be finished designs but to illustrate the general feel and principles which should be adopted in these locations. The over-riding aim is to achieve simplicity, clarity and lack of clutter in the arrangement of streetscape elements. The use of high quality materials and holistic design of streets and spaces will pay dividends in terms of long-term maintenance and durability as well as in terms of establishing a benchmark for quality in the town which will set the tone for wider developments.
Sketch 1—The Strand

- better use of dead space to extend market towards harbour
- contemporary market stalls
- possible introduction of distinctive bus shelter design
Sketch 2—Civic Hall Frontage

• simplify streetscape to remove clutter

• permeable boundary between pavement and public space

• tree planting and seating within boundary strip
Sketch 3a—Morrison and Castle

- formal tree planting to street frontage to screen car park
Sketch 3b—Morrisons and Castle

- formal tree planting to street frontage to screen car park
Sketch 4a—Queen Street

- simplification of cluttered space
- greater formality
- simple, elegant square, both attractive and comfortable to use
- central commission may incorporate sculptural or water feature
Sketch 4b—Irish and Roper Street

- improve quality of important corner space
- central sculptural feature and seating
- formal tree planting to define space
Sketch 4c—Duke Street

- simplification of cluttered space
- rationalise location of elements
Sketch 5—Cycle Route

- enhancement of key, strategic leisure route
- widening
- removal of unsightly fences
- tree planting and lighting
- improved surfacing
Sketch 8—Main access to town centre

- major landmark feature
- bold sculptural form to mark access to town centre
TRANSPORT AND INFRASTRUCTURE

The Cumbria County Local Transport Plan 2006/2012, is the Policy document and the guidance below is intended to provide further specific guidance relating to the Town Centre of Whitehaven.

ROADS & TRAFFIC

Whitehaven’s one way system was conceived when the mining, chemical and other industries made significant use of the harbour and rail transport; minor amendments took place during the first phase of the Regeneration programme which created the pedestrian priority on King Street. The decline of industry based traffic means that there are few congestion problems in Whitehaven, though the A5094/Coach Road and the associated traffic signals at the Bridges Retail Park have been identified as a peak hour bottleneck and the further developments planned to the southern side of the town rely on improvements to this junction that is also ill suited to the significant pedestrian movements through this point.
The A595 Trunk Road, the principle route used by traffic accessing Whitehaven, bypasses the Town Centre on a high level route to the east, so most traffic within the town is either accessing or servicing, or is related to the housing areas surrounding the town centre. The existing one-way system takes southbound “through traffic” along George St./Church St./Duke St./Scotch St./Irish St. Northbound “through traffic” is routed along Lowther St./Strand St./Tangier St., thereby creating an obstacle to pedestrian movement, which has the effect of separating the town from the harbour. A central aim of the Development Framework is to redirect the one way system from this route and to substantially reduce traffic movement, transforming this corridor into a pedestrian priority zone. The Development Framework identifies five key sites from the proposed Transport Interchange south to the Irish St./Albion St. junction, which in themselves will generate significant increases in pedestrian movements as well as some servicing traffic. Specific proposals related to these aims include:

- The preferred means of achieving this would be by creating a new link from Newtown to Catherine Street, providing an alternative return route for the one-way system. This would have the additional advantage of improving permeability and pedestrian movement along this edge of the town centre, as well as opening up new development opportunities which would help to achieve the wider aims of improving this main access corridor.

- A less radical alternative to this proposal would involve making Irish St./Scotch St. two way between Swingpump Lane and Lowther Street. This would be easier to implement but would not allow re-routing of the C2C cyclepath along Howgill Street and would be likely to result in some peak time congestion and loss of on-street parking.

- Two way traffic on Scotch Street between Lowther Street and Duke Street and a section of Duke Street.

- Junction improvements at Irish St./Scotch St.; Lowther St./Scotch St.; Catherine St./Lowther St.; Irish St/Preston St./Albion St. and A5094/Coach Rd.

- Environmental improvements to the Strand/Tangier Street corridor to create a pedestrian priority zone between the harbour and town centre.

- Restrictions on Strand St./Tangier St. corridor to prevent use by through traffic.

There are options for the possible changes within the one-way system to achieve the key objective of removing through traffic from Strand Street and this is illustrated in Figure 7.1; with the likely traffic flow changes and prospective junction improvements on the other diagrams. The existing West Cumbria SATURN model has been used to evaluate the effects of changes to traffic flows through the town centre, on the basis of changes to the one way system to allow an alternative through route. TRICS data has been used to establish the likely flows to/from the proposed development sites, together with the proposals to extend the Multi-Storey Car Park and provide parking/servicing within the developments themselves.

Initial discussions with the Local Highway Authority, Cumbria County Council (CCC) and the Constabulary, resulted in a number of amendments to the circulatory system originally proposed, in particular to allow continued penetration to the central area for buses and to rationalise the operation of the minor roads within the one-way system. These are shown in Figure 7.1.

Other possible improvements to the road network include:

- An improved gateway announcement at the main access to the town centre from the A595 Loop Road with a new identifiable landmark feature on the approach, to emphasise the significance of this junction;

- Extensive environmental improvements to main access roads including improved lighting, signage, bus stops, paving and main junctions, to emphasise the hierarchy of routes within the centre and improve the town’s image.

- Realignment of the last section of Albion Street and creation of a new crossroads junction between Swingpump Lane/Albion Street/Irish Street to
improve access to/from the Kells area and to the Haig Mining Museum and Coastal Park.

- Realignment and extension of road network around Bransty Gate area, associated with redevelopment of Tesco and the new transport interchange.

The southern A5094 approach to the town, as already noted, has a key junction at Coach Rd. which is currently traffic signalled, but is proposed to be upgraded to deal with the developments in the Pow Beck Valley and to the south of the Town Centre.

Within the town, the standard of vehicular and pedestrian direction signing and consistency of highway treatment in terms of materials and street furniture is poor. In terms of the accessibility of the town, the efficiency with which visitors are directed to appropriate car parking areas and other effective driver information are essential tools to maintain the efficient operation of the highway network and to minimise unnecessary traffic circulation within the sensitive town centre area. In general developers will be expected to provide financial assistance to assist in achieving these aims commensurate with the scale of the development.

Environmental improvements covered elsewhere in this document impinge upon accessibility for pedestrians and cyclists. It is expected that a consistent standard of direction signing, lighting, surfacing elements and dropped kerbs should be maintained along the main movement corridors.

**TRANSPORT INTERCHANGE**

Bransty Row is an important arrival point to the town for many visitors and day-trippers, including many that arrive by train and the cycleway from the north. The harbour is hidden away at this point and the entire area presents a scene of dereliction, traffic chaos and parked cars. The existing rail station is a small functional building constructed in the 1980s, adjacent to a large supermarket and car park, which has recently been granted Planning Approval for redevelopment as a larger retail building with parking beneath. The nearby former bus station and vehicle workshops, offices and garage are now largely derelict and are unsuitable for reuse, in part due to their size and dilapidation. Some of the local buses access the supermarket car park, but the key Service 30 bus route only serves the Duke St (southbound) and Lowther St (northbound) bus stops that are a considerable distance from what potentially should be the key transport hub and the most welcoming entry point to the Town Centre. The Development Framework proposes a public square and hotel development, with the new supermarket relocated to the harbourside, North Shore road re-aligned and a passenger Transport Interchange adjacent to the rail station.

The former bus station and workshops, to the east of Bransty Row, are also proposed for redevelopment, incorporating the highly successful Bransty Arch public house, recently converted from the disused offices and will incorporate the public open space at the Bransty Row/Wellington St./George St. junctions. This will create a welcoming and impressive “first impression” of the town for visitors and a much more user-friendly public transport system and improved accessibility for pedestrians and cyclists.

**Public Transport Accessibility**

The existing bus services provide good coverage to the residential areas of the town and the surrounding area, with the majority of properties within a comfortable catchment of regular bus services serving the Town Centre during working hours, though the midibuses generally used are not fully accessible nor comfortable. The longer distance services provide a 16-hour service, daily along the west coast with links beyond, but this involves a change of bus from/to the local services that is currently done on street in Duke St (southbound) and Lowther St. (northbound), which results in some bus and passenger congestion. Currently only the local services to the south serve the harbour area, due to the lack of services stopping on Strand Street. It is intended that, with the revised one-way system and Transport Interchange, this situation will improve, possibly with buses routed via stops on Strand Street. Significant additional bus services are unlikely to be viable and improvements will probably be limited to some evening and Sunday services and the quality of the vehicles themselves. However the Local Transport Plan envisages Whitehaven as a key
rail hub, with improvements to the service frequency southbound to Millom and a possible extension of Bus Route 30 to Seascale station, another rail interchange point. Shelters, seating and real time information systems should be provided at key boarding bus stops in the Town Centre.

**PEDESTRIAN ACCESSIBILITY**

Most of Whitehaven’s residential areas surrounding the Town Centre are poorly connected due to the surrounding hillsides, though the distances are not great. In the case of Corkicle/Mirehouse the route is level along the cyclepath, but this suffers from no defined route in the Town Centre; generally the quality of link footpaths is poor, and there are traffic barriers at a number of key road junctions. The “off road” routes are generally in a poor state of repair, unsigned, suffer from urban dereliction and are overgrown in woodland areas; these are not only important for residents but potentially offer a fantastic resource for visitors and tourists, providing many stunning vantage points over the harbour and town. A number of improvements are proposed to the footpath network including:

- Improved surfacing, lighting, signage and maintenance along all the main strategic footpath routes shown;
- Creation of a defined cyclepath link from Coach Rd. to the Wagonway, to the north of the rail station to improve pedestrian/cycle links through the Town;
- New and improved signage (and possibly tourist map leaflets) to help orientation around the town centre and surrounding areas;
- Provision of access for the less able bodied and wheelchair users wherever possible;
- New and high quality seating/resting areas along the footpath network;
- Use of public art to provide historical interpretation and visual interest at strategic points, in particular at key viewpoints.

As described above these improvements, which apply principally to the quality of environment for pedestrians, should ensure that the principal corridors of pedestrian movement into and within the town centre area are maintained with a high level of accessibility. The emphasis should be to remove existing deterrents and barriers to pedestrian movement and encourage greater use of these links.

**CYCLING**

Whitehaven is one of two starting point for the Sea to Sea cycle route (C2C). Cycling is one of the fastest growing leisure pursuits in the country and the route attracts 15,000 users annually. This is a potentially fantastic opportunity for the town to improve its image and attract more visitors. However, most of these visitors arrive and leave almost immediately, and the route takes them out along Swingpump Lane and Newtown, one of the busiest sections of road and one of the most rundown edges of the town centre. Currently there is no provision for secure long stay vehicle parking for support vehicles or cycles. The C2C has an alternative end point at Workington that is currently being upgraded. Whitehaven also lies on the Hadrian Trail, currently being developed from Ravenglass to the North East. Which enters along the same southern corridor and leaves northwards, behind the rail station, an area also in need of upgrading. All in all this presents a face of Whitehaven that is hardly likely to attract them to stop within the Town, nor come back for another visit. Cycling is also potentially an excellent way to improve links between the town centre and its outlying communities, as the existing “off road” network extends towards Cleator Moor and Ennerdale to the east, Workington to the north and eventually Ravenglass in the south. There is an opportunity to be realised for the town and wider district to build on the success of the millennium cycle network and promote a healthy, sustainable form of transport.

