

CARLISLE CITY COUNCIL

Report to:- **Carlisle City Council**

Date of Meeting:- **29th APRIL 2008**

Agenda Item No:-

Public

Title:- **URBAN DESIGN GUIDE AND PUBLIC REALM
FRAMEWORK - CONSULTATION DRAFT**

Report of:- **DIRECTOR OF DEVELOPMENT SERVICES**

Report reference:- **DS.58/08**

Summary:-

The Executive Committee is considering the attached Report - Urban Design Guide & Public Realm Framework Supplementary Planning Document – Agreement of Consultation Draft (DS 59 / 08) at its meeting on 21st April. The outcome of that meeting will be circulated as soon as it is available.

Recommendation:-

That Council agree the recommendations of the Executive Committee in relation to Report DS 59 / 08.

Contact Officer: Christopher Pearson
Christopher Hardman

Ext: 7015
7190

C Elliot

Director of Development Services

17 April 2008

Note: in compliance with section 100d of the Local Government (Access to Information) Act 1985 the report has been prepared in part from the following papers: None



EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Committee Report

Public

Date of Meeting: 21st April 2008

Title: Urban Design Guide & Public Realm Framework Supplementary Planning Document – Agreement of Consultation Draft

Report of: Director of Development Services

Report reference: DS 59 / 08

Summary:

This Report sets out the response of the Infrastructure Overview & Scrutiny Committee to a draft Supplementary Planning Document for consultation, comprising an Urban Design Guide and Public Realm Framework, predominantly for Carlisle City centre.

The Report therefore sets out the recommendations for amending the draft document for consultation arising from that response, and refers the original draft Urban Design Guide and Public Realm Framework and such recommended changes for consideration by the Full Council at its meeting of 29th April.

.

Recommendations:

1. The Executive Committee receives the appended excerpt Minute (IOS. 32 / 8) from Infrastructure Overview & Scrutiny Committee of 10th April setting out that Committees comments on the consultation draft of the Urban Design Guide & Public Realm Framework.
2. The Executive Committee additionally receives the draft summary of the Sustainability Appraisal of the Urban Design Guide & Public Realm Framework, as considered by

Note: in compliance with section 100d of the Local Government (Access to Information) Act 1985 the report has been prepared in part from the following papers: None

Infrastructure Overview & Scrutiny Committee of 10th April, as set out as Appendix I to this Report.

3. The Executive Committee agrees the recommended alterations to the consultation draft of the Urban Design Guide & Public Realm Framework as set out in Appendix II to this Report.
4. The Executive Committee refers the original draft Urban Design Guide & Public Realm Framework together with the proposed amendments set out in Appendix II for consideration by Full Council on 29th April.

Contact Officer: Chris Pearson & Chris Hardman **Ext:** 7015 / 7190

1. INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 The Executive Committee at its meeting of 7th April (Ref DS.48/08) considered a draft Urban Design Guide & Public Realm Framework to be utilised by the City Council as planning authority and as a guide to developers and their designers when putting forward proposals within the City Centre. It was considered that such an Urban Design Guide & Public Realm Framework should be drawn up and adopted as a Supplementary Planning Document.
- 1.2 The Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 sets out the process for producing planning policy documents as part of the Local Development Framework. As part of the production process a formal consultation period of a minimum of 6 weeks should be undertaken, responses considered and amendments to the statements made before adoption. It is necessary for the City Council to agree the draft document that is to be subject to this consultation process.
- 1.3 The Executive Committee at its meeting of 7th April referred the draft document to Infrastructure Overview & Scrutiny Committee for consideration at their meeting on 10th April 2008. The relevant Minute excerpt (IOS.32/08) from that meeting setting out that Committee's response is appended to this Report .
- 1.4 In considering the response of the Infrastructure Overview & Scrutiny Committee a series of amendments to the draft Urban Design Guide & Public Realm Framework document have been drawn up and are included as Appendix II to this Report.

- 1.5 These amendments to the draft Urban Design Guide & Public Realm Framework document, along with the original version of the document also need to be referred to Full Council for their consideration on 29th April 2008.
- 1.6 Additionally a Sustainability Appraisal of the Urban Design Guide & Public Realm Framework document is required and a summary of this is attached to this Report as Appendix I. The full version of this Sustainability Appraisal will be made available for consultation alongside the Urban Design Guide & Public Realm Framework document as per Paragraph 2.6 below.

2. PROCEDURE & TIMETABLE FOR CONSULTATION.

- 2.1 The draft Urban Design Guide & Public Realm Framework has been worked up by a consultancy team led by Messrs Gillespies and under the guidance of an officer Project Steering Group led by City Council and including both officers from the County Council and the North West Development Agency, as the majority funder of the project.

