

Draft City Centre Development Framework Consultation

28 July - 1 September 2014 Responses

Question No	CharacterArea	Agree ?	TopicArea	RepNo	RefNo	Consultee	Organisation	AgentRefN
Document	Primary Shopping Area	<input type="checkbox"/>		2075	Comment	043	Andy Hunton	Cumbria Constabulary an
Comment	This item is of significance to the Constabulary, due to the levels of retail related crime experienced. This crime type continues to generate calls for police service in the arrest and disruption of offenders. (A brief search of police records (31 Jul 2013 – 1 Aug 2014) shows over 700 recorded offences across beat codes X11 and X12, encompassing the City Centre). It follows that any new development within the retail sector has considerable implications for the Neighbourhood Policing Team and we seek the Council's support in being able to address these through the planning process (i.e. demanding compliance with Policy CP17 of the Local Plan).							
Response:	The emerging Local Plan includes a specific policy on 'planning out crime' and advocates that applicants consult, particularly on larger schemes, the police crime prevention design advisor.							
Proposed Change	No change considered necessary.							
Q2	Primary Shopping Area	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		2062	Support	042	Mrs Dallas Brewis	Cycle Carlisle
Comment								
Response:	Comments noted.							
Proposed Change	No change considered necessary.							
	Primary Shopping Area	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		2014	Support	001	Mr Nigel Winter	Stagecoach NorthWest Lt
Comment								
Response:	Comments noted.							
Proposed Change	No change considered necessary.							
	Primary Shopping Area	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		2316	Support	063	Mr Ian Grey	
Comment								
Response:	Comments noted.							
Proposed Change	No change considered necessary.							

Question No	CharacterArea	Agree ?	TopicArea	RepNo	RefNo	Consultee	Organisation	AgentRefN
Q2	Primary Shopping Area	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		2134	Support	047	Mrs Margaret Backhouse	
Comment								
Response:	Comments noted.							
Proposed Change	No change considered necessary.							
<hr/>								
	Primary Shopping Area	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		2339	Support	065	Miss Lindsey McNamee	
Comment	Fill all the empty units and help ones that are struggling and leave my home alone.							
Response:	Existing vacancies are considered to be below the national average with a number of long standing vacant units such as those at the Crown and Mitre having recently reverted back into active use. Feedback from agents within the City also supports that there is relatively strong demand for vacant units within the core of the City Centre, with relatively quick turnaround achieved. Notwithstanding this the City Council are committed to working with stakeholders to reduce the number of vacancies within the City Centre and will be proactive in using the powers available to them to assist in this objective. A good recent example of this is that the City Council agreed in January 2015 to update their Discretionary Rate Relief Policy in order to offer re-occupation relief for retail units which have been vacant for 12 months or more. The implementation of this national initiative at the local level sees such units qualify for a 50% reduction in their business rates (National Non Domestic Rates) for 18 months from the date the premises becomes occupied - and is likely to constitute a strong incentive in bringing empty units back into use.							
Proposed Change	No change considered necessary.							
<hr/>								
	Primary Shopping Area	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		2328	Support	064	Mrs Carol Grey	
Comment								
Response:	Comments noted.							
Proposed Change	No change considered necessary.							
<hr/>								
	Primary Shopping Area	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		2303	Support	062	Mr Hans J A Landstrom	
Comment								
Response:	Comments noted.							
Proposed Change	No change considered necessary.							
<hr/>								

Question No	CharacterArea	Agree ?	TopicArea	RepNo	RefNo	Consultee	Organisation	AgentRefN
-------------	---------------	---------	-----------	-------	-------	-----------	--------------	-----------

Q2	Primary Shopping Area	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		2226	Support	054	Mr Christopher Wheeler	
-----------	------------------------------	-------------------------------------	--	------	---------	-----	------------------------	--

Comment

Response: Comments noted.

Proposed Change: No change considered necessary.

	Primary Shopping Area	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		2051	Comment	039	Mr M Holliday	
--	------------------------------	-------------------------------------	--	------	---------	-----	---------------	--

Comment: Generally agree with the conclusions. What the owners of the Lanes have done recently regarding the removal of the public toilets to accommodate the wishes of a food chain/café is again unbelievable.

Response: Comments noted.

Proposed Change: No change considered necessary.

	Primary Shopping Area	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		2026	Support	034	Mr Eddie Haughan	
--	------------------------------	-------------------------------------	--	------	---------	-----	------------------	--

Comment

Response: Comments noted.

Proposed Change: No change considered necessary.

	Primary Shopping Area	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		2182	Support	051	Miss Susan Mark	
--	------------------------------	-------------------------------------	--	------	---------	-----	-----------------	--

Comment

Response: Comments noted.

Proposed Change: No change considered necessary.

	Primary Shopping Area	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		2429	Support	072	Mrs Jennifer Smith	
--	------------------------------	-------------------------------------	--	------	---------	-----	--------------------	--

Comment

Response: Comments noted.

Proposed Change: No change considered necessary.

Question No	CharacterArea	Agree ?	TopicArea	RepNo	RefNo	Consultee	Organisation	AgentRefN
-------------	---------------	---------	-----------	-------	-------	-----------	--------------	-----------

Q2	Primary Shopping Area	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		2254	Support	058	Mrs Joanne Swanton	JoMark House of Hair
-----------	------------------------------	-------------------------------------	--	------	---------	-----	--------------------	----------------------

Comment

Response: Comments noted.

Proposed Change: No change considered necessary.

Primary Shopping Area

2280 Support 060 Barry O Earp

Comment

Response: Comments noted.

Proposed Change: No change considered necessary.

Primary Shopping Area

2266 Support 059 Miss Carole Hoggan

Comment

Response: Comments noted.

Proposed Change: No change considered necessary.

Primary Shopping Area

2388 Support 015 Mr Viv Dodd Revival Carlisle

Comment

Response: Comments noted.

Proposed Change: No change considered necessary.

Primary Shopping Area

2400 Objection 069 Mrs Karen Atkinson

Comment No.

Response: Comment noted. In the absence of elaborating as to the reasons why the Council can not, on this occasion, comment further.

Proposed Change: No change considered necessary.

Question No	CharacterArea	Agree ?	TopicArea	RepNo	RefNo	Consultee	Organisation	AgentRefN
Q2	Primary Shopping Area	<input type="checkbox"/>		2351	Objection	066	Mrs Sandra Stockley	
Comment	Extending the Primary Shopping Area across Lowther Street into the car park would link in with the Bus Station and Lanes Complex and smarten up the area. Also with businesses such as Argos.							
Response:	Much of this area is already in retail use but in secondary terms owing to the decisive nature of Lowther Street. The City Centre Development Framework promotes the need to improve accessibility and permeability with and within this area and it is acknowledged that if this could be achieved that the area could play an enhanced role in the future.							
Proposed Change	No change considered necessary.							
<hr/>								
	Primary Shopping Area	<input type="checkbox"/>		2107	Objection	005	Mrs B A Robinson	
Comment	No							
Response:	Comment noted. In the absence of elaborating as to the reasons why the Council can not, on this occasion, comment further.							
Proposed Change	No change considered necessary.							
<hr/>								
	Primary Shopping Area	<input type="checkbox"/>		2213	Objection	053	Mrs Joyce Hetherington	
Comment								
Response:	Comment noted. In the absence of elaborating as to the reasons why the Council can not, on this occasion, comment further.							
Proposed Change	No change considered necessary.							
<hr/>								
	Primary Shopping Area	<input type="checkbox"/>		2447	Objection	075	Mr Neil Irving	SOS
Comment	No							
Response:	Comment noted. In the absence of elaborating as to the reasons why the Council can not, on this occasion, comment further.							
Proposed Change	No change considered necessary.							
<hr/>								
	Primary Shopping Area	<input type="checkbox"/>		2038	Objection	036	Ian Caruana	
Comment	No							
Response:	Comment noted. In the absence of elaborating as to the reasons why the Council can not, on this occasion, comment further.							
Proposed Change	No change considered necessary.							

Question No	CharacterArea	Agree ?	TopicArea	RepNo	RefNo	Consultee	Organisation	AgentRefN
Q2	Primary Shopping Area	<input type="checkbox"/>		2144	Objection	048	Mrs C E Simpson	
Comment	Rickergate and the Town Centre - The City Centre is difficult to get into now, especially for disabled people, as too far to walk Castle Street, and Abbey Street. There are enough retail shops standing empty in Carlisle [shops that are trading are charity shops and cafes] without building more in Rickergate area. There will be less footfall in Carlisle Centre once the parking meters kick in, as people will go to supermarkets, Metro Centre, where parking is free and time to look and browse, me included! How much is the cost of these parking meters. I have been unable to find out?							
Response:	Evidence in the form of the Carlisle Retail Study supports that there is a need for additional retail units within the City Centre particularly from a qualitative perspective in terms of providing the size, form and configuration of units which accord with retailers' current high street needs. This evidence is considered to remain robust with a number of those in the retail industry, within the City and beyond, recently reaffirming its conclusions. Such new units will be a key element of any strategy going forward to retain a number of existing retailers as well as too attract new retailers to Carlisle, and ultimately to maintain the vitality and viability of the City Centre and its overall offer.							
Proposed Change	Whilst on street parking is the responsibility of Cumbria County Council in their capacity as the highway authority, any detailed proposal for larger developments within the City Centre would have to include a clear and comprehensive car parking strategy, including demonstrating how the needs of the disabled will be met. No change considered necessary.							
	Primary Shopping Area	<input type="checkbox"/>		2292	Objection	061	Mr David Hamilton	
Comment								
Response:	Comment noted. In the absence of elaborating as to the reasons why the Council can not, on this occasion, comment further.							
Proposed Change	No change considered necessary.							
	Primary Shopping Area	<input type="checkbox"/>		2198	Objection	052	Mr Colin Latimer	
Comment	No							
Response:	Comment noted. In the absence of elaborating as to the reasons why the Council can not, on this occasion, comment further.							
Proposed Change	No change considered necessary.							
	Primary Shopping Area	<input type="checkbox"/>		2154	Objection	049	Mrs Mavis Sarginson	
Comment	No							
Response:	Comment noted. In the absence of elaborating as to the reasons why the Council can not, on this occasion, comment further.							
Proposed Change	No change considered necessary.							

Question No	CharacterArea	Agree ?	TopicArea	RepNo	RefNo	Consultee	Organisation	AgentRefN
Q2	Primary Shopping Area	<input type="checkbox"/>		2414	Objection	071	Mrs Joan Field	
Comment								
Response:	Comment noted. In the absence of elaborating as to the reasons why the Council can not, on this occasion, comment further.							
Proposed Change	No change considered necessary.							
<hr/>								
	Primary Shopping Area	<input type="checkbox"/>		2170	Objection	026	Elizabeth Allnutt	Save Our Streets
Comment	SOS does not agree with the conclusion for the Primary Shopping Area. Shopping is not the only activity in this area; this is the social heart of the city for informal gathering and events and holds a special place in the hearts and minds of local people. Many people live here as well. There is also much history and heritage here (why is the TIC here if this is not the case?) which also need to be considered. Consideration needs to be made as to how to maintain the vitality of the area. If the NPPF emphasises the need for vital city centres then the first priority should surely be to see what is happening in the shopping area here, and how this can be exploited and/or changed. Extending it could have the effect of spreading the already meagre available jam even more thinly. Could The Lanes and the City Council not work together to acquire empty shops (instead of houses/homes in Warwick St) to site assemble a larger retail space for the perceived needs of for example Primark? The shops could be let on meanwhile short term lets – possibly at reduced rents to encourage small and medium enterprises and keep money in the local economy as well as filling the empty gaps.							
Response:	It is acknowledged that this area fulfils a wider role than retailing but notwithstanding this its primary function and defining characteristic is retailing. Efforts are ongoing to maintain and enhance this area with the significant investment in the new Tourist Information Centre testament to this. Notwithstanding that these efforts will continue, evidence in the form of the Carlisle Retail Study supports that there is a need for additional retail units within the City Centre particularly from a qualitative perspective in terms of providing the size, form and configuration of units which accord with retailers' current high street needs. This evidence is considered to remain robust with a number of those in the retail industry, within the City and beyond, recently reaffirming its conclusions. Such new units will be a key element of any strategy going forward to retain a number of existing retailers as well as too attract new retailers to Carlisle, and ultimately to maintain the vitality and viability of the City Centre and its overall offer. Whilst the suggestion to meet future needs through ringing back into active use empty units is noted, the availability, size, form and spread of these is such that this is not considered a realistic option in meeting the intended objectives.							
Proposed Change	No change considered necessary.							
<hr/>								
	Primary Shopping Area	<input type="checkbox"/>		2121	Objection	046	Miss Gillian Smith	
Comment	No							
Response:	Comment noted. In the absence of elaborating as to the reasons why the Council can not, on this occasion, comment further.							
Proposed Change	No change considered necessary.							
<hr/>								
	Primary Shopping Area	<input type="checkbox"/>		2083	Objection	045	Ms Kate Carvana	
Comment	No							
Response:	Comment noted. In the absence of elaborating as to the reasons why the Council can not, on this occasion, comment further.							
Proposed Change	No change considered necessary.							

Question No	CharacterArea	Agree ?	TopicArea	RepNo	RefNo	Consultee	Organisation	AgentRefN
Q2	Primary Shopping Area	<input type="checkbox"/>		2099	Objection	011	Mrs Julie Templeton	Member of Save our Stree
Comment	The town hall square and surrounding streets are much more than primary shopping areas. The history of the city is steeped in these buildings. A large retail development in Rickergate will take trade away from the centre. This is a low waged area, local government jobs are disappearing fast. Even when/if the economy picks up it is unlikely that this area will ever match the prosperity of the South. I believe that growth should be organic evolving naturally to fit demand. A large retail development when so many shops are already empty and more and more stores joining them seems to be a rather stupid idea. Even if big named stores like Primark want to move into the city, there is still only so much money circulating and the success of that store may well lead to the demise of already existing stores.							
Response:	It is acknowledged that this area fulfils a wider role than retailing but notwithstanding this its primary function and defining characteristic is retailing. Being within a wider area designated as being a conservation area should, alongside other policies within the Local Plan, help to preserve and enhance the heritage significance of much of its fabric. Whilst efforts are ongoing to maintain and enhance this area with the significant investment in the new Tourist Information Centre testament to this, evidence in the form of the Carlisle Retail Study (which takes account of projected expenditure within the City Centre's catchment and its share compared to other centres and the internet) supports that there is a need for additional retail units within the City Centre particularly from a qualitative perspective in terms of providing the size, form and configuration of units which accord with retailers' current high street needs. This evidence is considered to remain robust with a number of those in the retail industry, within the City and beyond, recently reaffirming its conclusions. Such new units will be a key element of any strategy going forward to retain a number of existing retailers as well as too attract new retailers to Carlisle, and ultimately to maintain the vitality and viability of the City Centre and its overall offer. In this regard the new units would be designed to complement as opposed to competing with the retail floor offer already present within the City Centre. The key aim would be to design any new units to be an extension of the primary shopping area and to include design measures which would ensure effective pedestrian integration to support this.							
Proposed Change	Whilst the suggestion to meet future needs through ringing back into active use empty units is noted, the availability, size, form and spread of these is such that this is not considered a realistic option in meeting the intended objectives. No change considered necessary.							
	Primary Shopping Area	<input type="checkbox"/>		2239	Objection	055	Mrs Helen Blamire	
Comment	Why build more shops when so many shops lying empty with more big names closing each week?							
Response:	Evidence in the form of the Carlisle Retail Study supports that there is a need for additional retail units within the City Centre particularly from a qualitative perspective in terms of providing the size, form and configuration of units which accord with retailers' current high street needs. Whilst noting that there are a number of vacant units within the City Centre these do not currently, nor is there considered any scope for these in the future to, meet this full range of future needs. This evidence is considered to remain robust with a number of those in the retail industry, within the City and beyond, recently reaffirming its conclusions. Such new units will be a key element of any strategy going forward to retain a number of existing retailers as well as too attract new retailers to Carlisle, and ultimately to maintain the vitality and viability of the City Centre and its overall offer.							
Proposed Change	No change considered necessary.							
Document	Primary Shopping Area	<input type="checkbox"/>	Character Area Analysis & Option Development	2467	Comment	010	Emily Hrycan	English Heritage North
Comment	We are in general agreement with the analysis and proposed strategy for this area. However, we suggest that reference should also be made to linkages to the Railway Station, and also to the need to improve secondary routes between the pedestrianised centre and West Walls, which are quite poor at present. However, there is an opportunity to make better use of some good buildings and attractive spaces by improving these linkages.							
Response:	Comments noted. The Framework promotes improved accessibility permeability throughout the whole area essentially to better link key character areas.							
Proposed Change	No change considered necessary.							

Question No	CharacterArea	Agree ?	TopicArea	RepNo	RefNo	Consultee	Organisation	AgentRefN
Document	Primary Shopping Area	<input type="checkbox"/>	Character Area Analysis & Option Development	2493	Comment	o83	Michael Barry	Cumbria County Council
Comment	<p>Carlisle enjoys a relatively strong core retail area, and it will be important that the role of this area is not undermined in the pursuit of new development opportunities.</p> <p>It is agreed that there do not appear to be any strategic scale development sites in this location. Nevertheless it is considered that the Development Framework should be clear that proposals to refurbish and / or reuse buildings that come available are appropriate.</p> <p>Housing within the City Centre can have a role in supporting the vibrancy of the City Centre, and opportunities to deliver housing above existing commercial units will have an important role by allowing people to live close to shops and services, thus enhancing the level of activity within the City Centre. It is suggested that this point can be addressed by an appropriate policy within the Local Plan.</p> <p>Retaining the vibrancy of the existing retail area should be an important priority. Therefore, when considering the scale of development now proposed at Rickergate, there is a clear need to ensure that the vitality and viability of the existing town centre and the redevelopment / reuse of other available sites is not undermined by what may be an unbalanced approach to meet the retail needs.</p> <p>Paragraph 8.10 it is not clear what 'maintain and enhance transport movement circulation' is referring to and it is suggested this is reworded to state; manage and maintain vehicular access to key sites.</p>							
Response:	<p>Comments noted. The Local Plan contains a suite of policies which act to ensure that the core retail area remains the focus and that any extensions of this area seek to integrate effectively. This policy framework is driven by a need to maximise vitality and viability across the City Centre and to ensure that this need to do so is at the forefront of decision making. As recognised Local Plan policies also act to encourage and support opportunities to increase City Centre living as a positive means of helping to diversify and aid the vitality of the City Centre. It is acknowledged that it is not explicitly clear what is meant by 'maintain and enhance transport movement circulation' and accordingly this will be reworded, as suggested, to instead refer to 'manage and maintain vehicular access to key sites'.</p>							
Proposed Change	<p>Amend paragraph 8.10 of the report to refer to 'manage and maintain vehicular access to key sites' instead of 'maintain and enhance transport movement circulation'.</p>							
	Other	<input type="checkbox"/>		2480	Objection	o82	John Kelsall	Conservation Area Adviso
Comment	<p>The Committee recognised that the Authority was required to prepare its new Local Plan up to 2030 in line with National Planning Policy and to meet the recommendations set down within the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and National Planning Policy Guidance (NPPG). The compulsory requirement to present an 'evidence base' and realistic 'deliverability' was key to a successful Local Plan to be supported by a Planning Inspector at the formal Public Inquiry.</p> <p>In this respect the Committee felt the task required of the Authority and the difficulties it faced were not explicit within the current public consultation on the City Centre Framework. It was likely that the Authority would achieve more public and media support if documentation was more open and factual. An example was that the brief given to consultants had not been set down fully within their report with the result that the reader could conclude they were not receiving the 'whole' story or, worse still, that critical decisions had already been made and not subject to consultation.</p> <p>In general terms it was felt the City Centre Framework consultation document was potentially both misleading and incomplete. The title of "Carlisle City Centre Draft Development Framework" produced a document that almost exclusively only considered retail capacity issues that emerged from the 2012 City Wide Retail Study by the same consultants, GVA. Although the City Centre "character" areas are considered they were really only seen as setting the context for meeting a 200,000 sq.ft. retail need. This was considered an inappropriate title for this document – either the title be substituted for, say, Carlisle City Centre Draft Major Retail Development Framework or it should cover all aspects of the City Centre, encompassing the development of all retail needs i.e. addressing the issues of empty smaller shops bringing upper floors into use, encouraging heritage tourism, night time vitality and developing the Public Realm particularly. There was some doubt as to the wisdom of commissioning the same consultant for the Draft Framework as the Author of the Retail Study as agreement with the premise of the latter would be far less likely to be questioned.</p>							
Response:	<p>Acknowledgement of the Local Plan process welcomed. No firm decisions were taken prior to the consultants being appointed to undertaking the study in order for them to present their independent findings. The nature of the City Council being a public body is that had such decisions been taken, Executive or Council approval would have been required and consequently such decisions would have been transparent and well publicised. The consultants who undertook the study were appointed following a competitive tender process and the report and its recommendations reflect their independent findings. The context for the study being primarily focussed on a need to explore opportunities to accommodate new retail floorspace is already considered to be made clear within the report at paragraph 1.3.</p>							
Proposed Change	<p>No change considered necessary.</p>							

Question No	CharacterArea	Agree ?	TopicArea	RepNo	RefNo	Consultee	Organisation	AgentRefN
Document	Other	<input type="checkbox"/>		2161	Comment	013	Hammersons	A001

Comment

Whilst the aspirations' of the City Council to achieve its full potential as the major shopping destination in the region is to be welcomed, our client is concerned that the vision set out in the DDF and in particular the redeveloping of land to the north of Lowther Street, including Rickergate, is not viable, will not meet the stated aspirations or deliver the type of floorspace required to attract major retail-led development.

The 2012 Retail Study concludes that the City Centre is: vital and viable; does not achieve its full potential, due to its existing constraints; and the retail accommodation is fragmented (particularly the existing department stores). In terms of capacity the Retail Study concludes that there are limited development opportunities within the City's primary shopping area. These findings are not disputed.

As the retail market continues to go through a period of consolidation, with retailers seeking larger but fewer stores, careful consideration must be had to the likely tenant mix and range of operators that might occupy a scheme. Simply identifying a department store anchor, particularly in a City where the majority of such operators are already represented and those that are not a more likely to consider larger out of centre opportunities, is a shortcoming of the DDF.

Whilst we acknowledge that in identifying sites the DDF seeks to accord with the requirements of the NPPF, whereby all capacity identified over the plan period is allocated, we do not consider the current Options have been fully tested or the mix of accommodation considered against a commercial background.

The DDF concludes that the best option is the redevelopment of the Civic Centre/office site. As proposed, this would meet practically all of the capacity identified in the 2012 Retail Study. It is however not sufficient to merely provide a quantum of floorspace, the critical issue is the attractiveness of the proposal to tenants which in turn is informed by, among other factors, the size and type of accommodation proposed. In this regard we have severe reservations as to the commercial attractiveness of the proposals for Lowther Street and the Civic Centre.

Our client agrees with the findings of the DDF that Option A, which involves retention of the Civic Centre tower, is not a viable option, as insufficient floorspace would be provided. As proposed, we question the attractiveness of the current mix to retailers and, whilst the anchor store provides the type of accommodation such retailers are seeking, the supporting retail floor space is not of sufficient size to support the anchor store, or to create the necessary draw from the rest of the town centre.

Option B requires the relocation of the Civic Centre. However, the DDF is silent as to where this relocation might take place, the likely timescales involved (saved for reference to it occurring within the Plan period) or more importantly the cost. On this last point the costs associated with relocating the Civic Centre will be significant. Taking other costs into account (Construction, contribution to retailers, professional fees and loss of car parking revenue) it is difficult to see how such a proposal would be viable without additional funding, something that is still difficult to secure in the current economic climate.

Furthermore, the development proposed would require non-City Council owned land and commencement of CPO proceedings, new access for the wider City centre and new car parking provision, the latter of which is already under-served in the City

It is also unclear how either proposal would integrate with the rest of the primary shopping area which, at present, turns its back on the Civic Centre and surrounding area.

In conclusion whilst our client welcomes the Council's aspirations for the City Centre, the redevelopment of Lowther Street will require a number of obstacles to be overcome, not least relocating the existing office accommodation and securing non-City Council owned land. As planned our client has serious reservations that the proposals will deliver the step change envisaged by the Council and without significant funding the viability and ultimately the deliverability of the Civic Centre site must be questionable. Whilst we acknowledge the town centre first principle, if in or edge of centre sites are not deliverable then consideration should be given to other sites, including accessible out of centre locations

We trust these representations have been duly made and would welcome the opportunity to discuss with officers our comments in more detail at a later stage.

Response: Affirmation of the findings of the 2012 Retail Study are noted and welcomed.

Whilst concerns regarding the proposed options for land to the north of Lowther Street including Rickergate are noted, these are not shared. Initial albeit high level viability appraisals were undertaken in support of the options development with no significant concerns arising with regards to the proposed options. It is recognised however within the report that more detailed viability work would be prepared as part of progressing firm proposals. The options have also been informed and are supported through the soft market testing which has been undertaken which supports that a number of retailers would see an extension of the primary shopping area in this direction as the most attractive option from a retail and footfall perspective. Recent firm interest in this general area is also considered material to note.

Notwithstanding that the proposed options present indicative schemes, the identified department store should have been annotated as an anchor store which reflects that it need not necessarily be taken as a department store with other non department store retailers operating stores of a similar size, which as acknowledged may be on the increase as retailers seek larger but fewer stores. In this regard an anchor store of the nature proposed may, as emerged through soft market testing, be attractive to a wide range of retailers. Notwithstanding this there is no evidence to support that those department stores not currently represented in Carlisle would automatically seek an out of centre opportunity, which is evident by their existing portfolios and recent investment decisions.

Comments on Option A within the report and the perceived shortcomings of this are noted.

Whilst noting concerns regarding the relocation of services inherent in Option B, this is not in principle considered to constitute a significant constraint. This in part reflects that the availability of alternative premises is currently good, with a number of options which could be explored and pursued should the need arise. If relocations costs were to be encountered these would, as acknowledged, be accounted for as a 'development cost' associated with pursuing a given proposal, and factored into the viability assessment of any scheme. Recognition of this featured within the high level viability appraisals which were undertaken in support of the options development, with the degree of detail considered proportionate at this stage.

Question No	CharacterArea	Agree ?	TopicArea	RepNo	RefNo	Consultee	Organisation	AgentRefN
-------------	---------------	---------	-----------	-------	-------	-----------	--------------	-----------

The majority of the land required to deliver the indicative Option B is within City Council ownership and discussions with the Ministry of Justice have indicated that they are willing to explore relocation with a view to making their land available for redevelopment. The delivery of firm proposals in this area need not therefore be subject to CPO proceedings. The opportunity for a new access to the wider City Centre can be seen to be a positive opportunity and whilst the centre is served by an excess number of car parking spaces, new provision presents an opportunity to address perceived spatial imbalances with regards to the availability of existing provision.

It is recognised that careful consideration will need to be afforded to ensure that any redevelopment would integrate effectively with the existing area but this is not considered to be unachievable. To the contrary the extension of the City Centre in this direction offers an opportunity to better integrate with the parks beyond, the Sands Centre (as a key leisure hub), the new Arts Centre (and entertainment venue) and the car parks at the Sands and Swifts which many visitors from the north currently use.

The opportunity to discuss comments at a later stage, particularly as the Local Plan emerges, is welcomed.

Proposed Change

All references to department store should be updated to instead refer to 'anchor store'.

	Other	<input type="checkbox"/>		2474	Comment	o81	John Kelsall	Carlisle District Civic Tru
Comment	<p>The Trust found the GVA report well set out and straight forward to follow but its content and format did raise some concerns:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The terms of reference are not clearly stated. It is difficult to establish what, if any, decisions the Authority had already made before commissioning the report so it leaves an element of doubt in the readers mind as to what aspect the Authority is responsible for and what contribution and guidance is being made by the consultants. The reader is left with the impression that they are not seeing the whole story. • According to the report title there is an expectation of a comprehensive assessment of all potential development issues and options within the City Centre. What is delivered is a fairly direct assessment of meeting only retail needs arising from the Retail Study by the same Consultant carried out for the Authority in 2012. Where other aspects are touched upon they are seen only in the context of meeting the 200,000 sq.ft. Additional retail need set down by the former study. • We are surprised that the opportunity was not taken to commission a different consultant to the company that had undertaken the Retail Study. Doing so would have more genuinely affirmed or indeed challenged the former findings in a more dispassionate way leading to stronger and more valid advice. • Inclusion of quite specific sketch scheme visuals and layouts for the option 'preferred' by the Consultants/Authority together with indicative images from different cities may have been intended to explain scale and potential outcomes to the general public, however, the Trust believes such detail is premature and stifles consultation at this stage. Such a practice may be, on the one hand, informative but, on the other, suggests development work has already proceeded past the decisions under consideration — i.e.. What point is there responding, the matter is clearly a 'fait accompli'. 							
Response:	<p>The City Centre Development Framework is part of the evidence base which will help primarily inform the policies of relevance within the emerging Local Plan. The consultants who undertook the study were appointed following a competitive tender process and the report and its recommendations reflect their independent findings. The focus of the study on retail floorspace reflects that this was the primary purpose of commissioning the study but notwithstanding this the opportunity was also taken to identify opportunities to enhance the vitality and viability of the City Centre in its widest sense. Whilst comments are noted with regards to the inclusion of specific sketch scheme visuals it should be noted that there will always be difficulties in pitching a document of this nature for a broad audience so they understand it, with the visuals used included on the grounds that they would help achieve an appropriate balance in this regard.</p>							
Proposed Change	<p>No change considered necessary.</p>							
General	Other	<input type="checkbox"/>		2295	Comment	o61	Mr David Hamilton	
Comment	<p>The THOROUGH INVESTIGATION of the feasibility of running a park and ride facility.</p>							
Response:	<p>There is no evidence to currently support that there is a need for park and ride sites although transport modelling to support the Local Plan, including the testing of possible interventions, remains ongoing.</p>							
Proposed Change	<p>No change considered necessary.</p>							

Question No	CharacterArea	Agree ?	TopicArea	RepNo	RefNo	Consultee	Organisation	AgentRefN
General	Other	<input type="checkbox"/>		2308	Comment	062	Mr Hans J A Landstrom	
Comment	No charges for car parking in the City Centre. That is good for business and to make the centre alive otherwise many people will only go to the superstores for free parking.							
Response:	The City Council is currently considering the management and parking arrangements for car parks in its ownership and how these can be used to help maintain and enhance the vitality and viability of the City Centre.							
Proposed Change	No change considered necessary.							
<hr/>								
	Other	<input type="checkbox"/>		2189	Comment	051	Miss Susan Mark	
Comment	<p>Whole Document:</p> <p>We can all see improvements are needed, neglected areas, but easy to say.</p> <p>No ideas of improvement , any merit given. Just words, no costs, all pipe dreams.</p> <p>Only thing I can see in this document worth doing is relocating the Council to Botchergate.</p> <p>Boring, no imagination. Lack of substance.</p> <p>How much money has been spent so far with nothing to show for it.</p> <p>Anyone could have done that document from looking around the city, probably better. They would have noticed and noted all the empty premises.</p>							
Response:	The City Centre Development Framework (CCDF) has been prepared as part of a plan lead approach to dealing with identified retail needs and the development of planning policies to support the future vitality and viability of the City Centre. Such an approach responds to the requirements of national planning policy and in this regard a clear distinction The City Centre Development Framework (CCDF) The CCDF identifies key principles which will be carried forward into policy to inform planning applications and proposals as these emerge. It has been prepared as part of a plan lead approach to dealing with identified retail needs and the development of planning policies to support the future vitality and viability of the City Centre. Such an approach responds to the requirements of national planning policy. Whilst noting frustrations that the recommendations and proposals within are considered unimaginative, no alternative proposals are instead put forward, with the public consultation on the framework providing an opportunity to do so.							
Proposed Change	No change considered necessary.							
<hr/>								
	Other	<input type="checkbox"/>		2004	Comment	032	Pauline Nicholson	
Comment	I understand that one of the ways to develop retail space in the city centre would be to build on the site currently occupied by the Civic Centre. Another proposal is to create on-street parking charges. Do these two ideas really complement each other?							
Response:	Any detailed proposal for larger developments within the City Centre would have to include a clear and comprehensive car parking strategy. The illustrative schemes presented for the Rickergate area include car parking provision, and in this regard would not be dependent on street parking.							
Proposed Change	No change considered necessary.							

