

## 7. TRANSPORT

### 7.1 INTRODUCTION

7.1.1 The government's transport policy is based on the notion that we need a safe, efficient and integrated transport system which supports a strong and prosperous economy. This involves reducing the need for car journeys which cause congestion and pollution and making it easier for people to use alternative means of transport ie public or community transport, walking and cycling.

7.1.2 The government influences transport investment directly through the Transport Act 2000, and its 10 year investment plan Transport 2010. There are also a variety of guidance notes and codes of practice for the various public, private and agency bodies (and partnerships between). At the local level most transport investment is directed by the Regional Transport Strategy (which was approved as part of Regional Planning Guidance for the North West in March 2003) and the Cumbria Local Transport Plan (2001 – 2006). Both documents are required to implement the government's policy requirements as regards integration and sustainability.

7.1.3 Land-use planning is also seen as a key to delivering these aspects of policy through shaping the pattern of development and influencing the location, scale, density, design and mix of land uses. By improving overall accessibility but reducing the need to travel and the length of journeys required the planning system can enable people to make more sustainable transport choices. (PPG 13 Transport)

7.1.4 The Council supports the principles involved and the plan's Development Strategy and policies which follow are an attempt to meet this agenda. At the same time, however, it feels that there is insufficient recognition of Copeland's real transport problems. If we are to deliver regeneration we need to see the issue of West Cumbria's remoteness and poor transport links with the national networks being tackled together with acceptance that transport solutions for metropolitan areas are not always going to be appropriate to rural areas like Copeland where public transport options will remain limited and car-dependency is likely to continue.

### 7.2 STRATEGIC IMPROVEMENTS

7.2.1 The Council sees new transport infrastructure and making the best use of existing transport infrastructure as essential to

achieving its objectives of sustainable development and regeneration. Transport choices can only be delivered if modern, efficient infrastructure is available. Copeland has extremely good internal systems and links to the national networks for walking and cycling. Unfortunately this is not the case for other modes of transport, particularly road and rail – based. Journey times just to connect to the M6 or West Coast Main Line Railway are typically 1 - 1½ hours and it takes over 2½ hours to access the regional service centres and airports at Manchester and Newcastle-upon-Tyne. Both road links (A595/A66 or A595/A5092/A590) are long, often tortuous and mainly single carriageway standard. The Cumbria Coastal Railway line connecting to Carlisle and Barrow exhibits similar problems. Although the line has been maintained there has been markedly less investment in improving these links than for other disadvantaged parts of the country over the last 50 years. As a consequence travel times and the costs of moving people and freight are significant and are a) a disincentive to potential investors and b) a very real problem for some existing businesses and members of the local community (eg accessing job opportunities or higher education facilities).

7.2.2 As a corporate policy the Council will continue to lobby long and hard for a package of strategic improvements to the Borough's transport infrastructure and links to the national networks. The case for this in terms of regeneration is accepted by the North West Development Agency in the Regional Economic Strategy. Unfortunately it is not matched in the provisions of the Regional Transport Strategy (RTS). The RTS includes only one major improvement scheme to benefit Copeland over the period to 2021 and this is the Parton-Lillyhall Improvement (Policy TSP 1 refers). ~~— although a study of access to West Cumbria and Furness was “suggested” as a “potential future” issue (RPG para 10.36).~~ A study of “Access to Furness and West Cumbria” was undertaken in the summer of 2004, jointly funded by the North West Development Agency and the North West Regional Assembly. The results were very disappointing as far as the Council and its regeneration partners were concerned. No major improvement schemes were proposed merely a commitment to completing the current road and rail network investigations which were obviously happening anyway. The NWRA has at least acknowledged the Council's position on the matter and undertaken to seek the advice and recommendations of the Strategic Forum for West Cumbria on transport improvements as part of developing the new RSS (which will incorporate a revised RTS).