Proposals include:

- Possible realignment of the C2C, to avoid Swingpump Lane/Newtown and use the proposed link through the Playground to provide a much
more attractive route; and a clear route through the harbour to the rail station and beyond.

- In addition, cycle paths should be introduced on main access footpaths and key roads, to create a network of safe, cycle friendly routes to promote the use of the bike around the town as a whole.

- New facilities for cyclists including shower/toilet/washing facilities, bike and equipment hire, food and secure bike storage, should be provided at the Transport Interchange; with long stay vehicle parking, possibly at the South or North shore. Good quality cycle stands should be provided at strategic locations.

**CAR PARKING**

Town Centre car parking is currently focused on the multi–storey and two surface car parks accessed from Swingpump Lane. The public car parks have a vital function within the town centre and retention of the overall provision is recommended. The surface car parks in particular are generally well used. To some extent the Morrison, Aldi/Iceland and Tesco car parks also cater for many shoppers, who also shop in the town as part of a trip to the supermarkets.

A need for additional parking to serve existing business uses within the town has been identified through the consultation process. In order to serve this and the further expansion proposed, the proposals include additional parking attached to the existing multi-storey car park on Swingpump Lane which could be segregated from the existing parking within the building. This could potentially be accessed from Albion St./Rosemary Lane and be restricted business/residents (contract) parking.

Additionally, a lack of parking for residential properties within the Town Centre, has been identified, the proposed changes to the traffic circulation system have been developed with the possible provision of additional on-street parking on sections of Irish Street and potentially also Scotch Street in mind. The current “on street parking” is Time Restricted to 1hour with residents exempt, Monday to Saturday 8am to 6:30pm.

Any further significant residential developments will be required to either provide appropriate levels within the development, or contribute to communal parking, such as the extension to the Multi-Storey already referred to. Appropriate levels of additional parking provision associated with the redevelopment of individual sites within the town centre are incorporated within the development briefs.
REDEVELOPMENT AREAS

The likely traffic increases associated with the redevelopment of the various Key Sites, has been evaluated to determine whether amendments/improvements to the local highway network will be required. This includes consideration of the redevelopment of the Tesco store, for which planning approval has recently been granted. The assessments have been carried out for the busiest time periods only, i.e. the morning and evening peak hours.

The levels of traffic projected to arise from each of the redevelopment proposals identified within the study area during the morning and evening peak periods are detailed below:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Comments</th>
<th>GFA (sqm)/ Hhlds/ Hect</th>
<th>TRICS Class</th>
<th>Trip Rate</th>
<th>TRIPS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ARR</td>
<td>DEP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Branstey Gate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tesco</td>
<td>Existing 3716 sqm total proposed - 7998 sqm</td>
<td>4182</td>
<td>Retail - Food Superstore</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>1.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotel A3/Leisure</td>
<td></td>
<td>1800sqm</td>
<td>Hotel, Food and Drink - Hotels</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotel Accommodation</td>
<td></td>
<td>1605sqm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport Interchange</td>
<td>Ticketing/Info Centre, Bus and Taxi parking, public toilets</td>
<td>929</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus Station Site</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Arts/Youth/Cultural,</td>
<td>7435</td>
<td>Leisure - Art Galleries/ Museums/ Exhibitions</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential/Studios/ Workshops</td>
<td></td>
<td>1675</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SUBTOTAL</td>
<td>151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulwark Quay</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harbour Commissioners Building</td>
<td>B1 – Commercial</td>
<td>1858</td>
<td>Employment - Office</td>
<td>1.41</td>
<td>0.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark House Site</td>
<td></td>
<td>929</td>
<td>Retail - Mixed Shopping Malls</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>0.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Residential (2137sqm)</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Residential - Flats Privately Owned</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A1/A3 Retail at ground floor</td>
<td>1160</td>
<td>Retail - Mixed Shopping Malls</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>0.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old Baths Conversion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Leisure - Cafe/Bar (assume no car trips generated)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SUBTOTAL</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swingpump Lane</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi store</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Retail extension</td>
<td>4645</td>
<td>Retail - Mixed Shopping Malls</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>0.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Car park extension (dedicated for existing business use - no net change)</td>
<td>250 spaces</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Retail (niche)</td>
<td>4413</td>
<td>Retail - Mixed Shopping Malls</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>0.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quay Street South</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Live-Work (above niche retail units)</td>
<td>789</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Residential, Block 1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Residential - Flats Privately Owned</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quay Street North</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Leisure /A3/Brewery</td>
<td>1347</td>
<td>Hotel, Food and Drink - Restaurant/Pub</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Residential Block 2</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>Residential - Flats Privately Owned</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SUBTOTAL</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newtown/ Preston Street</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sites South of Road</td>
<td>Student Accommodation</td>
<td>5575</td>
<td>Residential - Student Accommodation</td>
<td>5.83</td>
<td>4.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sites Around Catherine Street Extension</td>
<td>B1 Commercial/Live-work (Development site not within current strategy)</td>
<td>3251</td>
<td>Employment - Office</td>
<td>1.41</td>
<td>0.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilkinson's Site</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SUBTOTAL</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B1 Commercial/Live-work</td>
<td>1486</td>
<td>Employment - Office</td>
<td>1.41</td>
<td>0.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Residential (units)</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>Residential - Flats Privately Owned</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SUBTOTAL</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aida</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Retail</td>
<td>6735</td>
<td>Retail - Food Superstore</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>1.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>Residential - Flats Privately Owned</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SUBTOTAL</td>
<td>225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Comments</td>
<td>GFA (sqm)/ Hilde/ Hect</td>
<td>TRICS Class</td>
<td>Trip Rate</td>
<td>Trips</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bransby Gate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ARR DEP</td>
<td>ARR DEP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tesco</td>
<td>Existing 3716 sqm total proposed - 7698 sqm</td>
<td>4182</td>
<td>Retail - Food Superstore</td>
<td>6.75 6.85</td>
<td>282 286</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotel A3/Leisure</td>
<td></td>
<td>1800sqm</td>
<td>Hotel, Food and Drink - Hotels</td>
<td>0.53 0.32</td>
<td>18 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotel Accommodation</td>
<td></td>
<td>1605sqm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport Interchange</td>
<td>Ticketing/Info Centre, Bus and Taxi parking, public toilets</td>
<td>920</td>
<td></td>
<td>- - - -</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus Station Site</td>
<td>Arts/Youth/Cultural,</td>
<td>7435</td>
<td>Leisure - Art Galleries/ Museums/ Exhibitions</td>
<td>0.03 0.24</td>
<td>2 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential/Workshops</td>
<td></td>
<td>1675</td>
<td></td>
<td>NA NA NA NA NA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SUBTOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>303 315</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulwark Quay</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harbour Commissioners Building</td>
<td>B1 – Commercial</td>
<td>1858</td>
<td>Employment - Office</td>
<td>0.23 1.02</td>
<td>4 19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark House Site</td>
<td>Retail/Leisure (ground floor)</td>
<td>929</td>
<td>Retail - Mixed Shopping Malls</td>
<td>1.44 1.64</td>
<td>13 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A1/A3 Retail at</td>
<td>Residential (2137sqm)</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Residential - Flats Privately Owned</td>
<td>0.21 0.09</td>
<td>6 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old Baths Conversion</td>
<td>Leisure - Cafe/Bar (assumed no car trips generated)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>NA NA NA NA NA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SUBTOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>41 60</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swingpump Lane</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi storey</td>
<td>Retail extension</td>
<td>4645</td>
<td>Retail - Mixed Shopping Malls</td>
<td>1.44 1.84</td>
<td>67 85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quay Street North</td>
<td>Car park extension (dedicated for existing business use – no net change)</td>
<td>250 spaces</td>
<td></td>
<td>- - - -</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quay Street South</td>
<td>Retail (niche)</td>
<td>4413</td>
<td>Retail - Mixed Shopping Malls</td>
<td>1.44 1.84</td>
<td>64 81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Live-Work (above niche retail units)</td>
<td>789</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td></td>
<td>NA NA NA NA NA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential, Block 1</td>
<td>Residential - Flats Privately Owned</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.21 0.09</td>
<td>3 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quay Street North</td>
<td>Leisure /A3/Brewery</td>
<td>1347</td>
<td>Hotel, Food and Drink - Restaurant/Pub</td>
<td>3.39 2.53</td>
<td>46 34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential Block 2</td>
<td>Residential - Flats Privately Owned</td>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.21 0.09</td>
<td>7 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SUBTOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>186 205</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newtown/Preston Street</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sites South of Road</td>
<td>Student Accommodation</td>
<td>5575</td>
<td>Residential - Student Accommodation</td>
<td>5.83 5.34</td>
<td>3 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sites Around Catherine Street Extension</td>
<td>B1 Commercial/Live-work (Development site not within current strategy)</td>
<td>3251</td>
<td>Employment - Office</td>
<td>0.23 1.02</td>
<td>7 33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilkinson’s Site</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1 Commercial/Live-work</td>
<td></td>
<td>1486</td>
<td>Employment - Office</td>
<td>0.23 1.02</td>
<td>3 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential (units)</td>
<td>Residential - Flats Privately Owned</td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.21 0.09</td>
<td>13 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SUBTOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>16 21</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asda</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail</td>
<td></td>
<td>6735</td>
<td>Retail - Food Superstore</td>
<td>6.75 6.65</td>
<td>455 461</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential</td>
<td></td>
<td>60</td>
<td>Residential - Flats Privately Owned</td>
<td>0.21 0.09</td>
<td>12.6 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SUBTOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>467 467</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In assessing the impact of traffic associated with the redevelopments allowance has been made for the fact that some of the trips attracted to the redeveloped sites will be trips already made by existing visitors to the town centre. To account for this, a 50% reduction has been applied to the amount of additional traffic generated by the leisure and retail proposals.

A further adjustment has been applied to employment proposals which include live/work elements, as the trip generation rates used in the above tables are derived from traditional office employment uses. Again, a 50% reduction has been applied to the trips shown in the tables above for these uses in undertaking the assessment of traffic impact.

The trips have been applied to the local highway network on the basis of the following distribution:

- North from Bransty New Road 30%
- East from Flatt Walks 30%
- South from New Town 30%
- West from Albion Street / Rosemary Lane 10%

In the case of the two supermarkets (Tesco and Asda) an adjustment has been made to the traffic distributions to take account of the greater likelihood of visitors from the north using Tesco and from the south using Asda.

The traffic increases projected as a result of the redevelopment proposals are shown in Figures 7.6 – 7.9.

The impact of traffic associated with the redevelopment proposals has been assessed at the key junctions within the revised “one way” circulatory system. The assessments show that additional junction improvement works over and above the minimum required to achieve the changes to traffic circulation outlined above will be required at the following locations:

- Scotch Street / Lowther Street

A possible further improvement scheme at this location is shown in Figure 7.12.