- 2.2 Member and relevant stakeholder consultation held to date has been:

3rd October 2007 - A joint Stakeholder / Member workshop to consider the pertinent issues to be included within an Urban Design Guide & Public Realm Framework

27th & 28th February 2008 - A Stakeholder and Member consultation to consider the principles being put forward in terms of both urban design and public realm, including illustrative examples of what these would mean in specific locations throughout the City Centre.

Consideration by the Executive Committee on 7th April

Consideration by Infrastructure Overview & Scrutiny Committee on 10th April 2008
Further Consideration by the Executive Committee (incorporating comments from Infrastructure Overview & Scrutiny) on 21st April 2008

- 2.3 The draft Urban Design Guide & Public Realm Framework to be subject to consultation is to be considered by Full Council on 29th April 2008

- 2.4 County Council will similarly be considering relevant highway and related issues within the draft Urban Design Guide & Public Realm Framework thus;

Consideration by the Carlisle Highways & Transport Working Group on 7th April

Consideration by the Carlisle Local Area Committee on 28th April

- 2.5 Should a final draft of the Urban Design Guide & Public Realm Framework be agreed through the processes outlined above the document will then be subject to a six week consultation period commencing on or around 12th May. As well as the relevant Notices being posted in the local press this will entail a number of consultation events and public displays to ensure that all parties have an opportunity to pass comment on the document.
- 2.7 The outcome of the consultation will be reported back through to the first available City Council Infrastructure Overview and Scrutiny Committee and Executive, as well as the appropriate County Council committees, as part of the final adoption procedure of the Urban Design Guide & Public Realm Framework as a Supplementary Planning Document.

3. RECOMMENDATIONS

It is recommended that:

1. The Executive Committee receives the appended excerpt Minute (IOS. 32 / 8) from Infrastructure Overview & Scrutiny Committee of 10th April setting out that Committees comments on the consultation draft of the Urban Design Guide & Public Realm Framework.
2. The Executive Committee additionally receives the draft summary of the Sustainability Appraisal of the Urban Design Guide & Public Realm Framework, as considered by Infrastructure Overview & Scrutiny Committee of 10th April, as set out as Appendix I to this Report.
3. The Executive Committee agrees the recommended alterations to the consultation draft of the Urban Design Guide & Public Realm Framework as set out in Appendix II to this Report

4. The Executive Committee refers the original draft Urban Design Guide & Public Realm Framework together with the proposed amendments for consideration by Full Council on 29th April

4. REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS

1. In order to fulfil the statutory requirements for consultation as part of the adoption process of the Urban Design Guide & Realm Framework as a Supplementary Planning Document.
2. To ensure that the draft Urban Design Guide & Realm Framework is fully in close alignment with the priorities identified within the Development Framework & Movement Strategy.

5. IMPLICATIONS

Staffing/Resources – Planned staff resources are being utilised in overseeing the production of the draft Urban Design Guide & Realm Framework and its subsequent consultation and adoption procedure.

- Financial – The production of the draft Urban Design Guide & Realm Framework is being funded from existing dedicated budgets the majority of which is being funded by the North West Development Agency.
- Legal – The consultation process as discussed in the Report is a statutory requirement of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 and associated regulations and guidance.
- Corporate – The production of the draft Urban Design Guide & Realm Framework contributes significantly towards the corporate policies of Cleaner, Greener, Safer and supporting Carlisle Renaissance initiatives..
- Risk Management – An Urban Design Guide & Realm Framework will assist in the planning process and guidance in particular covering design principles primarily in the City Centre.. Any risk currently relates to the process of adoption and without formal consultation the document will not be able to be adopted as a Supplementary Planning

Document. It would therefore not be considered as material when determining planning applications despite the extensive work carried out.

- Equality Issues – Documents relating to the Urban Design Guide & Realm Framework will be available in different formats on request. Access for All is a key theme within the document especially in relation to the Public Realm Framework.
- Environmental – The overall effect of the Urban Design Guide & Realm Framework once adopted will be to improve the local environment of those areas affected by it .
- Crime and Disorder - Consultation on the Urban Design Guide & Realm Framework will involve the police Architectural Liaison Officer for any specific design issues that may create conflict.
- Impact on Customers – Consultation on the Urban Design Guide & Realm Framework Discussions will include public exhibitions increasing awareness for customers of the increase of quality of public realm throughout the City Centre.