7.2.3 In the meantime the government is proposing to detrunk the southern portion of the Borough's spine road and M6 link the A595/A5092 between Calderbridge and Greenodd. The Council

is extremely concerned at this and has submitted a formal objection pointing out that there are significant safety/security issues involved in relation to the Sellafield site as well as detracting sending all the wrong messages to potential investors. The route itself needs considerable investment in improvement works and the County Council will never have the necessary resources. Only trunk-road status can deliver what is required.

**7.2.4** There are no provisions in the RTS for improvements to the Cumbria Coastal Railway.

**7.2.5** The A595 Parton-Lillyhall Improvement involves the replacement of the existing single carriageway trunk road by a dual carriageway between the A595/U4009 junction north of Whitehaven and the Borough boundary at Distington. Additional on-line improvements are proposed between Distington and the A595/A596 junction at Lillyhall (outside the plan area). A Preferred Route has been published by the Highways Agency for DfT and this will be protected from any development likely to compromise delivery of the scheme. (the Council will consult with the Highways Agency on any development proposals within 67m of the Route centreline).

~~The current timetable envisages formal orders being published in Spring 2004~~ were published on 1<sup>st</sup> March 2005 and the current timetable envisages that an ~~any necessary~~ Inquiry will be held in Autumn 2004 late 2005 and completion of construction by late 2008 ~~in Spring/Summer 2007.~~

#### **POLICY TSP 1 : Safeguarding the A595 Parton-Lillyhall Improvement**

**The Preferred Route of the A595 Parton-Lillyhall Improvement as proposed by the Department for Transport is shown on the Proposals Map. This route will be safeguarded from any inappropriate development**

**7.2.6** The current Cumbria Local Transport Plan (2001 – 2006) includes provision for work on four other infrastructure improvement schemes which are of strategic importance:

- Whitehaven Eastern Relief Road The feasibility of such a scheme was assessed in the early 1990s but as yet there is no formally declared route. The justification for it is rehearsed in paras ~~2.8.14/15~~ 3.1.16/17 of the Development Strategy. The County Council does not envisage a start on design work until after 2007. Estimated cost £4m.

- Whitehaven – Pow Beck Spine Road A concept which involves an alternative gateway route into the town centre from the St Bees Road. A new alignment could solve traffic congestion and capacity problems, allow for much needed environmental improvements and open up sites for development and investment. Further feasibility and design work is planned as part of the overall Action Plan for the Pow Beck/Coastal Fringe and Town Centre areas. Estimated cost £1.1m. The scheme is further enhanced by the inclusion of junction improvements at both ends of Coach Road in the LTP schedule, each costed at around £0.5m.
- A595 Duddon Bridge – Bypass A scheme which the County Council also safeguarded in relation to JSP Policy T26 although no Preferred Route has been published the question of responsibility for implementing the scheme will depend on the proposal to detrunk the A595 here. At this stage the County Council indicate post 2007 before any preparation. Estimated cost £2.5m.
- A5093 at Kirksanton A general upgrade for post 2007 preparation. Estimated cost £1.2m.

### 7.2.7

The Council supports all four projects and is keen to see an early start to implementation. It will work with the County Council in this regard and in bringing forward other proposals for strategic transport improvements as part of the Local Transport Plan process (work is now beginning on the second LTP for Cumbria which will cover the period 2006 – 2011). In particular it hopes to see a package of improvement schemes scheduled for the A5086 Cockermouth – Egremont road and the ~~B~~A5093 North of Millom. Policy TSP2 will be relevant in all such instances.

## **POLICY TSP 2 : New Road Building and Improvements**

~~The Council will support n~~**New road building and highway improvements which help to:**

1. **improve prospects for economic regeneration**
2. **assist local communities' access to jobs, services and leisure opportunities, and**
3. **improve road safety and general highway conditions**

**4. and take into account needs of public transport, pedestrians, cyclists, horseriders and people with impaired mobility**

**will be supported** so long as all practical measures are taken to mitigate the harmful effects of such works on the environment.

~~The Council will safeguard a~~**Any** area or route corridor **will be safeguarded** from inappropriate development to assist implementation of such works.