However, the reconfiguration of the “one way” system itself creates a rationalised system of traffic flow contributing to network capacity enhancement and enabling the additional traffic associated with redevelopment to be accommodated. Without the broader network changes it is likely that individual redevelopments would require piecemeal improvement of the local highway network if considered in isolation.

On this basis it is considered that a mechanism will need to be established to secure proportionate contributions from individual developers to the changes proposed to the local highway network, or for this work to be progressed in advance as part of the “pump priming” needed to progress development of marginal sites.

In the case of the Tesco redevelopment, provisional planning approval has been granted whilst this assessment work has been underway (though an approach has been made to the developers proposing a reconfiguration of the Site Layout) and it is recommended that conditions related to funding for transport network improvements should be considered to fund improvements consistent with the overall objectives of Key Sites 1, 2 & 3.
Figure X.8
Whitehaven Town Centre
Amended Traffic Management Improvements

This drawing is reproduced with the consent of the Ordnance Survey under Licence No. AL100018327
INTRODUCTION

Ultimately, the success of the Town Centre Development Framework will be measured by the scale and quality of investment it is able to deliver to Whitehaven. From a public sector perspective we need to be clear about the best way to organise people and resources to enable and facilitate the delivery of development.

Like many towns in need of regeneration the creation of attractive visions and designs is the part of the development process that is the easiest to achieve. Primarily, this is because all of the component elements are more or less within the span of control of the clients and their paid advisors. Realising these visions is of course much more challenging as by definition towns such as Whitehaven have attained a market equilibrium in which the potential returns on investments constrain development.

Although creating an exciting vision based on realistic developments is clearly an important component of the regeneration process, it will not be enough in itself to alter established patterns of investment and investor confidence. This is particularly true in Whitehaven where there is a general distrust of the public bodies and their ability to deliver a positive process of change.

CHALLENGES

In Whitehaven there are four main challenges:

I. To establish a focal point and champion for the Regeneration of Whitehaven that can strategically drive forward development in the town

II. To achieve a much greater level of coherence and coordination between statutory public services in
particular planning, transport and management of the public realm

III. To use the Town Centre Development Framework and other regeneration plans for the town to create commercial property solutions with land owners, investors and developers that create the necessary critical mass to lift values and embody a relationship to public realm and access investment

IV. To undertake detailed financial planning in respect of proposed development schemes and act as an investment interface between private finance and public sector gap funding and investment where applicable.

All four of these challenges must be met if progress is to be achieved. The consensus emerging from discussions about delivery between partners to date in Whitehaven suggests that while solutions can be found to points I and II, they are necessary, but not sufficient, to achieve III. and IV.

3. Engaging the Market

Identifying roles
Both existing site owners and external developers will need to be persuaded that the combination of public commitment, investment and development momentum created by the Town Centre Development Framework and other site based regeneration proposals will outweigh the assessment of risk and likely returns given current and known market conditions. Investors will need to be convinced that a ‘value added investment’ offers a sufficiently commercial proposition with the realistic potential of rising values and returns over the medium term. Achieving this will require much more than better marketing of the available opportunities, important though this is.

The public sector bodies need to be organised to be ‘investment friendly’ to provide a streamlined and coherent response that encourages development and positive investment decisions.

Context
In developing an appropriate structure to deliver the Whitehaven Town Centre Development Framework and Whitehaven Regeneration Programme, consideration must be given to the wider context of regeneration delivery in West Cumbria. It is likely that appropriate resources will be available within WLR to provide extra project management support for Housing Market Renewal and wider regeneration delivery in West Cumbria. It is envisaged that the proposed Whitehaven structure, outlined opposite, will become part of that WLR delivery resource. This team would work to the strategic direction provided by the Whitehaven Regeneration Programme Steering Group and implement the various recommendations within, in the first instance, the Town Centre Development Framework as well as subsequent studies. An ‘Implementation Plan’ is currently being developed which will set the foundations for and guide the work of the delivery body.

Structure
A management structure for the public sector bodies has been agreed as a delivery mechanism for the wider Whitehaven Regeneration Programme, of which the Town Centre Development Framework is the major element. This will require dedicated resource to ensure its successful delivery. None of the partners are able to bring sufficient resource, expertise and focus from within existing structures. It is therefore proposed to integrate the contributions of the key partners and their legislative responsibilities to provide the required capacity within a new team structure. As well as providing technical support for the programme, the team, particularly its manager, will provide leadership to the programme to drive forward its delivery.

The Whitehaven Delivery Team will be based on both permanent and seconded staff from the relevant partners, as follows:
Whitehaven TC Regeneration Delivery Framework

**Whitehaven Regeneration Steering Group**
CCC/CBC/WLR/CH/EP/LRT
- Overall Programme champion
- Co-ordinates Projects
- Monitors Implementation Plan
- Drives Delivery
- Secures Commitment

**Whitehaven TC Task Group**
CCC/CBC/WLR
- Agrees project plan and priorities
- Accountable for delivery
- Supports consultation and feedback
- Manages expectations
- Promotes publicity on projects

**Whitehaven TC Project Manager**
Project Champion
- Project and risk management plans
- Monitors, manages and reports progress
- Drives delivery

**Development Team**
1 FTE plus nominated officers
- Highways
- Planning
- Regeneration
- Building Control
- Environmental Health
- Team works collectively on the delivery of projects providing contact and advice points

**Whitehaven TC Management Group**
Traders & CBC Reps
Town Centre Manager Fte
- Supports & promotes town centre
- Liaison with traders
- BID development
- Marketing & PR

**Whitehaven Events Group**
Volunteers, Traders with CBC support
Events Support Officer Fte
- Develop, supports and promotes events/festivals
- Sets events programme
- Marketing & PR

**Professional and specialist Advisers**
- Technical
- Retail
- Marketing

**Administrative Support**
- Copeland BC

**Financial and Legal Advice and Support**
Copeland Borough Council
The new delivery structure would be based on the following:

1. The establishment of a Delivery Team to initially drive forward and implement the Town Centre Development Framework and ultimately deliver the Pow Beck Valley and Coastal Fringe programmes. The Delivery Team would be charged with the implementation of an agreed Action Plan of projects, ratified by all key partners. The principle of the delivery team has been agreed. The detailed roles and responsibilities will be clarified following the completion of the implementation plan.

2. A net increase in the delivery capacity for Whitehaven with a partnership approach to committing resources from key partners.

3. Secondees, employed by their host agency will work as part of a team to provide greater project management capacity for capital projects and increased resources for marketing and events.

4. Statutory functions will be resourced through the identification of dedicated individuals within the Borough and County Council who will be made available as required to work as part of the Delivery Team.

5. Close collaboration between key partners through a Delivery Management Group (DMG) established with representatives of all partners from the WRP Steering Group who are contributing staff resource to the Delivery Team. The DMG would meet on a bi-monthly basis to ensure the effectiveness of the ‘corporate’ integrated delivery approach and would operate under a Memorandum of Agreement.

6. The commission of an external commercial property consultancy for the first 12—18 months to secure private developer interest in key development sites and advise the WRP Steering Group as appropriate. It is recommended that a mechanism is agreed to secure this service on a ‘payment by results’ basis and that the commission is evaluated mid-way through the contract and at termination. It may be that at the expiry of this commission, the Delivery Team will need to be complemented by a new post-holder who would be a Development Manager with the skills and experience to replace the need for a consultancy service.

**Engaging the market**

Engaging the market to secure investment in the form and scale desired in Whitehaven will require an innovative approach that plays to the inherent strengths of the parties involved. Our view is that the role of engaging the market is not best suited to the public sector partners and their strengths relate much better to the strategic management of the process and its interface with statutory decision-making. The motivations and incentives of the public sector team are inherently different from the private sector and there remains an underlying wariness about the fine line between statutory process and the need to actively support development. This can be further complicated with the realities of local political concerns.

The alternative approach is to ‘contract out’ this part of the delivery programme to an external professional team. The relationship would create a degree of professional distance between both statutory processes and the strategic use of gap funding investment and the detailed negotiation of development proposals. It also allows an alternative interface for landowners and developers to dealing directly with public sector bodies.

The contracting out option should be ‘incentivised’ as far as possible with a payment structure that, beyond a basic fee, rewards successful progress through the key stages of the development process with bonus payments related to the value of investments as a proxy for the development quality. As developments progress there will also be the opportunity to incorporate the associated fees for the external professional team into the development costs.

A close relationship between the contracted team and the public sector team would be essential to manage the programme both strategically and operationally against an agreed development programme and priority development sites.

The contracted team would need to be able to demonstrate a sound understanding of the commercial property market and the experience to develop innovative design legal and financial solutions. This
would include, for example exploring the potential to use strategic finance that might look to take an equity stake in multiple development schemes provide a mechanism for wider sharing of risk.

**Prioritisation**

The Town Centre Development Framework presents a long-term vision for Whitehaven. In practice, choices will need to be made about which sites and areas are a priority for public sector investment based on the level of resources available to the local partners.

The choice of priority sites are also selected as those that are most likely to work with private sector investment, reinforcing and enabling the scale and quality of investment required. Decisions on investment in improvements to the public realm will clearly require a hard headed assessment of the benefits in terms of improving investor confidence against the longer term maintenance requirements and costs. Wherever possible partners should seek creative solutions to these issues which may involve the private sector in maintenance agreements. Similarly, the issue of business relocation—temporary as well as permanent—may prove an important factor in the viability and prioritisation of development decisions.

The tables in annex 1 set out the proposed priorities for further detailed development and for any public capital investment. Future commitment to any scheme will be reliant on the detail of any proposals.

Bransty Gate and Bulwark Quay emerge as having the greatest priority. There is the opportunity to harness the impact of the proposed Tesco store expansion as a catalyst for further development. This will help create the necessary critical mass of investment to further boost confidence in the town.