Catherine Elliot

Director of Development Services

Contact Officer: Chris Pearson / Christopher Hardman **Ext:** 7015 / 7190

Urban Design Guide & Public Realm Framework - Draft for Consultation

Summary Sustainability Appraisal

Objective	Criteria (key relationships with SPD highlighted in bold)	No SPD Scenario	Opportunities that could be incorporated into SPD and anticipated score if adopted	Potential SPD Score
To increase the level of participation in democratic processes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does the plan encourage and empower local people to become involved? Are all members of society able to participate fully in decision making processes based on an understanding of these processes and how decisions impact on them? Does the plan identify and set out how hard to reach groups will be involved? Do plan policies respect the needs of all communities and future generations? 	<p>NEUTRAL...</p> <p>Indirect link - existing level of participation will not decrease but there will be no opportunities for improvement</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Participation process with respect to SPD preparation in line with Local Development Scheme SPD to promote community involvement in the provision of heritage interpretation, public art etc. SPD to ensure buildings and public space are accessible to all groups including children, youths, the elderly and disabled with particular consideration being given to gradients, textured surfaces etc. SPD to promote future proofing of public space; enable adaptation to climate change by use of porous paving etc. 	POSITIVE
To improve access to services, facilities, the countryside and open spaces	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does the plan improve access and affordability for all to services, essential goods, facilities, and education and employment opportunities (where possible within local communities using sustainable transport choices)? Does it help retain essential local facilities and ensure that physical access to transport, facilities, buildings and public spaces are suitable for those with a disability? Does the plan promote and facilitate access to, and opportunities to enjoy, the countryside and green space? 	<p>NEUTRAL...</p> <p>Direct link – there will be no opportunity to implement comprehensive improvements in terms of access to public space etc.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> SPD to promote comprehensive improvements in terms of access to public space etc. SPD to ensure pedestrians and cyclists have priority over road traffic by considering the use of shared surfaces etc. SPD to ensure there are clear routes set out between public transport nodes and key locations in the city centre etc. SPD to ensure design of public transport stops encourages their use particularly with respect to creating a safe environment for users. SPD to ensure buildings and public space are accessible to all groups including children, youths, the elderly and disabled with particular consideration being given to gradients, textured surfaces etc. SPD to promote protection of existing green space and incorporation of new green space into the urban environment. SPD to promote links from the city centre to green space, signed routes etc. 	POSITIVE

Objective	Criteria (key relationships with SPD highlighted in bold)	No SPD Scenario	Opportunities that could be incorporated into SPD and anticipated score if adopted	Potential SPD Score
To provide everyone with a decent home	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Will the plan help meet local housing need by ensuring that good quality, resource efficient, affordable housing with reduced environmental impact is available to all? 	NO RELATIONSHIP	NO RELATIONSHIP	NEUTRAL
To improve the level of skills, education and training	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Will the plan deliver education and training which helps everyone develop the values, knowledge and skills necessary to enable them to live, act and work in society? Does the plan recognise the need for people to adapt to economic change and retrain where necessary? Does the plan enable people to live sustainable lifestyles? 	NEUTRAL... Indirect link - existing level of education will not decrease but there will be no opportunities for improvement	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> SPD to facilitate provision of heritage interpretation facilities. SPD to promote community involvement in the provision of heritage interpretation, public art etc. SPD to encourage adoption of training schemes with respect to landscaping works. SPD to encourage people to live sustainable lifestyles – provision of recycling bins in town, prioritise access by pedestrians and cyclists, create a safe environment for us of public transport, consider if use of outside space is sustainable i.e. café culture v use of outside heaters 	POSITIVE
To improve the health and sense of well-being of people	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Do plan policies ensure all members of society have access to the health care that they require? Do they reduce health inequalities within society associated with income, lifestyle and diet? Does the plan help create a healthy and safe working and living environment with low rates of crime and disorder? Does the plan help improve quality of life for all? 	NEUTRAL... Direct link – there will be no opportunity to implement comprehensive improvements in terms of secure by design etc.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> SPD to promote protection of existing green space and incorporation of new green space into the urban environment. SPD to promote links from the city centre to green space, signed routes etc. In urban design consider use of day lighting instead of artificial light SPD to ensure pedestrians and cyclists have priority over road traffic by considering the use of shared surfaces etc. SPD to ensure there are clear routes set out between public transport nodes and key locations in the city centre etc. SPD to ensure design of public transport stops encourages their use particularly with respect to creating a safe environment for users. SPD to adopt secure by design principles - footpaths and cycleways should be of generous width and have a suitable landscape setting to avoid creating narrow corridors which could be perceived as threatening – need to avoid creating areas that attract anti-social behaviour, the position of planting and choice of species should be such that hiding places are not created. 	POSITIVE