**7.3 LOCAL TRANSPORT IMPROVEMENTS**

**7.3.1** In addition to the major items listed in ~~6~~**7.2.6** the Cumbria Local Transport Plan provides for a number of other projects under the heading of Priority Transport Improvement Schemes. The County Council also undertakes a variety of improvement works as Annual Programmed Maintenance **Package of Measures**. All the schemes are in accordance with objectives based on integration, sustainability, social inclusion etc and the need to meet government targets which include safety, improved public transport use, more cycling and walking and reduced car use and so on.

**7.3.2** To achieve progress towards these objectives and targets it is important for all the transport schemes to be co-ordinated with parallel regeneration programmes and other initiatives (including this Local Plan) as part of the Community Strategy umbrella. For this reason the County Council is basing the production of the next LTP on a series of Area Plans (District level) which will better reflect/inform work on urban **Area** Action Plans like the Pow Beck/Coastal Fringe/Town Centre area in Whitehaven, the Market Town Initiatives at Egremont and Millom, the continuing SRB programmes in Cleator Moor and South Whitehaven and the development of Village Appraisals and Parish Plans elsewhere. In particular there will need to be close co-operation between land-use and transport planning in the design and implementation of neighbourhood renewal schemes and town centre improvements.

**7.3.3** The following paragraphs include the projects already scheduled in the current Local Transport Plan and the potential for schemes to be brought forward into the LTP 2 (2006 –2011). Alongside are the land-use policies which can assist the delivery of such projects. Policies to deal with the transport aspects of new development (which can also involve improvements to standards, facilities and infrastructure) are set out in section ~~6~~**7.4**.

## Traffic Management

**7.3.4** New road building and highway improvements do not have to be the solution to all congestion and capacity problems. In urban areas and village centres especially measures can be taken to control the route, speeds and flow of vehicles to improve conditions for drivers but also to improve public transport, cycle and pedestrian movement, access for people with impaired mobility and the general highway environment.

**7.3.5** In the current LTP traffic management schemes have been scheduled for:  
Haverigg and Holborn Hill, Millom (20mph zones with traffic calming)  
Hensingham and Hillcrest, Whitehaven  
Distington (Main Street)  
Egremont (St Bridget's Lane)  
South Whitehaven (parking restrictions plus additional footways)

The Council will be looking to have additional schemes incorporated in LTP2 particularly through the introduction of Home Zones to the area renewal programmes at Cleator Moor and Whitehaven, the continuation of Better (Safer) ways to Schools and neighbourhood/village traffic calming and to experiment with eg quiet lanes in rural areas where there is need and opportunity.

## **POLICY TSP 3 : Traffic Management**

**Where appropriate the Council will promote new or extended traffic management schemes which improve access and environmental conditions for all users with priority for people over motor traffic.**

### Parking

**7.3.6** The issues involved with both on and off street parking in the Borough are complex and the subject of varying opinion locally. The Council is no longer the sole provider of public off-street car parks but it has taken over responsibility for enforcing on-street parking in the new decriminalised regime. This situation will generally make it easier to prepare and implement an overall Parking Strategy for the main urban areas where the sustainability/integration/inclusiveness objectives of transport planning can be co-ordinated with other policy considerations. These will include tourism and general business needs – particularly in relation to competing centres as well as the corporate attitudes to parking as an income stream.

- 7.3.7 The Council intends to prepare a Parking Strategy shortly and this will inform future planning policy and the development of schemes through the LTP. In the main town centre at Whitehaven scheduled work on an Action Plan may include proposals for additional or replacement short stay public parking.

#### Public Transport, Cycling and Walking

- 7.3.8 By far the greatest emphasis in terms of LTP and government targets is put on these more sustainable alternatives to the motor car. Locally there is a need to help promote passenger transport service improvements with improved facilities and opportunities to extend the cycleway and footpath networks.