Question No	CharacterArea	Agree ?	TopicArea	RepNo	RefNo	Consultee	Organisation	AgentRefN
General	Other	<input type="checkbox"/>		2245	Comment	024	Nigel Holmes	
Comment	Letter referring to the Document 'Carlisle City Vision 2002 - 2012@ which was shaped by 'people from all walks of life' and the comments made by the leader. Highlights 4 objectives.							
	12 years ago there was not a word about seeking more shopping space but the 'Vision' did emphasise 'involving our communities more actively in decision making'. I tend to think that many of these computerised box filling forms are designed to deter people from expressing straight forward views, simply and easily. The Council can then dismiss the relatively little feedback they receive which negates democracy. Consulting during the main holiday period is another tactic to limit meaningful debate.							
	So do we really need more shops and offices? Many shops are empty and there's a huge surplus of office space in the city. And how many houses do we require? Would it not make more sense to use empty city centre offices or brownfield sites such as Caldew Riverside for housing rather than destroy the very essence of our exiting villages by over development? [rest of letter is more pertinent to the SHLAA]							
	Additional submission of Document "At Homes. 40 years of Pollard Thomas Edwards" regarding retaining the Civic Centre							
Response:	Consultation on the draft City Centre Development Framework (CCDF) accords with the Council's published Statement of Community Involvement and represents the second stage of consultation on it. Further consultation opportunities also likely to be forthcoming within the context of the Local Plan which will take forward key recommendations from the CCDF and which will itself be subject to further consultation in the future. It is therefore considered clear to see that both the CCDF and Local Plan have evolved over time with both having been positively informed by the process of consultation.							
	Within the context of the Local Plan the CCDF identifies and promotes taking opportunities in response to evidence. Evidence in the form of the Carlisle Retail Study supports that there is a need for additional retail units within the City Centre particularly from a qualitative perspective in terms of providing the size, form and configuration of units which accord with retailers' current high street needs. This evidence is considered to remain robust with a number of those in the retail industry, within the City and beyond, recently reaffirming its conclusions. Such new units will be a key element of any strategy going forward to retain a number of existing retailers as well as too attract new retailers to Carlisle, and ultimately to maintain the vitality and viability of the City Centre and its overall offer.							
Proposed Change	No change considered necessary.							
	Other	<input type="checkbox"/>		2421	Comment	071	Mrs Joan Field	
Comment	You state that officers would be available to answer queries on the consultation material on two dates. My husband and I attended on the second date - Wed 20th August 11am - 3pm. There was a poster and copies of questionnaires buut no officer [at 2pm].							
Response:	The City Council maintain that the stall at the Best of Carlisle Pageant market event was staffed between the hours witch such availability having been well publicised.							
Proposed Change	No change considered necessary.							
	Other	<input type="checkbox"/>		2160	Objection	049	Mrs Mavis Sarginson	
Comment	I am objecting to the city centre development as there is wasted space in the town centre without creating more empty shops and parking is a problem and too expensive. I would like the council to stop wasting money on consultants when they are cutting back on things like play areas, free parking and numerous other things.							
Response:	The City Centre Development Framework (CCDF) has been prepared as part of a plan lead approach to dealing with identified needs for additional retail floorspace and the development of planning policies to support the future vitality and viability of the City Centre. Such an approach responds to the requirements of national planning policy and in this regard is a mandatory exercise. The appointed consultants were appointed following a competitive tender process which amongst other things seeks to ensure value for money.							
Proposed Change	No change considered necessary.							
	Other	<input type="checkbox"/>		2190	Comment	051	Miss Susan Mark	
Comment	Idea of putting road in front of Castle underground, whilst I would expect very expensive. If, the Council looked at the project like a TV programme, the community, volunteers, businesses could get involved to improve their city, with a view to doing it as cheaply as possible e.g. Logos could be produced by children, win a prize NOT PAYING OUT BIG TIME FOR 1. Think Anika Rice.							
Response:	The Framework establishes the need to improve permeability within the historic quarter. Consideration will be afforded moving forward to the way in which this can best be achieved and appropriate opportunities will be pursued in due course. Suggestions for community involvement in the identification and implementation of solutions are noted and welcomed.							
Proposed Change	No change considered necessary.							

Question No	CharacterArea	Agree ?	TopicArea	RepNo	RefNo	Consultee	Organisation	AgentRefN
General	Other	<input type="checkbox"/>		2307	Comment	062	Mr Hans J A Landstrom	
Comment	Pages 2 & 6 - The Central Hotel, Victoria Viaduct							
	The Central Hotel is like a ruin for years - not good. How can a bad management [or lack of it] be above the law? Or is it the law an underdog? [a similar problem with a hotel in Annan Scotland - close to the railway station].							
Response:	Efforts are ongoing to find a viable, alternative use for the premises referred to which is not however in the ownership and therefore direct control of the City Council.							
Proposed Change	No change considered necessary.							
	Other	<input type="checkbox"/>		2188	Comment	051	Miss Susan Mark	
Comment	Tourists need to be attracted, beautiful surrounds, leisure amenities. A beautiful theatre, not roughing it in a sports centre. People like to dress up for certain occasions.							
Response:	Comments noted.							
Proposed Change	No change considered necessary.							
	Other	<input type="checkbox"/>		2202	Comment	052	Mr Colin Latimer	
Comment	Now that information about Central Plaza Hotel ownership had been made public, this should be allowed change of use/demolition for developers [Primark]. If this building is allowed to fall into major disrepair or arson, the resulting closure of the surrounding roads would lead to chaos as well as affecting existing retailers.							
	Allowing this development would open up the viaduct Estate. It would become a focal point should redevelopment of the baths to a transport hub materialise.							
Response:	Efforts are ongoing to find a viable, alternative use for the premises referred to which is not however in the ownership and therefore direct control of the City Council.							
Proposed Change	No change considered necessary.							
	Other	<input type="checkbox"/>		2218	Comment	053	Mrs Joyce Hetherington	
Comment	Could something be done about the Central Hotel, Royal Hotel and Railway Pub London Road. These are all a disgrace to the city, I am sure you agree.							
Response:	Efforts are ongoing to find viable, alternative uses for the premises referred to none of which are however in the ownership and therefore direct control of the City Council.							
Proposed Change	No change considered necessary.							
	Other	<input type="checkbox"/>		2205	Comment	052	Mr Colin Latimer	
Comment	In your conservation area policy Section 4 paragraph 2 you state 'Traffic generated by proposals can be satisfactorily accommodated on the surrounding road network'.							
Response:	Transport modelling is ongoing to support the emerging Local Plan including potential proposals which it may act to take forward, and those therefore identified through the City Centre Development Framework.							
Proposed Change	No change considered necessary.							

Question No	CharacterArea	Agree ?	TopicArea	RepNo	RefNo	Consultee	Organisation	AgentRefN
-------------	---------------	---------	-----------	-------	-------	-----------	--------------	-----------

General	Other	<input type="checkbox"/>		2392	Comment	068	Jilly Dougherty	Environment Agency
----------------	--------------	--------------------------	--	------	---------	-----	-----------------	--------------------

Comment We have significant concerns that areas within the city centre are at risk of flooding and this has not been accurately reflected within this document.

We feel that flood risk within the City Centre may affect the deliverability and viability of some of the schemes identified in the document. While we support sustainable economic growth and regeneration, where it is known that the risk of flooding will affect a site this should be clearly identified within the document. In particular, two of our main areas of concern relate to the sections on Riverside and Rickergate. For the Riverside area, the risk of flooding is mentioned but it does not reflect that this is a high risk area and appears to assume the presence of defences and an existing planning consent mean that the risk is low. Conversely, the section on Rickergate makes no mention of Flood Risk at all, despite being in an area at a high risk of flooding and supporting a development option which includes uses which may not necessarily be appropriate in this location. Would the preferred option for the redevelopment of this area comply with other policies in the Local Plan, the NPPF or the Council's own evidence base?

As stated in the document, it is neither a DPD nor an SPD and would not outweigh the policies within the adopted Local Plan or NPPF. Flood risk would be a material consideration to any development proposed in an area at risk and to overcome our concerns we would ask that the Framework is updated to ensure that it is clear that any development proposals in the city centre would be assessed against the Local Plan and NPPF as a whole, and that the sites identified within the framework would be subject to greater scrutiny and assessment if they were to be allocated through the Local Plan or were subject to a planning application before an up to date Local Plan is adopted.

We would therefore suggest that the document is revisited and amended to reflect the fact that other plans and policies, including the NPPF, Planning Practice Guidance, your own SFRA and your Local Plan, mean that there is no guarantee that the sites identified for growth and development in the City Centre Development Framework will be deliverable until such time as they have been subject to further scrutiny and assessment.

Response: The purpose of the City Centre Development Framework is to inform the Local Plan against which development proposals would have to be assessed against. The Local Plan already contains policies which deal with flood risk and the need to consider a breach scenario would be dealt with through the process of a Flood Risk Assessment required to accompany any proposal. The report will however be updated to acknowledge this approach.

Proposed Change Update the report to acknowledge the approach to assessing flood risk, including the testing of a flood defence breach scenario as part of the Flood Risk Assessment process.

	Other	<input type="checkbox"/>		2358	Comment	067	Mr Simon Artiss	Barratt Homes
--	--------------	--------------------------	--	------	---------	-----	-----------------	---------------

Comment CCDF – any residential opportunities here will, we assume, be higher density apartments, and therefore not typical of the schemes that we have been building over the last few years. Any larger sites for housing, with perhaps a small apartment element, would be of interest.

Response: Comments and interest noted.

Proposed Change No change considered necessary.

	Other	<input type="checkbox"/>		2320	Comment	063	Mr Ian Grey	
--	--------------	--------------------------	--	------	---------	-----	-------------	--

Comment I am fully supportive of an ambitious 'redesign' of the centre, however out of centre development to include park & ride and a safe cycle network should be incorporated in the plan.

Response: Other policies in the Local Plan seek to promote a continuous, safe and attractive public rights of way network including cycleways. The City Centre Development Framework does refer to improving permeability and it is considered that this could be strengthened to make clear that it should do so for all users (therefore extending coverage to cyclists). There is no evidence to currently support that there is a need for park and ride sites although transport modelling to support the Local Plan, including the testing of possible interventions, remains ongoing.

Proposed Change Strengthen the Framework to make clear that permeability should be improved for all users (therefore extending coverage to cyclists).

Question No	CharacterArea	Agree ?	TopicArea	RepNo	RefNo	Consultee	Organisation	AgentRefN
General	Other	<input type="checkbox"/>		2356	Comment	066	Mrs Sandra Stockley	
Comment	This is a unique opportunity for Carlisle. I came to live in the area 40 years ago when the Lanes was in a serious state of deterioration. However, thanks to a Conservation Group and not the Council in conjunction with Laings builders, this area was re-developed sensitively, unlike the former West Riding towns from where I originate. They were mostly flattened and redeveloped into flat roofed shopping centres with no variation or reference to their original characters. It is unlikely that I shall leave this area about which I have grown to be concerned. I hope and trust that where doubts exist those concerns should be fully addressed by ALL interested parties, and particularly those who live and work there.							
Response:	Comments noted. Any detailed development proposals would be subject to future consultation as part of the formal planning application process and prior to this, at pre-application stage, in accordance with the Council's published Statement of Community Involvement which identifies the requirements upon developers.							
Proposed Change	No change considered necessary.							
	Other	<input type="checkbox"/>		2355	Comment	066	Mrs Sandra Stockley	
Comment	I can see now the reasons for the changes made relatively recently to Castle Street. But it was never explained in context to the General Public. And no doubt the loss of parking spaces led to the demise of Hoopers Department Store, Jaegar and Benetton. What is planned for the Hoopers building?							
Response:	The City Council do not own the former Hoopers building. Planning permission was recently secured by the owners for restaurant use which facilities an alternative option to its continued use for retail purposes. The City Council are committed to working with stakeholders to reduce the number of vacancies within the City Centre and will be proactive in using the powers available to them to assist in this objective. A good recent example of this is that the City Council agreed in January 2015 to update their Discretionary Rate Relief Policy in order to offer re-occupation relief for retail units which have been vacant for 12 months or more. The implementation of this national initiative at the local level sees such units qualify for a 50% reduction in their business rates (National Non Domestic Rates) for 18 months from the date the premises becomes occupied - and is likely to constitute a strong incentive in bringing empty units back into use.							
Proposed Change	No change considered necessary.							
	Other	<input type="checkbox"/>		2231	Comment	054	Mr Christopher Wheeler	
Comment	'Indicative' Picture on page 8 - West Tower Street and its continuation round Debenhams is the principal traffic access route from north & west to the car parks in Lowther Street and the Lanes. The picture shows no traffic at all. Where has it all gone?							
Response:	The report and other illustrations identify the principle of a new access to serve these needs being taken from Georgian Way. The need to afford careful consideration to the flow and movement of traffic from west to east through this part of the City Centre is acknowledged, particularly within the context of needing to secure effective integration between the existing and any extension to the primary shopping area.							
Proposed Change	No change considered necessary.							
	Other	<input type="checkbox"/>		2217	Comment	053	Mrs Joyce Hetherington	
Comment	No mention of new facilities for cyclists to move freely from home or work to City Centre of Botchergate.							
Response:	Other policies in the Local Plan seek to promote a continuous, safe and attractive public rights of way network including cycleways and adequate cycle parking provision.							
Proposed Change	No change considered necessary.							

Question No	CharacterArea	Agree ?	TopicArea	RepNo	RefNo	Consultee	Organisation	AgentRefN
General	Other	<input type="checkbox"/>		2159	Comment	049	Mrs Mavis Sarginson	
Comment	There are enough empty retail premises and the Viaduct Hotel without building more - I now avoid the city centre because of the parking problems - this will be made worse when the parking meters begin to be installed.							
	Suggest improve Botchergate and Viaduct Hotel.							
Response:	Existing vacancies are considered to be below the national average with a number of long standing vacant units such as those at the Crown and Mitre having recently reverted back into active use. Feedback from agents within the City also supports that there is relatively strong demand for vacant units within the core of the City Centre, with relatively quick turnaround achieved. Notwithstanding this the City Council are committed to working with stakeholders to reduce the number of vacancies within the City Centre and will be proactive in using the powers available to them to assist in this objective. A good recent example of this is that the City Council agreed in January 2015 to update their Discretionary Rate Relief Policy in order to offer re-occupation relief for retail units which have been vacant for 12 months or more. The implementation of this national initiative at the local level sees such units qualify for a 50% reduction in their business rates (National Non Domestic Rates) for 18 months from the date the premises becomes occupied - and is likely to constitute a strong incentive in bringing empty units back into use.							
	Comments regarding on street parking are noted, but on street parking is the responsibility of Cumbria County Council in their capacity as the highway authority and is therefore beyond the direct control of the City Council.							
	The Framework is already considered to adequately promote opportunities to enhance Botchergate and the locality surrounding and including the Viaduct Hotel.							
Proposed Change	No change considered necessary.							
	Other	<input type="checkbox"/>		2230	Comment	054	Mr Christopher Wheeler	
Comment	Maps on Pages 1,2,3,4,5 While it is understood that the maps are intended to give a general overview, the roads marked in grey include a number of inaccuracies which reduce one's faith in the rest of the document:							
	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The maps appear to show English Street as a traffic thoroughfare - surely there is no plan to de-pedestrianise it? 2. The maps also show West Tower Street continuing straight through Debenhams. Why wasn't it shown as zigzagging round Debenhams as in the detailed map on page 6? 3. a non-existent road is shown passing behind the NE half of the Citadel. 							
Response:	The need for a consistent approach to identifying key thoroughfares is noted and the maps will be updated accordingly.							
Proposed Change	Update the maps to ensure a consistent approach is employed with regards to thoroughfares.							
	Other	<input type="checkbox"/>		2040	Objection	036	Ian Caruana	
Comment	I strongly oppose any further limitations or car access to city centre. The whole consultation is full of tired old ideas.							
Response:	The City Centre Development Framework identifies a need to maintain and enhance transport movement and circulation throughout a number of key areas. The Framework has identified and subsequently considered what are considered to be the reasonable options for addressing known key issues going forward.							
Proposed Change	No change considered necessary.							

Question No	CharacterArea	Agree ?	TopicArea	RepNo	RefNo	Consultee	Organisation	AgentRefN
General	Other	<input type="checkbox"/>		2243	Comment	055	Mrs Helen Blamire	
Comment	<p>Also see Repts 2240, 2241, 2242 We don't need more shops as many are standing empty. We don't want low cost housing, which will end up being 'let'. We don't need any more eateries. You should not be moving 80 yr old ladies from their homes - this could kill them and blood would be on your hands.</p>							
Response:	<p>How many millions of tax payers money have you wasted on this new scheme? Having worked for the LA for 20 yrs in a former life, I know you not will listen to the views of local residents - although there's always a first time</p> <p>Evidence in the form of the Carlisle Retail Study supports that there is a need for additional retail units within the City Centre particularly from a qualitative perspective in terms of providing the size, form and configuration of units which accord with retailers' current high street needs. Whilst noting that there are a number of vacant units within the City Centre these do not currently, nor is there considered any scope for these in the future to, meet this full range of future needs. This evidence is considered to remain robust with a number of those in the retail industry, within the City and beyond, recently reaffirming its conclusions. Such new units will be a key element of any strategy going forward to retain a number of existing retailers as well as too attract new retailers to Carlisle, and ultimately to maintain the vitality and viability of the City Centre and its overall offer. It is further considered that additional restaurants, leisure uses and additional opportunities for city centre living could all complement this aim.</p>							
Proposed Change	<p>The consultation on the draft City Centre Development Framework (CCDF) represented the second stage of consultation on it with further opportunities also likely to be forthcoming within the context of the Local Plan which will take forward key recommendations from the CCDF and which will itself be subject to further consultation in the future. It is therefore considered clear to see that both the CCDF and Local Plan have evolved over time with both having been positively informed by the process of consultation.</p> <p>No change considered necessary.</p>							

Question No	CharacterArea	Agree ?	TopicArea	RepNo	RefNo	Consultee	Organisation	AgentRefN
General	Other	<input type="checkbox"/>		2457	Comment	076	Lydia Leith	
Comment	<p>As part of the younger generation and future, I am writing to you as I am seriously concerned about the future of Carlisle's Iconic Civic Centre building. It would be a mistake to knock it down. Mid-Century modern is an architectural and interior style that is now recognised by scholars and museums worldwide as a significant design movement. Over time tastes change and in the future more and more people will like it.</p> <p>"Victorian architecture was out of favour in the 1960's and Georgian architecture was out of favour in the Victorian era, but over time as each previous generations buildings age attitudes change and their qualities become more widely appreciated." British Brutalist Architecture Blog</p> <p>People often don't know what they want but having the foresight to save a building gains respect and put an area it on the map, just look at Victor Pasmores, Apollo Pavilion in Durham, Morecambes Midland Hotel, Prestons Bus station or the Tyneside Cinema in Newcastle to name a few recent success stories. Carlisle civic centre could be the next success story.</p> <p>It will be very expensive to (god forbid) knock the Civic centre down to nothing and more money will be wasted on building an unimaginative boring shopping centre with no social relevance or history in its place. Plus many shops in Carlisle are already empty.</p> <p>The Civic Centre building could be restored and used for multi purpose. There is so much potential in this building. It just takes a few moments to realise this, it could contain shops, cafes, health and beauty suites and other sorts of outlets, there could even be a cinema in there. The top floors could be used for luxury flats or hotel rooms or offices. The 1st floor already looks like a perfect place for Location shooting and could be rented out for filming/ photo shoots. Even a swimming pool in the basement. Anything is an option, anything but knocking it down.</p> <p>I want people in Carlisle to join us and see the potential in what we already have, I have started a petition and already it is gaining interest: http://www.change.org/p/save-carlisle-civic-centre-save-carlisle-civic-centre-from-being-knocked-down?share_id=VdvUklPVYn&utm_campaign=share_button_action_box&utm_medium=facebook&utm_source=share_petition</p> <p>It is easy to throw a uneducated "its an eye sore" comment but if you look closer and read up on mid century modern design you will quickly realise what Carlisle has here is a real historic and architectural gem and should be saved.</p> <p>I want the best for Carlisle as a city but if we carry on like this I am afraid we will end up a series of mistakes. After the recent and tragic loss of the beautiful art deco cinema I feel it is time for Carlisle's beautiful and interesting that we have left buildings to be saved. Lets see the potential in what we have already got and think of the long term future.</p> <p>I have also gathered up quotes about why we should save Carlisle Civic Centre from a mix of people and I have a lot more quotes to come but here are a few for now:</p> <p>"Carlisle Civic Century is a magnificent example of Mid-Century modern architecture and an important piece of British design history. I am truly shocked and horrified by the plans for it to be demolished and replaced with potentially soulless retail outlet." Tilly Hemingway of Hemingway Design, London</p> <p>"To fight for the preservation of beauty, great architecture and timeless design." Rachel Benn, Graphic Designer, Carlisle</p> <p>"Don't let what happened to Lonsdale happen to civic. These buildings represent a piece of Carlisle's history and a piece of the hearts and minds of carlisians." Andrew Wilson, Carlisle</p> <p>"This is a wonderful example of 60's modernism, and has some wonderful interior spaces which are classic examples of the period. It would be tragic to see the long history of John Laing's relationship with Carlisle destroyed." Alex Kolombos, Wells</p> <p>"I believe we should take every opportunity to preserve our 20th century architectural heritage, and try together to not be short-sighted. Once it's gone, it's gone." Leigh Venus, Newcastle</p> <p>"STOP this Cultural Vandalism." Andrew Nix, London</p> <p>"Carlisle already has too many empty shops, none with architectural merit. We don't need more empty shops, we need more imaginative ideas for Carlisle, and the Civic Centre should be a part of that." Paul Taylor, Carlisle</p> <p>"Appreciation of great design. Disapproval of councils continuously misguided/lazy decision making and planning, lack of vision and involvement of creative minds." Sophie Jarzyna, Edinburgh</p> <p>"Retention of the best 20th century architecture is a vital part of preserving a contiguous architectural and social heritage for the future" James Francis, IPWICH</p> <p>"The Civic Centre's theatrical interiors exude 60's British MCM. They would provide the perfect backdrop for a for a Bond villain in an Egg Chair" David Ashton</p>							
Response:	Comments noted. The potential of the Civic Centre as a listed building and therefore its architectural and cultural merits have been examined in the recent past including by English Heritage. This process has concluded that the building is of no national interest as few original features remain and better examples exist elsewhere. Notwithstanding this any decision to demolish the building would not be taken lightly.							
Proposed Change	No change considered necessary.							
	Other	<input type="checkbox"/>		2439	Comment	073	Phil Gray	Green Spaces
Comment	<p>Green Infrastructure: I think the whole framework is lacking in consideration of the green environment, non-motorised transport and green infrastructure as an ameliorating factor against impacts of climate change.</p> <p>While I accept the framework adopts a broad brush approach and therefore doesn't have space for detailed proposals, if the green environment isn't considered at this stage there is a risk that it won't be included in the detailed document later.</p>							
Response:	Agree that the document could be strengthened in these regards.							
Proposed Change	Strengthen the document as suggested to reinforce the importance of Green Infrastructure moving forward.							

Question No	CharacterArea	Agree ?	TopicArea	RepNo	RefNo	Consultee	Organisation	AgentRefN
General	Other	<input type="checkbox"/>		2068	Comment	042	Mrs Dallas Brewis	Cycle Carlisle
Comment	Lack of cycling facilities: There is virtually no mention of encouraging cycling in the proposals. The only mention is the Caldew Riverside trail which already exists.							
Response:	Other policies in the Local Plan seek to promote a continuous, safe and attractive public rights of way network including cycleways. The City Centre Development Framework does refer to improving permeability and it is considered that this could be strengthened to make clear that it should do so for all users (therefore extending coverage to cyclists).							
Proposed Change	Strengthen the Framework to make clear that permeability should be improved for all users (therefore extending coverage to cyclists).							
	Other	<input type="checkbox"/>		2069	Comment	042	Mrs Dallas Brewis	Cycle Carlisle
Comment	Parking: The parking below West Walls could be enhanced by having a lift up from the Lower Viaduct car park to West Walls. There is enough car parking in the centre of Carlisle. There is no need for more - but certainly there should be a reduction in the Historic Core.							
Response:	Comments noted.							
Proposed Change	No change considered necessary.							
	Other	<input type="checkbox"/>		2485	Comment	082	John Kelsall	Conservation Area Adviso
Comment	In summary the Committee understood the need for the framework, the methodology and the context within which the Authority had to work and concluded the following:							
	i. The consultation documents were not truly a framework for the development of the city centre – but an implementation framework springing from the 2012 retail study – the committee would like to see the framework expanded to consider all aspects of the development of the City Centre.							
	ii. The premise that Carlisle will be assisted in remaining a sub-regional centre if it attracted another anchor store as a catalyst for a redevelopment project required to be questioned as the extent of the negative consequences appears not to have been evaluated i.e. – stores currently in The Lanes migrating to the new store – leaving the central shopping area potentially even less occupied than at present.							
	iii. Specific emphasis upon the redevelopment of Rickergate should be removed and the area only progressed as an option site together with the Citadel – this is seen as offering greater flexibility whilst maintaining an evidence base and deliverability. In this way it is felt that the blighting effect will be reduced.							
	iv. Sketch schemes and indicative images should only progress via serious developers and in the expectation that such will encompass the area's distinctiveness with design of the highest order.							
	v. Demolition of the iconic Civic Centre tower which represents the spirit of a distinct earlier era only be considered where the replacement architecture can be assessed as meriting such a change.							
Response:	It is the role of the Local Plan to provide appropriate policy coverage for all aspects of the development of the City Centre and indeed beyond. The potential displacement of existing retail occupiers within the City Centre is noted and it is acknowledged that this issue would have to be carefully managed as far as is possible within the context of the 'market'. Whilst noting comments regarding the removal of a specific emphasis on the redevelopment of Rickergate, it is considered that the level of detail within the report is needed in the interests of providing certainty. Whilst acknowledging that the opportunity that the Citadel presents, existing lease arrangements preclude comprehensive redevelopment of the site until the later years of the Local Plan. With regards to the proposed design of any new proposals which may emerge, it should be noted that policies within the Local Plan, against which any development proposals would have to be assessed, require high quality and appropriate design solutions which are responsive to their settings.							
Proposed Change	No change considered necessary.							

Question No	CharacterArea	Agree ?	TopicArea	RepNo	RefNo	Consultee	Organisation	AgentRefN
General	Other	<input type="checkbox"/>		2496	Comment	083	Michael Barry	Cumbria County Council
Comment	County Response Appendix B - Notes of Local Member Workshop 09 September 2014 Comments made regarding: - Spatial Distribution of Development - Access and Infrastructure - Design							
Response:	All of the key issues raised by the Group have been carefully considered but it is felt that many of the issues have been formally raised by either the County Council and/or others and in this regard appropriately responded to within the context of this consultation report when read in full.							
Proposed Change	No change considered necessary.							
	Other	<input type="checkbox"/>		2126	Comment	046	Miss Gillian Smith	
Comment	Carlisle needs better leisure facilities NOT shops. i.e. A REAL theatre would bring trade as people would not have to travel to Newcastle/Manchester etc. If the Civic Centre bulldozed where would staff be relocated? Cumbria CC state they want their staff to rejuvenate Botchergate!!. Why remove CCC staff from city centre.							
Response:	The City Council is committed to improving the leisure offer within the District with the investment in the creation of a new Arts Centre including entertainment street on Warwick Street testament to this. Options for the relocation of City Council staff would be considered at a future point in time if and when a firm need to do so arises. There is no suggestion however within the Framework that City Council staff or services would be moved out with the City Centre.							
Proposed Change	No change considered necessary.							
	Other	<input type="checkbox"/>		2483	Comment	082	John Kelsall	Conservation Area Adviso
Comment	Recollections were related that although the Lanes Development may be regarded as a successful retail centre its history was far from exemplary. The Council, in identifying The Lanes site, inadvertently condemned the area, its residents and business to many years of worry, decline and eventually dereliction. This was the Authority having a vision but it was not a 'funded' vision, so numerous developers and partners came and went leaving behind years of blight and dereliction in the heart of the city. The current plan – in the way it is presented – is reminiscent of this scenario and is of great concern in that respect. The businesses and residents of the Rickergate area are now in a similar predicament – until there is a firm scheme – which may never emerge. Property values will have been severely affected and relocations to similar premises impossible as a result. It did appear to the Committee that this 'trap', whilst it was not intended, had not been adequately prepared for and severe on the parties involved, particularly after the floods and the Renaissance debacle.							
Response:	Comments noted. The Local Plan which the City Centre Development Framework will help to inform will seek to give as much certainty as is possible.							
Proposed Change	No change considered necessary.							
	Other	<input type="checkbox"/>		2158	Comment	049	Mrs Mavis Sarginson	
Comment	Is this going to be repeat of Carlisle Renaissance? Which seemed to cost a lot of money and then nothing happened.							
Response:	The City Centre Development Framework (CCDF) has been prepared as part of a plan lead approach to dealing with identified retail needs and the development of planning policies to support the future vitality and viability of the City Centre. Such an approach responds to the requirements of national planning policy and in this regard a clear distinction can be made between the CCDF and previous Carlisle Renaissance efforts.							
Proposed Change	No change considered necessary.							