Objective	Criteria (key relationships with SPD highlighted in bold)	No SPD Scenario	Opportunities that could be incorporated into SPD and anticipated score if adopted	Potential SPD Score
To create vibrant, active, inclusive and open-minded communities with a strong sense local history	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does the plan promote a sense of community identity? Does it encourage social cohesion and help continue valued local traditions? Is recreational and cultural activity embracing the arts, heritage, the environment, dialect and sport promoted along with multicultural understanding, respect for all and equality of opportunity? 	<p>NEUTRAL...</p> <p>Direct link – there will be no opportunity to implement comprehensive improvements in terms of creating a sense of community etc.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> SPD to build on local traditions and history in providing direction of the public realm SPD to promote community involvement in the provision of heritage interpretation, public art etc. SPD to facilitate provision of heritage interpretation facilities SPD to promote protection of existing green space and incorporation of new green space into the urban environment. SPD to promote links from the city centre to green space, signed routes etc. 	POSITIVE
To protect and enhance biodiversity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does the plan protect and conserve habitats and species especially where these may be rare, declining, threatened or indigenous. Will the plan ensure biodiversity sustainability by enhancing conditions wherever necessary to retain viability of the resource? Do policies minimise adverse impacts on species and habitats through human activities and development? Do policies ensure continuity of ecological frameworks such as river corridors, coastal habitats, uplands, woodlands and scrub to enable free passage of specific habitat dependent species? 	<p>NEUTRAL...</p> <p>Indirect link - existing level of biodiversity will not decrease but there will be no opportunities for enhancement</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> SPD to promote protection of existing green space and incorporation of new green space into the urban environment. SPD to promote green “wildlife” corridors linking the city centre with other green spaces Green space planted with native species of local provenance; tree planting and use of wildflower mixes etc. SPD to recommend adoption of FSC certified timber and peat free planting media for any landscaping works 	POSITIVE

Objective	Criteria (key relationships with SPD highlighted in bold)	No SPD Scenario	Opportunities that could be incorporated into SPD and anticipated score if adopted	Potential SPD Score
To preserve, enhance and manage landscape quality and character for future generations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Are local landscape quality, distinctiveness and character protected from unsympathetic development and changes in land management? Is the remoteness and tranquillity of landscapes maintained? Is the character and appearance of world heritage sites, designated archaeological sites, historic parks and gardens, battlefields and their settings protected? Are areas of high archaeological and historic landscape sensitivity protected? Do policies encourage low input organic farming with environmental stewardship styles of land management? Do they sustain and extend tree cover, hedgerows, woodlands and sustainable forestry? 	<p>NEUTRAL...</p> <p>Direct link – there will be no opportunity to enhance landscape quality etc.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> SPD to build on local landscape character in providing direction of the public realm SPD to take into account heritage value of Carlisle City Centre and ensure areas of high archaeological and historic landscape sensitivity are protected SPD to facilitate provision of heritage interpretation facilities SPD to promote protection of existing green space and incorporation of new green space into the urban environment. Green space planted with native species of local provenance; tree planting and use of wildflower mixes etc. 	POSITIVE

Objective	Criteria (key relationships with SPD highlighted in bold)	No SPD Scenario	Opportunities that could be incorporated into SPD and anticipated score if adopted	Potential SPD Score
To improve the quality of the built environment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does the plan conserve features of historic and archaeological importance? Will policies ensure that new development is of high quality, sympathetic to the character of the built environment, strengthen local distinctiveness, enhance the public realm and help create a sense of place? Will policies promote adaptive re-use of buildings, sustainable design, sustainable construction, the use of locally sourced materials and low impact operation? Will policies guide inappropriate development away from flood risk areas? Do policies ensure that where development in flood risk areas is permitted, the risks to people and property are mitigated? Will the plan reduce noise levels, light pollution, fly tipping, the spread of litter and graffiti? 	<p>NEUTRAL...</p> <p>Direct link – there will be no opportunity to implement comprehensive improvements in terms of the built environment etc.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> SPD to build on local landscape character in providing direction of the public realm SPD to take into account heritage value of Carlisle City Centre and ensure areas of high archaeological and historic landscape sensitivity are protected SPD to facilitate provision of heritage interpretation facilities SPD to promote protection of existing green space and incorporation of new green space into the urban environment. Green space planted with native species of local provenance; tree planting and use of wildflower mixes etc. SPD to promote the sensitive re-use of existing buildings and infrastructure SPD to promote sustainable design i.e. achievement of BREEAM Excellent criteria SPD to recommend re-use and recycling of construction materials SPD to recommend use of materials that are A-rated in the Green Guide to Specification SPD to recommend adoption of FSC certified timber and peat free planting media for any landscaping works SPD to take into account flood risk within Carlisle City Centre; ensure retention of open space within the floodplain wherever possible SPD to consider drainage implications of hard landscaping schemes; increase in flood risk. SPD to recommend adherence to Considerate Constructors Scheme code of practice SPD to promote minimisation of light pollution and recommend lights that minimise light spill SPD to consider how to reduce litter and graffiti, provision of recycling bins in town. 	POSITIVE