**Outline Costs**

Annex 1 sets out the indicative capital and maintenance costs for the components of the Development Framework that require public investment. The figures shown are for broad planning purposes only and will require detailed planning and professional input at the appropriate time. The initial tables show a summary of headline costs by category and by three broad phases of implementation. These are followed by a more detailed breakdown of each category which describes the main elements and assumed rates. Key agencies involved in the implementation have been identified and linkages between projects highlighted. Notes clarify key assumptions behind calculation of costs where relevant.
# Annex 1 Public Realm Costs

## Summary of Capital Costs: Public Realm Works

| All projects                  | £ |  
|-------------------------------|---|---
| Public Squares                | 2,079,000  
| Secondary Spaces              | 695,000    
| Parks & Gardens               | 1,175,000  
| Secondary Greenspace          | 674,000    
| Footpaths/Cyclepaths         | 475,375    
| Streetscape Improvements     | 1,952,500  
| Public Art & Interpretation  | 600,000    
| Signage                      | 590,000    
| Play & Recreation            | 400,000    
| Transport                    | 730,000    
| **Total**                    | **£8,675,875**  

## Not included:
- Business relocation costs
- CPO’s
- Highways works other than costs of proposals included in transport strategy
- Utilities
- Remediation works
- Professional fees

## Summary of Capital Costs

### High Priority Projects: Years 1-3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>£</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Public Squares</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Brandy Gate                    | 625,000    
| Old Bath Square                | 580,000    
| **Total**                      | **£1,205,000**  
| **Secondary Squares**          |   |
| Swingpump/Ribbon St            | 100,000    
| George St/Wellington Row       | 200,000    
| Civic Hall Frontage            | 200,000    
| Duke Street/King Street Junction | 300,000  
| **Total**                      | **£900,000**  
| **Parks & Gardens**            |   |
| No Projects                    | 0  
| **Secondary Greenspace**       |   |
| Brandy Approach                | 350,000    
| North Shore Slopes             | 500,000    
| **Total**                      | **£850,000**  
| **Footpaths/Cyclepaths**       |   |
| C3C Improvements               | 775,000    
| **Total**                      | **£775,000**  
| **Streetscape Improvements**   |   |
| One way systems                | 680,000    
| Strand/Tangier Street          | 200,000    
| Swingpump Lane                 | 52,000     
| **Total**                      | **£932,000**  
| **Public Art & Interpretation**|   |
| Major Landmark Installations   | 100,000    
| **Total**                      | **£100,000**  
| **Signage**                    |   |
| Signage audit                  | 5,000      
| **Total**                      | **£5,000**  
| **Play & Recreation**          |   |
| No Projects                    | 0  
| **Transport**                  |   |
| One-way system improvements *  | 345,000    
| VMS and other vehicular signage| 100,000    
| Strand St improvements         | 35,000     
| **Total**                      | **£345,000**  

**Total** **£3,499,500**
### Summary of Capital Costs

#### Medium Priority Projects: Years 4-6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public Squares</td>
<td>£340,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapel Square &amp; Surrounds</td>
<td>£750,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary Spaces</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morrison’s Frontage</td>
<td>£15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks &amp; Gardens</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Hanging Gardens</td>
<td>£500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Castle Park Improvements</td>
<td>£375,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary Greenspace</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Shore Slopes</td>
<td>£50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Shore</td>
<td>£50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newtown Slopes</td>
<td>£50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Footpaths/Cyclepaths</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kells Footpath</td>
<td>£41,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Castle Park Footpath</td>
<td>£75,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Branchy Approach footpaths</td>
<td>£22,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town Centre Footpaths</td>
<td>£7,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preston St-Flat Walks</td>
<td>£36,625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Streetscape Improvements</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Approach Road</td>
<td>£1,005,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Art &amp; Interpretation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary Sculptural Installations</td>
<td>£50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signage</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signage design &amp; strategy</td>
<td>£25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Install pedestrian wayfinding &amp;</td>
<td>£50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>interpretive signs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Play &amp; Recreation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toddlers Play Area</td>
<td>£25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children’s Playgrounds</td>
<td>£225,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skatepark/BBX facility</td>
<td>£190,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport Interchange</td>
<td>£350,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>£4,093,375</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Low Priority Projects: Years 7-9

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public Squares</td>
<td>£0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary Spaces</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queen Square</td>
<td>£150,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Street/High Street</td>
<td>£75,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks &amp; Gardens</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St James’s Park</td>
<td>£250,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St James’s Churchyard</td>
<td>£50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary Greenspace</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Shore</td>
<td>£24,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Shore</td>
<td>£50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newtown Slopes</td>
<td>£50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Footpaths/Cyclepaths</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Shore Promenade</td>
<td>£165,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cumbrian Coastal Path</td>
<td>£50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Streetscape Improvements</td>
<td>£0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Art &amp; Interpretation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art Trails</td>
<td>£75,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feature Illumination</td>
<td>£50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reception</td>
<td>£125,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signage</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Install by law signage</td>
<td>£15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Play &amp; Recreation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No projects</td>
<td>£0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Projects</td>
<td>£0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>£1,124,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

The information is extracted from an unspecified document and is presented in a tabular format for clarity and easier readability.
### Major Public Squares

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Linked to</th>
<th>Main elements</th>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Key Agencies</th>
<th>Funding sources</th>
<th>Area (m2)</th>
<th>Rate £/m2</th>
<th>Cost (£)</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Trinity Gate</td>
<td>Tesco</td>
<td>Hard landscape</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Cambria Highways</td>
<td>W3M</td>
<td>2500</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>625,000</td>
<td>Coordination with adjacent developments important to avoid additional costs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bus Station</td>
<td>Lighting</td>
<td>W3M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bus Depot</td>
<td>Water feature</td>
<td>WLR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Highways improvements</td>
<td>Seating &amp; Furnishing</td>
<td>CBC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Tree planting</td>
<td>Tesco</td>
<td></td>
<td>Utilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old Baths Square</td>
<td>Marsh House</td>
<td>Hard landscape</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>W3M</td>
<td></td>
<td>1500</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>330,000</td>
<td>Coordination with adjacent developments important to avoid additional costs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Harbour Commissioners</td>
<td>Lighting</td>
<td>WLR</td>
<td>CBC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Strand improvements</td>
<td>Seating &amp; Furnishing</td>
<td>CBC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Planting</td>
<td>Utilities</td>
<td>Private Developers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapel Square &amp; Surrounds</td>
<td>Quay Street Development</td>
<td>Hard landscape</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>W3M</td>
<td></td>
<td>3000</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>750,000</td>
<td>Relocation of existing businesses not included</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Multi Storey Redevelopment</td>
<td>Lighting</td>
<td>WLR</td>
<td>CBC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Water feature</td>
<td>CBC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Seating &amp; Furnishing</td>
<td>Utilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Planting</td>
<td>Private Developers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Nicholas Square</td>
<td></td>
<td>Hard landscape</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Church Commissioners</td>
<td></td>
<td>1700</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>374,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lighting</td>
<td>WLR</td>
<td>CBC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Seating &amp; Furnishing</td>
<td>CBC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Planting</td>
<td>Private Developers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sub-total** 2,079,000

### Secondary Public Spaces

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Links to other projects</th>
<th>Main elements</th>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Key Agencies</th>
<th>Funding sources</th>
<th>Area (m2)</th>
<th>Rate £/m2</th>
<th>Cost (£)</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Swingcompl/Albion St Junction</td>
<td>Multi Storey Redevelopment</td>
<td>Hard landscape</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>W3M</td>
<td></td>
<td>500</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>One-way system improvements</td>
<td>Lighting</td>
<td>WLR</td>
<td>CBC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Quality bus route</td>
<td>Seating &amp; Furnishing</td>
<td>WLR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George St/Wellington Row</td>
<td>Bus Station redevelopment</td>
<td>Hard landscape</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>WLR</td>
<td>CBC</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>200,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>One-way system improvements</td>
<td>Lighting</td>
<td>CBC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Seating &amp; Furnishing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civic Hall Frontage</td>
<td>One-way system improvements</td>
<td>Hard landscape</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>WLR</td>
<td>CBC</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>200,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pass redevelopment of site</td>
<td>Lighting</td>
<td>CBC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Seating &amp; Furnishing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duke Street/King Street junction</td>
<td>Old Baths Square</td>
<td>Lighting</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>WLR</td>
<td>CBC</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Strand Street Improvements</td>
<td>Seating &amp; Furnishing</td>
<td>CBC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Planting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morrison’s Frontage</td>
<td>Streetscape improvements to main approach roads</td>
<td>Planting</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>WLR</td>
<td></td>
<td>300</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queen Square</td>
<td></td>
<td>Hard landscape</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>WLR</td>
<td>CBC</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Queen Street Space)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Lighting</td>
<td></td>
<td>CBC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roper Street/Fish Street</td>
<td>One-way system improvements</td>
<td>Hard landscape</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>WLR</td>
<td>CBC</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lighting</td>
<td></td>
<td>CBC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Seating &amp; Furnishing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sub-total** 695,000
### Public Parks & Gardens

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Links to other projects</th>
<th>Main elements</th>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Key Agencies</th>
<th>Funding sources</th>
<th>Area (m²)</th>
<th>Rate (£/m²)</th>
<th>Cost (£m)</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Hanging Gardens</td>
<td>Quay Street Redevelopment</td>
<td>Footpath improvements</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>WUR</td>
<td>Core area 5,000</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>Investment focused on smaller area of park to maximise benefits of lower budget</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lighting</td>
<td></td>
<td>CBC</td>
<td>Total area 10,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Furnishings</td>
<td></td>
<td>WJM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Planting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Steps &amp; retaining walls</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Castle Park Improvements</td>
<td></td>
<td>New bandstand</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>WUR</td>
<td>Core area 5,000</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>375,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Improved toilet block</td>
<td></td>
<td>CBC</td>
<td>Total area 10,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>New paved areas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Furnishings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St James’s Park</td>
<td></td>
<td>Planting</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>WUR</td>
<td>Core area 5,000</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>250,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation Grounds</td>
<td></td>
<td>Footpath improvements</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>CBC</td>
<td>Total area 5,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Furnishings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Railings &amp; Gates</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St James’s Churchyard</td>
<td></td>
<td>Planting</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>WUR</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Furnishings</td>
<td></td>
<td>CBC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Playground</td>
<td></td>
<td>See footpaths for costs of proposals for this area</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Sub-total             | 1,175,000               |

### Secondary Greenspace

**Arboricultural and habitat improvement works**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Links to other projects</th>
<th>Main elements</th>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Key Agencies</th>
<th>Funding sources</th>
<th>Area (m²)</th>
<th>Rate (£/m²)</th>
<th>Cost (£m)</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brandy Approach</td>
<td>Improvements to main road network</td>
<td>Arboricultural works</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>WUR</td>
<td>70,000</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>350,000</td>
<td>Phased over 3 year programme years 1-3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tree Planting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CBC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Shore</td>
<td>Improvements to North Shore Promenade</td>
<td>Woodland planting</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>WUR</td>
<td>8,000</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>24,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CBC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Shore Slopes</td>
<td>Arboricultural works</td>
<td>Med-Low</td>
<td></td>
<td>WUR</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>Phased over 3 year programme years 4-9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CBC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Shore</td>
<td>Arboricultural works</td>
<td>Med-Low</td>
<td></td>
<td>WUR</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>Phased over 3 year programme years 4-9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CBC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newtown Slopes</td>
<td>Kells footpath improvements</td>
<td>Arboricultural works</td>
<td>Med-Low</td>
<td>WUR</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>Phased over 3 year programme years 4-9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CBC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Sub-total             | 674,000                 |
## Main Footpaths & Cyclepaths