Question No	CharacterArea	Agree ?	TopicArea	RepNo	RefNo	Consultee	Organisation	AgentRefN
General	Other	<input type="checkbox"/>		2479	Comment	o81	John Kelsall	Carlisle District Civic Tru
Comment	<p>Given that the process has been in preparation for well over a year the proportionally short consultation period for something so significant to the City can only engender missed opportunities of interaction and foster frustration and potentially consultation fatigue. Wider publication and consultation periods of 2 -3 months would seem to be more fitting for major proposals that set or steer expectations for the next 16 years.</p> <p>The Trust would like to see the Local Plan incorporate a wider vision of how the City Centre can develop positively. Support for what is often termed the historic quarter, suggestions as to how amalgamation of empty retail units can better meet market needs and suggestions and support for specialist retail outlets that add to the vitality of the shopping experience that may struggle to meet city centre rents. In short a comprehensive framework for all city centre activity.</p>							
Response:	<p>Consultation on the draft City Centre Development Framework (CCDF) represented the second stage of consultation on it. Further consultation opportunities also likely to be forthcoming within the context of the Local Plan which will take forward key recommendations from the CCDF and which will itself be subject to further consultation in the future. The City Council operated a flexible deadline in order to maximise the inclusiveness of the response with the additional time afforded to the Trust to respond testament to this. Comments on potential incorporations with regards to the Local Plan are noted and will be considered in acting to refine it moving forward.</p>							
Proposed Change	<p>No change considered necessary.</p>							
General	Other	<input type="checkbox"/>		2465	Comment	o79	Mrs M Heinrichsous	
Comment	<p>Regardless of the two proposed options can we for once give Carlisle what it NEEDS not what some faceless consultant thinks we might want.</p> <p>If you must have extra shops use the parking area at the bottom of Lowther Street, kept free because you did not want traffic noise by the civic centre.</p> <p>As for building more houses - what is needed is manufacturing jobs so that the low paid workers and the current unemployed might even manage to get on the property ladder and make any homes built really affordable, not the inflated prices currently being asked. Houses will not be needed if there is no work available. Does anyone among our councillors or planners really remember just how many opportunities for semi skilled workers have been lost: Ferguson Fabrics, Courtaulds, Buck's, Atlas Works, Penguin Confectionery, Kangol and even may Carrs biscuit workers to name but some of them. Try to think of what is really needed, not just retail - we have several empty shops already and a serious car parking problem. Please don't repeat the 20 year discussion over 'The Lanes' when the query over keeping Margery Jackson's house went on until it literally fell down!</p> <p>All of this could be achieved without destroying houses on Warwick Street or Rickergate.</p> <p>Get out of that concrete monstrosity ad walk around the city and I mean the centre on the bottom of Rickergate.</p>							
Response:	<p>Comments noted. The emerging Local Plan seeks to address these and other key issues facing the District.</p>							
Proposed Change	<p>No change considered necessary</p>							
General	Other	<input type="checkbox"/>		2006	Comment	o03	Mr Stephen Glencross	Railway Historians
Comment	<p>We feel that a great part of the city's history has been sadly neglected, The Railway Heritage of this city has been overlooked by all departments.</p> <p>We feel that at this time it should be rectified as this city is undergoing a revamp.</p> <p>What a wonderful opportunity to have a monument which reflects the glorious past of the Railway Heritage and the men and women who worked on it, and have died while working on it.</p>							
Response:	<p>Comments noted. The City Centre Development Framework promotes improvements to the station building and opportunities could be taken through proposals to facilitate interpretation. It will be of interest to note that a new cultural and heritage policy to be included within the emerging Local Plan seeks to, amongst other things, promote the need to respond to opportunities to interpret and communicate the District's past.</p>							
Proposed Change	<p>No change considered necessary.</p>							

Question No	CharacterArea	Agree ?	TopicArea	RepNo	RefNo	Consultee	Organisation	AgentRefN
General	Other	<input type="checkbox"/>		2452	Comment	075	Mr Neil Irving	SOS
Comment	The consultants are biased, this is no more than a repeat of the Renaissance. Do a thorough option of Lowther Street. Commission an option for a retrofit on the Civic Centre and open it up to a national and local competition.							
Response:	The City Centre Development Framework (CCDF) has been prepared as part of a plan lead approach to dealing with identified needs for additional retail floorspace and the development of planning policies to support the future vitality and viability of the City Centre. Such an approach responds to the requirements of national planning policy and in this regard is a mandatory exercise. The appointed consultants were appointed following a competitive tender process and the report and its recommendations reflect their independent findings. In all of these regards a clear distinction can be made between the CCDF and previous Carlisle Renaissance efforts.							
Proposed Change	Parts of Lowther Street have been considered and nothing within the Framework acts to preclude development here where opportunities to do so arises. Similarly options which retain the Civic Tower have evidently been considered. No change considered necessary.							
	Other	<input type="checkbox"/>		2475	Comment	081	John Kelsall	Carlisle District Civic Tru
Comment	The Trust recognises that the Authority is required to prepare a new Local Plan up to 2030 in line with National Planning Policy and to meet the recommendations set down within the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and National Planning Policy Guidance (NPPG). The compulsory requirement to present an 'evidence base' and realistic 'deliverability' is clearly key to a Local Plan being supported by a Planning Inspector at the eventual formal public inquiry. Whilst the 2012 Retail Study represents a major element of the evidence base required it does not conclude that the 200,000 sq.ft. additional requirement by 2030 should, necessarily, include provision for a major anchor store which would take a lion's share of the projected need. The Trust notes that it is only approaching 2030 that this level of expansion demand is predicted. The Draft Framework, however, appears to follow the new anchor store model upon the basis that Carlisle shoppers have expressed a desire for stores such as 'Primark' open in the City – alternative strategies appear not to have been fully investigated such as aggregating vacant outlets in the Lanes to form potential far larger units. The Trust considers that this new anchor store development approach is potentially damaging. A new anchor store and supporting unit development will inevitably encourage the national chain outlets to consider re-locating closer to the 'new' development to benefit from perceived improved popularity (footfall). This can only damage The Lanes where maintaining full letting has proven difficult of late. There may be benefits to consideration of re-development within The Lanes for larger stores maintaining potential for medium sized retailers to cluster around in existing or improved property including historic frontages that may improve the attractiveness of Carlisle as a shopping destination not restrict it as the GVA report concludes. Yes, the appropriate refurbishment of historic frontages will be more costly but the Trust feels that it is inappropriate in a city such as Carlisle for the retail 'tail' to wag the city 'dog'. We are also surprised to see a particular store chain being named (Primark), in fact repeatedly, - surely the store chain will take confidence from this and negotiate from a much stronger position suiting their commercial needs over the views of the City?							
Response:	The option of remodelling existing units suggested would not, it is considered, generate the full extent or form of additional floorspace required within the City Centre. The Framework does not however preclude such an approach which it is acknowledged could be a useful way in responding to some vacancies within the City Centre. Primark is named alongside other retailers merely as an example to illustrate the retail sectors which are considered to be underrepresented within Carlisle City Centre at the present time.							
Proposed Change	No change considered necessary.							
	Other	<input type="checkbox"/>		2486	Comment	083	Michael Barry	Cumbria County Council
Comment	The Carlisle Retail Study 2012 underpins the retail floorspace requirements for the City. Paragraphs 158, 160 and 161 of the NPPF make clear the importance of Local Plans being based on up to date evidence. Given its age and importance to the planning strategy for the City Centre, it is recommended that this document should be subject to a refresh and review to reflect latest economic and population evidence for Carlisle.							
Response:	The Local Plan evidence base was developed to endure across the plan cycle and would be reviewed across the life cycle anyway. Soft marketing testing undertaken in conjunction with the development of the CCDF supports that at the present time there is no significant change to the conclusions reached by the study.							
Proposed Change	No change considered necessary.							

Question No	CharacterArea	Agree ?	TopicArea	RepNo	RefNo	Consultee	Organisation	AgentRefN
General	Other	<input type="checkbox"/>		2481	Objection	082	John Kelsall	Conservation Area Adviso
Comment	The Committee were generally surprised at the confined definition of "City Centre" i.e. a 300m radius from the Market Cross. This excluded the Botchergate area to the south and Damside to the West, both areas that all considered had potential for further development. Chris Hardman explained that 'Centre First' policies were required in order to overcome development proposals outside the city centre and that the driving force from major retailers and developers was for 'level-plate' easily developed sites which are clearly at a premium in such a confined definition of city centre. Whilst the Committee observed that footfall tailed off dramatically away from the Market Cross up Castle Street such that the former Hoopers department store was attracting little interest, it reluctantly had to conclude that Botchergate and Damside may suffer a similar effect.							
Response:	The Local Plan will give consideration to the definitions of 'centre' and 'edge-of-centre' development for the purposes of assessing development proposals for 'main town centre uses' (as defined by national policy).							
Proposed Change	No change considered necessary.							
Q1	Other	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		2030	Comment	035	Jenny I Turner	
Comment	It would be nice to see new shops but remember it is a very small city, only a few I believe that can be built. Carlisle always has been small not really it can be changed, we don't know.							
Response:	Comments noted.							
Proposed Change	No change considered necessary.							
	Other	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		2309	Comment	063	Mr Ian Grey	
Comment	Care must be taken to ensure the 'centres first' approach incorporates any necessary or preferable development further out. I am particularly referring to transport i.e. Park & ride and cycle network.							
Response:	The 'centres first' approach seeks to resist development from happening outside of defined centres and in this regard the care asked to be afforded appears contradictory. Other policies in the Local Plan seek to promote a continuous, safe and attractive public rights of way network including cycleways. The City Centre Development Framework does refer to improving permeability and it is considered that this could be strengthened to make clear that it should do so for all users (therefore extending coverage to cyclists). There is no evidence to currently support that there is a need for park and ride sites although transport modelling to support the Local Plan, including the testing of possible interventions, remains ongoing.							
Proposed Change	Strengthen the Framework to make clear that permeability should be improved for all users (therefore extending coverage to cyclists).							
	Other	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		2044	Comment	039	Mr M Holliday	
Comment	But I object strongly with the use of external consultants. The public vote to elect members to look after our interests. Surely they know better than external consultants what is required to develop our city centre – and at what cost? Ridiculous.							
Response:	Consultants lead on and provided specialist technical advice not available in-house. The consultants who undertook the study were appointed following a competitive tender process and the report and its recommendations reflect their independent findings. Notwithstanding this it should be noted that other stakeholders have helped to inform proposals through for example the two consultation exercises on the draft Framework as it has emerged.							
Proposed Change	No change considered necessary.							

Question No	CharacterArea	Agree ?	TopicArea	RepNo	RefNo	Consultee	Organisation	AgentRefN
Q1	Other	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		2019	Support	034	Mr Eddie Haughan	
Comment								
Response:	Comments noted.							
Proposed Change	No change considered necessary.							
<hr/>								
	Other	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		2344	Support	066	Mrs Sandra Stockley	
Comment	On the basis that no developments whatsoever, specifically the planned changes to the Old Fire Station, should be started until the whole plan is complete							
Response:	Comments noted.							
Proposed Change	No change considered necessary.							
<hr/>								
	Other	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		2007	Support	001	Mr Nigel Winter	Stagecoach NorthWest Lt
Comment								
Response:	Comments noted.							
Proposed Change	No change considered necessary.							
<hr/>								
	Other	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		2393	Support	069	Mrs Karen Atkinson	
Comment								
Response:	Comments noted.							
Proposed Change	No change considered necessary.							
<hr/>								
	Other	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		2247	Comment	058	Mrs Joanne Swanton	JoMark House of Hair
Comment	I support the aims but some of the aspects need questioning. Carlisle needs to regenerate but at what cost. Some areas now need to be used and in full service before building new retail buildings. I know lots of housing is happening in the city over the next 15 years but the city is lacking retail outlets on the south and west perimeters retail shops are now empty. City planners should not be held to ransom by big outlets that want shiny new stores.							
Response:	Comments noted. Proposals to enhance the mix of uses to the south and west of the City Centre including in the locality of the Citadel and Botchergate are promoted by the City Centre Development Framework.							
Proposed Change	No change considered necessary.							

Question No	CharacterArea	Agree ?	TopicArea	RepNo	RefNo	Consultee	Organisation	AgentRefN
Q1	Other	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		2321	Support	064	Mrs Carol Grey	
Comment								
Response:	Comments noted.							
Proposed Change	No change considered necessary.							
<hr/>								
	Other	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		2259	Comment	059	Miss Carole Hoggan	
Comment	Carlisle needs to move forward.							
	HOWEVER we DO NOT need a new shopping centre as there are too many shops sitting empty.							
Response:	Evidence in the form of the Carlisle Retail Study supports that there is a need for additional retail units within the City Centre particularly from a qualitative perspective in terms of providing the size, form and configuration of units which accord with retailers' current high street needs. Whilst noting that there are a number of vacant units within the City Centre these do not currently, nor is there considered any scope for these in the future to, meet this full range of future needs. This evidence is considered to remain robust with a number of those in the retail industry, within the City and beyond, recently reaffirming its conclusions. Such new units will be a key element of any strategy going forward to retain a number of existing retailers as well as too attract new retailers to Carlisle, and ultimately to maintain the vitality and viability of the City Centre and its overall offer.							
Proposed Change	No change considered necessary.							
<hr/>								
	Other	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		2296	Support	062	Mr Hans J A Landstrom	
Comment	The draft page 2,6,7 * but do not demolish the civic centre or make it shorter. This iconic building [why not make it a listed building] represents a period after WW2 when got rid of some slum buildings [ex for homes] let in light, sun, air, space, healthy conditions, sports grounds, green areas, social areas. Compare this with ex Vallingby, a suburb of Stockholm, Sweden 50s and the new capital of Brazil: Brasilia 50's and the new towns/garden towns like Milton Keynes in UK etc. Keep a lot of old buildings alive - of course. Why can't listed buildings automatically have secondary glass windows? [to save energy costs and promote healthy conditions]. Why not make the top floor of the civic centre to a Panorama Centre for visitors/tourists, schools. Conferences etc. This can be a contribution to make Carlisle and Solway area and Eden Valley and West Cumbria more attractive for visitors/tourists from UK and abroad. Cumbria is not only Lake District.							
Response:	The potential of the Civic Centre as a listed building and therefore its architectural and cultural merits have been examined in the recent past including by English Heritage. This process has concluded that the building is of no national interest as few original features remain and better examples exist elsewhere. Notwithstanding this any decision to demolish the building would not be taken lightly. Comments regarding improvements to the energy efficiency and in respect of potential wider uses for the Civic Centre are noted.							
Proposed Change	No change considered necessary.							
<hr/>								
	Other	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		2273	Comment	060	Barry O Earp	
Comment	It is essential that Carlisle has an up to date City Centre Development Plan.							
Response:	Comments noted.							
Proposed Change	No change considered necessary.							

Question No	CharacterArea	Agree ?	TopicArea	RepNo	RefNo	Consultee	Organisation	AgentRefN
Q1	Other	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		2422	Support	072	Mrs Jennifer Smith	
Comment	Yes							
Response:	Comments noted.							
Proposed Change	No change considered necessary.							
<hr/>								
	Other	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		2404	Comment	070	Pauline Dalton	
Comment	In general, I feel the planners have approached the future of the City Centre with the right aspirations. I especially like the plans for Botchergate and the Lowther Street area.							
Response:	Comments noted.							
Proposed Change	No change considered necessary.							
<hr/>								
	Other	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		2206	Comment	053	Mrs Joyce Hetherington	
Comment	No							
Response:	Comments noted.							
Proposed Change	No change considered necessary.							
<hr/>								
	Other	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		2434	Support	073	Phil Gray	Green Spaces
Comment	It seems sensible to include some consideration of the form and function of the city centre as part of the local plan process.							
Response:	Comments noted.							
Proposed Change	No change considered necessary.							
<hr/>								

Question No	CharacterArea	Agree ?	TopicArea	RepNo	RefNo	Consultee	Organisation	AgentRefN
Q1	Other	<input type="checkbox"/>		2162	Objection	o26	Elizabeth Allnutt	Save Our Streets
Comment	<p>No. It bears too much resemblance to Carlisle Renaissance proposals (2006) which are now nearly ten years old and were abandoned for good reasons. These proposals involved the demolition of all of the Rickergate area including three streets of good quality housing of historical and architectural value to the city and the consequent destruction of a good community of residents and small business people. The present proposals involve the similar destruction of Warwick St and the detrimental knock on effect on a strong community. This is still not acceptable. The consultants did not talk to the community when drawing up their proposals, despite the strength of their opposition to and positive contributions of alternative proposals to Carlisle Renaissance's plans. Where Renaissance proposals have been carried out (Castle St) they are not popular and have not been successful in their projected aim of increasing economic development and regeneration.</p> <p>The character areas are not particularly helpful; heritage and shopping are not confined to one area alone. The city centre has many more important functions than shopping that are largely ignored.</p> <p>The draft CCDF does not address the basic problem of how to build new developments in an historic city so that the heritage is preserved both for the local population and for visitors. There is scant reference to the Conservation Area which covers the entirety of the City Centre and all the area considered by the draft CCDF. In the December 2013 response SOS asked for a map with the Conservation Area overlaying and showing the relation to the character areas, which has still not been produced. Conservation Area status is a major consideration and not one to be brushed aside. History and heritage make each town/city unique and should be kept for the benefit of the local population as well as visitors. Tourism contributes greatly to the local economy and Carlisle's historical background and buildings needs to be fostered and promoted, not demolished.</p> <p>There is an overemphasis on retail development; both the importance of it and particularly the specified amount. There is no means of questioning the validity of the 2012 Retail Report. Many local residents are not happy with the projected need for the massive retail development predicated on the supposed need for a further 200,000sqft of space and question it closely, citing internet shopping, the recession and the large number of empty retail properties in the city. It is the same consultant who has written both the Retail Report and the draft CCDF. This seems to be producing a biased view and one which would seem to be incorrect. The options based on the supposed retail requirements feel like "off the peg" solutions and not ones which have been considered thoughtfully, taking into account the myriad other aspects and uses of the city centre.</p> <p>See also the comments in the December 2013 response about the role of the City Centre other than retail.</p> <p>NPPF guidelines emphasis the need for city centre first development. The consequences of this policy are only just beginning to filter through to what is happening in reality. Retailers, local authorities, consultants and developers need to adjust their demands and expectations. This does not seem to be happening in the draft CCDF which more closely reflects the situation before the NPPF guidelines were written.</p> <p>Retailers need to adjust their demands for excessive amounts of retail space close to city centre shopping if this is in conflict with the demands of historic centres which are also visitor/tourist destinations and therefore income generators and possibly also residential areas as well.</p> <p>Local authorities need to resist these unreasonable demands from retailers. They need to insist that Conservation Areas mean what they are intended for and preserve the best of the historic aspects of our towns and cities. They also need to look at other ways of supplying larger areas of space suitable for retail close to the shopping area e.g. acquiring retail properties for larger site assembly, as and when they become vacant in the existing shopping area. This would be far more appropriate than acquiring residential properties on the edge of the area – e.g. Warwick St.</p> <p>Consultants should be aware of these conflicts and adjust their advice accordingly – this is certainly not happening with the GVA report – they seem to have brushed off the dust from the Carlisle Renaissance proposals and resurrected all the worst bits of it. Carlisle City Council would be well advised to try another consultant who was a little more in tune with the longer term consequences of government policy.</p> <p>There are also a number of sustainability issues enshrined in the NPPF guidelines and in Carlisle's draft Local Plan, which the draft CCDF will be part of, which have been ignored. An entirely new retail development which involves large-scale demolition of buildings is not in line with environmental sustainability. It is also not in line with social sustainability when it involves demolishing peoples' homes and their history and heritage. The consultation document does not mention sustainability at all, yet this is a major consideration running right through the rest of the draft Local Plan. There should be a sustainability appraisal made on the final CCDF.</p> <p>Local people have been criticised for responding with detailed analysis to what have been described as concepts. It is vital that these "concepts" are criticised for what they are – ill conceived and ill thought through. The importance of "details" such as the over emphasis on shopping and the apparent faulty premises found in the Retail Report on which this is based, the loss of the City Council services and the Magistrate's Court service, the principles behind the demolition of people's homes and the history of the city need to be addressed here. Although they have been raised in earlier consultations they have not been addressed; they only become crystal clear when they are enshrined in plans which are totally unacceptable.</p>							
Response:	<p>The City Centre Development Framework (CCDF) has been prepared as part of a plan lead approach to dealing with identified retail needs and the development of planning policies to support the future vitality and viability of the City Centre. Such an approach responds to the requirements of national planning policy and in this regard a clear distinction can be made between the CCDF and previous Carlisle Renaissance efforts.</p> <p>The consultation on the draft City Centre Development Framework (CCDF) represented the second stage of consultation on it with further opportunities also likely to be forthcoming within the context of the Local Plan which will take forward key recommendations from the CCDF and which will itself be subject to further consultation in the future. It is therefore considered clear to see that both the CCDF and Local Plan have evolved over time with both having been positively informed by the process of consultation. No criticism has been levied at any responses with any comments and thoughts shared genuinely welcomed and wholly and fully considered in the context of acting to refine the Framework.</p> <p>Owing to its location on the edge of the City Centre and current primary shopping area, Rickergate is an area which needs to be explored and which is considered to present a reasonable option to accommodate future retail and leisure growth. There is no reason to suggest that existing homes and businesses could not happily co-exist as they do at present, with the interface between existing users an important point which would be considered if and when detailed proposals were progressed. Importantly only those buildings which are essential to delivery of a firm proposal would be considered for demolition in the future.</p>							

Evidence in the form of the Carlisle Retail Study supports that there is a need for additional retail units within the City Centre particularly from a qualitative perspective in terms of providing the size, form and configuration of units which accord with retailers' current high street needs. This evidence is considered to remain robust with a number of those in the retail industry, within the City and beyond, recently reaffirming its conclusions. Such new units will be a key element of any strategy going forward to retain a number of existing retailers as well as too attract new retailers to Carlisle, and ultimately to maintain the vitality and viability of the City Centre and its overall offer.

The focus of the study on retail floorspace reflects that this was the primary purpose of commissioning the study but notwithstanding this the opportunity was also taken to identify opportunities to enhance the vitality and viability of the City Centre in its widest sense. The proposed character areas were consulted on through a previous consultation and no major objections were received. The names allocated to areas is not intended to imply that these areas only fulfil a single function but notwithstanding this are considered to accurately portray their primary function and defining characteristic. The Local Plan, which the CCDF will in part inform, contains a wide suite of policies which seeks to promote the City Centre for a wide range of appropriate uses in order to preserve and where possible diversify its offer and enhance its overall vitality and viability.

Comments regarding Heritage are noted but any development proposals would be brought forward within the context of the Local Plan which contains a comprehensive suite of policies including those which place design and consideration of heritage at the forefront of decision making. The proposals and design approach within the CCDF are indicative and if and when firm proposals were brought forward these would be subject to consultation affording an opportunity to influence design and layout. From a Conservation Area perspective there are therefore no firm proposals on the table yet to assess in design terms, although the Conservation Area will need to be respected and opportunities taken to enhance its character. It is important to acknowledge that Conservation Area status does not outright preclude new development, and many historic cities such as Chester and York have managed to successfully integrate the old with the new, as has Carlisle itself previously, through for example the development of the Lanes Shopping Centre.

The Local Plan, which the Development Framework will help to inform, has been and will continue to be subject to the process of sustainability appraisal as it evolves. The Development Framework is not considered to require a separate and stand alone sustainability appraisal given that it merely constitutes part of the evidence base for the Local Plan and does not in itself constitute policy or a firm proposal.

Proposed Change
No change considered necessary.

Other

2078

Comment

045

Ms Kate Carvana

Comment There is no need for more retail space. Rickergate is not the only place suitable for development. Too much like Carlisle Renaissance.

Response: Evidence in the form of the Carlisle Retail Study supports that there is a need for additional retail units within the City Centre particularly from a qualitative perspective in terms of providing the size, form and configuration of units which accord with retailers' current high street needs. This evidence is considered to remain robust with a number of those in the retail industry, within the City and beyond, recently reaffirming its conclusions. Such new units will be a key element of any strategy going forward to retain a number of existing retailers as well as too attract new retailers to Carlisle, and ultimately to maintain the vitality and viability of the City Centre and its overall offer.

The City Centre Development Framework (CCDF) has been prepared as part of a plan lead approach to dealing with identified retail needs and the development of planning policies to support the future vitality and viability of the City Centre. Such an approach responds to the requirements of national planning policy and in this regard a clear distinction can be made between the CCDF and previous Carlisle Renaissance efforts.

Proposed Change
No change considered necessary.

Other

2035

Comment

036

Ian Caruana

Comment If you ask a property developer to be your consultant, it is surprising that the potential options concentrate on shopping.

Response: As identified at paragraph 1.3 of the draft report, the City Centre Development Framework was primarily commissioned to concentrate on retail floorspace in response to an evidenced need for more of it within the City Centre. The need to do so also responds to the requirements of national planning policy in planning to meet future development needs.

Proposed Change
No change considered necessary.

Question No	CharacterArea	Agree ?	TopicArea	RepNo	RefNo	Consultee	Organisation	AgentRefN
Q1	Other	<input type="checkbox"/>		2440	Objection	075	Mr Neil Irving	SOS
Comment	No, Although there are many aspect that I support, it seems that the repost has been made up purely as a smoke screen to develop the Rickergate area and re-light the old renaissance plans.							
Response:	The City Centre Development Framework (CCDF) has been prepared as part of a plan lead approach to dealing with identified retail needs and the development of planning policies to support the future vitality and viability of the City Centre. Such an approach responds to the requirements of national planning policy and in this regard a clear distinction can be made between the CCDF and previous Carlisle Renaissance efforts.							
Proposed Change	No change considered necessary.							
<hr/>								
	Other	<input type="checkbox"/>		2219	Objection	054	Mr Christopher Wheeler	
Comment	With so many city centre shops and other buildings empty, it is difficult to see why Carlisle needs another 200,000 sq ft of retail space at all.							
Response:	Evidence in the form of the Carlisle Retail Study supports that there is a need for additional retail units within the City Centre particularly from a qualitative perspective in terms of providing the size, form and configuration of units which accord with retailers' current high street needs. Whilst noting that there are a number of vacant units within the City Centre these do not currently, nor is there considered any scope for these in the future to, meet this full range of future needs. This evidence is considered to remain robust with a number of those in the retail industry, within the City and beyond, recently reaffirming its conclusions. Such new units will be a key element of any strategy going forward to retain a number of existing retailers as well as too attract new retailers to Carlisle, and ultimately to maintain the vitality and viability of the City Centre and its overall offer.							
Proposed Change	No change considered necessary.							
<hr/>								

Question No	CharacterArea	Agree ?	TopicArea	RepNo	RefNo	Consultee	Organisation	AgentRefN
-------------	---------------	---------	-----------	-------	-------	-----------	--------------	-----------

Q1	Other	<input type="checkbox"/>		2087	Comment	027	Elizabeth Allnutt	
-----------	--------------	--------------------------	--	------	---------	-----	-------------------	--

Comment No: This is Carlisle Renaissance, watered down but still just as inappropriate and unimaginative. It also feels like a design for a much larger city which has been inappropriately applied to a smaller, compact city.

This is not about planning a city centre which belongs to people generally and specifically to the people of Carlisle. It is all about shopping and economic development where national business involved in shopping centres and large retail concerns will benefit. The NPPF puts a lot of emphasis on sustainability which is all about a future which is acceptable for everyone and concerns itself with social and environmental sustainability as well as economic sustainability. The social and environmental elements are entirely missing. Will there be a Sustainability Appraisal?

There is no clarity about the need for the increased retail – the catchment area is so big as to be meaningless and seems to be appropriate to a larger city with a more populous hinterland where distances to travel are shorter than rural Cumbria and SW Scotland where the population is sparse and the city itself much smaller.

Carlisle also needs to deal with its own empty shops first – not create more which may not be filled – and address how the city centre first strategy in the NPPF can be fulfilled without just building more new retail.

Visitor attraction and tourism is a vital part of Carlisle's economy and forward economic development. Demolishing the city's history (Warwick St houses, complex of Laing/Dalton buildings, Civic Centre) and ruining more of it (inappropriate development next to attractive terraced housing of architectural merit in Corporation Rd and Peter St) runs against this strand of economic development.

Social sustainability has not been addressed at all if anyone can even countenance demolishing good quality family homes which are part of the social fabric and history of the city. The residents in Rickergate have had, and continue to have, a very raw deal. The floods in 2005 were devastating. The campaign needed to protect homes and businesses from the proposed Carlisle Renaissance was hard work immediately following on from renovating homes and moving back in. Adversity turned a good community into an even stronger one. It was gratifying to have the support of so many of the people of Carlisle who recognised this strength and largely agreed that Carlisle Renaissance was a bad idea.

The constant background threat continues as the Council continues to acquire property in the area. It should be noted that the consultants did not at any time speak to the Rickergate community before producing their plans. The proposals, if built, will have a detrimental effect on the Rickergate community. The loss of Warwick St and its residents will diminish our community. A huge shopping complex will be inappropriate next to streets of terraced housing where families live, dwarfing them and ruining their quality of life. It will also have a detrimental effect on the small businesses in Corporation Rd who are part of the community and who are supported by the community's custom and welcomed for their convenience and contribution.

Environmental sustainability has also been disregarded. Where is the environmental sustainability in demolishing swathes of buildings? The Civic Centre is a useful and flexible building. Where is the option for a retrofit? The building is now also part of Carlisle's psyche – generations have grown up with it and it has been accepted as part of the city's skyline. There is an affection there, a feeling that this is part of our city.

The architectural merit and historical interest of the buildings has also been ignored despite the Conservation Area status. The bland and quite frankly ugly shopping complex is a very poor substitute for the houses in Warwick St/old Police station/Fire Station and Magistrate's Court which are part of our history and city and should be kept.

Response: The City Centre Development Framework (CCDF) has been prepared as part of a plan lead approach to dealing with identified retail needs and the development of planning policies to support the future vitality and viability of the City Centre. Such an approach responds to the requirements of national planning policy and in this regard a clear distinction can be made between the CCDF and previous Carlisle Renaissance efforts.

The Local Plan, which the Development Framework will help to inform, has been and will continue to be subject to the process of sustainability appraisal as it evolves. The Development Framework is not considered to require a separate and stand alone sustainability appraisal given that it merely constitutes part of the evidence base for the Local Plan and does not in itself constitute policy or a firm proposal.

Evidence in the form of the Carlisle Retail Study supports that there is a need for additional retail units within the City Centre particularly from a qualitative perspective in terms of providing the size, form and configuration of units which accord with retailers' current high street needs. This evidence is considered to remain robust with a number of those in the retail industry, within the City and beyond, recently reaffirming its conclusions. Such new units will be a key element of any strategy going forward to retain a number of existing retailers as well as too attract new retailers to Carlisle, and ultimately to maintain the vitality and viability of the City Centre and its overall offer.

Existing vacancies are considered to be below the national average with a number of long standing vacant units such as those at the Crown and Mitre having recently reverted back into active use. Feedback from agents within the City also supports that there is relatively strong demand for vacant units within the core of the City Centre, with relatively quick turnaround achieved. Notwithstanding this the City Council are committed to working with stakeholders to reduce the number of vacancies within the City Centre and will be proactive in using the powers available to them to assist in this objective. A good recent example of this is that the City Council agreed in January 2015 to update their Discretionary Rate Relief Policy in order to offer re-occupation relief for retail units which have been vacant for 12 months or more. The implementation of this national initiative at the local level sees such units qualify for a 50% reduction in their business rates (National Non Domestic Rates) for 18 months from the date the premises becomes occupied - and is likely to constitute a strong incentive in bringing empty units back into use.

Owing to its location on the edge of the City Centre and current primary shopping area, Rickergate is an area which needs to be explored and which is considered to present a reasonable option to accommodate future retail and leisure growth. There is no reason to suggest that existing homes and businesses could not happily co-exist as they do at present, with the interface between existing users an important point which would be considered if and when detailed proposals were progressed. Importantly only those buildings which are essential to delivery of a firm proposal would be considered for demolition in the future.

Question No	CharacterArea	Agree ?	TopicArea	RepNo	RefNo	Consultee	Organisation	AgentRefN
-------------	---------------	---------	-----------	-------	-------	-----------	--------------	-----------

The proposals and design approach within the CCDF are indicative and if and when firm proposals were brought forward these would be subject to consultation affording an opportunity to influence design and layout. From a Conservation Area perspective there are therefore no firm proposals on the table yet to assess in design terms, although the Conservation Area will need to be respected and opportunities taken to enhance its character.

Proposed Change
No change considered necessary.

Other

2127

Objection

047

Mrs Margaret Backhouse

Comment
No

Response:
Comments noted.

Proposed Change
No change considered necessary.

Other

2381

Objection

015

Mr Viv Dodd

Revival Carlisle

Comment
The retail aims are fine but as it stands at present the framework reads like Carlisle Renaissance Revisited. It is too retail biased. The successful modern cities recognise that city centres are no longer primarily retailing centres. Internet shopping has changed everything. The successful centre of the future will have to acknowledge this fact and city centre plans must cater for it. City centres must cater for leisure, culture, recreation, housing, education and employment. This framework is a lost opportunity by concentrating so much on the retail role of the city centre

Response:
The City Centre Development Framework (CCDF) has been prepared as part of a plan lead approach to dealing with identified retail needs and the development of planning policies to support the future vitality and viability of the City Centre. Such an approach responds to the requirements of national planning policy and in this regard a clear distinction can be made between the CCDF and previous Carlisle Renaissance efforts.