Objective	Criteria (key relationships with SPD highlighted in bold)	No SPD Scenario	Opportunities that could be incorporated into SPD and anticipated score if adopted	Potential SPD Score
To improve local air quality and reduce greenhouse gas emissions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Will the plan ensure that local air quality is not adversely affected by pollution and seek to improve it where necessary? Will policies limit or reduce the emission of greenhouse gases and other air pollutants? Will the use of clean, low carbon energy efficient technologies be encouraged? Will policies maximise the use of energy from renewable resources? Will they reduce the need to travel especially by car, and switch goods from roads onto the rail network? Will the plan introduce strategies to adapt to and mitigate other climate change impacts? 	<p>NEUTRAL...</p> <p>Indirect link - existing level of air quality will not decrease but there will be no opportunities for improvement</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> SPD to ensure pedestrians and cyclists have priority over road traffic by considering the use of shared surfaces etc. SPD to ensure there are clear routes set out between public transport nodes and key locations in the city centre etc. SPD to ensure design of public transport stops encourages their use particularly with respect to creating a safe environment for users. SPD to consider the use of renewable energy in urban design, use of solar or wind powered signage or lighting SPD to recommend lighting is specifically designed to accommodate only compact fluorescent lamps SPD to recommend adoption of FSC certified timber and peat free planting media for any landscaping works In writing SPD consider if use of outside space is sustainable i.e. café culture v use of outside heaters SPD to promote future proofing of public space; enable adaptation to climate change by use of porous paving etc. 	POSITIVE
To improve water quality and water resources	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Will the plan maintain and, where possible, improve the quality and quantity of all water resources? Will it minimise the risk of water pollution from all sources? Will policies ensure sustainable drainage systems are widely used? Will policies lead to the effective management of demand for water, prevent stress on the natural environment and help water users adapt to the impacts of climate change? 	<p>NEUTRAL...</p> <p>Indirect link - existing level of water quality will not decrease but there will be no opportunities for improvement</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> SPD to promote future proofing of public space; enable adaptation to climate change by use of porous paving etc. SPD to consider drainage implications of hard landscaping schemes; increase in flood risk and use of SuDS. SPD to take into account flood risk within Carlisle City Centre; ensure retention of open space within the floodplain wherever possible Landscaping schemes to consider the conservation of water resources and use of herbicides and fertilisers that do not bio-accumulate in the environment 	POSITIVE

Objective	Criteria (key relationships with SPD highlighted in bold)	No SPD Scenario	Opportunities that could be incorporated into SPD and anticipated score if adopted	Potential SPD Score
To restore and protect land and soil	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Will the plan encourage development on brown field sites, using sustainable remediation technology to treat contaminated soils on site? Will it minimise the loss of Greenfield sites or areas of open space? Will policies prevent soil degradation, pollution of soil and the use of peat? 	<p>NEUTRAL...</p> <p>Indirect link - existing level of soil quality will not decrease but there will be no opportunities for improvement</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> SPD to promote protection of existing green space and incorporation of new green space into the urban environment. SPD to recommend adoption of peat free planting media for any landscaping works; alternative is to use composted green waste thereby creating a market for this material 	POSITIVE
To manage mineral resources sustainably and minimise waste	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Will policies minimise the extraction, transport and use of primary minerals and encourage the use of recycled material? Will the plan minimise the amounts of industrial, commercial and household waste generated and increase re-use, recovery and recycling? Will it promote the use of energy recovered from waste? 	<p>NEUTRAL...</p> <p>Indirect link - existing level of waste generated will not decrease but there will be no opportunities for improvement</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> SPD to consider provision of recycling bins in city centre SPD to recommend re-use and recycling of construction materials SPD to consider specification of recycled materials in hard landscaping schemes etc. 	POSITIVE

