

FAO Christopher Harrison  
Copeland Borough Council  
The Copeland Centre  
Catherine Street  
Whitehaven  
Cumbria  
CA28 7SJ

Date: 30/07/2021

Our ref: 4/20/2180/0B1: The Edge, Cumbria Coastal Activity Centre, Whitehaven  
Your Ref: N/A

Dear Mr. Harrison,

**The Edge, Cumbria Coastal Activity Centre, Whitehaven**

**Application Minor Material Amendment to Vary Condition 2 (Approved Drawings and Documents) of  
Planning Permission Ref: 4/20/2180/0B1**

Following receipt of the consultation responses to date, please accept this letter as clarification and further justification for the points raised by Conservation and Design Officer, Sammy Woodford, and Design Advisor, Graham Bell, in your e-mail dated Monday 19th July 2021.

Consultation Response: Conservation and Design Officer - Sammy Woodford

1. *"I would request clarification on the railings to be installed in the immediate vicinity of the doors to the building on the seaward side. The glass and stainless steel design doesn't perhaps compliment the building as well as it might. Is it proposed that this design is the final one?"*

In addition to its primary purpose as a guarding, the balustrade has been designed as a wind and weather break in order to provide additional protection to the glazed portion of the facade adjacent to the quayside entrance. The balustrade therefore has to retain a measure of solidity while ensuring views to the building are unimpeded. A glazed balustrade with minimal stainless steel elements was therefore considered the most appropriate solution to ensure all the required criteria were met. Furthermore, the glazed elements will be digitally printed or etched to ensure they are in keeping with the design of the overall facade.

Consultation Response: Design Advisor - Graham Bell

1. *"The scheme as now presented is the closest deliverable iteration yet to the original concept – a scheme which, through scrutiny and design testing, has emerged more coherent in the expression of function through form and materials. It remains surprising how coy the team is to show the building from important vantage points in the town; the addition of some nearby views is helpful but the harbour is part of the town, not its neighbour, and recognition of that relationship in terms of the*

*history of the community (the conservation area) and the life of its community would have been welcome and, in conservation planning terms, normal practice."*

The views presented in the submission dated 28th June 2021 were selected to best demonstrate the architecture as viewed by a pedestrian upon approach to the site, as requested by the Conservation Officer.

The Heritage Report submitted as part of the original planning application assessed more distant views; looking west across the Marina to the proposed site (denoted as View Point 1 - Medium Heritage Value) and looking north-west along West Strand (Denoted as View Point 3 - Low Heritage Value). The impact assessment concluded that the addition of the three storey Coastal Activity Centre on the Application Site was both neutral (View Point 1) and medium beneficial (View Point 3). Furthermore, the distance of these views and the relative scale of the building resulted in few discernible features being displayed in the images appended to the report.

As the current iteration of the building has, in fact, reduced in scale, it is considered that the impact on these views remains unchanged and the building will continue to "appear as an obscure and minor component of the background to the busy views of the Marina." With this in mind, and as agreed via telecom, additional photomontages are deemed an additional expense and unnecessary.

2. *"The updated drawings indicate that the isolated column on the terrace leading to the main entrance has been removed, but the visuals still show it. The assumption is that the plan is later and the column has been removed, which makes considerable aesthetic and practical sense."*

The column should have been displayed on the submitted drawings. This column is required to ensure the structural integrity of the building and thus cannot be removed.

3. *"Having arrived at the solution of an all-encompassing envelope in one predominant material, the detail with the plinth becomes the main (and most visible to public and users) junction to perform well and look well resolved. Detail D40 of Section A-A – drawing D(21)107 – is not typical (not that there are necessarily 'typical' details in this building); this is an overhang; the more vertical alignment instances are where the visual test and of performance will be scrutinised on a daily basis. In particular, D40 does not address and therefore cannot reassure on the problem of runoff, not just in torrential rain (substantial splashback? ground gutters?) but given the hard landscaping and proximity of pedestrians, the frequency of inconvenience in normal rain. Will there be additional splashing from higher level horizontal seams and projections? The detail drawings do not show any horizontal junctions where this might apply. In addition to impact (perhaps literally) on passers-by, runoff will find out the weak points such as joints in cappings and panel junctions. Some streaking is inevitable, but maintenance and in-time repairs should ensure streaking does not become disfiguring staining."*

There are no horizontal members where two planes or seams meet, rather, the standing seam cladding is folded to create a continuous form. Please refer to new detail D80.

4. *"It is slightly bizarre therefore, with so much reconciliation in the design, that window W1.07 on the first floor of the south east elevation – drawing 2452\_L(02)102 South East + North West Elevations – is the only one to have a sloping head without any obvious logical justification."*

After further consideration, it was deemed unnecessary to have a window backlighting the stage. Please refer to the revised elevation drawing L(02)102 which has removed window W1.07.

5. *"There is no new information on doors. Previously expressed queries and concerns remain."*

Please refer to the revised external door schedule S(31)100 and the cross-referenced manufacturer's details.

Due to the unique post-pandemic environment and rising inflation, the project is required to move forwards expeditiously and any assistance in reducing further delay would be greatly appreciated. We trust that the above clarification and enclosed drawings are satisfactory and the application can now move forwards to a positive conclusion.

Yours sincerely,

Hannah Dockerty  
Architect  
On behalf of Northmill Associates Chartered Architects

Encs.

- D(21)107 Envelope Section Details 2
- L(02)102 - South East + North West Elevations
- L(03)101 - Sections C - E
- S(31)100 External Door Schedule\_02
  - ADS\_75\_SI\_Double Door Unit Elevation
  - ADS\_75\_SI\_General Information
  - ADS\_75\_SI\_Horizontal Section - Door Meeting Stile
  - ADS\_75\_SI\_Horizontal Section - Jamb Detail
  - ADS\_75\_SI\_Vertical Section - Cill Detail
  - ADS\_75\_SI\_Vertical Section - Head Detail
  - glazed leaf (image)
  - solid leaf (image)
  - ASE\_80\_HI\_General Information
  - ASE\_80\_HI\_Horizontal Section - Interlock Detail
  - ASE\_80\_HI\_Horizontal Section - Jamb Detail
  - ASE\_80\_HI\_Unit View
  - ASE\_80\_HI\_Vertical Section - Cill Detail
  - ASE\_80\_HI\_Vertical Section - Head Detail