The focus of the study on retail floorspace reflects that this was the primary purpose of commissioning the study but notwithstanding this the opportunity was also taken to identify opportunities to enhance the vitality and viability of the City Centre in its widest sense. The Local Plan, which the CCDF will in part inform, contains a wide suite of policies which seeks to promote the City Centre for a wide range of appropriate uses in order to preserve and where possible diversify its offer and enhance its overall vitality and viability.

Proposed Change
No change considered necessary.

Other

2232

Objection

055

Mrs Helen Blamire

Comment
City Council and 'consultants' will do whatever they want despite any opposition. Already spent millions on the Renaissance - now wasting more on non-local consultants and those making the decisions don't even live in the areas concerned.

Response:
The consultation on the draft City Centre Development Framework (CCDF) represented the second stage of consultation on it with further opportunities also likely to be forthcoming within the context of the Local Plan which will take forward key recommendations from the CCDF and which will itself be subject to further consultation in the future. It is therefore considered clear to see that both the CCDF and Local Plan have evolved over time with both having been positively informed by the process of consultation.

The City Centre Development Framework (CCDF) has been prepared as part of a plan lead approach to dealing with identified retail needs and the development of planning policies to support the future vitality and viability of the City Centre. Such an approach responds to the requirements of national planning policy and in this regard a clear distinction can be made between the CCDF and previous Carlisle Renaissance efforts.

Proposed Change
No change considered necessary.

Question No	CharacterArea	Agree ?	TopicArea	RepNo	RefNo	Consultee	Organisation	AgentRefN
Q1	Other	<input type="checkbox"/>		2175	Objection	051	Miss Susan Mark	
Comment	The only improvement of ANY merit would be the demolition of the Civic Centre. Someone's had a dream which didn't involve walking around Carlisle.							
Response:	Comments noted.							
Proposed Change	No change considered necessary.							
<hr/>								
	Other	<input type="checkbox"/>		2092	Objection	011	Mrs Julie Templeton	Member of Save our Stree
Comment	<p>The GVA Draft CCDF appears to have been heavily influenced by Carlisle Renaissance plans.</p> <p>I question the statement made in 1.2 of the Introduction to the GVA report in which it states that Carlisle is recognised as one of the largest and most important cities in northern England with a significant population and sub-regional catchment are of almost 500,000 people. The GVA report looks like it has been cut and pasted from much larger city development plans and little effort has been made to adapt them for a small historic city such as Carlisle.</p> <p>I question why no other areas were put forward as an option for large scale retail development. In 'Area North of Lowther Street including Rickergate' both Option A and Option B do not allow for the retention of the houses in Warwick Street. The CCDF cannot therefore be classed as a consultation. It appears to be a very biased planning document that has already decided the outcome and must therefore be open to challenge.</p> <p>Despite comments from the Local Planning Inspector, Mr P Whitehead on Carlisle Renaissance's plans for Rickergate "proposals that would have serious consequences for the resident of Rickergate, their homes and businesses which merit careful consideration" GVA made no attempt to talk to or involve the Rickergate community in plans for their area.</p> <p>I believe that the projections for the scale of retail development proposed are flawed and question why Yorkshire was included in the retail catchment area for Carlisle.</p> <p>There seems to have been no consideration for the Conservation areas. The Carlisle economy also relies heavily on tourism and the historic heritage of the city is not just concentrated in the so called Historic Core.</p> <p>It is not made clear if the proposed selling off of assets, such as the Civic Centre, in the Rickergate area is as a result of Tesco pulling out of purchasing land at Morton.</p>							
Response:	<p>The City Centre Development Framework (CCDF) has been prepared as part of a plan lead approach to dealing with identified retail needs and the development of planning policies to support the future vitality and viability of the City Centre. Such an approach responds to the requirements of national planning policy and in this regard a clear distinction can be made between the CCDF and previous Carlisle Renaissance efforts.</p> <p>The catchment referred to at 1.2 of the introduction is supported by evidence in the form of primary research undertaken within the context of the Carlisle Retail Study in 2012. The draft Framework considered what were regarded to be all of the reasonable development options and alternatives in terms of meeting future needs, and consultation throughout the process has provided an opportunity for stakeholders to identify any other alternatives. The Local Plan which the Framework will help to inform already acknowledges that heritage is district wide and its importance with regards to supporting tourism. Finally land at Morton is separate to and beyond the scope of the City Centre Development Framework.</p>							
Proposed Change	No change considered necessary.							
<hr/>								
	Other	<input type="checkbox"/>		2104	Objection	005	Mrs B A Robinson	
Comment	<p>Carlisle needs a REAL theatre which is accessible to pedestrians - not more shops when so many have closed recently.</p> <p>Warwick Street and Old magistrates Court should be left alone. These people suffered badly in the floods.</p>							
Response:	Owing to its location on the edge of the City Centre and current primary shopping area, Rickergate is an area which needs to be explored and which is considered to present a reasonable option to accommodate future retail and leisure growth. The area is included within the scope of the City Centre Development Framework on this basis.							
Proposed Change	No change considered necessary.							

Question No	CharacterArea	Agree ?	TopicArea	RepNo	RefNo	Consultee	Organisation	AgentRefN
Q1	Other	<input type="checkbox"/>		2114	Objection	046	Miss Gillian Smith	
Comment	No							
Response:	Comments noted.							
Proposed Change	No change considered necessary.							
<hr/>								
	Other	<input type="checkbox"/>		2137	Objection	048	Mrs C E Simpson	
Comment	No							
Response:	Comments noted.							
Proposed Change	No change considered necessary.							
<hr/>								
	Other	<input type="checkbox"/>		2407	Objection	071	Mrs Joan Field	
Comment	This development plan concentrates on the provision of more retail provision. Currently in Carlisle shops are closing almost weekly. We have a large department store empty [Hoopers}. Why provide more shops when we cannot support the ones we have now?							
Response:	Evidence in the form of the Carlisle Retail Study supports that there is a need for additional retail units within the City Centre particularly from a qualitative perspective in terms of providing the size, form and configuration of units which accord with retailers' current high street needs. Whilst noting that there are a number of vacant units within the City Centre these do not currently, nor is there considered any scope for these in the future to, meet this full range of future needs. This evidence is considered to remain robust with a number of those in the retail industry, within the City and beyond, recently reaffirming its conclusions. Such new units will be a key element of any strategy going forward to retain a number of existing retailers as well as too attract new retailers to Carlisle, and ultimately to maintain the vitality and viability of the City Centre and its overall offer.							
Proposed Change	No change considered necessary.							
<hr/>								
	Other	<input type="checkbox"/>		2453	Objection	074	Mrs Jean Hall	A003
Comment	No							
Response:	Comments noted.							
Proposed Change	No change considered necessary.							

Question No	CharacterArea	Agree ?	TopicArea	RepNo	RefNo	Consultee	Organisation	AgentRefN
Q1	Other	<input type="checkbox"/>		2191	Objection	052	Mr Colin Latimer	
Comment	There are too many empty buildings in Carlisle that need redeveloped rather than demolishing those in use.							
Response:	Only those buildings which are essential to delivery of a firm proposal would be considered for demolition in the future.							
Proposed Change	No change considered necessary.							
<hr/>								
	Other	<input type="checkbox"/>		2359	Objection	009	Trevor Wilson	
Comment	I say no because if I say yes then at some future point the Carlisle City Council will resort to using the statement 'The public said yes in a consultation'. I am not interested in political buck passing which is what I have seen happen too many times. However, I am prepared to comment and contribute on that which has been presented.							
Response:	Comments noted.							
Proposed Change	No change considered necessary.							
<hr/>								
	Other	<input type="checkbox"/>		2285	Objection	061	Mr David Hamilton	
Comment	Developing an area for a dedicated concert hall and cultural centre would in my opinion be preferable.							
Response:	Comments noted.							
Proposed Change	No change considered necessary.							
<hr/>								
	Other	<input type="checkbox"/>		2147	Objection	049	Mrs Mavis Sarginson	
Comment	no							
Response:	Comments noted.							
Proposed Change	No change considered necessary.							

Question No	CharacterArea	Agree ?	TopicArea	RepNo	RefNo	Consultee	Organisation	AgentRefN
Q1	Other	<input type="checkbox"/>		2332	Objection	065	Miss Lindsey McNamee	
Comment	I do not want my family home to be demolished. There are plenty of empty stores and units that need to be filled before any plans about destroying peoples homes and lives get into place. We have never been consulted on this.							
Response:	Evidence in the form of the Carlisle Retail Study supports that there is a need for additional retail units within the City Centre particularly from a qualitative perspective in terms of providing the size, form and configuration of units which accord with retailers' current high street needs. Whilst noting that there are a number of vacant units within the City Centre these do not currently, nor is there considered any scope for these in the future to, meet this full range of future needs. This evidence is considered to remain robust with a number of those in the retail industry, within the City and beyond, recently reaffirming its conclusions. Such new units will be a key element of any strategy going forward to retain a number of existing retailers as well as too attract new retailers to Carlisle, and ultimately to maintain the vitality and viability of the City Centre and its overall offer.							
	Consultation on the draft City Centre Development Framework constitutes the start of ongoing consultation with further consultation as the Local Plan, which the CCDF will help inform, progresses and ultimately when detailed and firm proposals are taken forward through the process of seeking planning permission.							
Proposed Change	No change considered necessary.							
Q2	Other	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		2366	Support	009	Trevor Wilson	
Comment								
Response:	Comments noted.							
Proposed Change	No change considered necessary.							
	Other	<input type="checkbox"/>		2448	Comment	075	Mr Neil Irving	SOS
Comment	No. The way that this report has been worded and highlighted leads me to believe that the whole report is biased . It highlights areas that the consultant is trying to push and leads anyone reading the text and plans to lean in the consultants favour. It does not give fair options with the same degree of detail, in text or diagrams. Examples:							
	Only the Rickergate area has had any expansion or ideas. No other area of consultation has had any development ideas drawn or written down, e.g. 10, lowther st/Portland square, although in consultation feedback there is a need for 'more city centre living', 'car parking', 'position of the bus station '. None of these ideas are expanded on at all.							
	13.7. Consultation feedback. This basically just says what the consultants have cherry picked. The only mention of the 'Rickergate community' is that it supports the arts centre. It completely ignores the strong wish of the community to retain the historic street layout and the strong social and architectural links between the proposed art centre (old fire station) and Warwick Street.							
	Figure 5. The area coloured orange (city council/private), in my opinion depicting this as a block colour suggests to a viewer that this block is all open to redevelopment . The private areas should be coloured separately to allow a viewer to see who owns what.							
Response:	It needs to be recognised that a key objective of the Framework was to identify and consider which areas / sites within the City Centre could accommodate future retail growth and the evidenced quantum of new floorspace. The level of detail provided for each of the character areas is considered proportionate to the perceived degree of change.							
	Previous consultation responses are published in full on the City Council's website as will be responses to this latest consultation. Such an approach, and importantly in acting to address comments individually, is considered to provide complete transparency regarding the outcomes of consultation.							
	Whilst noting the comments in respect of Figure 5 it is not considered necessary at this stage to disaggregate ownership further. It should be noted that anyone can obtain land ownership details through the service provided by the Land Registry.							
Proposed Change	No change considered necessary.							

Question No	CharacterArea	Agree ?	TopicArea	RepNo	RefNo	Consultee	Organisation	AgentRefN
Q2	Other	<input type="checkbox"/>		2088	Objection	027	Elizabeth Allnutt	
Comment	No. The compartmentalising of the city is inflexible and does not recognise that history/heritage/tourism and shopping, for example, go on in all areas of the city and cannot be confined to set areas. The Conservation Area is ignored for many of the areas.							
Response:	There is an inability to seriously consider development in areas of the city other than Rickergate – The Caldew Riverside, Citadel and Lowther St/Portland Sq also need to be considered. Even better would be consideration of how to manage the primary shopping area to attract and expand retail (if the perceived need for expansion is correct) so that this can prosper as designated in the NPPF, but not at the expense of other areas.							
Proposed Change	The recommendations within the City Centre Development Framework do not preclude growth in other areas where opportunities exist. The conservation area status across much of the City Centre is acknowledged but this designation equally does not preclude development from coming forward and in this regard becomes more relevant as specific development proposals emerge. The other areas referred top have been considered by the CCDF and the Local Plan, which the CCDF will help to inform, will set out polices to improve the vitality and viability of the City Centre in its widest sense.							
	Other	<input type="checkbox"/>		2063	Comment	042	Mrs Dallas Brewis	Cycle Carlisle
Comment	There is nothing in the Vision which equals with the best of Northern European Cities - far more should be done to encourage the use of bicycles, all recent alterations to the Historic Core have made cycle access to the City Centre more difficult. York and Cambridge have at least made some effort in this respect.							
Response:	Other policies in the Local Plan seek to promote a continuous, safe and attractive public rights of way network including cycleways. The City Centre Development Framework does refer to improving permeability and it is considered that this could be strengthened to make clear that it should do so for all users (therefore extending coverage to cyclists).							
Proposed Change	Strengthen the Framework to make clear that permeability should be improved for all users (therefore extending coverage to cyclists).							
Q5	Other	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		2269	Comment	059	Miss Carole Hoggan	
Comment	Why can't the council fill Rufus House/ or Hoopers/ [use the Castle Way car park for workers to park their cars] Keep Portland Square the same, update the gardens.							
Response:	The premises referred to are not within the ownership and therefore direct control of the City Council . Notwithstanding this the ability of these premises to meet the level and nature of additional retail floorspace required by the evidence is limited. Regarding Portland Square, its conservation area status (as well as number of statutory heritage listings) will act to protect its character moving forward.							
Proposed Change	No change considered necessary.							
	Other	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		2017	Support	001	Mr Nigel Winter	Stagecoach NorthWest Lt
Comment	No consideration for passenger transport, lack of passenger facilities, missed opportunities to improve air quality and traffic congestion. Surely this flies in the face of policy and will worsen air quality on Botchergate and Scotland Road, to name two places.							
Response:	The City Centre Development Framework talks about positive improvements in these regards which the Local Plan will build on and be more specific where it can be. The Local Plan also includes policies which are focussed on protecting air quality. The transport implications of developments across the City are also continuing to be modelled in conjunction with the County Council and necessary improvements and interventions to enable growth to happen identified and costed.							
Proposed Change	No change considered necessary.							

Question No	CharacterArea	Agree ?	TopicArea	RepNo	RefNo	Consultee	Organisation	AgentRefN
Q5	Other	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		2173	Comment	026	Elizabeth Allnutt	Save Our Streets
Comment	There has been no attempt to seriously look at alternative sites for development. The Caldew Riverside, Citadel and Lowther St/Portland Square have not been considered for schemes at all.							
	No thought has been given as to how to encourage the smaller independent shops and retailers back into the main shopping area to give Carlisle a uniqueness and difference which it singularly lacks. Rents and rates are hard to control but the CCDF should at least be addressing the issue of why Carlisle is such a clone town.							
	There needs to be a Sustainability Appraisal.							
Response:	The Framework has considered what are regarded to be the reasonable options in terms of accommodating the required additional retail floorspace within the City Centre moving forward. The City Council continues to work with and support independent retailers where it can, with the ongoing development of an independent retailer website / smart phone app through the Knowledge Transfer Partnership in concert with the University of Cumbria testament to this. The Local Plan, which the Development Framework will help to inform, has been and will continue to be subject to the process of sustainability appraisal as it evolves. The Development Framework is not considered to require a separate and stand alone sustainability appraisal given that it merely constitutes part of the evidence base for the Local Plan and does not in itself constitute policy or a firm proposal.							
Proposed Change	No change considered necessary.							
	Other	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		2257	Comment	058	Mrs Joanne Swanton	JoMark House of Hair
Comment	Some planning in this country have turned some historic towns/cities into American designs, hence totally loosing British Heritage. Please keep some quaintness people need a change but Glass and concrete is not what it is all about							
Response:	Comments noted. Firm proposals are not however yet being progressed.							
Proposed Change	No change considered necessary.							
	Other	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		2242	Comment	055	Mrs Helen Blamire	
Comment	City Centre Retail Study? Really? If shops are lying empty in town, there cannot be a need for more. Why not buy back Tesco land and relocate CCC offices there or build Carlisle a proper venue for major pop and rock bands so they stop bypassing Carlisle and going straight to Newcastle and Glasgow. Don't forget Corporation Road is in a conservation area so strict building rules should apply. You've already decided to charge for on-street parking which will reduce footfall, so any new shops will probably suffer anyway.							
Response:	Evidence in the form of the Carlisle Retail Study supports that there is a need for additional retail units within the City Centre particularly from a qualitative perspective in terms of providing the size, form and configuration of units which accord with retailers' current high street needs. Whilst noting that there are a number of vacant units within the City Centre these do not currently, nor is there considered any scope for these in the future to, meet this full range of future needs. This evidence is considered to remain robust with a number of those in the retail industry, within the City and beyond, recently reaffirming its conclusions. Such new units will be a key element of any strategy going forward to retain a number of existing retailers as well as too attract new retailers to Carlisle, and ultimately to maintain the vitality and viability of the City Centre and its overall offer. The conservation area status across much of the City Centre is acknowledged but this designation equally does not preclude development from coming forward and in this regard becomes more relevant as specific development proposals emerge. On-street parking is the responsibility of Cumbria County Council in their capacity as the highway authority and is therefore beyond the direct control of the City Council. The City Council is currently considering the management and parking arrangements for car parks in its ownership and how these can be used to help maintain and enhance the vitality and viability of the City Centre.							
Proposed Change	No change considered necessary.							

Question No	CharacterArea	Agree ?	TopicArea	RepNo	RefNo	Consultee	Organisation	AgentRefN
Q5	Other	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		2391	Comment	015	Mr Viv Dodd	Revival Carlisle
Comment	By concentrating too much on the Rickergate area to the detriment of other parts of the city centre the framework runs a serious risk of undermining key retail areas, especially English Street (from Devonshire Street) through to the top of Botchergate, which is already showing signs of decline.							
	Our other concerns relate to the missed opportunities which we cover with our comments on Botchergate, The Caldew Riverside and The Citadel together with our great concern about the potential loss of employment from the demolition of the Civic Centre with no indication as to where the staff will be relocated.							
Response:	The Local Plan will seek to ensure an appropriate balance between key areas and opportunities through putting into effect an appropriate policy framework.							
	Options for the relocation of City Council staff would be considered at a future point in time if and when a firm need to do so arises. There is no suggestion however within the Framework that City Council staff or services would be moved out with the City Centre and the employment in this regard not lost.							
Proposed Change	No change considered necessary.							
	Other	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		2283	Comment	060	Barry O Earp	
Comment	A similar plan was envisaged for 'Renaissance'! But more thought to future development - joining Bitts Park and the Castle back into the city - removing Castle Way - either an under pass or re-routed. Improving the entrances to the city - Botchergate [English Gate], Caldewgate [Irish Gate] etc.							
Response:	Comments noted. The City Centre Development Framework promotes enhanced permeability throughout the City Centre.							
Proposed Change	No change considered necessary.							
	Other	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		2319	Comment	063	Mr Ian Grey	
Comment	Parking is a big issue. Pedestrian comfort can be improved by instigating a park & ride. This should also service the hospital which has an urgent need to improve access. I would like to see and integrated cycle plan.							
Response:	Other policies in the Local Plan seek to promote a continuous, safe and attractive public rights of way network including cycleways. The City Centre Development Framework does refer to improving permeability and it is considered that this could be strengthened to make clear that it should do so for all users (therefore extending coverage to cyclists). There is no evidence to currently support that there is a need for park and ride sites although transport modelling to support the Local Plan, including the testing of possible interventions, remains ongoing.							
Proposed Change	Strengthen the Framework to make clear that permeability should be improved for all users (therefore extending coverage to cyclists).							
	Other	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		2185	Comment	051	Miss Susan Mark	
Comment	Improvements to attract Tourism, they don't travel to see buildings of no architectural merit, not enough signposts to find certain attractions, people travel to look at e.g. Antiques.							
Response:	Comments noted. The City Centre Development Framework promotes improvements to the public realm and enhanced permeability including signage. Other Council initiatives are also focussed on these matters including the development of an independent retailer website for the City centre through the Knowledge Transfer Partnership in concert with the University of Cumbria and retailers.							
Proposed Change	No change considered necessary.							

Question No	CharacterArea	Agree ?	TopicArea	RepNo	RefNo	Consultee	Organisation	AgentRefN
Q5	Other	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		2354	Comment	066	Mrs Sandra Stockley	
Comment	I feel that Carlisle lacks proper Arts facilities. I no longer attend quality productions at the Sands Centre because the sound and ambience leave much to be desired. I would rather go to Newcastle, but could we not support our own professional performing facilities which could be easier to access by West as well as North Cumbrian residents? It works well for the amateur groups (e.g. Staged Right) but mostly its costs are out of reach. Carlisle has a host of creative amateur performing groups who struggle for suitable performance premises. Similarly on cost, there is a good but grossly underused building (occupied by Fylde YMCA) in Caldewgate which would make a perfectly good Exhibition Area, but the University's Institute of the Arts cannot afford to use it.							
Response:	Planning permission has since been granted and for and a new Arts Centre (including flexible entertainment space) is subsequently actively being created in the former Fire Station on Warwick Street within the city centre.							
Proposed Change	No change considered necessary.							
	Other	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		2403	Comment	069	Mrs Karen Atkinson	
Comment	I would like to see a much greater variety of options for the expansion of shopping provision in Carlisle – not just focussed on one small area, but smaller areas spread around to give benefit to the wider Carlisle city centre area; perhaps incorporating all those areas considered in the document – after all it takes only 15 minutes to walk from one end of the city centre to the other, if people are to spend increased time browsing around town that shouldn't be an issue.							
Response:	Development in other areas of the City Centre is not precluded and the draft options illustrate that not all of the retail needs would be met by redeveloping parts of Rickergate, thereby enabling a more flexible approach.							
Proposed Change	No change considered necessary.							
	Other	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		2437	Comment	073	Phil Gray	Green Spaces
Comment	I think there is an opportunity to make Carlisle a much more liveable city by building on the existing green infrastructure assets. Linkages with HW Work Heritage Site, imaginative interpretation of the Caldew Riverside space and its links with Bitts/Rickerby and Rickergate area.							
Response:	These comments are considered to relate to broader issues which the emerging Local Plan is considered top positively address, through for example the inclusion of strategic policies covering Green Infrastructure, Heritage and Culture.							
Proposed Change	No change considered necessary.							
	Other	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		2451	Comment	075	Mr Neil Irving	SOS
Comment	Why has there not been a local designer or consultant been involved. Why have the consultants blatantly ignored local resident views. Allow the people of Carlisle to decide the fate of the Civic Centre and open it up to a design competition, locally or nationally. Give us a real consultation, not this sham, yet again.							
Response:	The consultants who undertook the study were appointed following a competitive tender process. The consultation on the draft City Centre Development Framework (CCDF) represented the second stage of consultation on it with further opportunities also likely to be forthcoming within the context of the Local Plan which will take forward key recommendations from the CCDF and which will itself be subject to further consultation in the future. It is therefore considered clear to see that both the CCDF and Local Plan have evolved over time with both having been positively informed by the process of consultation.							
Proposed Change	No change considered necessary.							

Question No	CharacterArea	Agree ?	TopicArea	RepNo	RefNo	Consultee	Organisation	AgentRefN
Q5	Other	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		2103	Comment	011	Mrs Julie Templeton	Member of Save our Stree
Comment	I think that the Development Framework put forward by GVA is a deeply flawed document, it is not a consultation document. No alternative sites have been put forward for the large retail development other than Rickergate. No attempt was made to talk to or involve the community of Rickergate by GVA when it was putting together this report. It appears that GVA were given the Carlisle Renaissance plans and told to produce something similar.							
Response:	The City Centre Development Framework (CCDF) has been prepared as part of a plan lead approach to dealing with identified retail needs and the development of planning policies to support the future vitality and viability of the City Centre. Such an approach responds to the requirements of national planning policy and in this regard a clear distinction can be made between the CCDF and previous Carlisle Renaissance efforts.							
	The draft Framework considered what were regarded to be all of the reasonable development options and alternatives in terms of meeting future needs, and consultation throughout the process has provided an opportunity for stakeholders to identify any other alternatives. The consultation on the draft City Centre Development Framework (CCDF) represented the second stage of consultation on it with further opportunities also likely to be forthcoming within the context of the Local Plan which will take forward key recommendations from the CCDF and which will itself be subject to further consultation in the future. It is therefore considered clear to see that both the CCDF and Local Plan have evolved over time with both having been positively informed by the process of consultation.							
Proposed Change	No change considered necessary.							
	Other	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		2342	Support	065	Miss Lindsey McNamee	
Comment	Absolutely: Citadel, Lowther Street/Portland Square and of the flood defences are made adequate, Caldew Riverside.							
Response:	Comments noted.							
Proposed Change	No change considered necessary.							
	Other	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		2066	Comment	042	Mrs Dallas Brewis	Cycle Carlisle
Comment	Having spent over 20 years arguing for a greater emphasis on cycling to improve the environment and the health and well being of the people of Carlisle, I have low expectations of this ever happening.							
Response:	Other policies in the Local Plan seek to promote a continuous, safe and attractive public rights of way network including cycleways. The City Centre Development Framework does refer to improving permeability and it is considered that this could be strengthened to make clear that it should do so for all users (therefore extending coverage to cyclists).							
	Transport modelling to support implementation of the Local Plan remains ongoing and consultants have recently been appointed to undertake an assessment of necessary interventions, including specific improvements to the districts cycle and walking networks. This study will be published shortly and will inform the Infrastructure Delivery Plan which will act to prioritise investment in infrastructure including cycleways.							
Proposed Change	Strengthen the Framework to make clear that permeability should be improved for all users (therefore extending coverage to cyclists).							
	Other	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		2417	Comment	071	Mrs Joan Field	
Comment	Carlisle should develop 'niche' shopping - small specialist shops using existing empty units. There are very successful in places like York and Whitby. Lost of craft, arts and gift ware, people are self employed in Cumbria. Appointment of professional shopping consultants could help. This goes hand in hand with developing tourism. Carlisle always says it wants to support tourism, but lets face it, everything stops at 5:30 pm!							
Response:	The City Council will consider how they can support initiatives alongside planning efforts to enhance the vitality of the City Centre. Significant investment is ongoing in relation to a significant enhancement of the Tourist Information centre within the heart of the City Centre and an Arts Centre and entertainment space is now being developed on Warwick Street.							
Proposed Change	No change considered necessary.							

Question No	CharacterArea	Agree ?	TopicArea	RepNo	RefNo	Consultee	Organisation	AgentRefN
Q5	Other	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		2331	Support	064	Mrs Carol Grey	
Comment	There is little reference to parking solutions. This might be the time to reconsider Park & Ride facilities for the city especially as increased retail outlets should attract a greater number of visitors.							
Response:	There is no evidence to currently support that there is a need for park and ride sites although transport modelling to support the Local Plan, including the testing of possible interventions, remains ongoing.							
Proposed Change	No change considered necessary.							
<hr/>								
	Other	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		2369	Comment	009	Trevor Wilson	
Comment	There is no mention of what to do about Hooper's. Caldew Riverside and Tesco is a bit like 'Waiting for Godot'. This area is in abeyance and there is no strategy mentioned for what will happen next. This area, certainly at the southern end, should be linked to the Citadel as it is near the railway station and thus provides suitable space for a huge multi-story car park, if required, to bolster car parking at the railway station or to provide all day parking (say permit based) for city centre workers. More is needed on moving forward a transport hub that includes a bus station at the railway station.							
Response:	The City Council do not own the former Hoopers building. Planning permission was recently secured by the owners for restaurant use which facilities an alternative option to its continued use for retail purposes. The City Council are committed to working with stakeholders to reduce the number of vacancies within the City Centre and will be proactive in using the powers available to them to assist in this objective. Comments regarding car parking and the need for a transport hub / interchange are noted.							
Proposed Change	No change considered necessary.							
<hr/>								
	Other	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		2229	Comment	054	Mr Christopher Wheeler	
Comment	1. Castle Way should be in a cutting or preferably a tunnel to link the Castle more effectively to the Historic Quarter. 2. The Citadel 'gateway' is currently a gateway to nowhere, and cries out for a really impressive redevelopment along with the axis of Blackfriars Street.							
Response:	The Framework establishes the need to improve permeability within the historic quarter. Consideration will be afforded moving forward to the way in which this can best be achieved and appropriate opportunities will be pursued in due course. Regarding the Citadel, this is the opportunity which the City Centre Development Framework and therefore the Local Plan will seek to promote.							
Proposed Change	No change considered necessary.							
<hr/>								
	Other	<input type="checkbox"/>		2029	Objection	034	Mr Eddie Haughan	
Comment	No							
Response:	Comment noted. In the absence of elaborating as to the reasons why the Council can not, on this occasion, comment further.							
Proposed Change	No change considered necessary.							