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Links to other projects</th>
<th>Main elements</th>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Key Agencies</th>
<th>Funding sources</th>
<th>Length (lin. m.)</th>
<th>Rate (£/lin m)</th>
<th>Cost (£m)</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CWC</td>
<td></td>
<td>Improved lighting</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>WUR</td>
<td>CBC</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>56.250</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Improved surfacing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Road markings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Signage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. New stretch of cycle path</td>
<td>Surfacing</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>WUR</td>
<td>CBC</td>
<td>Subtrans</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>21,250</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lighting</td>
<td>CBC</td>
<td>Subtrans</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Planting</td>
<td>Planting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New footpath Preston St - Platt Walks</td>
<td>Surfacing</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>WUR</td>
<td>CBC</td>
<td></td>
<td>293</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>36,625</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lighting</td>
<td>CBC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Signage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Planting</td>
<td>Planting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kelt Footpath</td>
<td>Improved lighting</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>WUR</td>
<td>CBC</td>
<td></td>
<td>550</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>41,250</td>
<td>Assumes existing cabling for lighting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Improved surfacing</td>
<td>CBC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Furnishings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Castle Park Footpath</td>
<td>Improved lighting</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>WUR</td>
<td>CBC</td>
<td></td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>75,000</td>
<td>Assumes existing cabling for lighting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Improved surfacing</td>
<td>CBC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Furnishings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brantin Approach footpaths</td>
<td>Improved lighting</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>WUR</td>
<td>CBC</td>
<td></td>
<td>300</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>22,500</td>
<td>Assumes existing cabling for lighting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Improved surfacing</td>
<td>CBC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Railings</td>
<td>Railings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town Centre Footpaths</td>
<td>Improved lighting</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>WUR</td>
<td>CBC</td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>7,500</td>
<td>Assumes existing cabling for lighting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Improved surfacing</td>
<td>CBC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Shore Promenade</td>
<td>Improved lighting</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>WUR</td>
<td>CBC</td>
<td></td>
<td>500</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>125,000</td>
<td>Assumes existing cabling for lighting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Improved surfacing</td>
<td>CBC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Spec to match harbour area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Furnishings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Planting</td>
<td>Planting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. New footbridge link to Cumbrian Coastal Path</td>
<td>Timber footbridge</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>WUR</td>
<td>CBC</td>
<td></td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Additional lengths of path</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cumbrian Coastal Path</td>
<td>Improved surfacing</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>WUR</td>
<td>CBC</td>
<td></td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>Assumes existing cabling for lighting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Furnishings</td>
<td>CBC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Planting</td>
<td>Planting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sub-total** 475,375
## Streetscape Improvements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Links to other projects</th>
<th>Main elements</th>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Key Agencies</th>
<th>Funding sources</th>
<th>Length (m.)</th>
<th>Rate (£/m)</th>
<th>Cost (£m)</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>One-way system</td>
<td></td>
<td>Paving</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>WLR</td>
<td>CBC</td>
<td>1700</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>680,000</td>
<td>Potential savings if coordinated with highways works</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junction improvements</td>
<td></td>
<td>Lighting</td>
<td></td>
<td>CBC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rate allows for double pavement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brandy Gate Improvements</td>
<td></td>
<td>Furnishings</td>
<td></td>
<td>Cumbria CC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Signage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Tree Planting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strand/Tangier Street</td>
<td>Quay Street Developments</td>
<td>Paving</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>WLR</td>
<td>CBC</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>200,000</td>
<td>Potential savings if coordinated with highways works</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old Baths Square Developments</td>
<td></td>
<td>Lighting</td>
<td></td>
<td>CBC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rate allows for double pavement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved bus network</td>
<td></td>
<td>Furnishings</td>
<td></td>
<td>Cumbria CC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Signage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Tree Planting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swingpump Lane</td>
<td>Quay Street Redevelopment</td>
<td>Paving</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>WLR</td>
<td>CBC</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>72,000</td>
<td>Potential savings if coordinated with highways works</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Storey Redevelopment</td>
<td></td>
<td>Lighting</td>
<td></td>
<td>CBC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rate allows for double pavement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Furnishings</td>
<td></td>
<td>Cumbria CC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Signage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Tree Planting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Approach Roads</td>
<td>One-way system improvements</td>
<td>Paving</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>WLR</td>
<td>CBC</td>
<td>1400</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>560,000</td>
<td>Potential savings if coordinated with highways works</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development Sites 1, 2, 3</td>
<td></td>
<td>Lighting</td>
<td></td>
<td>CBC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rate allows for double pavement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development Sites 9, 10, 11</td>
<td></td>
<td>Furnishings</td>
<td></td>
<td>Cumbria CC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Signage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Tree Planting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Brandy Approach</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>450</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>135,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Rat Walks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>560</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>168,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Southern Approach</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>475</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>142,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Rosemary Lane/Heberbour View</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>1,957,500</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Public Art & Interpretation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Links to other projects</th>
<th>Main elements</th>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Key Agencies</th>
<th>Funding sources</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Rate (£/item)</th>
<th>Cost (£m)</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Major Landmark Installations</td>
<td>Loop Road Junction Improvements</td>
<td>Major public art</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>WLR</td>
<td>CBC</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Loop Road Junction</td>
<td></td>
<td>commission to create gateway feature at key junctions</td>
<td></td>
<td>CBC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The Gates</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cumbria CC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>North West Arts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary sculptural installations</td>
<td>Streetscape Improvements</td>
<td>Smaller, figurative sculptures on historical themes</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>WLR</td>
<td>CBC</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improvements to parks and gardens</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CBC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>North West Arts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art Trails</td>
<td>Footpath/Cyclepath Improvements</td>
<td>Art installations on industrial heritage themes using reclaimed materials</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>WLR</td>
<td>CBC</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>75,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. C2C route</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CBC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>North West Arts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Cumbrian Coastal Path</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Subtrans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Links to Hog Ara &amp; Coastal Park</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feature Illumination</td>
<td></td>
<td>Lighting to frontages of key historic buildings and structures</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>WLR</td>
<td>CBC</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Main Historic Churches</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CBC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>W3M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Lighthouses and Harbour features</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Industrial Structures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Key Georgian Buildings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fauxopticon</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sculptural viewing platforms incorporating interpretation at key vantage points</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>WLR</td>
<td>CBC</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>125,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sub-total** 400,000
ANNEX 2 OUTLINE MAINTENANCE COSTS

Summary of Maintenance Costs: Public Realm Works

All projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Area (m²)</th>
<th>Rate (£/m²)</th>
<th>Cost (£)</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public Squares</td>
<td>43,500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary Spaces</td>
<td>18,150</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Footpaths/Cyclepaths</td>
<td>15,372</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Streetscape Improvements</td>
<td>42,120</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks &amp; Gardens</td>
<td>66,750</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary Greenspace</td>
<td>114,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>299,892</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
These costs are indicative only and are provided only as a broad guide to potential costs involved in long term maintenance of public spaces and streetscape. They are based on a broad assessment of the quality of maintenance required and on the basis of rates derived from fundamentally private sector led maintenance models. They may vary widely depending on a number of factors and will clearly increase over time in relation to market conditions, new techniques, etc. Two of the key factors in determining the variance of these rates

1. Costs may vary widely depending on the approach to maintenance and the various potential models applied in different situations. For example, the costs of subcontracting to a private maintenance firm may vary substantially from those incurred by using the council’s own in house parks and gardens service. Similarly, private developers may see it as in their own interests to take responsibility for all or part of the maintenance of the public spaces associated with their developments.

2. The costs shown do not take into account existing maintenance costs but assumptions have been made as to where these are additional or where they may be already covered under existing budgets. For example, new public spaces or amenities are assumed to be a new cost whereas maintenance of improved streetscape is assumed to be covered. However, these assumptions do not take into account increases over existing budgets required to achieve a higher standard of maintenance.

Major Public Squares

Main operations:
Litter picking & rubbish removal
Pavement and surface cleaning; eg. Removal of leaves, chewing gum, dog dirt, etc
Repair and maintenance of fixtures and fittings
Watering and maintenance of trees and planting

Note: All are additional costs to existing budgets

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Area (m²)</th>
<th>Rate (£/m²)</th>
<th>Cost (£)</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brandy Gate</td>
<td>2500</td>
<td>£5</td>
<td>12,500</td>
<td>Potentially covered by developers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old Baths Square</td>
<td>1500</td>
<td>£5</td>
<td>7,500</td>
<td>Potentially covered by developers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapel Square &amp; Surrounds</td>
<td>3000</td>
<td>£5</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>Potentially covered by developers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Nicholas Square</td>
<td>1700</td>
<td>£5</td>
<td>8,500</td>
<td>Church Commissioners?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sub-total**     | **43,500** |
Secondary Public Spaces

Main operations:
Litter picking & rubbish removal
Pavement and surface cleaning: eg. Removal of leaves, chewing gum, dog dirt, etc
Repair and maintenance of fixtures and fittings
Watering and maintenance of trees and planting
Maintenance of public art and signage

Note: All areas covered by existing budgets

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Area (m2)</th>
<th>Rate (£/m2)</th>
<th>Cost (£m)</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Swingpump/Albion St junction</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>£5</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George St/Wellington Row</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>£5</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>Potentially linked to redevelopment of bus workshop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civic Hall frontage</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>£5</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duke Street/King Street junction</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>£5</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morrison's frontage</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>£3</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>Covered within existing budgets for planting strip</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queen Square</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>£5</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>Morrisons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roger Street/Pittish Street</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>£5</td>
<td>1,250</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sub-total: 18,150

Main operations:
Litter picking & rubbish removal
Pavement and surface cleaning: eg. Removal of leaves, chewing gum, dog dirt, etc
Repair and maintenance of fixtures and fittings
Watering and maintenance of trees and planting

Note: All areas covered by existing budgets
Note: Lengths refer to total length of pavement on both sides of road

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Length (lin. m)</th>
<th>Rate (£/lin. m)</th>
<th>Cost (£m)</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>One way system</td>
<td>3400</td>
<td>£4</td>
<td>13,600</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strand/Fangier Street</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>£4</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swingpump Lane</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>£4</td>
<td>1,440</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Main Approach Roads:
1. Brandy Approach: 2800 £4 11,200
2. Flatt Walks: 900 £4 3,600
3. Southern Approach: 1120 £4 4,480
4. Rosemary Lane/Harbour View: 950 £4 3,800

Sub-total: 42,120
**Main Footpaths & Cyclepaths**

**Main operations:**
- Litter picking & rubbish removal
- Pavement and surface cleaning
- Repair and maintenance of fixtures and fittings
- Watering and maintenance of trees and planting
- Maintenance of public art and signage

*Note:* All areas covered by existing budgets
*Note:* Widths between 1.8 and 3m approx

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Length (lin. m.)</th>
<th>Rate £/lin m</th>
<th>Cost (£m)</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C2C new route (off streets)</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>£4</td>
<td>960</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Newtown to Flatt Walks Path</td>
<td>293</td>
<td>£4</td>
<td>1,172</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kells Footpath</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>£4</td>
<td>2,200</td>
<td>Assumes existing cabling for lighting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Castle Park Footpath</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>£4</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>Assumes existing cabling for lighting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bransy Approach footpaths</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>£4</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td>Assumes existing cabling for lighting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town Centre Footpaths</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>£4</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>Assumes existing cabling for lighting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Shoe Promenade</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>£4</td>
<td>2,400</td>
<td>Assumes existing cabling for lighting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cumbrian Coastal Path</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>£4</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>Assumes existing cabling for lighting</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sub-total:** 15,372