- 7.3.9 Perhaps the single most important item in the current LTP schedules is a Transport Interchange at Whitehaven. Because of a commercial decision the town's Bus Station is no longer available and there is no obvious ready alternative. Bus service routings and the provision of information and facilities has become rather disjointed as a result and a source of continuing complaint from passengers and business people in the town centre. The town centre is focal point for all transport networks including well-used national cycle routes, long-distance paths and sea-routes as well as road and rail. There is need for a safe, accessible interchange facility which can help encourage motorists to use alternative modes of transport and assist transport users generally to combine sustainable choices. The establishment of an Interchange will be a high priority in The Action Plan for the Pow Beck/Coastal Fringe/Town Centre area. Policy TCN 1 refers with a site envisaged adjoining the main (Bransty) railway station.

- 7.3.10 To some degree a programme of smaller railway station improvements scheduled in the LTP will improve interchange facilities elsewhere. Modest schemes are included in the current programme for stations at Green Road, Millom, Drigg, Sellafield, Braystones, Nethertown, St Bees, Whitehaven – Corkicle and Parton but most of these will be dependent on a separate Rail Passenger Partnership bid to the Strategic Rail Authority and additional contributions and/or co-operation from the rail service and infrastructure providers. The most promising scheme is at Seascale where station facility improvements are to be co-ordinated with a bus service extension. The Council would like to see more of these types of initiative. Rail use locally has become more and more marginalized during the last twenty years and there needs to be more effort from all parties

to provide better services and facilities for potential users – including secure car and cycle parking.

### 7.3.11

Since the 1985 Transport Act deregulated bus companies there has been a significant change in the provision of public transport. Urban services have been largely maintained or even extended but many rural services have declined or have disappeared entirely. The Council will try to assist wherever possible in service improvements by the main operators and in bringing forward alternative Community transport based initiatives. It will also ensure that there is no planning impediment to developing additional facilities for passengers and service operators where there is justifiable need. Where appropriate and usually as a result of a Transport Assessment or Travel Plan (Policy TSP7) improved public transport service facilities will be required as part of development. Where necessary these could be delivered as part of a commuted sum payment to the Council or other provider as part of a larger scheme.

## **POLICY TSP 4 : Measures to Improve Public Transport**

~~The Council will support m~~**Measures to improve public transport services and associated facilities will be supported. ~~Wherever possible it will permit d~~**Development which will improve access to services and/or make them more attractive to users or is required to improve the efficiency of the service will be permitted.****

The Council may seek funding contributions from developers to support new or extended public transport services required to service new development in accordance with Policy TSP 7 requirements.

### 7.3.12

The Council has always been keen to provide cycling and walking for recreational and non-recreational purposes. They are non-polluting, healthy ways of travelling which are essential alternatives to the car. There is an extensive network of footpaths and cycleways which connect between urban centres, provide direct access to the surrounding countryside and link to national and regional long-distance routes. The networks are increasingly important for work and school journeys as well as the developing tourism sector where integration between different modes of transport presents opportunities for business as well as sustainability per se. Their improvement can also be a means of achieving environmental enhancements. Policy ENV13 provides protection for existing rights of way and supports proposals for the improvement and promotion of locally important circular routes and long-distance paths.

7.3.13 There is need to extend the networks however and there are 4 cycle route schemes in the current LTP:

Gosforth – Seascale  
Whitehaven – St Bees  
Moresby – Keekle  
Gosforth – Calderbridge

The Council would wish to see additional schemes brought forward particularly for the Millom area, which could link to the Greenways programme undertaken on the other side of the Duddon Estuary and connect to the rest of the West Cumbria cycle network. As far as possible these additional schemes should involve off-highway routes but there are options to incorporate safe cycle/walking on quieter sections of highway. The Council would also wish to see both existing and new parts of the cycleway network adopted by the County Council as Transport Authority so that there is no dual-standard approach to cycling provision in Copeland or the rest of the county. It should be noted that the Council has already improved all sections of cycleway it owns to adoption standard. In addition the Council will seek improvements to the bridleway network through the planning process.