Question No	CharacterArea	Agree ?	TopicArea	RepNo	RefNo	Consultee	Organisation	AgentRefN
Q5	Other	<input type="checkbox"/>		2054	Objection	039	Mr M Holliday	
Comment	<p>There does not seem to be any mention of an arts centre/theatre, something I believe Carlisle needs. Where is the money going to come from, particularly to pay for the relocating of Council staff and other public bodies in these days of massive cuts in public spending. A large department store on Castle Street has remained empty for years, if people are queuing up to set up in Carlisle, why has this and countless other empty units not been filled already. The reason high streets are dying is because of the free parking in out of town developments, yet Carlisle is proposing to have more parking restrictions applied, and no doubt higher parking charges !!!! Parking in the city centre car should be free and/or an efficient park and ride schemes adopted.</p>							
Response:	<p>An Arts Centre (including entertainment space) is now being actively developed in the old Fire Station on Warwick Street and this is already acknowledged within the draft report. Any development proposals would likely be financed through the private sector and if any relocations costs were to be encountered these would be accounted for as a 'development cost' associated with pursuing a given proposal. Whilst acknowledging that a number of units within the City Centre are currently vacant, this in part reflects that the size and configuration of these units (and sometimes their location) is such that they do not align with the current needs of high street retailers. The evidence therefore supports that new retail floorspace is equally as required from a qualitative as opposed to quantitative perspective if the City Centre is both to retain existing and attract new retailers to the high street. On-street parking is the responsibility of Cumbria County Council in their capacity as the highway authority and is therefore beyond the direct control of the City Council. The City Council is currently considering the management and parking arrangements for car parks in its ownership and how these can be used to help maintain and enhance the vitality and viability of the City Centre.</p>							
Proposed Change	<p>No change considered necessary.</p>							

Question No	CharacterArea	Agree ?	TopicArea	RepNo	RefNo	Consultee	Organisation	AgentRefN
Q5	Other	<input type="checkbox"/>		2091	Comment	027	Elizabeth Allnutt	
Comment	Real options could be drawn up for other areas of the city.							
	No serious consideration has been given as to how the demands of the NPPF for city centres first, can be accommodated in historic cities where people live. This can only be worked out in practice and Carlisle could be the first place to actually come up with something which fits the bill for everybody involved in the city, not just the demands of retail. The draft CCDF has not even considered this; just slap down a new shopping complex in the easiest place. This may only be a concept but once embedded in the Local Plan it may well be difficult to shift. The city will be very much the poorer if the concept as seen in the CDDF is translated into reality. Concepts need much more thought and imagination and the needs of the entire city should be addressed and accommodated.							
	The City Council should consider writing their own document and bypassing the consultants. The expertise and local knowledge in the Council is ignored and overridden by out of town consultants who charge too much (which drains out of the local economy), think they know best and come up with plans which show a wilful disregard for local knowledge.							
	There is also a missed opportunity to plan for the support and survival of independent small businesses which contribute so much to the interest and uniqueness of city centres. Carlisle is overwhelmingly a clone town. Rents and rates may be difficult to control for the support of small enterprise but it should at least be raised here and the desirability of independents recognised.							
	A Sustainability Appraisal is essential and needs to be written.							
	The effects of private ownership on public places should also be addressed. The proposed shopping complex would undoubtedly be in private ownership as is The Lanes. The Lanes has become increasingly commercialised in recent years e.g. the removal of the toilets, the night time barriers on Scotch St, the loss of seating (and the proper water round the otters) and the appearance of commercial carts in the central public area.							
Response:	The draft Framework considered what were regarded to be all of the reasonable development options and alternatives in terms of meeting future needs, and consultation throughout the process has provided an opportunity for stakeholders to identify any other alternatives.							
	Whilst consultants lead on and provided specialist technical advice, which was not available in-house but which is required to ensure robust and credible evidence, other stakeholders have helped to inform proposals through for example the two consultation exercises on the draft Framework as it has emerged.							
	The focus of the study on retail floorspace reflects that this was the primary purpose of commissioning the study but notwithstanding this the opportunity was also taken to identify opportunities to enhance the vitality and viability of the City Centre in its widest sense. The Local Plan, which the CCDF will in part inform, contains a wide suite of policies which seeks to promote the City Centre for a wide range of appropriate uses in order to preserve and where possible diversify its offer and enhance its overall vitality and viability.							
	The Local Plan, which the Development Framework will help to inform, has been and will continue to be subject to the process of sustainability appraisal as it evolves. The Development Framework is not considered to require a separate and stand alone sustainability appraisal given that it merely constitutes part of the evidence base for the Local Plan and does not in itself constitute policy or a firm proposal.							
	The City Council continues to work with and support independent retailers where it can, with the ongoing development of an independent retailer website / smart phone app through the Knowledge Transfer Partnership in concert with the University of Cumbria testament to this.							
	It must be recognised that the Lanes understandably operates as a shopping centre but provides enhanced facilities to aid its vibrancy.							
Proposed Change	No change considered necessary.							
	Other	<input type="checkbox"/>		2034	Comment	035	Jenny I Turner	
Comment	We love our town we enjoy shopping there, we enjoy our bus ride. We want our Asda's in west kings down, we need our Farmfoods , we need the Poundlands.							
Response:	Comments noted.							
Proposed Change	No change considered necessary.							

Question No	CharacterArea	Agree ?	TopicArea	RepNo	RefNo	Consultee	Organisation	AgentRefN
Q5	Other	<input type="checkbox"/>		2124	Comment	046	Miss Gillian Smith	
Comment	Relocation of the Bus Station. Suggest using the Civic Centre car park. Current land of the bus station could be used as a short stay car park. Free after 6pm for use of customers visiting city centre restaurants etc.							
Response:	Comments noted.							
Proposed Change	No change considered necessary.							
<hr/>								
	Other	<input type="checkbox"/>		2157	Comment	049	Mrs Mavis Sarginson	
Comment	Develop the 'Hoopers Store', Viaduct Hotel and Dias building at the end of Botchergate.							
Response:	Efforts are ongoing to find viable, alternative uses for the premises referred to none of which are however in the ownership and therefore direct control of the City Council.							
Proposed Change	No change considered necessary.							
<hr/>								
	Other	<input type="checkbox"/>		2109	Comment	005	Mrs B A Robinson	
Comment	When were these plans proposed? Internet shopping has completely changed the way most people shop.							
Response:	The Carlisle Retail Study was prepared in 2012 and took full account of retail trends and likely future changes including patterns of internet shopping. The recent rise in the use of 'click and collect' is one example of how internet shopping is working in tandem with as opposed to against high street retailers.							
Proposed Change	No change considered necessary.							
<hr/>								
	Other	<input type="checkbox"/>		2306	Comment	062	Mr Hans J A Landstrom	
Comment	In general the draft is good. I am impressed of its 8 pages of texts and maps. Carlisle is a beautiful City with good shops, greenish [parks, playgrounds ...] close to M6, good public transport [buses & trains], a Historical City. My friends from Sweden & Finland adore Carlisle. Myself I put Carlisle on the top 5 list of towns and cities in Europe: to live here and show visitors around.							
Response:	Comments noted.							
Proposed Change	No change considered necessary.							
<hr/>								
Document	Other	<input type="checkbox"/>	Aims & Objectives/Introduction	2071	Comment	017	Ms Rose Freeman	The Theatres Trust
Comment	We refer generally to the leisure content of the document. Although the title of the document is City Centre we note that the contents deal with the rural economy and other aspects of the district rather than just the city centre, and suggest this may be confusing.							
Response:	The focus of the City Centre Development Framework is on the City Centre. References to the rural economy and other aspects of the district are confined to passing ones when acting to summarise the relevant policy and strategy context. Their inclusion is not therefore considered to lead to confusion.							
Proposed Change	No change considered necessary.							

Question No	CharacterArea	Agree ?	TopicArea	RepNo	RefNo	Consultee	Organisation	AgentRefN
Document	Other	<input type="checkbox"/>	Character Area Analysis & Option Development	2488	Objection	o83	Michael Barry	Cumbria County Council
Comment	<p>When considered on the whole, the County Council has concerns about the potential effects of locating such a large quantum of retail floorspace at a single site at Rickergate. There are concerns that this may be prejudicial to the overall balance of commercial development across the City Centre and thereby, adversely affect the ability to deliver other regeneration priorities around the key gateway of Carlisle Station and Botchergate. Paragraph 23 of the NPPF requires that planning looks to “promote competitive town centre that promote customer choice and a diverse retail offer which reflects the individuality of town centres” and we would wish to see the development pattern across the city to better reflect this important principle.</p> <p>The County Council recognise the proposed strategy for each character area does not consider the transport implications of the proposals within them. It is therefore recommended that following the completion of the Infrastructure Delivery Plan, the strategy for each area is then reviewed.</p> <p>It also is considered important that the design of new development in the City Centre is carefully considered to ensure good quality schemes emerge.</p>							
Response:	<p>Comments noted. Development in other areas of the City Centre is not precluded and the draft options illustrate that not all of the retail needs would be met by redeveloping parts of Rickergate, thereby enabling a more flexible approach.</p> <p>The Local Plan, which the CCDF will in part inform, contains a wide suite of policies which seeks to promote the City Centre for a wide range of appropriate uses in order to preserve and where possible diversify its offer and enhance its overall vitality and viability. Other areas of the City Centre will therefore be strongly promoted where opportunities exist in a bid to ensure that a balanced approach to the growth and regeneration of the City Centre prevails. It must be recognised however that opportunities for major retail development are limited.</p> <p>With regards to the proposed design of any new proposals which may emerge, it should be noted that policies within the Local Plan, against which any development proposals would have to be assessed, require high quality and appropriate design solutions which are responsive to their settings.</p>							
Proposed Change	No change considered necessary.							
Q2	Other	<input type="checkbox"/>	Character Area Analysis & Option Development	2163	Comment	o26	Elizabeth Allnutt	Save Our Streets
Comment	<p>All of the character areas are covered by a Conservation Area. The character areas listed below are prioritised for intervention. Why is Conservation Area status only mentioned for the character areas where intervention and development are not proposed? This implies that the consultant thinks that conservation only applies when it does not interfere with proposed plans and certainly must not be allowed to stand in the way of proposed development. Conservation Area status reflects the historic nature of the area which needs protecting from development.</p> <p>Why has the line delineating the Primary Shopping Area been removed from this stage of the consultation? It was clearly defined in the December 2013 document which was extremely helpful and showed how the shopping area covered more than one character area. Incidentally it would also show how it would increase if the projected plans were included.</p>							
Response:	<p>The purpose of the conservation area is not to preclude development but instead to ensure character is maintained and enhanced. Reference to conservation areas when discussing interventions for other character areas only occurs where there is a meaningful guiding principle which flows from the designation i.e. In the case of Botchergate there is an adopted management plan in place for the conservation area which was prioritised given the need to manage change given that the CA was identified as being at risk, and in the case of Portland Square because the character of that area is such that physical intervention is limited (which is not however the case for other parts of the City centre covered by conservation area designation).</p>							
Proposed Change	No change considered necessary.							
	Other	<input type="checkbox"/>	Character Area Analysis & Option Development	2100	Comment	o11	Mrs Julie Templeton	Member of Save our Stree
Comment	<p>Why has the reference to Conservation Area status been removed for character areas that are put forward for intervention and development. The Conservation Areas are still there, ignoring them doesn't mean that they have gone away. The map showing the Primary Shopping Area that covered more than one character area has had the line delineating it removed. There is no explanation given for this.</p>							
Response:	<p>The element of the report referred to concentrates on interventions as opposed to constraints or opportunities which explains why reference to the conservation areas is not repeated at this point. It is assumed comments on the map relate to figure three within the report where again the purpose is to identify the nature of interventions as opposed to delineating the character areas in the same manner as Figure Two.</p>							
Proposed Change	No change considered necessary.							

Question No	CharacterArea	Agree ?	TopicArea	RepNo	RefNo	Consultee	Organisation	AgentRefN
Document	Other	<input type="checkbox"/>	Economic Development Context	2074	Comment	043	Andy Hunton	Cumbria Constabulary an
Comment	<p>Paragraph 5.23 - Public Realm Strategy: The Constabulary supports the Council's aspiration to improve and enhance the Public Realm. From a community safety perspective, this means creating places where people feel safe and encourages legitimate activity 24/7. An objective of the public realm is its enjoyment by different cultural or age groups at the same time. This can be achieved by providing a range of complementary activities and designing the environment to minimise conflict. The creation of places that become devoid of activity at certain times of the day or night, whilst remaining accessible to offenders, should be avoided. Decisions about the appropriate level and type of activity must be made with the local context in mind. Criminals should not be able to go about their business unnoticed. Certain types of places, such as public squares and town centres, thrive on attracting a large number of people. The key is to create a high quality environment with alternative opportunities and activities for all. For safety and security purposes, unrestricted access by motor vehicles should be prevented. A town centre residential population brings activity, surveillance and ownership and should be encouraged. However bars and clubs are best located away from these areas. It is perhaps prudent to mention the Police and Crime Commissioner's county-wide CCTV project, which is expected to deploy initially six cameras around Carlisle City Centre. We believe there is widespread public support for this scheme, providing reassurance and addressing the fear of crime. Accordingly, we seek the Council's support in attracting funding from developers (whose schemes shall impact on the public realm) through CIL bids to enhance and improve the CCTV infrastructure. When improvements to the Public Realm are proposed, consideration must be given to the type, location, dimensions and structure of elements so that natural surveillance and CCTV views are not compromised.</p> <p>However unlikely the concept may appear to be relevant to Carlisle, basic 'Crowded Place' protection must be incorporated. A link to RIBA's guidance on this issue is included: http://www.architecture.com/Files/RIBAHoldings/PolicyAndInternationalRelations/Policy/CounterTerrorism/RIBADesigningforCounterTerrorism.pdf</p>							
Response:	Comments noted. The emerging Local Plan includes a specific policy on 'planning out crime' and advocates that applicants consult, particularly on larger schemes, the police crime prevention design advisor. The Plan also contains other design policies the ultimate aim of which is to create attractive, safe and valued environments.							
Proposed Change	No change considered necessary.							
Document	Other	<input type="checkbox"/>	Economic Development Context	2487	Comment	083	Michael Barry	Cumbria County Council
Comment	<p>While it is agreed that most of the strategy relevant to Carlisle has been identified, the heading on page 17 should be Cumbria Local Enterprise Partnership Strategic Economic Plan; and not "Business Plan" (para 5.10).</p> <p>References to the public realm strategy should recognise the highway de-cluttering work that the County Council are progressing in conjunction with the City Council. This work will complement the signing strategy.</p>							
Response:	Comments noted and suggested changes to be made.							
Proposed Change	Update the heading on page 17 of the report to instead read "Cumbria Local Enterprise Partnership Strategic Economic Plan" as opposed to 'Cumbria Local Enterprise Partnership Business Plan'. Include reference to the highway de-cluttering work that the County Council are progressing in tandem with the City Council on page 19 under the sub heading of Public Realm Projects.							
Document	Other	<input type="checkbox"/>	Economic Development Context	2072	Comment	017	Ms Rose Freeman	The Theatres Trust
Comment	Paragraph 5.20 has a bullet point to improve our leisure and cultural facilities in town centres. The word 'cultural' does not appear anywhere else in the document and we suggest the title of paras.4.8 and 4.9 should be Leisure and Cultural Facilities, for consistency.							
Response:	The titles referred to at paras 4.8 and 4.9 are considered appropriate within the context of the property market analysis within which they are presented.							
Proposed Change	No change considered necessary.							

Question No	CharacterArea	Agree ?	TopicArea	RepNo	RefNo	Consultee	Organisation	AgentRefN
Document	Other	<input type="checkbox"/>	Introduction	2370	Comment	009	Trevor Wilson	
Comment	<p>Paragraph 1.2 States "In regional catchment terms the City Centre caters for almost 500,000 people". Can you please reply stating how 500,000 has been calculated and justified. A map or list of towns/counties/etc with population sizes would be useful. I think 500,000 is severely flawed. I also read in the Cumberland News, dated Friday August 22, 2014, page 13 Letters, a letter from John Walsh which states "now we have Jane Meek of the city economic department saying Carlisle has a potential catchment area of 400,000" - so which figure is correct 400,000 or 500,000? In my view neither are correct. Later John Walsh states that "The 400,000 catchment would have to include the shopping centres that already exist in Kendal, Workington, Dumfries, Hexham, etc. Even so, this continues to be flawed for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We have a relative in Workington. In the last 2 years she has only once specifically visited Carlisle for shopping. The other visits have been as a by-product of visiting and staying with us in Brampton and then the most popular Carlisle location has been Tullie House. • Working and Carlisle both have - Marks and Spencer, Debenhams, ASDA, Morrison's, Tesco, B & Q, Currys PC World, a multiplex cinema and Dunelm. Therefore Workington has a reasonable selection of major high street multiples so why visit Carlisle. And residents of Whitehaven will go to Workington for the larger shops. • We have relatives in Hexham. I do not know when they last visited Carlisle - not for a long time. Why would residents of Hexham visit Carlisle when Newcastle/Gateshead/Tyne and Wear is just down the road and: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - the A69 to Newcastle is a dual carriageway all the way in 30 minutes vs. A single lane each way with limited overtaking A69 to Carlisle in 60 minutes - a train every 30 minutes to the Gateshead Metro Centre and Newcastle Central vs. A train every 60 minutes to Carlisle - 3 buses per hour via the A69 north bank of the Tyne route into Newcastle and 2 buses per hour via the south bank of the Tyne to Newcastle via Gateshead Metre Centre vs. 1 bus per hour to Carlisle - Shops, supermarkets and retail parks several times over. <p>Dumfries has a reasonable shopping centre, larger than Workington and again, why visit Carlisle? Glasgow is not far away and there is an hourly express bus/coach service between Dumfries and Glasgow using the A74(M)/M74. And Gretna works both for Carlisle (persons coming here to shop) or perhaps even more against with the large outlet village Penrith - yes, I think people of Penrith would visit Carlisle for shopping. Kendal - has a reasonable shopping centre so I do not see why residents of Kendal would visit Carlisle. If residents of Kendal require better shopping then I would expect them to travel south to Manchester (the Trafford Centre is next to the M62) or maybe Liverpool (Liverpool ONE). And we go to Newcastle once every 3 months, Glasgow or Edinburgh once every 3 months and Liverpool/Manchester once every 3 months and if we go in the shopping centre we visit the John Lewis - we miss that store most!</p>							
Response:	<p>The retail catchment was identified through the Carlisle Retail Study which within makes clear the extent of this catchment in geographic terms, as well as the methodology used to capture the primary research which supports the catchment identified. The retail study is published on the Council's website or alternatively can be viewed at the Council's Civic Centre offices upon request. Hard copies can be provided for a modest charge which covers print costs.</p> <p>In retail terms evidence supports that Carlisle is a higher order centre than others within Cumbria and retailers often tailor their offer based on recognition of this. Whilst some stores may operate in multiple locations within Carlisle's higher order catchment, generally speaking stores in the higher order centre are often larger and stock more product lines and therefore attract from a greater distance. It must also be acknowledged that Carlisle is fortunate to have a City Centre leisure and cultural offer which equally attracts people in its own right and which secures incidental retailing expenditure. Carlisle's relative ease of access in terms of its rail and road links also make it an attractive destination for much of its hinterlands, although as is to be expected there is indeed a point at which the closest highest order centre becomes Newcastle, Preston or Glasgow (with the costs of accessing these also a factor in influencing peoples choices).</p>							
Proposed Change	No change considered necessary.							
General	Other	<input type="checkbox"/>	Low Potential	2067	Comment	042	Mrs Dallas Brewis	Cycle Carlisle
Comment	Access to the Castle: Money was obtained from Sainsbury which would have given traffic free access to the Castle - this has apparently been scrapped - why?							
Response:	Monies were secured through a S106 agreement for improvements in this locality but these are yet to be implemented as opposed to having been 'scrapped'.							
Proposed Change	No change considered necessary.							

Question No	CharacterArea	Agree ?	TopicArea	RepNo	RefNo	Consultee	Organisation	AgentRefN
Document	Other	<input type="checkbox"/>	Property Market Analysis	2073	Comment	017	Ms Rose Freeman	The Theatres Trust
Comment	<p>The two paragraphs (4.8 and 4.9) do not refer to your cultural facilities and therefore is not consistent with para.5.20. The Sands Centre website page states that it is Cumbria and South West Scotland's premier venue for entertainment. 'Catering to over 735,000 customers per year and plays host to international orchestras, theatre, opera and ballet companies, international recording artists and comedians, both past and present'. Also the West Walls Theatre has been consistently providing dramatic entertainment in Carlisle for over 60 years, but neither is mentioned in the Leisure section.</p> <p>As both these venues provide a valuable contribution to your evening economy, we suggest para.4.8 is amended to include a general reference to your theatres (or performance spaces). We wish to ensure that the Development Framework recognises the importance of the cultural elements of your evening economy as well as the many types of places to eat. Theatres will still exist when all the shops operate from the internet!</p>							
Response:	<p>The titles referred to at paras 4.8 and 4.9 are considered appropriate within the context of the property market analysis within which they are presented.</p> <p>The draft report will however be amended to include reference, for contextual purposes, to the wider functions the City Centre performs.</p>							
Proposed Change	<p>Amend the draft report to include reference, for contextual purposes, to the wider functions the City Centre performs.</p>							
Document	Other	<input type="checkbox"/>	Property Market Analysis	2371	Comment	009	Trevor Wilson	
Comment	<p>Paragraph 4.3 states "There is potentially latent demand for existing comparison retailers to 'up-size' ". This is a weak statement. I would have expected GVA to have come up with something better, more concrete, more substantive such as we have had n responses from retailers who we know are seeking larger premises or to upsize.</p> <p>You need to go back and push GVA to further expand on this potential or remove it. Potential is a non-word - it lacks commitment - it provides GVA with far too easy a get out when the potential fails to materialise. Hence one reason why I said NO in response to Q1.</p>							
Response:	<p>The document is supported by soft market testing, within which the confidentiality of those approached is common practice owing to commercial sensitivities. Notwithstanding this a number of those in the retail industry, within the City and beyond, have recently and publically reaffirmed that the conclusions from the Retail Study remain valid.</p>							
Proposed Change	<p>No change considered necessary.</p>							
Document	Other	<input type="checkbox"/>	Property Market Analysis	2372	Comment	009	Trevor Wilson	
Comment	<p>Paragraph 4.15 Residential. You should see what has happened in the City of London (or Square Mile) in the last 10-20 years. At one time it was all offices from ground level up. Then there was a planning strategy change which stated that the ground floor of any new development must be retail. So now we have lots of retail on the ground floor with new or refurbished offices above and the City of London is becoming a shopping destination - the locals and the city workers do not need to go to Oxford Street but can shop local.</p> <p>So maybe you can do something similar here? A mixed use - retail on the ground floor and apartments above?</p>							
Response:	<p>Comments noted. The City Centre Development Framework nor the Local Plan against which development proposals will ultimately be assessed does not preclude this approach.</p>							
Proposed Change	<p>No change considered necessary.</p>							
General	Lowther Street/Portland Square	<input type="checkbox"/>		2462	Comment	079	Mrs M Heinrichsous	
Comment	<p>Priority: A proper bus station on the current leased car park in Lowther St. You own that site as it was Lowther St and St Patricks Schools. Facilitate access by opening up Lowther St to Hardwicke Circus North to South, coach traffic entering from Lowther St and exiting onto Georgian Way. At the same time let us have the necessary facilities included in a Bus Station, not shops as happened with the last disaster.</p> <p>A) a proper waiting room that does not close at 5:20 pm B) proper toilet facilities instead of ONE in the booking office. C) a taxi rank - not the evenings only effort in Lonsdale Street which serves the night clubs only. There are none there during the day.</p>							
Response:	<p>Comments noted. The City Council are committed to continuing to work with Cumbria County Council and stakeholders to enhance and improve the attractiveness and effectiveness of public transport infrastructure across the city including the city centre.</p>							
Proposed Change	<p>No change considered necessary.</p>							

Question No	CharacterArea	Agree ?	TopicArea	RepNo	RefNo	Consultee	Organisation	AgentRefN
General	Lowther Street/Portland Square	<input type="checkbox"/>		2460	Comment	078	F & C REITT Asset Mana	A004
Comment	<p>Proposed Extension to The Lanes:</p> <p>The owners of the Shopping Centre are in negotiations for the extension and enhancement of The Lanes as there is the opportunity for Carlisle to be supported by a stronger retail core and the potential to welcome other high end national multiples to be accommodated in the City Centre who do not currently have a presence. This includes the provision of a new anchor / department store and family friendly leisure and food offers.</p> <p>There is considerable merit in the extension of the Primary Shopping Area to the east, and specifically extending The Lanes shopping centre. The area to the east of Lowther Street is a prime location for the extension of The Lanes, particularly the existing car park which has been identified as a future acquisition for the owner of the shopping centre.</p> <p>The extension of The Lanes to the east on the existing Lowther Street Car Park is considered to be a more viable and realistic opportunity to deliver an extension to the retail core in Carlisle City Centre. It provides the opportunity to deliver a more cohesive and comprehensive redevelopment which accords with the existing character of The Lanes and this area of Carlisle City Centre. The proposals do not rely on the future release of land and are not contingent on the identification of alternate premises being found for the City Council operations that are currently in place at the Civic Centre and the associated offices.</p> <p>Our Client has drawn up some initial plans for an extension to The Lanes which would in effect extend the Primary Shopping Area east and form a more robust and connected Primary Shopping Area. The plans are enclosed with this letter and we would welcome the early opportunity to discuss the proposals in more detail with Officers.</p> <p>The proposals incorporate the redevelopment of the surface level car park to the east of Lowther Street, seeking to deliver 22 additional retail units, an anchor store, up to 4 food outlets, a multiplex cinema, and an additional 150 roof level car parking spaces (net) which would be accessed through the roof of the existing car park at The Lanes.</p> <p>The proposals seek to maximise the use of what is currently an inefficient land use in the form of the surface level car park. By building to 3 storeys, it creates the opportunity to increase the amount of floorspace as well as diversifying the use of the extension through the delivery of food outlets and a multiplex cinema.</p> <p>It is considered that the delivery of leisure uses alongside additional retail floorspace would be of significant benefit to Carlisle, in terms of linked trips, given that it serves such a large sub-regional catchment throughout Cumbria. The delivery of leisure uses would also seek to extend evening activity and the related economy, and contribute to Carlisle becoming more of a destination. This would consequently encourage visitors to undertake multi-purpose trips. It is considered that this would benefit The Lanes particularly however there will inevitably be linked trips outside of the shopping centre to other areas in Carlisle City Centre.</p> <p>The future of The Lanes must be bolstered in order to maintain an attractive and vital destination for Cumbria.</p> <p>Given the success of The Lanes in recent years, the provision of additional units in the shopping centre in an attractive controlled environment in immediate vicinity to established retailers such as House of Fraser and Marks & Spencer will be a considerable draw for retailers that are not currently represented in Carlisle, through the certainty of consumer footfall on the basis that it is physically connected to The Lanes.</p>							
Response:	<p>Aspirations of the Lanes to extend and current acquisition intentions are noted and in principle welcomed.</p> <p>Whilst the potential of extending to the east is noted, and that this is considered to be a preferable option to those outlined in the Framework, this notion is not without its challenges particularly with regards to permeability and the decisive nature of Lowther Street and issues associated with multiple land ownership. Soft market testing casted some doubts as to how attractive this option would be to the industry, being out of site and somewhat tucked away without any logical through fare. Long standing and unimplemented allocations in this area act to reinforce some of these concerns.</p> <p>Notwithstanding the challenges posed in terms of extending to the east, it is noted that there is some recent firm interest in this area, albeit not on the scale which would address the evidence needs in full. Whilst the framework does not preclude such development in this location, subject to addressing the challenges outlined particularly regarding permeability, it is acknowledged that the identification of this area along with land to the north of Lowther Street / Rickergate would afford a greater degree of flexibility to responding to the identified needs, an approach which is considered to be advantageous and entirely appropriate.</p> <p>The opportunity to discuss the Lanes expansion proposals and future intentions in more detail is welcomed and will be acted on.</p>							
Proposed Change	<p>Consider identification of wider broad location to encompass land to the east of Lowther Street to enable more flexibility regarding options to respond to meeting future needs through extending the Primary Shopping Area.</p>							

Question No	CharacterArea	Agree ?	TopicArea	RepNo	RefNo	Consultee	Organisation	AgentRefN
Q2	Lowther Street/Portland Square	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		2225	Support	054	Mr Christopher Wheeler	
Comment								
Response:	Comments noted.							
Proposed Change	No change considered necessary.							
<hr/>								
	Lowther Street/Portland Square	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		2327	Support	064	Mrs Carol Grey	
Comment								
Response:	Comments noted.							
Proposed Change	No change considered necessary.							
<hr/>								
	Lowther Street/Portland Square	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		2428	Support	072	Mrs Jennifer Smith	
Comment								
Response:	Comments noted.							
Proposed Change	No change considered necessary.							
<hr/>								
	Lowther Street/Portland Square	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		2365	Support	009	Trevor Wilson	
Comment								
Response:	Comments noted.							
Proposed Change	No change considered necessary.							
<hr/>								
	Lowther Street/Portland Square	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		2265	Support	059	Miss Carole Hoggan	
Comment								
Response:	Comments noted.							
Proposed Change	No change considered necessary.							

Question No	CharacterArea	Agree ?	TopicArea	RepNo	RefNo	Consultee	Organisation	AgentRefN
Q2	Lowther Street/Portland Square	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		2279	Support	060	Barry O Earp	
Comment								
Response:	Comments noted.							
Proposed Change	No change considered necessary.							
	Lowther Street/Portland Square	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		2338	Support	065	Miss Lindsey McNamee	
Comment								
Response:	Comments noted.							
Proposed Change	No change considered necessary.							
	Lowther Street/Portland Square	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		2181	Support	051	Miss Susan Mark	
Comment	Viable use for vacant premises NEEDED, just a dream, as ideas could be put into action now. MANY VACANT SHOPS!							
Response:	The City Council are committed to working with stakeholders to reduce the number of vacancies within the City Centre and will be proactive in using the powers available to them to assist in this objective. A good recent example of this is that the City Council agreed in January 2015 to update their Discretionary Rate Relief Policy in order to offer re-occupation relief for retail units which have been vacant for 12 months or more. The implementation of this national initiative at the local level sees such units qualify for a 50% reduction in their business rates (National Non Domestic Rates) for 18 months from the date the premises becomes occupied - and is likely to constitute a strong incentive in bringing empty units back into use.							
Proposed Change	No change considered necessary.							
	Lowther Street/Portland Square	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		2197	Support	052	Mr Colin Latimer	
Comment								
Response:	Comments noted.							
Proposed Change	No change considered necessary.							

Question No	CharacterArea	Agree ?	TopicArea	RepNo	RefNo	Consultee	Organisation	AgentRefN
Q2	Lowther Street/Portland Square	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		2025	Support	034	Mr Eddie Haughan	
Comment								
Response: Comments noted.								
Proposed Change No change considered necessary.								
<hr/>								
	Lowther Street/Portland Square	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		2302	Support	062	Mr Hans J A Landstrom	
Comment								
Response: Comments noted.								
Proposed Change No change considered necessary.								
<hr/>								
	Lowther Street/Portland Square	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		2413	Support	071	Mrs Joan Field	
Comment								
Response: Comments noted.								
Proposed Change No change considered necessary.								
<hr/>								
	Lowther Street/Portland Square	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		2315	Support	063	Mr Ian Grey	
Comment Enhance transport - include bikes.								
Response: Comments noted.								
Proposed Change No change considered necessary.								
<hr/>								
	Lowther Street/Portland Square	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		2253	Support	058	Mrs Joanne Swanton	JoMark House of Hair
Comment								
Response: Comments noted.								
Proposed Change No change considered necessary.								

Question No	CharacterArea	Agree ?	TopicArea	RepNo	RefNo	Consultee	Organisation	AgentRefN
Q2	Lowther Street/Portland Square	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		2244	Support	056	Mr B Taylor	Taylor & Hardy
Comment	The Lowther Street car park is identified as having high potential for change / intervention. It is noted to be an opportunity for further beneficial development. It is our client's intention to bring the site forward for retail development at the earliest opportunity. To that end pre – application discussions are taking place with the LPA in relation to a potential redevelopment scheme.							
Response:	Comments and intentions noted.							
Proposed Change	No change considered necessary.							
	Lowther Street/Portland Square	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		2387	Support	015	Mr Viv Dodd	Revival Carlisle
Comment								
Response:	Comments noted.							
Proposed Change	No change considered necessary.							
	Lowther Street/Portland Square	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		2212	Support	053	Mrs Joyce Hetherington	
Comment								
Response:	Comments noted.							
Proposed Change	No change considered necessary.							
	Lowther Street/Portland Square	<input type="checkbox"/>		2050	Comment	039	Mr M Holliday	
Comment	CCC should not be relocating to a brand new building on a well used car park. Yet another ridiculous decision. Portland Square is indeed an attractive area and the vacant offices should continue to be converted into good quality apartments. The Iceland car park and surrounding area on Lowther Street should be considered as a site for suitable retail use.							
Response:	The decision has already been taken by the Cumbria County Council to relocate. Comments regarding Iceland car park noted - the Framework does not preclude development of this area.							
Proposed Change	No change considered necessary.							
	Lowther Street/Portland Square	<input type="checkbox"/>		2260	Objection	059	Miss Carole Hoggan	
Comment	Yes knock down the Civic Centre but NO to a shopping centre. Perhaps a concert hall/theatre SAVE the old police station.							
Response:	Comments noted.							
Proposed Change	No change considered necessary.							