**Public Parks & Gardens**

**Main operations**
- Litter picking & rubbish removal
- Cleaning of paths, play area and paved areas
- Planting maintenance and watering
- Amenity grass mowing
- Meadow grass strimming
- Tree maintenance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Area (m²)</th>
<th>Rate £/m²</th>
<th>Cost (£m)</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Hanging Gardens</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Ornamental Planting Beds</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>£5</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Grass and wildflower</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>£1</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Hard surfaced areas</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>£3</td>
<td>4,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Trees and woodland</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>£2</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Playground</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>£5</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Castle Park Improvements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Ornamental Planting Beds</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>£5</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Grass and wildflower</td>
<td>6,500</td>
<td>£1</td>
<td>6,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Hard surfaced areas</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>£4</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Trees and woodland</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>£2</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St James’s Churchward</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Ornamental Planting Beds</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>£5</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Grass and wildflower</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>£1</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Hard surfaced areas</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>£3</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Trees and woodland</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>£2</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Playground</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>£5</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St James’s Cemetery</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Ornamental Planting Beds</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>£5</td>
<td>1,250</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Grass and wildflower</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>£4</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Hard surfaced areas</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>£4</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Playground</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Costs included under footpaths</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sub-total:** 66,750
Secondary Greenspace
Additional/replacement tree planting
Care of new tree planting
Scrub grassland maintenance
Arboricultural works: thinning, pruning, felling
Understorey care/strimming etc

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Area (m²)</th>
<th>Rate (£/m²)</th>
<th>Cost (£m)</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bransby Approach</td>
<td>70,000</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>35,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Shore</td>
<td>8,000</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Shore Slopes</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Shore</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newtown Slopes</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>114,000</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ANNEX 3 ACCOMMODATION SCHEDULE

Indicative Schedule of Accommodation: GEA (sq.m.):

Bransty Gate

Site 1: Tesco
7898sq.m. /85,000sq.ft.  
Cars: circa 500 spaces

Site 2: Bus Station site:
Arts/Youth/Cultural: 2790sq.m. /30,000sq.ft.  
Residential/studio/workshop: 1675sq.m. /18000sq.ft.  
Circa 20 units  
Parking potentially in bus stn below

Site 3: Bus Depot
Hotel A3/Leisure: 800sq.m. /8500sq.ft.  
Hotel Accommodation 3220sq.m. /35,000sq.ft.  
Circa 88 rooms  
Cars: circa 40 spaces in nearby quayside car park  
OR: circa 90 spaces in basement level car park

Transport Interchange: 929sq.m. /10000sq.ft.  
Ticketing/Information centre  
Bus and taxi parking  
Public toilets  
Cars: circa 35 spaces in area to rear

Bulwark Quay

Site 4: Harbour Commissioners Building:
B1/Commercial 1858sq.m. /20000sq.ft.  
Retail/Leisure at ground floor 600sq.m./6000sq. ft.

Site 5: Mark House site
Residential 2137sq.m. /23000sq.ft.  
A1/A3 Retail at ground floor: 890sq.m. /9,500sq.ft  
Circa 30 units  
Capacity for up to 65 cars on 2 floors

Old Baths Conversion
Leisure (café/bar) 100sq.m./1100 sq. ft
Swingpump Lane

Site 6: Quay Street Car Parks

Quay Street South
Retail (niche): 1200sq.m. /12917sq.ft.
Live-Work (above niche retail units): 1184sq.m. /12744sq.ft.

Residential, block 1
Retail: 242sq.m. /2604sq.ft.
Residential: 1320sq.m. /14208sq.ft
  CIRCA 20 UNITS
Cars: circa: 70 spaces

Leisure/A3/Brewery: 1347sq.m. /14000sq.ft.

Quay Street North, Residential, block 2
Retail: 1220sq.m. /12900sq.ft.
Residential 2555sq.m./27500sq.m.
  CIRCA 35 UNITS
Cars: Car Parking 20 spaces (Additional Space in Block 1)

Site 7: Multi-storey and adjacent sites (to Albion Street)
Retail Extension (ground floor): 4645sq.m. /50000sq.ft.
Carpark extension: CIRCA 250 additional spaces

Site 8: Wilkinsons site
B1 Commercial/Live-work: 1486sq.m./16000sq.ft.
Residential: 5110sq.m. /55000sq.ft.
  CIRCA 60 UNITS
Cars: 75 spaces

Newtown/Preston Street
Site 9: Albion Street – end of IMO car wash
Student Accommodation: 4000m2/43,000 sq ft
Retail/Commercial accommodation 200m2/2200 sq.ft
  Car Parking to rear: CIRCA 75 UNITS

Site 10:
Retail/Commercial at ground floor 1912m2/20500sq.ft.
Residential/Hostel accommodation: 4000m2/41,000sq.ft.
  Car Parking to rear: CIRCA 100 SPACES

Sites around Catherine Street Extension
B1 Commercial/Live-work: 3251sq.m. /35000sq.ft.
(development site not within current strategy)

Site 11: Asda
Retail floorspace: 6735sq.m. /75000sq.ft.
Petrol Station: N/A
  Cars circa 400 spaces
ANNEX 4 SITE DEVELOPMENT COSTS

Summary of Site Development Costs

These costs are based on the outline proposals illustrated in the Development Prospectus and Briefs and are explained in more detail in the Development Viability Forecasts, provided as a separate document. They are broad estimates, drawn up to inform the prioritisation and viability assessment process, based on knowledge available during the study and not on a complete understanding of site constraints and conditions. During the implementation process, market conditions may substantially alter the reliability of these forecasts and a constant process of updating will be required to gauge more accurately the viability of a given development at a given moment. It should also be borne in mind that implementation of public realm works to a high standard may substantially affect the property values of adjacent and nearby sites. This is especially true of those properties adjoining Bransty Gate, Old Baths Square and Chapel Square.

Site 2: Bus Station & Workshops

Site
0.28 ha
Local Plan Designation: WCT 5 office/car parking
Owned by City & Provincial, speculative land holders / developers
B1 employment use; cost of provision exceeds market value
Site works very difficult and expensive

Master Plan Proposal:
- Residential / studio / workshops above existing garage structure (1675 sq m)
- Arts / youth / cultural on raised ground to the rear (7435 sq m)

Residential
1675 sq m / 18,000 sq ft gross x 80% = 14,400 sq ft / 20 units = 720 sq ft 2 bed apartment / studio

Forecast receipts: 20 units at £95,000 (£132 psf): £1,900,000
Forecast Development Costs: £1,915,520
Net margin before site cost, abnormalities and phasing cost -£15,520

Cultural Facility
Net assumed build cost £3,073,500
This facility has no open market value until a business case is proven, as it is driven by public policy decisions to determine its provision and will depend on the financial model adopted for its development.

Site 3: Bus Depot

Site
0.18 ha
Local Plan Designation: WCT 4 hotel / office
Owned by City & Provincial, speculative land holders / developers.
Former office scheme discarded when BNG chose Westlakes Science & Technology Park; cost of provision exceeds market value for offices
Current application from C&P for apartments on three floors and retail on ground floor; no dedicated parking spaces.

Master plan proposal
- A3 / leisure/reception/servicing to ground floor (1800 sq m / 19375 sq ft)
- Hotel (88 bedrooms) above (3,220 sq.m./35,000 sq.ft)

Forecast receipts: £4,495,000
Forecast Development Costs: £6,614,350
Net margin before site cost, abnormalities and phasing cost -£1,819,350
Site 4: Harbour Commissioners Offices & Jackson’s Marine

Site
0.10 ha (1000 sq m)
Local Plan Designation: WCT 3 mixed retail / leisure with commercial (office) on first floor
Current use is first floor offices and former tyre fitters now used as a boat yard;
Dixon Webb view of market value is circa £150,000 in current condition with local plan designation.

Master plan proposals:
• 10,000 sq ft niche retail / leisure on ground floor
• 20,000 sq ft office on first and second floors

Total forecast value of completed scheme: £4,600,000
Forecast Development Costs: £4,711,600
Net margin before site cost, abnormals and phasing cost -£111,600

Site 5: Mark House and Old Baths Conversion

Site
0.25 ha
Local Plan Designation: WCT 2 mixed retail, leisure, retail and residential
Purchased by private developer from Inland Revenue in 2005 of £575,000; plus value apportioned pro-rata to remainder of site. Currently vacant

Master plan proposals
• A1/A3 retail on ground floor of Mark House site (1160 sq m / 12500 sq ft)
• Harbourside residential apartments on three floors (2137 sq m / 23000 sq ft)
• Leisure / café bar in Old Baths conversion (x / x)

Total forecast value of completed scheme: £5,580,000
Total Forecast Development Costs: £4,490,995
Net margin before site cost, abnormals and phasing cost £1,089,005

Sites 6 & 7: Quay Street Car Parks & Multi-Storey

Sites 6 and 7, Quay Street and the Multi-Storey Car Parks, have been considered as a single development due to the close integration of the sites and necessity to coordinate the development of both areas as part of a single project.

Site
0.75 ha
Local Plan Designation: WCT 1 and area not identified within Local Plan opportunity sites
Current use short-term car parking, retail outlet (Argos) and multi-storey car park

Master plan proposals
• Extensions to multi-storey car park to north and south to approx 250 spaces
• Retail units at ground floor with additional car parking above
• Retail units with residential above on Quay St car parks
• New public space and pedestrian streets (costs not included here)

Total forecast value of completed scheme: £20,292,500
Total Forecast Development Costs: £18,581,487
Net margin before site cost, abnormals and phasing cost -£2,038,987
Site 8: Wilkinsons

Site
Circa 2,800 sq. m site footprint
Not identified within Local Plan opportunity sites
Current use Wilkinsons store and vacant retail space

Master plan proposals:
- High density residential with live/work
- Ground floor car parking

Total forecast value of completed scheme: £7,000,000
Total Forecast Development Costs: £7,537,000
Net margin before site cost, abnormals and phasing cost -£537,000

Alternate residential scheme; lower density 3 storey townhouses with
courtyard gardens and off street parking.

Total forecast value of completed scheme: £6,000,000
Total Forecast Development Costs: £5,485,712
Net margin before site cost, abnormals and phasing cost £514,288

Site 9: Newtown

Site
0.8 ha
Local Plan Designation: WCT9 (Albion St) and area not identified within Local Plan opportunity sites
Current uses include: breakers yard, car wash, Kwik Fit garage

Masterplan proposals
- Student/temporary worker accommodation, circa 75 units
- Limited retail/commercial space at ground floor, 2 x 100m² units

Total forecast value of completed scheme: £4,360,000
Total Forecast Development Costs: £6,896,900
Net margin before site cost, abnormals and phasing cost -£2,536,900

Site 10: Preston Street

Site
0.4 ha
Local Plan Designation: WCT11 and area not identified within Local Plan.
Current uses include: Cycle, motorcycle and car retail and repair businesses, residential

Master plan proposals
- Residential accommodation above ground floor retail or workshop space
- Approx. 5 rooms hostel accommodation above expanded ground floor cycle hire and sales unit

Total forecast value of completed scheme: £6,355,000
Total Forecast Development Costs: £7,158,125
Net margin before site cost, abnormals and phasing cost -£803,125
ANNEX 5A CONSULTATION PROCESS

Annex 5a: Summary of Public & Stakeholder Consultation Process

Stages of Consultation
The study which preceded the formulation of this development framework for Whitehaven Town Centre had at its heart a consultation programme that worked to ensure that the opinions and concerns of all the key stakeholders, interest groups and the wider public were taken into consideration throughout the process. The programme ran parallel to the phases of the study itself and can broadly be broken down into three phases:

1. Baseline Study
   An initial consultation that ascertained usage, perceptions and concerns relating to the town centre. This, together with the site survey and analyses, led to the identification of key issues and opportunities. The results of this stage of the consultation programme were summarised and included in the Baseline Report.