## **POLICY TSP 5 : Cycleways, and Footpaths and Bridleways**

**Wherever appropriate the Council will seek to extend and provide continuity in the network of footpaths, and cycleways and bridleways. It will safeguard any route corridor from inappropriate development to assist the process including development alongside cycleway routes designed to facilitate their use will be permitted subject to other policies in the Local Plan.**

### Access for People with Impaired Mobility

7.3.14 There are no specific schemes in the LTP under this heading – the County Council is committed to the notion of inclusively where the needs of people with impaired mobility are taken into account in the design of all public realm improvements as a matter of course.

## **7.4 NEW DEVELOPMENT**

7.4.1 All development requires access in one form or another and it is important to ensure that this is achieved for all in a safe and efficient manner. The design and layout of all roads, junctions,

footpaths, cycleways, parking and service areas must be safe and cause no undue damage to the landscape and character of the area. Equally they must contribute to the objectives of providing integration and genuine choice for all people in the community.

**7.4.2** The policy requirements to deal with these issues are explained in some detail in ~~2.3.3/4~~ **3.2.3/4** and ~~2.9.8/9~~ **3.2.8/9** (Development Strategy). This includes reference to situations where transport infrastructure improvements directly related to a proposed development are required (with the developer contributing to costs by agreement). The Council will consider proposals against the good practice guide “Planning and Access for Disabled People” (ODPM, 2003), Cycle Friendly Infrastructure (CTC) and Planning for Public Transport in Developments (IHT).

## **POLICY TSP 6 : General Development Requirements**

**New development will only be permitted where the access and travel needs of ~~all those affected~~ created by the development are catered for through the provision of:**

- 1. safe, convenient, and attractive means of pedestrian access**
- 2. appropriate cycle access, including links to existing cycleways**
- 3. appropriate access and facilities for people with impaired mobility**
- 4. appropriate facilities for or access to public transport**
- 5. safe and appropriate access onto the road network to accommodate all forms of vehicle including emergency vehicles**
- 6. appropriate traffic management measures to reduce traffic speeds and give priority to pedestrians, cyclists, people with impaired mobility and public transport**
- 7. parking in accordance with the standards set out in Appendix 1 together with adequate and safe space for site servicing and manoeuvring.**

**Where any of these items requires undertaking off site works or the provision of particular services these must be**

provided before any part of the development is brought into use.

~~(nb: in relation to items 3 the Council will consider proposals against the good practice guide “Planning and Access for Disabled People” published by ODPM in March 2003)~~

7.4.3 Where development has the potential to cause a significant impact on local highway conditions it will be necessary for the proposal to be accompanied by a Transport Assessment (TA). For small schemes the TA should simply outline the transport aspects of the application. For major proposals the TA should illustrate the likely modal split of journeys to and from the site together with details of proposed measures to improve access by public transport, walking and cycling; to reduce the need for parking and to mitigate the transport impacts. Where access is via a trunk road the TA should assess the impact of development proposals on all the affected trunk road network. Contributions will be sought for any mitigation measures necessary to ensure the safe and efficient operation of the trunk road network. Developers should refer to the DLTR Circular 04/2001 “Control of Development Affecting Trunk Roads and Agreements under Section 278 of the Highways Act 1980”, which sets out Government Policy with respect to access to the trunk road network. The Highways Agency should be contacted at the earliest possible stage about any development that may affect the trunk road network.

7.4.4 A Travel Plan may also be required. Such plans should have clear targets for reducing car-use and parking and set out how these will be achieved alongside measures to increase the use of public transport and walking and cycling. They should provide for improved road safety, personal security and more efficient/environmentally friendly delivery and freight movements. The content of the Travel Plan will depend on the need arising from the development and be related in scale and kind to the development. The relevant threshold for development in relation to Transport Assessments and Travel Plans are set out in Appendix 4. The Council will consider the use of planning conditions or seek a planning obligation to make some or all of a Travel Plan binding. Existing companies with a large workforce and the main schools and health establishments in the area will also be encouraged to prepare and adopt such plans.