Question No	CharacterArea	Agree ?	TopicArea	RepNo	RefNo	Consultee	Organisation	AgentRefN
Q2	Lowther Street/Portland Square	<input type="checkbox"/>		2153	Objection	049	Mrs Mavis Sarginson	
Comment	No							
Response:	Comment noted. In the absence of elaborating as to the reasons why the Council can not, on this occasion, comment further.							
Proposed Change	No change considered necessary.							
	Lowther Street/Portland Square	<input type="checkbox"/>		2082	Objection	045	Ms Kate Carvana	
Comment	No							
Response:	Comment noted. In the absence of elaborating as to the reasons why the Council can not, on this occasion, comment further.							
Proposed Change	No change considered necessary.							
	Lowther Street/Portland Square	<input type="checkbox"/>		2120	Objection	046	Miss Gillian Smith	
Comment	No							
Response:	Comment noted. In the absence of elaborating as to the reasons why the Council can not, on this occasion, comment further.							
Proposed Change	No change considered necessary.							
	Lowther Street/Portland Square	<input type="checkbox"/>		2143	Objection	048	Mrs C E Simpson	
Comment	No							
Response:	Comment noted. In the absence of elaborating as to the reasons why the Council can not, on this occasion, comment further.							
Proposed Change	No change considered necessary.							
	Lowther Street/Portland Square	<input type="checkbox"/>		2133	Objection	047	Mrs Margaret Backhouse	
Comment	No							
Response:	Comment noted. In the absence of elaborating as to the reasons why the Council can not, on this occasion, comment further.							
Proposed Change	No change considered necessary.							

Question No	CharacterArea	Agree ?	TopicArea	RepNo	RefNo	Consultee	Organisation	AgentRefN
Q2	Lowther Street/Portland Square	<input type="checkbox"/>		2238	Objection	055	Mrs Helen Blamire	
Comment	CCC will struggle to sell these and will end up lying empty.							
Response:	Comments noted.							
Proposed Change	No change considered necessary.							
	Lowther Street/Portland Square	<input type="checkbox"/>		2350	Objection	066	Mrs Sandra Stockley	
Comment	Extending the Primary Shopping Area across Lowther Street into the car park would link in with the Bus Station and Lanes Complex and smarten up the area. Also with businesses such as Argos.							
Response:	Comments noted. Whilst the development framework does not preclude redevelopment here, it highlights some of the barriers to extending in this direction which may prove capable of however being overcome.							
Proposed Change	No change considered necessary.							
	Lowther Street/Portland Square	<input type="checkbox"/>		2098	Objection	011	Mrs Julie Templeton	Member of Save our Stree
Comment	I believe that this area should also be considered as an appropriate site for retail development. This was identified for retail development in the GVA Retail report 2012.							
Response:	Whilst the development framework does not preclude redevelopment here, it highlights some of the barriers to extending in this direction which proposals and wider initiatives should seek to address. It must be recognised however that there are currently a number of uncertainties regarding the availability and ability to accommodate major retail development in this location and as such it is not currently considered to present a realistic option which can be relied upon. Notwithstanding this the Council remain committed to enhancing and better integrating this important area with others in the City Centre.							
Proposed Change	No change considered necessary.							
	Lowther Street/Portland Square	<input type="checkbox"/>		2169	Objection	026	Elizabeth Allnutt	Save Our Streets
Comment	SOS does not agree with the conclusions for this area. There is considerable potential for change with large areas of car parking and a bus station which is supposed to be moving to a transport hub near the station, which are suitable sites for development. A retail scheme should be worked up for this area, though Conservation Area status needs to be recognised.							
Response:	No firm proposals are yet in place for a transport hub near the station but the City Council are committed to continuing to work with Cumbria County Council and stakeholders to enhance and improve the attractiveness and effectiveness of public transport infrastructure across the city including the City Centre.							
Proposed Change	Whilst the development framework does not preclude redevelopment here, it highlights some of the barriers to extending in this direction which proposals and wider initiatives should seek to address. It must be recognised however that there are currently a number of uncertainties regarding the availability and ability to accommodate major retail development in this location and as such it is not currently considered to present a realistic option which can be relied upon. Notwithstanding this the Council remain committed to enhancing and better integrating this important area with others in the City Centre.							

Question No	CharacterArea	Agree ?	TopicArea	RepNo	RefNo	Consultee	Organisation	AgentRefN
Q2	Lowther Street/Portland Square	<input type="checkbox"/>		2446	Objection	075	Mr Neil Irving	SOS
Comment	No							
Response:	Comment noted. In the absence of elaborating as to the reasons why the Council can not, on this occasion, comment further.							
Proposed Change	No change considered necessary.							
	Lowther Street/Portland Square	<input type="checkbox"/>		2013	Comment	001	Mr Nigel Winter	Stagecoach NorthWest Lt
Comment	In consideration of expanded retail activity, if the bus station is to remain in this section of the City it will require a larger site and upgrading to a 21st century facility. The bus station at certain times past the hour is at capacity and cannot accommodate more than one tri axle coach at a time. The bus stn is an important public facility, it must not act to detract from visitors coming to Carlisle to spend their money and should be part of a developing Carlisle beyond its current limits.							
	As the City area is a short walk from one end to the other, this framework plan presents the opportunity to restrict traffic to the outer area with car parks relocated and accessed from Castle Way, Georgian Way, Victoria Viaduct etc. Park & Ride is a possibility from one or more of the three motorway junctions, or from land off the junction city side. Incorporating existing bus routes in Park & Ride provides for the opportunity to operate on a sustainable basis, no revenue support required.							
	If Carlisle is to shine as an attractive place to visit, then congestion must be removed and air quality improved, with affordable attractive passenger transport and infrastructure to match							
Response:	Comments noted and issues with current bus station acknowledged. The City Council are committed to continuing to work with Cumbria County Council and stakeholders to enhance and improve the attractiveness and effectiveness of public transport infrastructure across the city including the city centre.							
	The transport implications of developments across the City are continuing to be modelled in conjunction with the County Council and necessary improvements and interventions to enable growth to happen, alleviate congestion and avoid adverse impacts on air quality are being identified and costed. Such interventions include passenger transport improvements and enhanced sustainable forms of movement alongside those to the highway network. There is no evidence however to currently support that there is a need for park and ride sites.							
Proposed Change	No change considered necessary.							
	Lowther Street/Portland Square	<input type="checkbox"/>		2291	Objection	061	Mr David Hamilton	
Comment	The present apology for a bus station should be high on the priority list. Visitors to our city have a bad impression on arriving with lack of good facilities. As stated the bus station is 'an important hub' area.							
Response:	Comments noted and issues with current bus station acknowledged. The City Council are committed to continuing to work with Cumbria County Council and stakeholders to enhance and improve the attractiveness and effectiveness of public transport infrastructure across the city including the city centre.							
Proposed Change	No change considered necessary.							
	Lowther Street/Portland Square	<input type="checkbox"/>		2399	Objection	069	Mrs Karen Atkinson	
Comment	Comment noted. In the absence of elaborating as to the reasons why the Council can not, on this occasion, comment further.							
Response:	No change considered necessary.							
Proposed Change	No change considered necessary.							

Question No	CharacterArea	Agree ?	TopicArea	RepNo	RefNo	Consultee	Organisation	AgentRefN
Q5	Lowther Street/Portland Square	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		2201	Comment	052	Mr Colin Latimer	
Comment	The land area on Lowther Street with less property to acquire. Probation services could be moved in with magistrates court [land earmarked for flats]. Eden Bridge House could be relocated to Kingmoor Park.							
Response:	Comments noted. Whilst the development framework does not preclude redevelopment here, it highlights some of the barriers to extending in this direction which may prove capable of however being overcome.							
Proposed Change	No change considered necessary.							
Document	Lowther Street/Portland Square	<input type="checkbox"/>	Character Area Analysis & Option Development	2469	Support	010	Emily Hrycan	English Heritage North
Comment	We are in general agreement with the analysis and proposed strategy for this area.							
Response:	Comments noted.							
Proposed Change	No change considered necessary.							
	Lowther Street/Portland Square	<input type="checkbox"/>	Character Area Analysis & Option Development	2492	Comment	083	Michael Barry	Cumbria County Council
Comment	This area contains two distinct areas; Lowther Street; and the area around Warwick Road and Portland Square. Recognition of the County Council's efforts to deliver sustainable uses for Portland Square is welcome.							
Response:	Nonetheless it is recommended that references to the bus station being a "limited transport facility" should be removed as it appears a contradictory statement which is not based on evidence. References to "enhance transport / movement circulation (where possible)" fail to pick up on the importance of pedestrian movement and should be reworded to state "enhance pedestrian and vehicular movement". Comments noted. Reference to the bus station as a 'limited transport facility' is considered an accurate reflection which is supported by other responses to the consultation. It is agreed that "enhance transport (movement) circulation (where possible)" should be reworded to state "enhance pedestrian and vehicular movement".							
Proposed Change	Para. 10.9 - "enhance transport (movement) circulation (where possible)" should be reworded to state "enhance pedestrian and vehicular movement".							
General	Lowther Street/Portland Square	<input type="checkbox"/>	Medium Potential	2420	Comment	071	Mrs Joan Field	
Comment	Again linking to the idea of supporting tourism the bus station has poor provision and has no public toilets [a must for long distance travellers] The nearby excellent Lanes toilets were pulled out without public consultation.							
Response:	Comments noted and issues with current bus station acknowledged. The City Council are committed to continuing to work with Cumbria County Council and stakeholders to enhance and improve the attractiveness and effectiveness of public transport infrastructure across the city including the city centre.							
Proposed Change	No change considered necessary.							

Question No	CharacterArea	Agree ?	TopicArea	RepNo	RefNo	Consultee	Organisation	AgentRefN
General	Lowther Street/Portland Square	<input type="checkbox"/>	Medium Potential	2125	Comment	046	Miss Gillian Smith	
Comment	Having worked in Portland Square, I have experienced the difficulties of parking. To build on Williams street car park will only create more problems. Suggest relocating Cumbria CC HQ to Caldew Riverside OR use vacant offices in Civic Centre.							
Response:	The decision has already been taken by the Cumbria County Council to relocate.							
Proposed Change	No change considered necessary.							
<hr/>								
	Historic Quarter	<input type="checkbox"/>		2003	Comment	031	Jeremy Griffiths	
Comment	Having read the document I think there is much in it which will enhance the city centre although I will bow to those with more experience as to whether all the additional shopping is viable. It does occur to me however that although the matter of Castle Way severing access to the Castle from the city is mentioned on page 2 and indirectly on page 4 the presence of this road is "the elephant in the room" and is worthy of more attention. If substantial sources of investment are going to be forthcoming then dealing with this road should be a priority. I confess I have no easy answer apart from sending it behind the Castle perhaps but with clear access down Castle Street to the Castle I'm certain Carlisle could well take on the likes of York as a tourist destination with all the advantages that brings.							
Response:	Comments noted. Given the strategic nature of the Framework it is considered appropriate to raise the principle of the issue and avoid being overly prescriptive.							
Proposed Change	No change considered necessary.							
<hr/>								
	Historic Quarter	<input type="checkbox"/>		2112	Comment	005	Mrs B A Robinson	
Comment	Castle Street has been sadly affected by the previous plans - uncomfortable granite seats; lack of parking etc. Hoopers has closed and other businesses have less trade. Please change these latest plans!							
Response:	The City Centre Development Framework seeks to put in place a positive framework to protect and enhance the character and attractiveness of the historic quarter.							
Proposed Change	No change considered necessary.							
<hr/>								
Q2	Historic Quarter	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		2061	Support	042	Mrs Dallas Brewis	Cycle Carlisle
Comment								
Response:	Comments noted.							
Proposed Change	No change considered necessary.							
<hr/>								
	Historic Quarter	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		2314	Support	063	Mr Ian Grey	
Comment								
Response:	Comments noted.							
Proposed Change	No change considered necessary.							

Question No	CharacterArea	Agree ?	TopicArea	RepNo	RefNo	Consultee	Organisation	AgentRefN
-------------	---------------	---------	-----------	-------	-------	-----------	--------------	-----------

Q2	Historic Quarter	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		2349	Support	066	Mrs Sandra Stockley	
-----------	-------------------------	-------------------------------------	--	------	---------	-----	---------------------	--

Comment

Response: Comments noted.

Proposed Change: No change considered necessary.

	Historic Quarter	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		2224	Support	054	Mr Christopher Wheeler	
--	-------------------------	-------------------------------------	--	------	---------	-----	------------------------	--

Comment

Response: Comments noted.

Proposed Change: No change considered necessary.

	Historic Quarter	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		2386	Support	015	Mr Viv Dodd	Revival Carlisle
--	-------------------------	-------------------------------------	--	------	---------	-----	-------------	------------------

Comment

Response: Comments noted.

Proposed Change: No change considered necessary.

	Historic Quarter	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		2024	Support	034	Mr Eddie Haughan	
--	-------------------------	-------------------------------------	--	------	---------	-----	------------------	--

Comment

Response: Comments noted.

Proposed Change: No change considered necessary.

	Historic Quarter	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		2301	Support	062	Mr Hans J A Landstrom	
--	-------------------------	-------------------------------------	--	------	---------	-----	-----------------------	--

Comment

Response: Comments noted.

Proposed Change: No change considered necessary.

Question No	CharacterArea	Agree ?	TopicArea	RepNo	RefNo	Consultee	Organisation	AgentRefN
-------------	---------------	---------	-----------	-------	-------	-----------	--------------	-----------

Q2	Historic Quarter	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		2326	Support	064	Mrs Carol Grey	
-----------	-------------------------	-------------------------------------	--	------	---------	-----	----------------	--

Comment

Response: Comments noted.

Proposed Change No change considered necessary.

	Historic Quarter	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		2211	Support	053	Mrs Joyce Hetherington	
--	-------------------------	-------------------------------------	--	------	---------	-----	------------------------	--

Comment

Response: Comments noted.

Proposed Change No change considered necessary.

	Historic Quarter	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		2290	Support	061	Mr David Hamilton	
--	-------------------------	-------------------------------------	--	------	---------	-----	-------------------	--

Comment

Response: Comments noted.

Proposed Change No change considered necessary.

	Historic Quarter	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		2412	Support	071	Mrs Joan Field	
--	-------------------------	-------------------------------------	--	------	---------	-----	----------------	--

Comment

Response: Comments noted.

Proposed Change No change considered necessary.

	Historic Quarter	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		2081	Support	045	Ms Kate Carvana	
--	-------------------------	-------------------------------------	--	------	---------	-----	-----------------	--

Comment

Response: Comments noted.

Proposed Change No change considered necessary.

Question No	CharacterArea	Agree ?	TopicArea	RepNo	RefNo	Consultee	Organisation	AgentRefN
Q2	Historic Quarter	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		2180	Support	051	Miss Susan Mark	
Comment								
Response:	Comments noted.							
Proposed Change	No change considered necessary.							
<hr/>								
	Historic Quarter	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		2264	Support	059	Miss Carole Hoggan	
Comment	Must do something with Hoopers. More parking for free not just for loading.							
Response:	Comments noted. The City Council do not own the former Hoopers building. Planning permission was recently secured by the owners for restaurant use which facilities an alternative option to its continued use for retail purposes. Regarding parking there is a need to cater for all users to avoid conflict.							
Proposed Change	No change considered necessary.							
<hr/>								
	Historic Quarter	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		2012	Support	001	Mr Nigel Winter	Stagecoach NorthWest Lt
Comment								
Response:	Comments noted.							
Proposed Change	No change considered necessary.							
<hr/>								
	Historic Quarter	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		2278	Support	060	Barry O Earp	
Comment								
Response:	Comments noted.							
Proposed Change	No change considered necessary.							
<hr/>								
	Historic Quarter	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		2427	Support	072	Mrs Jennifer Smith	
Comment								
Response:	Comments noted.							
Proposed Change	No change considered necessary.							

Question No	CharacterArea	Agree ?	TopicArea	RepNo	RefNo	Consultee	Organisation	AgentRefN
Q2	Historic Quarter	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		2364	Support	009	Trevor Wilson	
Comment								
Response:	Comments noted.							
Proposed Change	No change considered necessary.							
<hr/>								
	Historic Quarter	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		2252	Support	058	Mrs Joanne Swanton	JoMark House of Hair
Comment								
Response:	Comments noted.							
Proposed Change	No change considered necessary.							
<hr/>								
	Historic Quarter	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		2097	Comment	011	Mrs Julie Templeton	Member of Save our Stree
Comment	The influence of Hooper's store on the development of Castle Street should act as a caution to other development areas. There is little support for the public realm changes, the black marble slabs already look dated and are uncomfortable to sit on especially for the elderly and people with disabilities. There was an attempt to make the area exclusive, but the changes implemented did not enhance the area, or guarantee that up-market retail would thrive in the area. Carlisle is still a small city and I do not believe that copying large city development areas by parcelling up different areas into zones and character areas works in a city the size of Carlisle even allowing for growth.							
Response:	Comments noted but notwithstanding these there is a need to ensure an appropriate policy framework is in place to guide future development and change.							
Proposed Change	No change considered necessary.							
<hr/>								
	Historic Quarter	<input type="checkbox"/>		2037	Objection	036	Ian Caruana	
Comment	No							
Response:	Comment noted. In the absence of elaborating as to the reasons why the Council can not, on this occasion, comment further.							
Proposed Change	No change considered necessary.							
<hr/>								
	Historic Quarter	<input type="checkbox"/>		2152	Objection	049	Mrs Mavis Sarginson	
Comment	No							
Response:	Comment noted. In the absence of elaborating as to the reasons why the Council can not, on this occasion, comment further.							
Proposed Change	No change considered necessary.							

Question No	CharacterArea	Agree ?	TopicArea	RepNo	RefNo	Consultee	Organisation	AgentRefN
Q2	Historic Quarter	<input type="checkbox"/>		2398	Objection	069	Mrs Karen Atkinson	
Comment	No							
Response:	Comment noted. In the absence of elaborating as to the reasons why the Council can not, on this occasion, comment further.							
Proposed Change	No change considered necessary.							
<hr/>								
	Historic Quarter	<input type="checkbox"/>		2337	Objection	065	Miss Lindsey McNamee	
Comment	Improvement was supposed to have been done. I personally think this is an eyesore and feel the Castle is not part of it [it is supposed to be our emblem].							
Response:	Comments noted. Improved permeability which the Framework promotes could include better integration with the Castle.							
Proposed Change	No change considered necessary.							
<hr/>								
	Historic Quarter	<input type="checkbox"/>		2049	Comment	039	Mr M Holliday	
Comment	Castle Way is the single most destructive, short sighted abomination to have been forced on the citizens of Carlisle since we made up with the Scots. It should either be buried or taken around the castle.							
Response:	The City Centre Development Framework raises the issue of the need to improve permeability within this area.							
Proposed Change	No change considered necessary.							
<hr/>								
	Historic Quarter	<input type="checkbox"/>		2196	Objection	052	Mr Colin Latimer	
Comment	No							
Response:	Comment noted. In the absence of elaborating as to the reasons why the Council can not, on this occasion, comment further.							
Proposed Change	No change considered necessary.							
<hr/>								
	Historic Quarter	<input type="checkbox"/>		2142	Objection	048	Mrs C E Simpson	
Comment	No							
Response:	Comment noted. In the absence of elaborating as to the reasons why the Council can not, on this occasion, comment further.							
Proposed Change	No change considered necessary.							

Question No	CharacterArea	Agree ?	TopicArea	RepNo	RefNo	Consultee	Organisation	AgentRefN
Q2	Historic Quarter	<input type="checkbox"/>		2168	Objection	026	Elizabeth Allnutt	Save Our Streets
Comment	<p>SOS does not entirely agree with the conclusions for this area. This is still a vital part of the city and is not a history ghetto. There is also considerable history in other areas which should not be ignored. The public realm is not attractive – very few people in the city like it (a loss of parking for the small businesses in Castle St, very cold marble slabs which do not invite comfortable seating and are not user friendly for anyone who needs back support or arm rests to help getting up again; the pillars in Castle St are often disparagingly referred to as matchsticks, Hadrian’s Wall in the pavement is back to front). Castle Way and the severance of the castle from the city is an insoluble problem which the city has to live with – it is inconceivable to divert the volume of traffic which goes along Castle Way. The railway and changes in level is also something which could possible be exploited as attractive in itself and as an historic tourist attraction. The line of the city walls and the antiquity of the Sallyport Steps as well as the industrial heritage is made very little of.</p>							
Response:	Comments noted. Whilst acknowledging that other areas and places are equally of historic value 'history' / 'heritage' is nevertheless the key defining characteristic in this particular area. The issue of permeability within this area is already noted and this would extend to include the integration of the Castle.							
Proposed Change	No change considered necessary.							
	Historic Quarter	<input type="checkbox"/>		2119	Objection	046	Miss Gillian Smith	
Comment	No							
Response:	Comment noted. In the absence of elaborating as to the reasons why the Council can not, on this occasion, comment further.							
Proposed Change	No change considered necessary.							
	Historic Quarter	<input type="checkbox"/>		2445	Objection	075	Mr Neil Irving	SOS
Comment	No							
Response:	Comment noted. In the absence of elaborating as to the reasons why the Council can not, on this occasion, comment further.							
Proposed Change	No change considered necessary.							
	Historic Quarter	<input type="checkbox"/>		2237	Objection	055	Mrs Helen Blamire	
Comment	Restaurants in Hoopers? Do we really need more?							
Response:	Comments noted but it will be the 'market' which determines whether existing planning permissions are indeed implemented.							
Proposed Change	No change considered necessary.							

Question No	CharacterArea	Agree ?	TopicArea	RepNo	RefNo	Consultee	Organisation	AgentRefN
Q2	Historic Quarter	<input type="checkbox"/>		2132	Objection	047	Mrs Margaret Backhouse	
Comment	No							
Response:	Comment noted. In the absence of elaborating as to the reasons why the Council can not, on this occasion, comment further.							
Proposed Change	No change considered necessary.							
<hr/>								
Document	Historic Quarter	<input type="checkbox"/>	Character Area Analysis & Option Development	2466	Support	010	Emily Hrycan	English Heritage North
Comment	We are in general agreement with the analysis and proposed strategy for this important and sensitive area. We particularly support the identified requirements in paragraph 7.6 to increase pedestrian permeability and accessibility across Castle Way, and to promote key attractions such as the Castle, Cathedral and Tullie House.							
Response:	Comments noted.							
Proposed Change	No change considered necessary.							
<hr/>								
	Historic Quarter	<input type="checkbox"/>	Character Area Analysis & Option Development	2494	Comment	083	Michael Barry	Cumbria County Council
Comment	This area is very important to the creation of sustainable development in Carlisle. The protection of this areas role therefore needs to be a priority for the Local Plan. As part of this, it is considered that the Framework should be more aspirational about the delivery of appropriate changes of uses in this area, and the introduction of sensitive new design elements that can enhance yet respect the character of this area.							
	We note this section refers to an aspiration to; "Increase Pedestrian Permeability and Accessibility" around Castle Way. It is considered that this reference should be removed as pedestrian permeability and accessibility improvements here, are not considered to be well related to the role of the Framework.							
Response:	It is considered that it would be inappropriate and furthermore that it is not necessary to provide further detail as to do so would act to remove flexibility the need for which is considered paramount. Reference to pedestrian permeability and accessibility are considered entirely appropriate matters to be included within the Framework.							
Proposed Change	No change considered necessary.							
<hr/>								
	Historic Quarter	<input type="checkbox"/>	Character Area Analysis & Option Development	2374	Comment	009	Trevor Wilson	
Comment	Paragraph 7.6 The bullet list is very high level. The items stated are good but lacking in detail. I would have expected more detail here. If GVA can produce more detail on Rickergate, why is there not more detail here? Not much to comment on as the bullet list is open to a wide interpretation which thus makes it difficult to agree, but in principle the list is ok.							
Response:	Comments noted. No specific proposals are being advanced in this area hence why the detail is not as worked up as much. The difference in detail therefore reflects different degrees of change being promoted in each of the character areas.							
Proposed Change	No change considered necessary.							

Question No	CharacterArea	Agree ?	TopicArea	RepNo	RefNo	Consultee	Organisation	AgentRefN
Document	Historic Quarter	<input type="checkbox"/>	Character Area Analysis & Option Development	2375	Comment	009	Trevor Wilson	
Comment	Overall General Comment. Following on from Paragraph 7.6 comment [ref No 2374], the Development Framework Report perhaps should be renamed as "Rickergate Option B Report" - this is reinforced by the section "Part 3 Preferred Option and Way Forward " where there is no mention of any other part of the city centre other than the proposed Rickergate development. Whilst the report is 75 pages long an awful lot of it is repetition of how we got here, much general non-specific statement and lacking in detail except when it comes to Rickergate Option B. There appears to be limited forward movement on all the areas except Rickergate. I would have thought that there would be more.							
Response:	It needs to be recognised that a key objective of the Framework was to identify and consider which areas / sites within the City Centre could accommodate future retail growth and the evidenced quantum of new floorspace. The level of detail provided for each of the character areas is considered proportionate to the perceived degree of change.							
Proposed Change	No change considered necessary.							
	Historic Quarter	<input type="checkbox"/>	Character Area Analysis & Option Development	2373	Comment	009	Trevor Wilson	
Comment	Paragraph 7.5 Refers to the consultation feedback report on the Council's website. I followed the link to http://www.carlisle.gov.uk/downloads/responses_to_consultation_-_city_centre_plan.pdf but it did not appear to be responses to the city centre plan but more like responses to the preceding New Local Plan. Can you please confirm the document published on the website link is the correct document.							
Response:	The responses to the previous consultation are available from the downloadable documents link at the footer of the following page: http://www.carlisle.gov.uk/planning_and_buildings/planning_policy/the_new_local_plan/city_centre_dev_framework.aspx or can be accessed directly via: http://www.carlisle.gov.uk/downloads/responses_to_consultation_-_city_centre_plan.pdf							
Proposed Change	No change considered necessary.							
General	Citadel	<input type="checkbox"/>		2203	Comment	052	Mr Colin Latimer	
Comment	When County Council move to their new location, this is going to leave a large area for redevelopment on the site of the portacabins and car park again close to proposed transport hub.							
Response:	Comments noted. The Framework already acknowledges this redevelopment opportunity.							
Proposed Change								
	Citadel	<input type="checkbox"/>		2357	Comment	066	Mrs Sandra Stockley	
Comment	What plans are there for the swimming pool site? This should be included with the Citadel Area. The building next door to the Courts, currently occupied by B and M and a betting shop is iconic Art Deco. That area is shamefully scruffy yet that and Botchergate are what railway visitors first see on arrival. What plans are being made for the deteriorating hotel on the Viaduct Bridge?							
Response:	It is agreed that a stronger reference to the relocation of the baths and the opportunity this presents could be included in the report. The Framework already picks up on the issues surrounding the Citadel and Botchergate from a gateway and sense of arrival perspective and the importance of these. The City Council continues to explore opportunities to promote and secure the re-use of the former Central Plaza but it does not own the building and it is therefore beyond the City Council's direct control.							
Proposed Change	Include a stronger reference to the relocation of the baths and the opportunity this presents within the report.							

Question No	CharacterArea	Agree ?	TopicArea	RepNo	RefNo	Consultee	Organisation	AgentRefN
General	Citadel	<input type="checkbox"/>		2463	Comment	079	Mrs M Heinrichsous	
Comment	Priority: Demolish the Central Plaza before it falls down and create another multi storey car park - if there is no parking facility, shoppers won't come. That would release the current bus station site for extra shops, central to the city - not merely yards from crossing the bridge out of the city.							
Response:	Comments noted. The City Council continues to explore opportunities to promote and secure the re-use of the former Central Plaza.							
Proposed Change	No change considered necessary.							
<hr/>								
	Citadel	<input type="checkbox"/>		2110	Comment	005	Mrs B A Robinson	
Comment	There would have to be a permanent lift or escalators to cope with the difference in elevation.							
Response:	Comment noted. In responding to design policies within the Local Plan all development schemes must be designed to be as inclusive as possible from an accessibility perspective.							
Proposed Change	No change considered necessary.							
<hr/>								
Q2	Citadel	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		2263	Support	059	Miss Carole Hoggan	
Comment	Take away the parking from in front of the station but open more around the back of the Hallmark Hotel							
Response:	Comments noted. The Framework already promotes the need to improve the Station Square and access to the station by a variety of means.							
Proposed Change	No change considered necessary.							
<hr/>								
	Citadel	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		2048	Comment	039	Mr M Holliday	
Comment	Broadly agree with the conclusions. The existing bus station (with no proper waiting areas or toilets !!!!) should be relocated to the rear of the train station to improve transport links/integration. This in turn would free up the existing site for retail use.							
Response:	Comments noted and issues with current bus station acknowledged. The City Council are committed to continuing to work with Cumbria County Council and stakeholders to enhance and improve the attractiveness and effectiveness of public transport infrastructure across the city including the city centre.							
Proposed Change	No change considered necessary.							
<hr/>								
	Citadel	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		2251	Support	058	Mrs Joanne Swanton	JoMark House of Hair
Comment								
Response:	Comments noted.							
Proposed Change	No change considered necessary.							

Question No	CharacterArea	Agree ?	TopicArea	RepNo	RefNo	Consultee	Organisation	AgentRefN
-------------	---------------	---------	-----------	-------	-------	-----------	--------------	-----------

Q2	Citadel	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		2223	Support	054	Mr Christopher Wheeler	
Comment	While my general conclusions are as in Q1 above [Rep Ref 2219], I feel that Botchergate and Citadel need to be prioritise much higher than a speculative new development of Rickergate.							
Response:	Comments noted but opportunities for major retail development and the ability to respond to evidenced needs are more limited in Botchergate and in the vicinity of the Citadel.							
Proposed Change	No change considered necessary.							

	Citadel	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		2195	Support	052	Mr Colin Latimer	
Comment								
Response:	Comments noted.							
Proposed Change	No change considered necessary.							

	Citadel	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		2411	Support	071	Mrs Joan Field	
Comment								
Response:	Comments noted.							
Proposed Change	No change considered necessary.							

	Citadel	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		2300	Support	062	Mr Hans J A Landstrom	
Comment								
Response:	Comments noted.							
Proposed Change	No change considered necessary.							

	Citadel	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		2363	Support	009	Trevor Wilson	
Comment								
Response:	Comments noted.							
Proposed Change	No change considered necessary.							

Question No	CharacterArea	Agree ?	TopicArea	RepNo	RefNo	Consultee	Organisation	AgentRefN
-------------	---------------	---------	-----------	-------	-------	-----------	--------------	-----------

Q2	Citadel	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		2210	Support	053	Mrs Joyce Hetherington	
-----------	----------------	-------------------------------------	--	------	---------	-----	------------------------	--

Comment

Response: Comments noted.

Proposed Change: No change considered necessary.

	Citadel	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		2313	Support	063	Mr Ian Grey	
--	----------------	-------------------------------------	--	------	---------	-----	-------------	--

Comment

Response: Comments noted.

Proposed Change: No change considered necessary.

	Citadel	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		2348	Support	066	Mrs Sandra Stockley	
--	----------------	-------------------------------------	--	------	---------	-----	---------------------	--

Comment

Response: Comments noted.

Proposed Change: No change considered necessary.

	Citadel	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		2023	Support	034	Mr Eddie Haughan	
--	----------------	-------------------------------------	--	------	---------	-----	------------------	--

Comment

Response: Comments noted.

Proposed Change: No change considered necessary.

	Citadel	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		2325	Support	064	Mrs Carol Grey	
--	----------------	-------------------------------------	--	------	---------	-----	----------------	--

Comment

Response: Comments noted.

Proposed Change: No change considered necessary.