2. Draft Strategies
   On the basis of the initial findings, three draft strategies were produced:
   - Public Realm
   - Transport
   - Built Development.
   These laid out the basic principles and overall objectives of the three main strands of the Development Framework. Consultation at this stage was used to inform stakeholders and residents of the broad strategies under consideration. The results of this stage were used to further refine the strategies, ensuring that they reflected as far as was practicable the concerns of the recognised stakeholders. This then acted as a solid foundation for the final stage.

3. Outline Proposals
   Once the broad strategies had been agreed, three dimensional images of key development proposals and public realm schemes were generated. These graphic impressions of the transformation which the Development Framework proposed were used as the basis for the final stage of consultation.

Branding
Using experience from other projects we recognise the importance of a strong ‘branding’ for any consultation exercise. It helps avoid confusion with other programmes, agencies and initiatives and assists the credibility and objectivity of the overall project. This ‘life of its own’, outside and away from those agencies connected with it, ensures that the potential for the programme to become embroiled in local politics is kept to a minimum.

The project was ‘branded’ with the distinctive name ‘Seachange for Whitehaven Town Centre’ and an associated strong visual style that was used throughout the programme.

Consultation Methods & Consultees
A variety of different techniques were used to ensure that as wide a range of people as possible were informed of the developing proposals and consulted on their opinions. The key consultation methods were:

1. Consultation Station
   A retail unit within the Lonsdale Centre was used to display graphic material and to enable the public to ‘drop in’ to an informal setting throughout the life of the programme and give feedback. This was staffed and open three days a week and was advertised in the local press and through a leaflet campaign, designed to generate initial interest. An evolving ‘question board’ elicited feelings, ideas and concerns which were collected in a feedback box.

2. Website
   A website was set up to parallel the Consultation Unit in which the study was described and developing ideas were illustrated and responses requested. A wide range of written responses was received from members of the public who accessed the site.
3. Media
The project team worked with the local media to publicise the programme at key stages and to encourage the public to respond and get involved. A series of newspaper articles were used to highlight aspects of the study and central issues as they emerged, some of which generated written responses or phone calls.

4. Presentations & Discussions
A number of presentations were given to special interest and community groups within and beyond the town. These included heritage groups, The Chamber of Trade, youth groups, The South Whitehaven Partnership, The Town Centre Task Group, Councillors, the Western Lake District Tourism Partnership and the four main Neighbourhood Forums.

5. Meetings
In addition a number of meetings were held with specific key consultees, such as W3M, The Harbour Commissioners and agents representing major landowners.

6. Drop in Day
Site owners and occupiers were invited to attend a drop in day at the Lonsdale Unit, to discuss the way in which the proposals might affect their properties and businesses and to talk about their own requirements and future plans.

Summary of Responses
This complex process of consultation succeeded in engaging a diverse range of interests from the local population and the vast majority of special interest groups in the town, as well as a number of residents of nearby towns and villages who regularly use Whitehaven as a service centre. Responses were, however, not as diverse as would normally be expected. There was, in general, a remarkable consistency about the written and verbal responses received. These were broadly positive regarding the proposals themselves but were qualified by a widespread scepticism about the ability of local organisations to deliver, or about the effectiveness of such changes in attracting investment and reversing the town’s economic decline. The summary below is taken from feedback provided in the ‘Consultation Station’, e-mails to the website, letters to the local paper or directly to the project team, and verbal comments at presentations and meetings. The main comments are summarised below:

Changes to the One-Way System
Most people were keen on this idea and especially supportive of reducing traffic along The Strand. However, a number of people were concerned about more investment and upheaval in the town centre roads on top of the recently completed programme of improvements. Site owners and occupiers of buildings around the site of the proposed Catherine Street extension were enthusiastic about the possibility as long as they were guaranteed new and improved premises in the same location or nearby.

Development Proposals
The only development proposal that was specifically criticised in its conception was the proposed nine-storey hotel on the site of the bus depot. A number of negative responses were received to this including a strongly worded letter published in the local press. However, a greater number of responses were broadly supportive of the general proposals around Bransy Gate and a majority of respondents shared our impression that this is a high priority area and an embarrassment for the town. Relatively few members of the general public raised concerns about the scale of the building or its character and the Heritage Groups were generally supportive of the idea, as was the Chamber of Trade. A large majority of the professional and business community shared the opinion that a large hotel was one of the most urgent priorities for the town’s successful regeneration. Few other sites evoked specific responses but a number of people were enthusiastic about the proposals for the Quay Street area. The major concern throughout has been the perceived loss of car parking capacity, but when these concerns were allayed, most respondents were supportive of the ideas.

There was a strong sense across the range of respondents that the Georgian heritage of the town should not be lost and that new development should reflect and enhance this.

Public Space
The proposals which provoked the main responses in this category were the Hanging Gardens Park and the Bransy Gate Square. Responses were almost universally enthusiastic regarding both these proposals, which were perceived as the most obviously beneficial to the town. A small number of
respondents questioned the proposal to turn part of St Nicholas Gardens into a public square, but hostile responses to this proposal were surprisingly few and the Heritage Groups were broadly supportive of the idea. A member of the church commissioners attended a presentation given to a range of special interest groups and expressed concern but willingness to discuss the idea. However, no further discussions were held during the life of the programme.

Maintenance and Management
A great deal of scepticism was expressed regarding the council’s ability to maintain existing public spaces in the town, let alone additional spaces, and a one of the most widespread concerns related to the general quality and condition of the public realm in the town centre. The general impression is that people feel a far higher priority should be given to this and that new spaces will only make the situation worse unless the council is prepared to invest more money in the maintenance of the public realm. The harbour is considered to be maintained to a higher, satisfactory standard. This however, is carried out by W3M without the financial support of the council. A long term solution to this issue and practical arrangements for the management of any new spaces will; be essential to the achievement of the Development Framework aims.

Youth
Throughout the programme the issue of provision for the youth of the town featured highly. There is a wide consensus that there should be more, and existing provisions improved. This includes diversionary leisure and recreational opportunities as well as skills development and business training. There is wide agreement that the young of the town need much more encouragement to stay and that latent entrepreneurialism needs nurturing and financial support.
ANNEX 5B CONSULTATION RECORD

Whitehaven TCDF: Consultation Record

1. Community Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Format/Subject</th>
<th>Attended by</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Neighbourhood Forums</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Hensingham</td>
<td>Presentation/Discussion</td>
<td>JP/JS/JB</td>
<td>1.11.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Egremont &amp; St. Bees</td>
<td>Presentation/Discussion</td>
<td></td>
<td>9.11.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. South Whitehaven</td>
<td>Presentation/Discussion</td>
<td></td>
<td>24.11.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Bransty</td>
<td>Presentation/Discussion</td>
<td></td>
<td>30.11.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth Project</td>
<td>Discussion</td>
<td>JP</td>
<td>13/1/05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Whitehaven Partnership</td>
<td>Presentation/Discussion</td>
<td>JS</td>
<td>20/01/05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town Centre Group and Heritage Groups/Chamber of Trade</td>
<td>Presentation/Discussion</td>
<td>EF</td>
<td>28.04.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Stakeholders/ Strategic Organisations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Format/Subject</th>
<th>Attended by</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Council Executive</td>
<td>Presentation/Discussion</td>
<td>RL/AT</td>
<td>11.10.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council Members</td>
<td>Presentation/Discussion</td>
<td>EF/WH</td>
<td>28.02.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town Centre Task Group</td>
<td>Informal presentation and Q/A</td>
<td>EF</td>
<td>04.11.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Formal presentation and discussion</td>
<td>EF/RL/PB</td>
<td>16.11.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Initial baseline discussion</td>
<td>AT/JS</td>
<td>03.02.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W3M</td>
<td>Key concerns, organisation, ownership</td>
<td>MD/RH</td>
<td>07.12.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harbour Commissioners</td>
<td>Key concerns, organisation, ownership</td>
<td>EF/AT</td>
<td>24.02.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town Centre Manager</td>
<td>Responsibilities and views</td>
<td>EF</td>
<td>4.11.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jack Cunningham MP</td>
<td>Meeting arranged and cancelled at last minute (half day spent in preparation). Presentation sent by post.</td>
<td>EF/AT</td>
<td>Oct 04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cumbria Tourist Board</td>
<td>Phone calls</td>
<td>JP/JS/JB</td>
<td>Oct – Dec 2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Cumbria Local Strategic Partnership</td>
<td>Telephone discussion and e-mail exchange of documents with LSP Co-</td>
<td>Judith Brown</td>
<td>Oct 04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisation</td>
<td>Format/Subject</td>
<td>Attended by</td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chamber of Trade</td>
<td>Presentation/Discussion</td>
<td>JS</td>
<td>14/3/05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heritage/Civic Groups</td>
<td>Presentation/Discussion</td>
<td>JS</td>
<td>16/2/05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cumbria Inward Investment Agency</td>
<td>Discussions with John Grainger on their take</td>
<td>RH</td>
<td>Via e-mail and telephone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Lake District Tourism</td>
<td>Presentation/Discussion</td>
<td>EF/AT</td>
<td>24.02.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partnership</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBC Members</td>
<td>Presentation/Discussion</td>
<td>RL/PB</td>
<td>20.04.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBC Executive</td>
<td>Presentation/Discussion</td>
<td>EF/PB</td>
<td>19.04.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regeneration Partnership</td>
<td>Presentation/Discussion</td>
<td>EF/PB</td>
<td>02.06.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 3. Site owners/developers/agents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Format/Subject</th>
<th>Attended by</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Blue Mantle</td>
<td>Meeting to discuss their interests in the town and views on changes</td>
<td>AT/PB/MD/EF</td>
<td>03.12.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whitehaven Brewing Company</td>
<td>Meeting to discuss proposals and site requirements</td>
<td>EF/AT</td>
<td>24.02.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YMCA/Howgill Centre</td>
<td>Meeting to discuss requirements</td>
<td>RH</td>
<td>03.11.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tesco</td>
<td>Pending arrangement by CBC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Held in Manchester after pre-meeting at BM offices</td>
<td>EF/RM</td>
<td>16.06.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asda</td>
<td>Pending arrangement by CBC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Two meetings held with Maple Grove and Morbaine at BM offices</td>
<td>EF/PB</td>
<td>1.06.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilkinson's, Morrisons and other retailers</td>
<td>Approached by phone and e-mail as part of informal retail survey</td>
<td>Melvin Davis/Ian Barbour</td>
<td>Dec 2004 – Feb 2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthony Ansdell (WRLFC)</td>
<td>Informal Discussions</td>
<td>RH</td>
<td>15.02.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dixon Webb</td>
<td>Market testing</td>
<td>RH</td>
<td>08.11.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site owners drop in day</td>
<td>Full day of meetings at Lonsdale Unit 2 days organisation</td>
<td>EF/RW</td>
<td>25.05.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(see appendix 6)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisation</td>
<td>Format/Subject</td>
<td>Attended by</td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark House Owner and agents</td>
<td>Meeting in W’haven</td>
<td>EF</td>
<td>02.06.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Media/Public Relations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Format/Subject</th>
<th>Attended by</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Whitehaven News &amp; Star</td>
<td>1. Interview</td>
<td>AT/RL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Interview</td>
<td>WH/GH</td>
<td>17.11.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Border TV</td>
<td>1. Interview</td>
<td>AT/RL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Interview</td>
<td>WH/GH</td>
<td>17.11.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BBC North</td>
<td>Interview</td>
<td>WH/GH/EF</td>
<td>17.11.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radio Cumbria</td>
<td>Interview</td>
<td>WH/GH/EF</td>
<td>17.11.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tamesis</td>
<td>Meeting to discuss role in marketing TCDF</td>
<td>AT/EF</td>
<td>24.01.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property Week</td>
<td>Phone conversation and provision of graphics</td>
<td>EF</td>
<td>19.05.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site</td>
<td>Harbour Commissioners Area</td>
<td>Site 4 Harbour Commissioners Area</td>
<td>Site 5 Mark House Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jackson’s Marine</td>
<td>Mrs. Thomas</td>
<td>Renting the site from Terry Ponting (W3M) on a short term lease</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Harbour Commissioner’s Office</td>
<td>No Mr. Gordon Thomas</td>
<td>Harbour Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mark House</td>
<td>No Margaret Bushnell</td>
<td>Owned by Mr. Peter Williams, Queens Hotel, Keswick</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*Subsequent meeting held on June 2nd</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>John Paul Jones PH</td>
<td>No Paul Bellamy</td>
<td>Owner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Park Night Club</td>
<td>Frank Lowe</td>
<td>Owner</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Site Owners Consultation Summary**