## **POLICY TSP 7 : Transport Assessments and Travel Plans**

Development which is likely to have significant transport implications and all major development proposals above the thresholds set out in Appendix 4 of the Local Plan or any developments which may directly or indirectly impact upon the trunk road network must be accompanied by a Transport Assessment and, in the cases indicated, by a Travel Plan.

Where a Transport Assessment or Travel Plan requires the undertaking of off site works or the provision of particular services these must be provided before any part of the development is brought into use.

~~The Council will refuse~~ Development which generates excessive or inappropriate traffic in the locality will not be permitted.

#### Parking Requirements

- 7.4.5 In accordance with government requirements (principally PPG 13), RPG and JSP have introduced new parking standards for most types of development in the County. These are expressed as maximum levels of provision in order to encourage the provision and use of alternative modes of transport. The new standards are set out in Appendix 1.
- 7.4.6 In applying the new Standards the Council will adopt a flexible approach. Essentially the Borough is rural and public transport options are likely to remain limited. Also topography and distances can limit the practicality of walking and cycling for large sections of the local community. The results of any surveys or other information submitted as part of Transport Assessments and Travel Plans will inform the Council's decision on parking provision for new development. The Council will liaise with the providers of public transport, taxi services etc. to achieve appropriate levels of parking provision in association with modal interchange facilities.
- 7.4.7 The new parking standards do not at this stage include residential development nor do they indicate revised requirements for cycles, motor cycles or provision for disabled people. The County Council will publish comprehensive new guidelines in due course but until then developers will be expected to use the relevant standards set out in the "Schedule of Guidelines" in Appendix 1 (b) for Use Class C3 : Dwelling Houses and non-car parking requirements.

## POLICY TSP 8 : Parking Requirements

All proposals for new development must comply with the parking requirements set out in Appendix 1. These include new maximum standards for most car parking requirements and interim standards for all other type of parking.

### 7.5 RAIL FREIGHTING

- 7.5.1 The physical state of the Cumbria Coastal Railway makes it difficult to expand its has reduced its use for freight movements to almost zero. Whilst improvements are necessary the Council will wherever possible encourage development which is rail-dependent and facilities which support the transfer of freight between rail and road. It will expect that most development generating significant amounts of goods traffic will locate wherever possible on sites easily served by rail.

## POLICY TSP 9 : Rail Freighting

~~The Council will support~~ **The transfer of freight traffic from road haulage to the railway especially for bulk commodities and dangerous materials will be supported. Proposals in appropriate locations for new development likely to have high rail-dependency or for facilities to assist rail freighting will be approved subject to other policies in the plan.**

### 7.6 PORTS AND AIR TRAVEL

- 7.6.1 Whitehaven harbour is the most important port resource in the Borough. In its heyday it was second only in importance to Bristol in terms of England's west-coast maritime trade. Since the last main port users – the coal and chemical industries – have declined there has been significant investment in the harbour. This is directed at expanding its tourism and fishing potential with already a degree of success. The marina is set to expand and there are plans to capitalise on ferry and cruise-visit potential. Further proposals will be brought forward as part of the Action Plan to be prepared for this area of Whitehaven. Care is needed in relation to Scheduled Monument and Listed Building status.
- 7.6.2 Millom Pier is no longer the facility it was when the iron industry was in operation. It has deteriorated badly in parts but could play a useful role subject to care against international and local nature conservation interests. ~~An Employment Opportunity~~

~~Development site is designated alongside — see 4.2.17 and Policy EMP 3.~~

## **POLICY TSP 10 : Port Development**

**Proposals for the improvement of harbour facilities and harbourside development at Whitehaven and at Millom Pier will be permitted subject to adequate safeguards as regards their historic and nature conservation significance.**

- 7.6.3** There have been suggestions from time to time that an air strip allowing feeder flights to Carlisle Airport or the main regional airports at Manchester, Newcastle and Teeside should be developed. In the event no detailed proposals for such a facility have been brought forward despite studies which have indicated latent demand. The Council would be prepared to support an airstrip or similar type of development subject to the policies in the plan particularly in terms of protecting residential environment.