Question No	CharacterArea	Agree ?	TopicArea	RepNo	RefNo	Consultee	Organisation	AgentRefN
Q2	Citadel	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		2336	Support	065	Miss Lindsey McNamee	
Comment								
Response:	Comments noted.							
Proposed Change	No change considered necessary.							
<hr/>								
	Citadel	<input type="checkbox"/>		2289	Objection	061	Mr David Hamilton	
Comment	No							
Response:	Comment noted. In the absence of elaborating as to the reasons why the Council can not, on this occasion, comment further.							
Proposed Change	No change considered necessary.							
<hr/>								
	Citadel	<input type="checkbox"/>		2277	Comment	060	Barry O Earp	
Comment	Traffic free Court Square [Station Square] widen road [English Street] to original, allowing more room for buses and taxis.							
Response:	Comments noted. The Framework already promotes the need to improve the Station Square and access to the station by a variety of means.							
Proposed Change	No change considered necessary.							
<hr/>								
	Citadel	<input type="checkbox"/>		2179	Objection	051	Miss Susan Mark	
Comment	Council enjoy wasting money, city without a proper theatre.							
Response:	The City Council has invested significantly in a new Arts Centre (including entertainment space) which is actively being developed in the former fire station on Warwick Street within the City Centre.							
Proposed Change	No change considered necessary.							

Question No	CharacterArea	Agree ?	TopicArea	RepNo	RefNo	Consultee	Organisation	AgentRefN
Q2	Citadel	<input type="checkbox"/>		2056	Comment	041	Steve Traviss	Dickinsons Furnishers Lt
Comment	<p>I have been reviewing the draft framework as published on the website. Can I please raise a couple of queries that are specifically related to the development of Citadel, in which our store on Victoria Viaduct is situated.</p> <p>The overall plan as it stands is likely to skew the retail centre of the city towards the North of the city, making it ever harder to attract passing traffic to retail premises in the Citadel area. Do you have any specific proposals within the plan to counter this? At the moment the plan simply talks about the opportunity for improvement/intervention around the Station and English Street, whilst the majority of the plan (understandably) focuses on the development of the area North of Lowther Street.</p> <p>We currently see the shop fronts and general condition of buildings in our vicinity on Victoria Viaduct being of lower quality, so is there likely to be activity/investment available to change this? We also have very close to us the eyesore of the derelict hotel opposite Tesco – is this included in the plan to either demolish or rebuild it, in order to help balance the pull of what will be the new part of the retail centre in Carlisle?</p> <p>Also, as part of the plan we believe that parking should be an integral part of any development plan – both its provision and the parking fees. Has this been included anywhere, and if so what is the proposal? There is plenty of evidence that lack of parking availability and high charges are counter-productive to city centre retailers, which is helping to drive customers out of city and town centres. Given that there needs to be parking close to retail stores, how is it proposed to try and offset the increased pull of customers to the North of the city? Has any thought been put to creating additional car parking in the Citadel area, and also at either a nil or very low charge to encourage visitors to this end of the city? There is a real danger that what will happen with the new development is that the North of the City will prosper, but the southern end of the city centre will become a ghost town with at best a host of discount/charity stores.</p> <p>As things stand within the plan at the moment, development and improvement on Victoria Viaduct looks like a complete blank, which would be a huge opportunity missed. I would welcome your feedback and comments.</p>							
Response:	<p>The Framework highlights the importance of the Citadel from a gateway and sense of arrival perspective and recognises the sites potential for mixed use redevelopment. The City Council are continuing to work jointly with Cumbria County Council to fully understand, promote and accelerate the realisation of the redevelopment potential of the Citadel site. Whilst the Citadel opportunity has always been recognised as a potential catalyst for much needed investment in the wider locality (including Viaduct vicinity), it is accepted that the report could be more explicit in acknowledging this opportunity. The report will therefore be amended accordingly.</p> <p>The Local Plan will seek to build on key aspects of the City Centre Development Framework to ensure that an appropriate balance between key areas and opportunities prevails, through putting into effect an appropriate policy framework. The City Council will also continue to explore initiatives with partners such as the recent PSICA scheme to enhance shop fronts, architectural quality and the environment of the City Centre in its widest sense.</p> <p>The City Council continues to explore opportunities to promote and secure the re-use of the former Central Plaza but it does not own the building and it is therefore beyond the City Council's direct control. There are no firm redevelopment proposals for the building at the present time of which the City Council are aware.</p> <p>The need to manage parking capacity is acknowledged by the Framework as a matter which requires attention. The City Council is currently considering the management and parking arrangements for car parks in its ownership and how these can be used to help maintain and enhance the vitality and viability of the City Centre.</p>							
Proposed Change	<p>The Citadel section of the report should be updated to more explicitly acknowledge the opportunity the redevelopment of the Citadel complex presents as a catalyst for much needed investment in the wider locality, including in the vicinity of the Viaduct.</p>							
	Citadel	<input type="checkbox"/>		2118	Objection	046	Miss Gillian Smith	
Comment	No							
Response:	Comment noted. In the absence of elaborating as to the reasons why the Council can not, on this occasion, comment further.							
Proposed Change	No change considered necessary.							

Question No	CharacterArea	Agree ?	TopicArea	RepNo	RefNo	Consultee	Organisation	AgentRefN
Q2	Citadel	<input type="checkbox"/>		2426	Objection	072	Mrs Jennifer Smith	
Comment	If the Pools is relocated, what would happen to the Turkish Baths?							
Response:	Owing to the listed status of this building there would be a very strong presumption in favour of its retention.							
Proposed Change	No change considered necessary.							
<hr/>								
	Citadel	<input type="checkbox"/>		2167	Objection	026	Elizabeth Allnutt	Save Our Streets
Comment	SOS does not agree with the conclusions for this area. The potential for change here is not seriously considered. There is potentially room here for the projected need for retail, adjacent to the existing shopping area. Development here could potentially cause as much trouble as in Rickergate but this is not envisaged as an obstacle in Rickergate and therefore should not be considered an obstacle here. The considerable changes in level around Victoria Viaduct could lead to an interesting building with access at the top level rather than at ground level. The Central Plaza Hotel on Victoria Viaduct offers considerable opportunity for development though overcoming land ownership might be problematic. These sites could also link into the Caldew Riverside area and make a continuous area for development. How about buying the Tesco store next door to the Central Plaza Hotel to site assemble a larger area? The City Council already owns the Burton's (B and M) building which would facilitate development. The industrial heritage of the city in the area could also be explored fully as a tourist attraction. Further exploratory work needs to be done here as a viable option for development in the Rickergate area.							
Response:	Comments noted but opportunities for major retail development and the ability to respond to evidenced needs within the required timeframe are more limited in the vicinity of the Citadel. This largely reflects that the development potential is unlikely to be realised until the longer term owing to existing lease arrangements across key aspects of the site.							
Proposed Change	No change considered necessary.							
<hr/>								
	Citadel	<input type="checkbox"/>		2011	Comment	001	Mr Nigel Winter	Stagecoach NorthWest Lt
Comment	The current site of the pools is totally unsuited to a passenger transport hub. Passenger transport users wish to arrive as close to their destination as possible. The pools are outside the perceived City Centre. Commercial bus operators will be committing financial suicide if this site were to be used for buses in future. Further, the traffic delays in accessing the pools site will add cost and inconvenience to passenger transport users, again detracting from passenger transport.							
Response:	Comments noted. The Framework does not promote the site of the pool as a city centre transport hub but instead highlights the opportunity to improve rail/bus interchange.							
Proposed Change	No change considered necessary.							
<hr/>								
	Citadel	<input type="checkbox"/>		2141	Objection	048	Mrs C E Simpson	
Comment	No							
Response:	Comment noted. In the absence of elaborating as to the reasons why the Council can not, on this occasion, comment further.							
Proposed Change	No change considered necessary.							

Question No	CharacterArea	Agree ?	TopicArea	RepNo	RefNo	Consultee	Organisation	AgentRefN
Q2	Citadel	<input type="checkbox"/>		2151	Objection	049	Mrs Mavis Sarginson	
Comment	No							
Response:	Comment noted. In the absence of elaborating as to the reasons why the Council can not, on this occasion, comment further.							
Proposed Change	No change considered necessary.							
<hr/>								
	Citadel	<input type="checkbox"/>		2096	Comment	011	Mrs Julie Templeton	Member of Save our Stree
Comment	I believe that this area should also be considered as a viable option for development.							
Response:	Comments noted but opportunities for major retail development and the ability to respond to evidenced needs within the required timeframe are more limited in the vicinity of the Citadel. This largely reflects that the development potential is unlikely to be realised until the longer term owing to existing lease arrangements across key aspects of the site.							
Proposed Change	No change considered necessary.							
<hr/>								
	Citadel	<input type="checkbox"/>		2397	Objection	069	Mrs Karen Atkinson	
Comment	No							
Response:	Comment noted. In the absence of elaborating as to the reasons why the Council can not, on this occasion, comment further.							
Proposed Change	No change considered necessary.							
<hr/>								
	Citadel	<input type="checkbox"/>		2236	Objection	055	Mrs Helen Blamire	
Comment	What could this possibly be used for?							
Response:	The site owing to its location lends itself to a wide range of uses which would be suitable in principle, with a mixed use scheme likely to prevail.							
Proposed Change	No change considered necessary.							
<hr/>								
	Citadel	<input type="checkbox"/>		2444	Objection	075	Mr Neil Irving	SOS
Comment	No							
Response:	Comment noted. In the absence of elaborating as to the reasons why the Council can not, on this occasion, comment further.							
Proposed Change	No change considered necessary.							

Question No	CharacterArea	Agree ?	TopicArea	RepNo	RefNo	Consultee	Organisation	AgentRefN
-------------	---------------	---------	-----------	-------	-------	-----------	--------------	-----------

Q2	Citadel	<input type="checkbox"/>		2131	Objection	047	Mrs Margaret Backhouse	
-----------	----------------	--------------------------	--	------	-----------	-----	------------------------	--

Comment No

Response: Comment noted. In the absence of elaborating as to the reasons why the Council can not, on this occasion, comment further.

Proposed Change No change considered necessary.

	Citadel	<input type="checkbox"/>		2385	Objection	015	Mr Viv Dodd	Revival Carlisle
--	----------------	--------------------------	--	------	-----------	-----	-------------	------------------

Comment This area should be promoted as a business/leisure heritage area in the short term, in view of the county council's imminent departure

Response: Comments noted.

Proposed Change No change considered necessary.

Question No	CharacterArea	Agree ?	TopicArea	RepNo	RefNo	Consultee	Organisation	AgentRefN
Document	Citadel	<input type="checkbox"/>	Character Area Analysis & Option Development	2489	Comment	o83	Michael Barry	Cumbria County Council
Comment	<p>This priority location is extremely important to maintaining the balance development across Carlisle. In particular, the coming vacation of The Courts by the County Council creates an opportunity to deliver significant new investment which would bring strategic benefit given that development here could act as a catalyst for positive change linked to improvements at the strategic gateway of Carlisle Station and the regeneration aspirations for Botchergate. In this context it is worth noting the high priority given to Carlisle Station with the Cumbria Strategic Economic Plan. This highlights the need for future investments that improve; “facilities at, and around, Carlisle Station as the principal point of arrival in the heart of Carlisle”. For these reasons the delivery of new development in the area of the Courts/Citadel and Carlisle Station should be a key priority within the City Centre Development Framework.</p> <p>It is considered that the delivery of transformative development at this site should help preserve the overall vitality of Carlisle City Centre by providing an opportunity for a landmark development that can help maintain the southern end of the City Centre and the existing retail function within it. Despite this, the Development Framework would appear overly pessimistic about the ability of the Courts/Citadel and land facing English Street to accommodate the full range of uses that may form part of a comprehensive mixed use development at this site. This may have the effect of fettering future options, opportunities and aspirations to allow this site to come forward in a viable format in response to the prevailing market conditions.</p> <p>It is considered essential that the Framework promotes a more visionary approach that reflects the potential for comprehensive development across this site. Therefore the Framework needs to set out the potential for a mix of uses at this site including; leisure, retail, cultural, office, car parking and educational uses. Linked to this, within the Framework; reference to “The Courts” being a “backland” location should be removed, given this site enjoys important frontages to English Street, Court Square Brow and Borough Street where there is significant footfall, especially going to and from the Station.</p> <p>With respect to the highways and transport issues we note the reference to opportunities for enhanced transport interchange at Station Square. This reference should be removed as there will be a range of possible options to deliver improved accessibility to Carlisle Station. Reflecting this particular issue, there should be additional point in the proposed strategy; “to review and improve station car parking access and drop off provision”.</p> <p>Other factual issues include the incorrect reference to Court Square as station square. In Figure 4 the depiction of the public baths site is not correct, as the site shown is a combination of public baths and Network Rail car park. In paragraph 12.12 references to land ownership are not correct. These sites are not all County Council or City Council owned land is also partly within Network Rail ownership.</p>							
Response:	<p>The Framework highlights the importance of the Citadel from a gateway and sense of arrival perspective and already recognises the sites potential for mixed use redevelopment. The City Council are continuing to work jointly with Cumbria County Council to fully understand, promote and accelerate the realisation of the redevelopment potential of the Citadel site. Whilst the Citadel opportunity has always been recognised as a potential catalyst for much needed investment in the wider locality, it is accepted that the report could be more explicit in acknowledging this opportunity. The report will therefore be amended accordingly.</p> <p>Notwithstanding the above it is considered that it must equally be acknowledged that owing to the character and constraints of the site it does not readily lend itself to major retail redevelopment. In this regard it is considered important to be realistic about what can be achieved, with reference to much of the potential being ‘backland’ (in the context of retail development potential) therefore an accurate present reflection, with scope to radically change this position limited by the heritage status of much of the complex.</p> <p>The retention of reference to potentially enhanced transport interchange opportunities is considered to be justified, although it is acknowledged that these may not be confined to just those associated with Court Square and that this could be clarified. It is agreed that an additional point in the proposed strategy as suggested which should read “to review and improve station car parking access and drop off provision”. This reflects that this is a key current issue. The need to refer to ‘Court Square’ as opposed to ‘Station Square’ is acknowledged.</p> <p>Land ownership references will be further verified and the report amended as necessary.</p>							
Proposed Change	<p>The Citadel section of the report should be updated to more explicitly acknowledge the opportunity the redevelopment of the Citadel complex presents as a catalyst for much needed investment in the wider locality.</p> <p>Amend inaccurate references to ‘Station Square’ to instead refer to ‘Court Square’.</p> <p>Acknowledge at para 12.16 that enhanced transport interchange opportunities may not be confined to just those associated with Court Square.</p> <p>The text within the report should be updated to acknowledge that whilst the parcel of land shown and annotated in Figure 4 as ‘Public Bath’ Site also includes land used by Network Rail for car parking.</p>							

Question No	CharacterArea	Agree ?	TopicArea	RepNo	RefNo	Consultee	Organisation	AgentRefN
Document	Citadel	<input type="checkbox"/>	Character Area Analysis & Option Development	2379	Comment	009	Trevor Wilson	
Comment	Paragraph 12.17 and 12.18 states "There is a need for short-term parking". There is a huge need for more car parking at the station as the car park is full even on Saturdays. I think it needs a 100% increase. And perhaps a price reduction for all day parking with a "clever link" to a rail ticket, say £4 if you have a rail ticket. We quite often go to Glasgow and the £8 rail station car park charge is a big deterrent. If you require an excellent example of very cost effective modular multi storey car parks, then visit Chiltern Railways at Beaconsfield, High Wycombe, Bicester North and Warwick Parkway. Definitely need an integrated transport hub - Hull Paragon is a good example. Also the bus stations in Newcastle city centre are good.							
Response:	Comments noted and the Framework is considered to already acknowledge these key issues. Highlighted examples from elsewhere are welcomed. The City Council are committed to continuing to work with Cumbria County Council and stakeholders to enhance and improve the attractiveness and effectiveness of public transport infrastructure across the city including the city centre.							
Proposed Change	No change considered necessary.							
	Citadel	<input type="checkbox"/>	Character Area Analysis & Option Development	2471	Support	010	Emily Hrycan	English Heritage North
Comment	We are in broad agreement with the analysis and proposed strategy for this key gateway to the City Centre.							
Response:	Comments noted.							
Proposed Change	No change considered necessary.							
	Citadel	<input type="checkbox"/>	Character Area Analysis & Option Development	2378	Comment	009	Trevor Wilson	
Comment	Paragraph 12.16 first line of page 37 - you have a typo - Shopping.							
Response:	Comments noted. Typo to be rectified.							
Proposed Change	Address highlighted typo in para 12.16 on page 37.							
General	Caldew Riverside	<input type="checkbox"/>		2111	Comment	005	Mrs B A Robinson	
Comment	This area could be used for a large shop like Primark or a supermarket. The different level from the main shopping area are an issue for pedestrians.							
Response:	The accessibility issues referred to are already acknowledged within the Framework and planning permission for a foodstore is already in place on part of the site.							
Proposed Change	No change considered necessary.							

Question No	CharacterArea	Agree ?	TopicArea	RepNo	RefNo	Consultee	Organisation	AgentRefN
General	Caldew Riverside	<input type="checkbox"/>		2438	Comment	073	Phil Gray	Green Spaces
Comment	The comment about Caldew Riverside and green infrastructure could be expanded by describing the potential for links with the public transport hub [railway station] and the sport/recreational zone at Bitts Park. The Caldew Riverside is an attractive environment in its own right and could make a significant contribution to health & wellbeing/green infrastructure.							
Response:	The existing reference to the principle of improving Green Infrastructure connectivity is considered adequate.							
Proposed Change	No change considered necessary.							
<hr/>								
	Caldew Riverside	<input type="checkbox"/>		2458	Comment	077	E T Amos	
Comment	GVA has noted that Caldew Riverside is detached from the city centre with limited prospects for physical integration. I would hope that in planning the future of Carlisle consideration might be given to the development of a multi story car park on English Damside. This might possibly be at the southern end of the existing car park near Sallyport steps and adjacent to West Walls. This would provide additional car parking close to the city centre. Also the installation of lifts within the development would give easy access from English Damside up onto West Walls and the city centre. At the same time the link between the city and Caldew Riverside would be strengthened and thus assist in the regeneration of this brown field site. A multi story car park could be developed so as not to be materially detrimental to the views from West Walls nor the views towards the city from Caldeagate.							
Response:	Comments noted. The historical context would be a determining factor as to what may or may not be an appropriate form of development in this area. The Framework already acknowledges that accessibility needs to be improved and in responding to design policies within the Local Plan all development schemes are required to be designed to be as inclusive as possible from an accessibility perspective.							
Proposed Change	No change considered necessary.							
<hr/>								
	Caldew Riverside	<input type="checkbox"/>		2272	Comment	059	Miss Carole Hoggan	
Comment	We don't need another Tesco. No to another Tesco							
Response:	Comments noted but planning permission has already been granted for the foodstore on this site.							
Proposed Change	No change considered necessary.							
<hr/>								
	Caldew Riverside	<input type="checkbox"/>		2186	Comment	051	Miss Susan Mark	
Comment	Implemented foodstore for Tesco's: Carlisle is being turned into a 'big supermarket'. Large areas of land with unattractive buildings and not enough shoppers to justify the need. Building affordable flats above should be a stipulation, less traffic. Underground parking so more green areas.							
Response:	Comments noted but planning permission has already been granted for the foodstore on this site.							
Proposed Change	No change considered necessary.							

Question No	CharacterArea	Agree ?	TopicArea	RepNo	RefNo	Consultee	Organisation	AgentRefN
Q2	Caldew Riverside	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		2299	Support	062	Mr Hans J A Landstrom	
Comment								
Response: Comments noted.								
Proposed Change No change considered necessary.								
<hr/>								
	Caldew Riverside	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		2130	Support	047	Mrs Margaret Backhouse	
Comment								
Response: Comments noted.								
Proposed Change No change considered necessary.								
<hr/>								
	Caldew Riverside	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		2312	Support	063	Mr Ian Grey	
Comment Care must be taken to ensure any cycle path forms part of an integrated cycle network with separate bike lanes, bike friendly junctions and good bike parking facilities in town [bottom floor of multi story car park?]								
Response: Comments noted. Policies within the Local Plan will seek to secure these matters.								
Proposed Change No change considered necessary.								
<hr/>								
	Caldew Riverside	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		2222	Support	054	Mr Christopher Wheeler	
Comment								
Response: Comments noted.								
Proposed Change No change considered necessary.								
<hr/>								
	Caldew Riverside	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		2250	Support	058	Mrs Joanne Swanton	JoMark House of Hair
Comment								
Response: Comments noted.								
Proposed Change No change considered necessary.								
<hr/>								

Question No	CharacterArea	Agree ?	TopicArea	RepNo	RefNo	Consultee	Organisation	AgentRefN
Q2	Caldew Riverside	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		2288	Support	061	Mr David Hamilton	
Comment								
Response:	Comments noted.							
Proposed Change	No change considered necessary.							
<hr/>								
	Caldew Riverside	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		2324	Support	064	Mrs Carol Grey	
Comment	Proposals are very vague but something needs to be done. Nice to see the mention of a cycle way [although there is already one there] which seems to be lacking from most of the rest of the proposals.							
Response:	Other policies in the Local Plan seek to promote a continuous, safe and attractive public rights of way network including cycleways. The City Centre Development Framework does refer to improving permeability and it is considered that this could be strengthened to make clear that it should do so for all users (therefore extending coverage to cyclists). There is no evidence to currently support that there is a need for park and ride sites although transport modelling to support the Local Plan, including the testing of possible interventions, remains ongoing.							
Proposed Change	Strengthen the Framework to make clear that permeability should be improved for all users (therefore extending coverage to cyclists).							
<hr/>								
	Caldew Riverside	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		2010	Support	001	Mr Nigel Winter	Stagecoach NorthWest Lt
Comment								
Response:	Comments noted.							
Proposed Change	No change considered necessary.							
<hr/>								
	Caldew Riverside	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		2140	Support	048	Mrs C E Simpson	
Comment								
Response:	Comments noted.							
Proposed Change	No change considered necessary.							
<hr/>								
	Caldew Riverside	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		2410	Support	071	Mrs Joan Field	
Comment								
Response:	Comments noted.							
Proposed Change	No change considered necessary.							

Question No	CharacterArea	Agree ?	TopicArea	RepNo	RefNo	Consultee	Organisation	AgentRefN
-------------	---------------	---------	-----------	-------	-------	-----------	--------------	-----------

Q2	Caldew Riverside	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		2347	Support	066	Mrs Sandra Stockley	
-----------	-------------------------	-------------------------------------	--	------	---------	-----	---------------------	--

Comment

Response: Comments noted.

Proposed Change No change considered necessary.

	Caldew Riverside	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		2022	Support	034	Mr Eddie Haughan	
--	-------------------------	-------------------------------------	--	------	---------	-----	------------------	--

Comment

Response: Comments noted.

Proposed Change No change considered necessary.

	Caldew Riverside	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		2425	Support	072	Mrs Jennifer Smith	
--	-------------------------	-------------------------------------	--	------	---------	-----	--------------------	--

Comment

Response: Comments noted.

Proposed Change No change considered necessary.

	Caldew Riverside	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		2194	Support	052	Mr Colin Latimer	
--	-------------------------	-------------------------------------	--	------	---------	-----	------------------	--

Comment

Response: Comments noted.

Proposed Change No change considered necessary.

	Caldew Riverside	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		2209	Support	053	Mrs Joyce Hetherington	
--	-------------------------	-------------------------------------	--	------	---------	-----	------------------------	--

Comment

Response: Comments noted.

Proposed Change No change considered necessary.

Question No	CharacterArea	Agree ?	TopicArea	RepNo	RefNo	Consultee	Organisation	AgentRefN
-------------	---------------	---------	-----------	-------	-------	-----------	--------------	-----------

Q2	Caldew Riverside	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		2362	Support	009	Trevor Wilson	
-----------	-------------------------	-------------------------------------	--	------	---------	-----	---------------	--

Comment

Response: Comments noted.

Proposed Change No change considered necessary.

	Caldew Riverside	<input type="checkbox"/>		2117	Objection	046	Miss Gillian Smith	
--	-------------------------	--------------------------	--	------	-----------	-----	--------------------	--

Comment No

Response: Comment noted. In the absence of elaborating as to the reasons why the Council can not, on this occasion, comment further.

Proposed Change No change considered necessary.

	Caldew Riverside	<input type="checkbox"/>		2178	Objection	051	Miss Susan Mark	
--	-------------------------	--------------------------	--	------	-----------	-----	-----------------	--

Comment Another supermarket! We already have too many, not enough shoppers.

Response: Comments noted but planning permission has already been granted for the foodstore on this site.

Proposed Change No change considered necessary.

	Caldew Riverside	<input type="checkbox"/>		2047	Objection	039	Mr M Holliday	
--	-------------------------	--------------------------	--	------	-----------	-----	---------------	--

Comment Disagree strongly. There is no need for another supermarket in this location. Kick Tesco into touch/encourage them to develop on the Western fringe of the City. This area is run down but has massive potential for a mix of retail and riverside apartments. Pedestrian links would need to form an integral part of any scheme to link it with the adjacent Historic Quarter.

Response: Comments noted but planning permission has already been granted for the foodstore on this site. The Framework already acknowledges the need for improved accessibility in this location.

Proposed Change No change considered necessary.

	Caldew Riverside	<input type="checkbox"/>		2080	Objection	045	Ms Kate Carvana	
--	-------------------------	--------------------------	--	------	-----------	-----	-----------------	--

Comment No

Response: Comment noted. In the absence of elaborating as to the reasons why the Council can not, on this occasion, comment further.

Proposed Change No change considered necessary.

Question No	CharacterArea	Agree ?	TopicArea	RepNo	RefNo	Consultee	Organisation	AgentRefN
Q2	Caldew Riverside	<input type="checkbox"/>		2150	Objection	049	Mrs Mavis Sarginson	
Comment	No							
Response:	Comment noted. In the absence of elaborating as to the reasons why the Council can not, on this occasion, comment further.							
Proposed Change	No change considered necessary.							
<hr/>								
	Caldew Riverside	<input type="checkbox"/>		2235	Objection	055	Mrs Helen Blamire	
Comment	CCC should never have sold this land to Tesco. This is where the new CCC offices should be.							
Response:	Comments noted.							
Proposed Change	No change considered necessary.							
<hr/>								
	Caldew Riverside	<input type="checkbox"/>		2405	Objection	070	Pauline Dalton	
Comment	I believe the suggestions for Caldew Riverside ideas are very limited. Yes, make the most of this (could be) attractive part of the city. Linked with the present parking and fairly easy access to the centre of the City at English Damside (A lift ??). There are retail opportunities here apart from the suggested Tescos, to which I am strongly opposed. The small Tescos is adequate for a city centre and a larger store with parking would cause traffic and circulation problems because the current road infrastructure is inadequate. What makes vibrant city centres are individual/interesting/independent shops as well as the multi-nationals. These only serve to make every town/city like the one down the road. Clearly, rates need to be affordable and this area could provide such opportunities.							
Response:	Comments noted. Planning permission has already been granted for the foodstore on this site. The City Council continues to work with and support independent retailers where it can, with the ongoing development of an independent retailer website / smart phone app through the Knowledge Transfer Partnership in concert with the University of Cumbria testament to this.							
Proposed Change	No change considered necessary.							
<hr/>								
	Caldew Riverside	<input type="checkbox"/>		2262	Objection	059	Miss Carole Hoggan	
Comment	NO to another Tesco!							
Response:	Comments noted but planning permission has already been granted for the foodstore on this site.							
Proposed Change	No change considered necessary.							

Question No	CharacterArea	Agree ?	TopicArea	RepNo	RefNo	Consultee	Organisation	AgentRefN
Q2	Caldew Riverside	<input type="checkbox"/>		2095	Objection	011	Mrs Julie Templeton	Member of Save our Stree
Comment	This site should have been put forward as a potential retail site. If Tesco's had their area of land decontaminated there should be no problem decontaminating the rest of the area. There is space for a large retail store such as Primark and there will be no need to demolish buildings. The area is in a Flood Zone, but so is Rickergate.							
Response:	Aside from the documented constraints this site is sequentially less preferable in retail planning terms being detached from the primary shopping area. In this regard it is material to note that plans and proposals progressed by the City Council and others must accord with national guidance which requires other sites to be prioritised as far as comparison retailing is concerned.							
Proposed Change	No change considered necessary.							
	Caldew Riverside	<input type="checkbox"/>		2384	Objection	015	Mr Viv Dodd	Revival Carlisle
Comment	This area should be strongly promoted for housing /recreation uses in the short /medium term							
Response:	Comments noted.							
Proposed Change	No change considered necessary.							
	Caldew Riverside	<input type="checkbox"/>		2335	Objection	065	Miss Lindsey McNamee	
Comment	Although it's a much better alternative and wouldn't make families homeless, this is still an area that floods.							
Response:	Comments noted. Aside from the documented constraints this site is sequentially less preferable in retail planning terms being detached from the primary shopping area. In this regard it is material to note that plans and proposals progressed by the City Council and others must accord with national guidance which requires other sites to be prioritised as far as comparison retailing is concerned.							
Proposed Change	No change considered necessary.							
	Caldew Riverside	<input type="checkbox"/>		2276	Comment	060	Barry O Earp	
Comment	Should be Riverside apartments with ground floor car parking - apartments above.							
Response:	Comments noted and this land use is not precluded by the Framework.							
Proposed Change	No change considered necessary.							
	Caldew Riverside	<input type="checkbox"/>		2060	Objection	042	Mrs Dallas Brewis	Cycle Carlisle
Comment	No							
Response:	Comment noted. In the absence of elaborating as to the reasons why the Council can not, on this occasion, comment further.							
Proposed Change	No change considered necessary.							

Question No	CharacterArea	Agree ?	TopicArea	RepNo	RefNo	Consultee	Organisation	AgentRefN
Q2	Caldew Riverside	<input type="checkbox"/>		2396	Objection	069	Mrs Karen Atkinson	
Comment	No							
Response:	Comment noted. In the absence of elaborating as to the reasons why the Council can not, on this occasion, comment further.							
Proposed Change	No change considered necessary.							
	Caldew Riverside	<input type="checkbox"/>		2443	Objection	075	Mr Neil Irving	SOS
Comment	No							
Response:	Comment noted. In the absence of elaborating as to the reasons why the Council can not, on this occasion, comment further.							
Proposed Change	No change considered necessary.							
	Caldew Riverside	<input type="checkbox"/>		2166	Objection	026	Elizabeth Allnutt	Save Our Streets
Comment	<p>SOS does not agree with the conclusions for this area in terms of the development potential and believes that there is much more potential for development here than is projected. The changes of level are quite as challenging as those between the back of the market and Warwick Street. West Tower Street is also quite as difficult a barrier to overcome as the railway. The railway line should not be a barrier as access to the area would be from Castle Way or the James St roundabout. Additional pedestrian routes under the railway from the West Walls area to Viaduct Rd would be welcome. There is probably no need to make further vehicle routes, though a little imagination could see a new purpose-built bridge and road through the industrial estate on Milbourne St.</p> <p>There is considerable space and empty buildings in Caldew Riverside which could be utilised more readily and cause no disruption to public services and less disruption to businesses etc located here than the development envisaged for the Rickergate area. There is no reason why this area should not be considered for retail development and a detailed option for this area – considering size of stores, parking and road access - should be worked up as a viable alternative to Rickergate.</p> <p>Any development in this area should take notice of the Conservation Area which extends across it.</p> <p>The area is also at risk from flooding. This must be taken into consideration if the riverside location is exploited as an asset.</p>							
Response:	Aside from the documented constraints this site is sequentially less preferable in retail planning terms being detached from the primary shopping area. In this regard it is material to note that plans and proposals progressed by the City Council and others must accord with national guidance which requires other sites to be prioritised as far as comparison retailing is concerned.							
Proposed Change	No change considered necessary.							
Q5	Caldew Riverside	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		2432	Comment	072	Mrs Jennifer Smith	
Comment	St Nicholas area would be better if developed. Also the area alongside the River Caldew between Denton Holme and Caldewgate.							
Response:	Aside from the documented constraints this site is sequentially less preferable in retail planning terms being detached from the primary shopping area. In this regard it is material to note that plans and proposals progressed by the City Council and others must accord with national guidance which requires other sites to be prioritised as far as comparison retailing is concerned.							
Proposed Change	No change considered necessary.							