The following represents a summary of views expressed by those site owners and occupiers who attended a drop-in day held at the Lonsdale Centre on 25th May, 2005.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Development Site</th>
<th>Site Occupier</th>
<th>Contact/Attendance at Drop-In Day</th>
<th>Ownership Issues</th>
<th>Other Key Issues</th>
<th>General View of Proposals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site 6 Quay Street Area</strong></td>
<td>Argos</td>
<td>Margaret Kerr (Manager)</td>
<td>The lease is up for auction on the Argos building and is in the offer stages at present. Argos wouldn't try to buy the lease, they just rent it. Both parts of the building could be owned by 2 landlords (agreed to provide contact details but not forthcoming).</td>
<td>Would be interested in forming part of extended and revitalised retail area provided suitable accommodation included. Would want to remain in town centre.</td>
<td>Agreed that it should be a long-term process of redevelopment and that there needs to be better links to the harbour, which is the 'heart of the town'. Stated that the proposals are very positive.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site 6 Quay Street Area</strong></td>
<td>B &amp; M Retail</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Ian Beresford (Manager)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site 6 Quay Street Area</strong></td>
<td>Quay Street Car Parks</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Terry Ponting (W3M)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site 7 Multi-storey and land north and south of Albion Street</strong></td>
<td>GJ Autos</td>
<td>Mr. &amp; Mrs. Atkinson</td>
<td>Owners (building and land)</td>
<td>They have felt unsettled since purchasing the site due to Safeway's not locating there, and other companies proposing options/contracts. They feel that their future is very uncertain, particularly with given that their site is within a proposed 'development site'. They initially wanted to demolish and rebuild the property in order to modernise it, but have waited until their future on the site is more certain. Would consider being relocated as long as they are as close to the town centre as possible. They also want to be located somewhere that doesn't have major traffic problems. Would be open to proposals a 'land swap'</td>
<td>Agree that the site should be improved and is of poor quality at present. Concerned about rumours for a roundabout on Swingpump Lane. They feel that the junction should be improved but not with a roundabout – concerned that a new junction/traffic lights etc. may clog up the road and deter people from coming to their business.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site 7 Multi-storey and land north and south of Albion Street</strong></td>
<td>Multi-storey</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Terry Ponting</td>
<td>Previous discussions held. See Harbour Commissioners Offices above</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site 7 Multi-storey and land north and south of Albion Street</strong></td>
<td>Harton Developments</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Anne Taylor</td>
<td>The premises is on the market</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site 7 Multi-storey and land north and south of Albion Street</strong></td>
<td>Hanratty’s Yard</td>
<td>Peter and Bernard Hanratty</td>
<td>Freeholders on the land for approximately 100 years</td>
<td>Concerned that they have not been consulted on proposals which affect them in the past, and they object to anything which would be detrimental to them or beneficial to someone who buys the site (see objection letter received at the unit 25/05/05). They object in principle car park extension as they see this as a probably representing a low value for their site but keen to discuss details. They believe the proposed realignment of Albion St is not feasible due to ground levels and contamination etc. They say that similar proposals have been rejected in the past. They believe that solution is return to old one way system for Albion St (?) They will send a plan of their site.</td>
<td>Generally hostile to CBC on grounds of previous experience but willing and keen to cooperate with proposals if there is full consultation and negotiation over site and if realistic market value can be achieved.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site 8</td>
<td>Wilkinson's</td>
<td>John Bruce &amp; Mrs. Riley (Store Managers)</td>
<td>Leasing the site – will speak to Head Office (Planning) to determine the owners.</td>
<td>The store is prospering at present and needs to be on the main shopping high street – not out of town. Very low rental currently so no incentive to move. Current extension of store means no interest in short term move but long term move might be considered if suitable site available in town centre area. They are preparing to extend the sales area of the shop by 26 sqm (7000 sq ft) to the rear in order to increase retail space and open the shop front up along Roger Street. This will improve customer flow and provide more of an inviting frontage with increased glazing. The service access and loading bay area will remain the same. The area that they are extending into is not occupied. This will hopefully improve footfall figures from people attending the market. The extension will start in June 2005 and will be finished at the end of the summer. Agree that the current Wilkinson's building is an eyesore at present. There should be more financial incentives for businesses to come to Whitehaven.</td>
<td>Saw redevelopment of northern area of the town / empty bus station as a priority. Like the idea of having a modern hotel. Like the proposals for linking the harbour to the town centre and residential areas, particularly where there a good views and parking provision.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site around YMCA and Jackson's Timber</td>
<td>Jackson’s Timber</td>
<td>No Paul Mossop</td>
<td>Owner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site around YMCA and Jackson's Timber</td>
<td>Royal Mail Group plc, Whitehaven Sorting Office</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No contact made</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site around YMCA and Jackson's Timber</td>
<td>Steve’s Paints</td>
<td>Maria Burns, Neil Storey and Tim Williams</td>
<td>Leaseholders (also attempted to purchase the leasehold for the car park which belongs to CBC) Head office is based in Workington.</td>
<td>They are looking to extend the business; they received planning permission to extend the existing site and were hoping to start work next year. They need to be in an area where they can diversify and grow. At present, the building is too small for their needs. Location is ideal and would not like to move far. They would consider a move to new accommodation along Preston St/Newtown They are concerned about the redevelopment of the adjacent building (Jackson’s) and where they will relocate to during road construction. Clarify needed on effects of proposals on their building.</td>
<td>Like the idea of relocating Wilkinson’s and replacing the site with residential. However, if Wilkinson’s is moved closer to their business it will close them down – they are their main competitors. Overall enthusiasm for proposals and especially for hotel and new residential – new life needed!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site around YMCA and Jackson’s Timber</td>
<td>First Image Signs</td>
<td>Debbie Haley (Reza)</td>
<td>Owner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The current premises are too small, and they have to rent a separate unit. They want to buy a piece of land and build a building with the business on the ground floor with retail above. They want to stay close to current location. Need somewhere with access to parking/unloading area.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site around YMCA and Jackson’s Timber</th>
<th>Monumental Masons</th>
<th>Clive Haley</th>
<th>Owner</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Currently shares premises with First Image Signs. Would like to keep the business small and remain on this site as the rates are low and parking is available. Would like to develop the First Image Signs workspace once they move for bicycle restoration. The location of the business is not a key factor due its nature.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Considers that the proposed road coming through the site would benefit the business and would provide an opportunity to develop the adjacent land for First Image Signs. General concern over high rates in town centre W’haven. Worried about these being increased further due to proposals. Interest in availability of EU funds.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Supportive of the proposals as they can only make the situation better.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site 9</th>
<th>Imo Car Wash</th>
<th>David Little</th>
<th>Franchise owner – leased from ‘Anduff’ who own Imo. Contact details to be provided.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The business is successful but could be better; they have a good town centre location. They need to be near the town centre in order that the ‘drop and shop’ element of the business can be maintained.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site 9</th>
<th>Kwik Fit</th>
<th>No Craig Strickland (Manager) Scott Kinslier (Assistant Manager)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Site 10 | Dave Milling Imports | Dave Milling | Owner  
The garage site adjacent belongs to the Mill – doesn’t know who the owners are.  
Complex ownership pattern on this site. Shared mainly with Brian Robb.  
Wants to maximise the land value of the site, applied for outline planning permission and will pursue. Need bigger premises therefore will have to find somewhere else due to the development.  
Has considered developing his land with residential above ground floor workshop/sales outlet  
Very flexible as long as the right site is available and good deal for his land.  
The business deals mainly in sales whereas the business adjacent – Preston Street Garage, deals with mainly rentals.  
Need a rate reduction as cannot afford to expand. | Likes the idea of putting residential uses on this development site.  
Likes the development site around the existing multi-storey and Argos and would be prepared to relocate there if appropriate.  
Where will fair be located if Quay Street is developed?? |
| Site 10 | Preston Street Garage | Brian Robb | Owner  
Owner of building for 15 years and the majority of the car park which is situated adjacent to Dave Milling Imports  
The small strip of land fronting Dave Milling Imports is owned by Mrs. Hartley (Lakeland Cars)  
The business includes cycle hire and sales, the manufacture of gates and railings, a garage workshop, an auto accessory shop etc. all on one site.  
Mainly interested in building on cycle related business.  
Questioned if EU funding is being given to assist the development of these sites – grants? Would they be eligible to claim?  
If they were to relocate they wish to be as close, if not closer, to the town centre. Concerned about proposal for cycle hub on harbour. Would not want to see someone else set up in competition.  
Considering the prospect of joining forces with Dave Milling in order to make the development site more attractive and marketable.  
To send details of ideas to expand the cycle business to fit in with the cycle hub concept. Also to send detailed plan of their site. | Like the idea of the cycle hub and would like to be involved in this – i.e. would be interested in relocating to the hub as their business provides a complete package for cyclists travelling along the C2C route. Their garagaretails outlets can be split if necessary. If the cycle hub didn’t involve them it would ruin their business.  
Stated that the cycle hub may be better near the main public transport area – train station etc. Possibly within bus station bldg |
| Site 10 | Lakeland Cars | No Mrs. Hartley | Owner |