Objective	Criteria (key relationships with SPD highlighted in bold)	No SPD Scenario	Opportunities that could be incorporated into SPD and anticipated score if adopted	Potential SPD Score
To retain existing jobs and create new employment opportunities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Will the plan increase the number, variety and quality of employment opportunities including those offered by tourism and social enterprise? Will the plan support local companies and help local businesses develop export markets? Will the plan help retain a skilled workforce and graduates in Cumbria? 	NO RELATIONSHIP	NO RELATIONSHIP (although improved environment can help economic growth, this may enable a positive score to be achieved for this objective)	NEUTRAL
To improve access to jobs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Will plan policies increase access for all to a range of jobs through improved training, sustainable transport and communication links? Will the plan lead to the location of new employment opportunities in areas of greatest need? 	NEUTRAL... Indirect link – there will be no opportunity to implement comprehensive improvements in terms of access.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> SPD to ensure pedestrians and cyclists have priority over road traffic by considering the use of shared surfaces etc. SPD to ensure there are clear routes set out between public transport nodes and key locations in the city centre etc. SPD to ensure design of public transport stops encourages their use particularly with respect to creating a safe environment for users. SPD to encourage adoption of training schemes with respect to landscaping works. 	POSITIVE

Objective	Criteria (key relationships with SPD highlighted in bold)	No SPD Scenario	Opportunities that could be incorporated into SPD and anticipated score if adopted	Potential SPD Score
To diversify and strengthen the local economy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Will the plan help create the right climate and infrastructure provision to encourage private sector investment? Will it encourage indigenous growth? Will it stimulate the use of local companies, local products and services and provide other forms of community benefit? Will it lead to ' increase the environmental performance of local companies and their products/services? Are innovation, entrepreneurship and diversification encouraged, particularly in rural areas? Does the plan provide financial assistance? Will it help improve the competitiveness and productivity of the local economy? Do policies support research and development into environmental and other new key sector technologies including opportunities to recycle and re-use waste products? 	NO RELATIONSHIP	NO RELATIONSHIP (although improved environment can help economic growth, this may enable a positive score to be achieved for this objective)	NEUTRAL

Urban Design Guide & Public Realm Framework

Draft for Consultation - Proposed Amendments

1. Historical Content –

Recommended Rewording: Page 11 under “Anchors to the Past”

“Opportunities may arise that allow some interpretation of Carlisle's origin as a Roman town, for example, through public art, public archaeology or interpretation’.

2. Links to Hadrian's Wall

Suggest that greater prominence is given to links to the City from the Hadrian's Wall cycle route and walking route.

Recommended Rewording: Page 15. Under Walking & Cycling

'Routes between the city and the Hadrian's Wall World Heritage Site with its cycle and walking routes are currently weak. Carlisle's potential as a key milestone on this route can be strengthened by clearer routes through The Sands area and through Bitts Park. The Car park at the sands offers potential to be remodelled to express this route very clearly'

This additionally could be shown diagrammatically on 60,62, and 64.

3. Rickergate

Suggest closer alignment with outcome of Local Plan Inquiry

Recommended Rewording: Page 26

Degree of Intervention - Substitute existing paragraph with:

“The potential for substantial intervention within the Rickergate area is put forward in the Local Plan Inquiry Report in that the revised Regeneration Policy DP2 indicates that it is an area that is able to contribute to the regeneration of the economic, social and environmental capital of the City.

The Local Plan Inquiry Report is not prescriptive in future land use within the area but states that a detailed brief should be prepared for proposals for subsequent intervention in the area. In drawing up such a brief the following principles should be considered”

Principles - As per existing draft document except for:

A Quality Public Realm

Omit the sentence *“A major public transport hub, the square will facilitate arrival integrating bus and pedestrian movement”*

Ease of Movement

Second bullet point – first sentence – replace “Rickergate Plaza” with *“Rickergate square”*

Diversity

The first sentence to read *“Mixed use development will create a vibrant City quarter that can successfully integrate with retained uses”*

Page 27 – Amend precedent image to remove middle-bottom monolithic image and replace with Manchester Great Northern Square tiered plaza.

Page 28

Add existing Debenhams store to artist’s impression image to give context.

4. Caldew Riverside

Suggest closer alignment with outcome of Local Plan Inquiry

Recommended Rewording: Page 30

Degree of Intervention - substitute existing paragraph with:

“The potential for substantial intervention within the Caldew Riverside area is put forward in the Local Plan Inquiry Report in that the revised Regeneration Policy DP2 indicates that it is an area that is able to contribute to the regeneration of the economic, social and environmental capital of the City.

The Local Plan Inquiry Report is not prescriptive in future land use within the area but states that a detailed brief should be prepared for proposals for subsequent intervention in the area. In drawing up such a brief the following principles should be considered”

5. Citadel

Suggest closer alignment with outcome of Local Plan Inquiry

Recommended Rewording: Page 38

Degree of Intervention - substitute existing paragraph with:

“The potential for substantial intervention within the Citadel area is put forward in the Local Plan Inquiry Report in that the revised Regeneration Policy DP2

indicates that it is an area that is able to contribute to the regeneration of the economic, social and environmental capital of the City.

The Local Plan Inquiry Report is not prescriptive in future land use within the area but states that a detailed brief should be prepared for proposals for subsequent intervention in the area. In drawing up such a brief the following principles should be considered”

6. Cycling in the City

Recommended change – Page 64

Add potential route on the right bank of the Caldew as shown on plan on page 62 as extension to existing cycle routes hence linking Caldew Riverside to Bitts Park.

7. Public Realm Components

Recommended Rewording: Page 91

Public Realm Standards alter bullet point 3 to read:

“are of a high quality classic design that respects and enhances both the modern and historic City”

EXCERPT FROM THE MINUTES OF THE INFRASTRUCTURE OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE HELD ON 10 APRIL 2008

IOS.34/08 URBAN DESIGN GUIDE AND PUBLIC REALM FRAMEWORK SUPPLEMENTARY PLANNING DOCUMENT

The Development Manager (Mr Pearson) submitted report DS.47/08, attaching a report presented to the Executive on 7 April 2008 (DS.48/08), on the preparation of a Supplementary Planning Document comprising an Urban Design Guide and Public Realm Framework, predominantly for Carlisle City centre.

Mr Pearson reminded Members that as part of the Carlisle Renaissance Programme a Development Framework and Movement Strategy Policy Statement had been agreed in April 2007, one of the key issues arising from that document being the need for an Urban Design Guide and Public Realm Framework to be agreed for use as a guide to developers and their designers and putting forward proposals within the City. In order to give sufficient weight to that document it was agreed that the Urban Design Guide and Public Realm Framework should be drawn up and adopted as a Supplementary Planning Document. Details of the process for producing Planning Policy documents as part of the Local Development Framework as contained in the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 were provided.

The draft Urban Design Guide and Public Realm Framework was appended to the report for consideration.

Sally Nash of Gillespies Consultants, was present at the meeting and gave a presentation to the Committee on the content of the draft consultation document. Ms Nash stressed that the document was an aspirational document and would work over a number of years.

The Executive had on 7 April 2008 considered report DS.48/08 and decided:

“1. That the Executive receive the draft Urban Design Guide and Public Realm Framework as attached to report DS.48/08 which is to be the subject of consultation and note its contents. The Framework be referred to the Infrastructure Overview and Scrutiny Committee for their comments with a view to considering such comments at the meeting of the Executive on 21 April and referred to the full Council on 29 April 2008 for agreement.

2. The Executive Committee note the parallel process through the County Council of considering the relevant highways issues within the draft Urban Design Guide and Public Realm Framework. The Highways and Transport Working Group on 7 April and the Local Area Committee on 28 April 2008 will consider this.”

In considering the report, Members raised the following questions and observations:

(a) A Member commented that the framework was a very good idea but had reservations regarding the Rickergate plans. The Member felt they did not match the rest of the plans and had concerns that the City did not have the capacity to support such a large centre.

Mr Pearson responded that potential regeneration within the Rickergate area had been subject to scrutiny through the Local Plan Inquiry process, the outcome of which had just become known. The plans in the Urban Design Guide and Public Realm Framework document were drawn up without the outcome of the inquiry. There was a Members briefing on 17 April 2008 to discuss the outcome of the inquiry and how this document would sit within the Local Plan outcome.

A Member added that the changes in Rickergate largely came from the 2005 floods. There had been speculation over the use of the fire station and police station and so there was an opportunity to look at the whole area.

Mr Pearson agreed to look, with Gillespies, at the issues relating to the Rickergate area with the Urban Design Guide and Public realm Framework document in the light of the Planning Inspectors Report arising from the Local Plan Inquiry.

(b) At the request of the Chairman, Members agreed:

- The principles on page 10 of the document
- The levels of intervention on page 21 of the document
- With the aims and aspirations of the document
- With the design, colour, surfaces and materials palettes as set out in the document
- With the soft landscaping principles and the idea of a water feature
- With the lighting and signage as set out in the document

Mr Pearson reminded Members that area 1c, Western Approaches, was subject to the creation of a Planning Brief as a Supplementary Planning Document and in due course would come back through this Committee for consideration.

(c) A Member raised concerns that the Roman heritage of the City was not being included as well as it could. It was understood that the site of Roman forum was in the City Centre, could this be expanded on.

Ms Nash responded that the Roman Forum was in the City Centre and the introduction of a forum area had been included in the plans to highlight that area of history. Ms Nash agreed to explain the Roman history and connections to Carlisle more clearly in the document.

(d) In response to a Member's comments Ms Nash explained that there would have to be some in depth discussions regarding a potential water feature in Carlisle and reminded Members that the City already had a good water feature in Bitts Park.

A Member added that a water feature would help to make the City Centre more fun and

inviting for young people and making it a more family orientated place.

Mr Pearson commented that in drawing up the document discussions had been held with Community Services and included integration with the proposed City Centre Play Trail.

(e) How would the public consultation be carried out?

Mr Pearson explained that because the document was a supplementary planning document it would go through a statutory consultation period of 6 weeks but specific details still needed consideration. There would be a process of members of the public being able to view the document and plans and then they would have the opportunity to comment.

A Member added that the Council had presented exhibitions for the public in previous years but this document was difficult to present unless it was split into specific areas so people could really focus and understand the document.

Mr Pearson responded that certain plans in the document relating to public realm projects were only illustrative at this stage but were designed to give people an opportunity see the principles involved In creating higher quality public realm design to which the whole Public Realm Framework aspired to.

Ms Nash added that it would be challenging for the public to understand the level of how the document worked but it did need to be kept at a strategic level at the moment.

The Principal Assistant Local Plans Officer (Ms Goodridge) explained that there was 3 other Supplementary Planning Documents being prepared and all 4 would go out to consultation. The Urban Design guide document was due for consultation in May / June2008. The 3 other documents were not required to be part of the same consultation process as the Design Guide and were now scheduled for later in the year.

(f) Was it possible to have a list of renaissance style initiatives in the public realm in other Cities?

Mr Pearson and Ms Nash recommended Glasgow, Newcastle, Sheffield, Penrith and Keswick as good examples of such work.

The Urban Designer (Mr Higgins) recommended the Commission for Architecture and the Built Environment website (www.cabe.org.uk), which had good practice examples of regeneration work both nationally and internationally and also published a document entitled 'A Councillors Guide to Urban Design'.

(g) There was concern that the quality of the materials would be expensive and that Carlisle did not have the economy to support the cost.

Mr Pearson explained that high quality public design could encourage investment and therefore help the local economy. There were national developers interested in Carlisle and they had been pleased that Carlisle was addressing these issues. There was a

debate with the County Council on ongoing costs. When the materials used are of such high quality they take less long term maintenance. Both the County and the City Councils had concerns regarding the future maintenance and there was a section in the document that began to address the concerns.

(h) In response to a Member's comments Mr Pearson explained that the document did refer to work of other strategies such as projects coming forward under the Movement Strategy, and that it was a two way process between this document and those other strategies that were being addressed by both the City and County Council.

(i) A Member highlighted the components and materials on page 91 and drew Members attention to the need for quality of design throughout the City.

Ms Nash explained that a lot of the 'street clutter' would be removed to provide a better public realm. The document also highlighted areas for increased 'active frontage' to improve pedestrian routes.

(k) A Member raised concerns that the term 'timeless classic design' was not appropriate. Whatever design was implemented would not stay timeless and might ultimately become dated.

Ms Nash responded that the aim of the plans were to stay away from fashion in urban design but agreed that they would look to change the term.

(l) The document looks to promote 'a café culture' but privately provided seating areas should be supplemented by other resting places throughout the City, especially if cars were being diverted away from the Centre, with the public having to walk further into the town.

With the permission of the Chair, members of the public asked the following questions:

(a) Was this the actual document that would be put out to consultation?

Mr Pearson explained that the document would form the basis of the consultation. The Local Plan inquiry had different timescales to the document so the Rickergate area would be revisited as a result of the inquiry so this would not be the final document that would go out to consultation. Executive would agree the final consultation document.

(b) There were a lack of questions from Members of the Committee today so it appeared that this document would be the final document.

Mr Pearson explained that the document was not the final version and would be subject to appropriate change following the input of the Committee.

(c) There were issues with the possible extension of the conservation area that would need addressing. It was felt that document should not go out to public consultation until those issues had been addressed.

Members commented that they felt they had had a fair input into the document and the

process behind it and they felt other people's views and comments had been incorporated into the document.

RESOLVED – 1) That the Urban design Guide and Public Realm Framework Supplementary Planning Document be endorsed for consultation;

2) That the concerns and comments of the Committee as above be passed to Executive for consideration.