Question No	CharacterArea	Agree ?	TopicArea	RepNo	RefNo	Consultee	Organisation	AgentRefN
Q5	Caldew Riverside	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		2086	Comment	045	Ms Kate Carvana	
Comment	Retail development ideas/proposals for other areas in the city - particular Caldew Riverside.							
Response:	Aside from the documented constraints this site is sequentially less preferable in retail planning terms being detached from the primary shopping area. In this regard it is material to note that plans and proposals progressed by the City Council and others must accord with national guidance which requires other sites to be prioritised as far as comparison retailing is concerned.							
Proposed Change	No change considered necessary.							
Document	Caldew Riverside	<input type="checkbox"/>	Character Area Analysis & Option Development	2491	Comment	083	Michael Barry	Cumbria County Council
Comment	This large site is well related to the City Centre which benefits from the Caldew Cyclepath that runs through part of the site. This site has been vacant for a considerable period of time and given its location, its delivery should be given priority.							
	The proposed flexibility about the future use of this site is welcome. However consideration should be given to the potential role of housing development to help facilitate the delivery of new development and the benefits associated with city centre living. Consideration could also be given to the role of office development as part of a mix of uses at this site.							
	Nevertheless, uses of land here would need to be compatible with the highway network and be appropriately tested. Previous modelling work undertaken in April 2014 suggests that junctions in the vicinity of the site will be operating close to capacity. A key constraint to the site is access and a core part of development here will need to consider improved west / east pedestrian access and opportunities for inter-linkages with the Caldew Riverside Cycleway. Given this issue, the proposed strategy should include reference to the requirement to improve pedestrian and vehicular access to the site.							
	This site is also affected by areas of flood risk. Although defences have been installed by the Environment Agency some areas in this location were recently flooded due to debris in a surface water flap valve. Therefore, any development should take consideration of this and ensure any new buildings in the area are constructed so that they are resilient to any flooding that may occur.							
Response:	The mixed use development potential of the site is already considered to be adequately acknowledged within the Framework. It is agreed that the strategy for this area should make reference to improving vehicular and pedestrian access to the site as suggested. Other policies within the Local Plan will ensure appropriate consideration so afforded to the risk of flooding.							
Proposed Change	The strategy for this area should be updated to make reference to improving vehicular and pedestrian access to the site as suggested.							
	Caldew Riverside	<input type="checkbox"/>	Character Area Analysis & Option Development	2470	Comment	010	Emily Hrycan	English Heritage North
Comment	Although there is reference at paragraph 11.2 to the fact that the area is detached from the wider City Centre by the railway line, the major urban impact of the West Coast Main Line as a hard edge to the City Centre and a barrier between it and areas to the west is not explicitly identified as a constraint in the 'Opportunities/Constraints and Key Issues' section. There also ought to be reference to the setting of the West Walls, which are scheduled as an ancient monument, and have recently been conserved by the City Council with some grant aid from English Heritage. Views towards the West Walls, and views from them, should be a consideration in the design of any new development in this area, as should the archaeological potential of the area.							
Response:	Comments noted. References to be updated as suggested.							
Proposed Change	References to be updated as suggested.							
	Caldew Riverside	<input type="checkbox"/>	Character Area Analysis & Option Development	2376	Comment	009	Trevor Wilson	
Comment	Paragraph 11.6 Please also note that there is the old Carlisle Goods Avoiding Line to the west of the site and is part used by the cycleway. The route of the Carlisle Goods Avoiding Line needs to be protected for future use - yes I know that Network Rail may have issued a statement regarding no future plans but that should not stop the route being safe guarded.							
Response:	Policies within the Local Plan seek to protect these routes where possible to do so.							
Proposed Change	No change considered necessary.							

Question No	CharacterArea	Agree ?	TopicArea	RepNo	RefNo	Consultee	Organisation	AgentRefN
Document	Caldew Riverside	<input type="checkbox"/>	Character Area Analysis & Option Development	2377	Comment	009	Trevor Wilson	
Comment	<p>Paragraph 11.9 The proposed strategy states "Implemented Foodstore Consent (Tesco). Not quite sure what that means. All it seems to state is that Tesco have an approved planning consent. It is not clear on what action the council is taking to move the planning consent forward or not. The report does not mention the fact that Tesco are the preferred bidder on the Morton supermarket which according to recent press has just stalled due to Tesco having poor financial results.</p> <p>I have read that the preferred option is that when Tesco eventually sign-up to the Morton store the planning consent for Caldew Riverside will be allowed to lapse or be withdrawn thus providing greater choice redeveloping the area in conjunction with the Citadel railway station.</p> <p>In the local paper it was stated that Carlisle City Council had included income from the sale of the Morton supermarket site in this year's or next year's budget and the stalling by Tesco would have an impact of the Carlisle City Council's budget. I think that there is now a very great risk that Carlisle City Council will not achieve the desired income (£25m was it?) but will be negotiated down in price. By including the yet to be achieved sale income in the budget this will have weakened Carlisle City Council's negotiating position.</p>							
Response:	<p>An implemented planning consent means that the permission that was granted for a given development has been made live (extant) through having been physically implemented through a start on site - in the case of the Tesco proposal in question through physically starting the proposed site access arrangements.</p> <p>The Council will continue to engage in dialogue and work where possible and appropriate with land owners to understand barriers preventing consented developments from coming forward and/or in exploring alternative proposals where approved schemes are unlikely to be brought forward or where there is a strong argument to pursue alternative proposals in any event.</p>							
Proposed Change	<p>It is important to acknowledge that planning permission runs with the land and relates to a specific use. In this regard whilst Tesco's intentions are relevant, the sites could equally be acquired and progressed by a number of operators given permissions to do so are in place. This also acts to reinforce that the proposed development at Morton is beyond the scope of the City Centre Development Framework and any direct relationships between the sites not necessarily obvious.</p> <p>No change considered necessary.</p>							
General	Caldew Riverside	<input type="checkbox"/>	Priorities	2002	Comment	030	Mrs Pauline Latimer	
Comment	<p>The development of the city centre, in my opinion, should be from Victoria Viaduct down to the Viaduct Estate which would not disrupt the lives and properties of any residents. This would make better use of a derelict part of town in need of development and also tie in with the plans to move the bus station to behind the railway station giving a more centralized access for visitors and commuters who will presumably shop and work in the new development.</p>							
Response:	<p>Aside from the documented constraints this site is sequentially less preferable in retail planning terms being detached from the primary shopping area. In this regard it is material to note that plans and proposals progressed by the City Council and others must accord with national guidance which requires other sites to be prioritised as far as comparison retailing is concerned.</p>							
Proposed Change	<p>No change considered necessary.</p>							
Document	Botchergate	<input type="checkbox"/>		2076	Comment	043	Andy Hunton	Cumbria Constabulary an
Comment	<p>As part of the wider consultation in respect of the Draft Carlisle District Local Plan in September 2013, I highlighted the particular policing issues relating to Botchergate with the Night time Economy. The Constabulary supports the Council's aspiration to create vibrancy and sustainability in this area and would concur with the 'Alive after Five' concept that could generate activity in this area. However, there is concern that there may be an over-reliance on the establishment of A4 and A5 class premises to achieve this objective. Experience in other Police Forces has shown that too many A4 and A5 premises concentrated in a small area will generate a disproportionate level of public disorder and alcohol-related crime. Therefore, the Constabulary would favour an approach that encourages a broader range of retail/leisure/residential uses around Botchergate and consideration of a 'Saturation Policy' that would place a limitation ratio not exceeding 20% of Night time Economy establishments compared to other Uses. A greater diversity of Uses would contribute to vibrancy and sustainability in this area and provide additional interest and appeal to this Conservation Area.</p>							
Response:	<p>Comments noted. The Local Plan affords consideration to the issues raised and further consultation on the Local Plan will be forthcoming in early 2015.</p>							
Proposed Change	<p>No change considered necessary.</p>							

Question No	CharacterArea	Agree ?	TopicArea	RepNo	RefNo	Consultee	Organisation	AgentRefN
General	Botchergate	<input type="checkbox"/>		2216	Comment	053	Mrs Joyce Hetherington	
Comment	Botchergate: money should be spent on Botchergate not Rickergate, it is still a disgrace i.e. Building corner South Henry Street. Gates into Botchergate should be retained as they are.							
Response:	Comments noted and the Framework seeks to put in place a positive framework to enhance this area. There continues to be investment in Botchergate and the proposed new Cumbria County Council offices will undoubtedly act as a catalyst for further investment.							
Proposed Change	No change considered necessary.							
<hr/>								
	Botchergate	<input type="checkbox"/>		2284	Comment	060	Barry O Earp	
Comment	This road should not be closed to traffic on Friday & Saturday evenings as it is a major gateway to the city and closure gives the city a bad name as a city of drunkenness and anti social behaviour.							
Response:	Comments noted.							
Proposed Change	No change considered necessary.							
<hr/>								
	Botchergate	<input type="checkbox"/>		2461	Comment	079	Mrs M Heinrichsous	
Comment	Priority: A multi storey car park on the current parking space behind the ex Textile World & Fads on St Nicholas Street. Entrance as not, from Lord Street or even exit from King Street. This is to replace the lost parking on Williams St car park when the new proposed Cumbria Council Offices are built. Essential NOW.							
Response:	Comments noted. The need to manage parking capacity is acknowledged by the Framework as a matter which requires attention.							
Proposed Change	No change considered necessary.							
<hr/>								
	Botchergate	<input type="checkbox"/>		2271	Comment	059	Miss Carole Hoggan	
Comment	Save William Street car park. Build new Civic Centre elsewhere in the City. Use Central Plaza Hotel or Hoopers or build a new one at Caldew Riverside.							
Response:	The proposed development on William Street car park relates to Cumbria County Council offices and not those of the City Council. The decision for the County to relocate has been taken and an application submitted for the new office block. Efforts are ongoing to find viable, alternative uses for the premises referred to none of which are however in the ownership and therefore direct control of the City Council.							
Proposed Change	No change considered necessary.							
<hr/>								
	Botchergate	<input type="checkbox"/>		2070	Support	042	Mrs Dallas Brewis	Cycle Carlisle
Comment	I support the development of Botchergate and the area to the west of it.							
Response:	Comments noted.							
Proposed Change	No change considered necessary.							

Question No	CharacterArea	Agree ?	TopicArea	RepNo	RefNo	Consultee	Organisation	AgentRefN
General	Botchergate	<input type="checkbox"/>		2113	Comment	005	Mrs B A Robinson	
Comment	Moving the Council Offices down to this area will not give a good impression of the city to visitors. It is run down. At the weekend it is a no go area to older people. Busses don't run past the Vue cinema because of drunkenness. The cinema is the only evening entertainment after dark.							
Response:	Comments noted. The decision has however already been taken by Cumbria County Council and a planning application for the new offices has been submitted.							
Proposed Change	No change considered necessary.							
Q2	Botchergate	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		2059	Support	042	Mrs Dallas Brewis	Cycle Carlisle
Comment								
Response:	Comments noted.							
Proposed Change	No change considered necessary.							
	Botchergate	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		2046	Comment	039	Mr M Holliday	
Comment	Generally agree with the conclusions. However the relocation of the CCC offices onto a well used car park is a mistake. More thought/incentives should be given to encourage more individual shops to locate here with apartments above to increase footfall.							
Response:	Comments noted. It is considered that the Framework could be strengthened to make reference to making use of upper floors in this and other areas throughout the City Centre.							
Proposed Change	Amend framework to strengthen references to making use of upper floors throughout the City Centre.							
	Botchergate	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		2361	Support	009	Trevor Wilson	
Comment								
Response:	Comments noted.							
Proposed Change	No change considered necessary.							

Question No	CharacterArea	Agree ?	TopicArea	RepNo	RefNo	Consultee	Organisation	AgentRefN
Q2	Botchergate	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		2009	Comment	001	Mr Nigel Winter	Stagecoach NorthWest Lt
Comment	Development of Botchergate is positive. The increase in road traffic is not. There needs to be joined up activity with Cumbria County Council as to how the traffic flow may be better managed. The recent St Nicholas retail development has seen traffic increase, journeys take longer, with a bus on average every 5 mins, increasing the journey time into the City increases the cost of transport, which will inevitably fall upon the passenger. Making bus services more unattractive with reduce patronage, encourage car trips, with the potential of bringing Botchergate to a standstill. There is a real danger of a worsening air quality situation in this area, fundamental to the success of a food and drink area. The bus provides a real opportunity to improve this space.							
Response:	Comments noted. The Framework already acknowledges the need to improve transport movement and circulation. The transport implications of developments across the City are also continuing to be modelled in conjunction with the County Council and necessary improvements and interventions to enable growth to happen identified and costed.							
Proposed Change	No change considered necessary.							
	Botchergate	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		2021	Support	034	Mr Eddie Haughan	
Comment								
Response:	Comments noted.							
Proposed Change	No change considered necessary.							
	Botchergate	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		2311	Support	063	Mr Ian Grey	
Comment								
Response:	Comments noted.							
Proposed Change	No change considered necessary.							
	Botchergate	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		2249	Support	058	Mrs Joanne Swanton	JoMark House of Hair
Comment								
Response:	Comments noted.							
Proposed Change	No change considered necessary.							

Question No	CharacterArea	Agree ?	TopicArea	RepNo	RefNo	Consultee	Organisation	AgentRefN
-------------	---------------	---------	-----------	-------	-------	-----------	--------------	-----------

Q2	Botchergate	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		2177	Support	051	Miss Susan Mark	
-----------	--------------------	-------------------------------------	--	------	---------	-----	-----------------	--

Comment Description of most areas vacant of any ideas of improvement. The only idea of any sense is the new Cumbria County Council Offices.

Response: Comments noted.

Proposed Change No change considered necessary.

	Botchergate	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		2323	Support	064	Mrs Carol Grey	
--	--------------------	-------------------------------------	--	------	---------	-----	----------------	--

Comment

Response: Comments noted.

Proposed Change No change considered necessary.

	Botchergate	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		2424	Support	072	Mrs Jennifer Smith	
--	--------------------	-------------------------------------	--	------	---------	-----	--------------------	--

Comment

Response: Comments noted.

Proposed Change No change considered necessary.

	Botchergate	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		2193	Support	052	Mr Colin Latimer	
--	--------------------	-------------------------------------	--	------	---------	-----	------------------	--

Comment

Response: Comments noted.

Proposed Change No change considered necessary.

	Botchergate	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		2208	Support	053	Mrs Joyce Hetherington	
--	--------------------	-------------------------------------	--	------	---------	-----	------------------------	--

Comment No ticked too.

Response: Comments noted.

Proposed Change No change considered necessary.

Question No	CharacterArea	Agree ?	TopicArea	RepNo	RefNo	Consultee	Organisation	AgentRefN
-------------	---------------	---------	-----------	-------	-------	-----------	--------------	-----------

Q2	Botchergate	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		2346	Support	066	Mrs Sandra Stockley	
-----------	--------------------	-------------------------------------	--	------	---------	-----	---------------------	--

Comment

Response: Comments noted.

Proposed Change: No change considered necessary.

	Botchergate	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		2298	Support	062	Mr Hans J A Landstrom	
--	--------------------	-------------------------------------	--	------	---------	-----	-----------------------	--

Comment

Response: Comments noted.

Proposed Change: No change considered necessary.

	Botchergate	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		2221	Support	054	Mr Christopher Wheeler	
--	--------------------	-------------------------------------	--	------	---------	-----	------------------------	--

Comment: While my general conclusions are as in Q1 above [Rep Ref 2219], I feel that Botchergate and Citadel need to be prioritise much higher than a speculative new development of Rickergate.

Response: Comments noted but opportunities for major retail development and the ability to respond to evidenced needs are more limited in Botchergate and in the vicinity of the Citadel.

Proposed Change: No change considered necessary.

	Botchergate	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		2139	Support	048	Mrs C E Simpson	
--	--------------------	-------------------------------------	--	------	---------	-----	-----------------	--

Comment

Response: Comments noted.

Proposed Change: No change considered necessary.

	Botchergate	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		2287	Support	061	Mr David Hamilton	
--	--------------------	-------------------------------------	--	------	---------	-----	-------------------	--

Comment

Response: Comments noted.

Proposed Change: No change considered necessary.

Question No	CharacterArea	Agree ?	TopicArea	RepNo	RefNo	Consultee	Organisation	AgentRefN
Q2	Botchergate	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		2129	Support	047	Mrs Margaret Backhouse	
Comment								
Response:	Comments noted.							
Proposed Change	No change considered necessary.							
<hr/>								
	Botchergate	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		2275	Support	060	Barry O Earp	
Comment								
Response:	Comments noted.							
Proposed Change	No change considered necessary.							
<hr/>								
	Botchergate	<input type="checkbox"/>		2116	Objection	046	Miss Gillian Smith	
Comment	No							
Response:	Comment noted. In the absence of elaborating as to the reasons why the Council can not, on this occasion, comment further.							
Proposed Change	No change considered necessary.							
<hr/>								
	Botchergate	<input type="checkbox"/>		2094	Comment	011	Mrs Julie Templeton	Member of Save our Stree
Comment	Any development should reflect the fact that it is a Conservation Area. There is a large residential presence in the area and the commercial and retail demands should not be to the detriment of the existing community. The community should be included in any decision making for the area.							
Response:	Comments noted. The proposed strategy for Botchergate explicitly states "Implement the adopted Conservation Area Management Plan.....". Public consultation has sought to be as inclusive as possible both with regards to the City Centre Development Framework and the emerging Local Plan.							
Proposed Change	No change considered necessary.							

Question No	CharacterArea	Agree ?	TopicArea	RepNo	RefNo	Consultee	Organisation	AgentRefN
Q2	Botchergate	<input type="checkbox"/>		2165	Objection	026	Elizabeth Allnutt	Save Our Streets
Comment	SOS does not disagree with this conclusion but feels that there needs to be further additions. There needs to be reference to the Conservation Area and how this relates to any development. The green space also needs highlighting. There is a significant area of housing to the east of Botchergate. Residents access their streets from Botchergate, and therefore have an input into the life of the main thoroughfare. This needs consideration so that the contribution made by this community is not undervalued and their needs ignored in commercial and retail concerns.							
Response:	Comments noted. The proposed strategy for Botchergate explicitly states "Implement the adopted Conservation Area Management Plan.....". Public consultation has sought to be as inclusive as possible both with regards to the City Centre Development Framework and the emerging Local Plan.							
Proposed Change	No change considered necessary.							
	Botchergate	<input type="checkbox"/>		2395	Objection	069	Mrs Karen Atkinson	
Comment	No							
Response:	Comment noted. In the absence of elaborating as to the reasons why the Council can not, on this occasion, comment further.							
Proposed Change	No change considered necessary.							
	Botchergate	<input type="checkbox"/>		2334	Objection	065	Miss Lindsey McNamee	
Comment	No							
Response:	Comment noted. In the absence of elaborating as to the reasons why the Council can not, on this occasion, comment further.							
Proposed Change	No change considered necessary.							
	Botchergate	<input type="checkbox"/>		2383	Objection	015	Mr Viv Dodd	Revival Carlisle
Comment	We are concerned that the opportunities that will arise when the County council relocate to Botchergate are missed. This area should be strongly promoted and marketed for business/evening economy activities/secondary retailing with discussions planned with landlords etc. with discussions planned with the County Council to resolve traffic problems and ensure the area is more environmentally attractive and a befitting entrance to the city centre whether coming by road or rail.							
Response:	Comments noted. The City Centre Development Framework acknowledges these issues as important and as such they will be carried forward into the Local Plan which will be a key mechanism with regards to implementation.							
Proposed Change	No change considered necessary.							

Question No	CharacterArea	Agree ?	TopicArea	RepNo	RefNo	Consultee	Organisation	AgentRefN
-------------	---------------	---------	-----------	-------	-------	-----------	--------------	-----------

Q2	Botchergate	<input type="checkbox"/>		2409	Objection	071	Mrs Joan Field	
-----------	--------------------	--------------------------	--	------	-----------	-----	----------------	--

Comment

Response: Comment noted. In the absence of elaborating as to the reasons why the Council can not, on this occasion, comment further.

Proposed Change: No change considered necessary.

	Botchergate	<input type="checkbox"/>		2106	Objection	005	Mrs B A Robinson	
--	--------------------	--------------------------	--	------	-----------	-----	------------------	--

Comment: No

Response: Comment noted. In the absence of elaborating as to the reasons why the Council can not, on this occasion, comment further.

Proposed Change: No change considered necessary.

	Botchergate	<input type="checkbox"/>		2149	Objection	049	Mrs Mavis Sarginson	
--	--------------------	--------------------------	--	------	-----------	-----	---------------------	--

Comment: No

Response: Comment noted. In the absence of elaborating as to the reasons why the Council can not, on this occasion, comment further.

Proposed Change: No change considered necessary.

	Botchergate	<input type="checkbox"/>		2261	Objection	059	Miss Carole Hoggan	
--	--------------------	--------------------------	--	------	-----------	-----	--------------------	--

Comment: SAVE William Street Car Park. Built the new civic Centre where the old one is or use Hoopers/Central Plaza Hotel.

Response: The proposed development on William Street car park relates to Cumbria County Council offices and not those of the City Council. The decision for the County to relocate has been taken and an application submitted for the new office block. Efforts are ongoing to find viable, alternative uses for the premises referred to none of which are however in the ownership and therefore direct control of the City Council.

Proposed Change: No change considered necessary.

	Botchergate	<input type="checkbox"/>		2234	Objection	055	Mrs Helen Blamire	
--	--------------------	--------------------------	--	------	-----------	-----	-------------------	--

Comment: Love the way this is described as 'evening economy use' aka binge drinking. CCC offices there won't change that and just taking up more valuable parking spaced and wasting more tax payers money.

Response: Comments noted. The decision has however already been taken by Cumbria County Council and a planning application for the new offices has been submitted.

Proposed Change: No change considered necessary.

Question No	CharacterArea	Agree ?	TopicArea	RepNo	RefNo	Consultee	Organisation	AgentRefN
Q2	Botchergate	<input type="checkbox"/>		2442	Objection	075	Mr Neil Irving	SOS
Comment	No							
Response:	Comment noted. In the absence of elaborating as to the reasons why the Council can not, on this occasion, comment further.							
Proposed Change	No change considered necessary.							
<hr/>								
Document	Botchergate	<input type="checkbox"/>	Character Area Analysis & Option Development	2495	Comment	083	Michael Barry	Cumbria County Council
Comment	Botchergate is a key gateway to the City Centre. Its revitalisation therefore needs to be priority for the City Centre. The identification of the new site for Cumbria County Council's offices and the acknowledgement of the regenerative benefits of this development in the Framework are therefore welcome.							
	Nevertheless, we are concerned that at present the Framework fails to fully recognise the value of this location and the need to be aspirational when considering its future role. In particular reference should be made to the appropriate reuse of empty and vacant sites.							
	References to "enhance transport (movement circulation (where possible))" does not pick up on the importance of pedestrian movement and should be reworded to state "enhance pedestrian and vehicular movement".							
Response:	Comments noted. Agree that a reference to making the most beneficial use of gap and infill sites should be added as a key element of the strategy for Botchergate, as well as empty premises and upper floors. Both aspects of movement referred to are already acknowledged within the report but it is accepted that these could be merged and take on the form of wording suggested.							
Proposed Change	Acknowledge the importance of making the most beneficial use of gap and infill sites, as well as empty premises and upper floors, as a key principle of the strategy for Botchergate. Remove the 2nd and 7th bullet points and instead insert a new bullet point which reads "enhance pedestrian and vehicular movement".							
<hr/>								
	Botchergate	<input type="checkbox"/>	Character Area Analysis & Option Development	2468	Support	010	Emily Hrycan	English Heritage North
Comment	We are in general agreement with the analysis and proposed strategy for this area.							
Response:	Comments noted.							
Proposed Change	No change considered necessary.							

Question No	CharacterArea	Agree ?	TopicArea	RepNo	RefNo	Consultee	Organisation	AgentRefN
Document	Area North of Lowther Street including Rickergate	<input type="checkbox"/>		2482	Objection	o82	John Kelsall	Conservation Area Adviso
Comment	<p>In regard to the retail space need predicted by the 2012 Retail Study, there was some surprise that such an increase in retail capacity was really required and that the 2 years following of apparent further retail contraction with more empty shops. Did Carlisle really need another 'anchor' store to fund further comprehensive redevelopment where the result would surely be the relocation of medium sized national chains and further abandonment of existing shopping areas including 'The Lanes'? In this respect the evidence base that there was some interest from large store organisations was not necessarily justification to automatically cater for that interest – when, the bigger picture could see a speedier decline elsewhere.</p> <p>Notwithstanding the views as to need, discussion moved on to consider the conclusions of the Draft Development Framework. The reasons for the suggested location of Rickergate for a major redevelopment and anchor store were acknowledged subject to the pre-supposition of need, proximity to the existing centre and deliverability, however, the limitations in the Citadel area were considered not so important as to rule out its suitability – closer to main public transport hubs – flatter terrain etc. and also a proportion was already retail. The Committee saw no difficulty in the Framework identifying both sites as being potentially suitable (but not both) subject to detailed proposals by interest parties and felt the draft document should have ended there – proceeding with sketch scheme designs, suggested layouts, demolition proposals and photographs of similarly scaled schemes seemed a step too far and come over not as 'deliverable' so much as already decided.</p>							
Response:	<p>Evidence in the form of the Carlisle Retail Study supports that there is a need for additional retail units within the City Centre particularly from a qualitative perspective in terms of providing the size, form and configuration of units which accord with retailers' current high street needs. This evidence is considered to remain robust with a number of those in the retail industry, within the City and beyond, recently reaffirming its conclusions. Such new units will be a key element of any strategy going forward to retain a number of existing retailers as well as too attract new retailers to Carlisle, and ultimately to maintain the vitality and viability of the City Centre and its overall offer. Notwithstanding this the potential displacement of existing retail occupiers within the City Centre is noted and it is acknowledged that this issue would have to be carefully managed as far as is possible within the context of the 'market'.</p> <p>Whilst comments regarding the Citadel are noted, there is no getting away from the need to deliver within the plan period and in this regard availability is a key determinant of 'deliverability'. Whilst the Citadel can play an important part in strengthening the City moving forward, being an important opportunity for additional reasons which extend beyond simply meeting new retail floorspace needs, the nature of the uncertainties and particularly existing lease arrangements are such that it is not considered to represent a robust preferred option in comparison to Land to the North of Lowther Street including Rickergate.</p> <p>The level of detail provided for each of the character areas is considered proportionate to the perceived degree of change. Whilst comments are noted with regards to the inclusion of specific sketch scheme visuals it should be noted that there will always be difficulties in pitching a document of this nature for a broad audience so they understand it, with the visuals used included on the grounds that they would help achieve an appropriate balance in this regard.</p>							
Proposed Change	<p>No change considered necessary,</p>							

Question No	CharacterArea	Agree ?	TopicArea	RepNo	RefNo	Consultee	Organisation	AgentRefN
-------------	---------------	---------	-----------	-------	-------	-----------	--------------	-----------

General	Area North of Lowther Street including Rickergate	<input type="checkbox"/>		2043	Objection	o38	Brian Leather	
----------------	--	--------------------------	--	------	-----------	-----	---------------	--

Comment The proposal to demolish the Civic Centre and to introduce a lavish department store as a likely alternative is a fairly standard local gov't response to the redundant building syndrome. The public are generally supportive of the proposals to increase the range of retail outlets and to provide a range of high quality leisure facilities. The fact that the area will be dominated initially by empty space, converted into a car park will not register as a major objection. The problem of course is that such a major project would be undertaken by the private sector and will happen at the time of their choosing, dictated by the expansion/contraction of the retail economy. The other commercial consideration would be the overall potential for retail expansion in Carlisle. By way of an example, Bury in Gtr Manchester is rightly famous for it's market and shopping complex, it attracts visitors from near and far. Bury MBC decided that they would demolish an area adjacent to the existing shopping complex and double the size of it's retail facility. This was duly completed by private sector developers and offered at highly increased rents to retailers. The result was that all the main outlets (M & S etc) moved leaving the smaller businesses in the original complex (rents too high). The result is numerous empty shops. You can spend a lot of money by not thinking out through the outcome. The other issue is of course the overall potential for more retail space, I can't answer that, but the commercial interests will do their homework before they invest in more retail outlets. In the four years we have lived in Carlisle the number of Charity shops has increased massively, like most other towns. However, it is an indication that people have only a limited amount of money to spend and there is a limit to the amount of cafes and shops that you can sustain. Leisure facilities provided by the private sector, depending on your definition of leisure will, generally be very expensive and consequently limit in access. We already have a cinema, bowling alley and more hotel accommodation on the way.

Lets look at some alternative uses for the building. Firstly, although the building apparently attracts a lot of criticism, it's also a good example of 1960's/70's development and apart from being a unique landmark it appears to be a goo quality functional building. I personally think it fits in very well with the City Centre and gives the area a range of building styles. In recent years there's been a general rethink regarding this era of building, the better quality examples are being preserved and refurbished (Preston Bus Station). Using the principles of matching resources with local need we could come up with the following options:

1. Convert into small units for local 'start up' businesses at low rents.
2. Hire out office space at commercial rents a money earner for the City.
3. Hire out at low rents to the voluntary sector for office space, meeting and day centre facilities.
4. Sell off the building for conversion into residential flats mainly for specific groups such as elderly people. My own experience tells me that flats are a 'no-no' for families with young children, selective development for the elderly would be attractive to some people.
5. convert as a training/further education facility for 16 - 19 yr olds. This is worth thinking about as the Labour Leadership are talking about putting much needed resources into post 16 education and training. Those authorities with appropriate buildings could be given priority in any pilot schemes.
6. If unfortunately demolition is necessary, then consider the need for a council led housing initiative, or, a low cost starter housing development for first time buyers. That would certainly be matching need and resources.

The City Council deserves congratulations for its foresight in working towards a Civic Theatre and putting the needs of future generations as a priority. These are just a few examples of what I think this building could contribute towards Carlisle's future. However I have fought this battle in my own past local gov't days and they always ended up as a car park 10 yrs later and people saying 'what happened to the new development we were promised then'. So my track record is not good. Council Officers are not generally capable of too much 'lateral thinking' it goes against the bureaucratic mind set. They generally favour quick and final solutions, like demolish, sell off with planning permission - end of council interest. So I's not holding my breath, but you can always surprise me.

Response: Comments noted.

Evidence in the form of the Carlisle Retail Study supports that there is a need for additional retail units within the City Centre particularly from a qualitative perspective in terms of providing the size, form and configuration of units which accord with retailers' current high street needs. This evidence is considered to remain robust with a number of those in the retail industry, within the City and beyond, recently reaffirming its conclusions. Such new units will be a key element of any strategy going forward to retain a number of existing retailers as well as too attract new retailers to Carlisle, and ultimately to maintain the vitality and viability of the City Centre and its overall offer. Notwithstanding this the potential displacement of existing retail occupiers within the City Centre is noted and it is acknowledged that this issue would have to be carefully managed as far as is possible within the context of the 'market'.

The Civic Centre is not being proposed for demolition for an alternative use but instead in response to exploring how identified retail needs can be accommodated within the City Centre and relate well to the existing primary shopping area. Any actual decision to demolish the building would not be taken lightly and reflects that only those buildings which are essential to delivery of a firm proposal would be considered for demolition in the future.

Proposed Change No change considered necessary.

Question No	CharacterArea	Agree ?	TopicArea	RepNo	RefNo	Consultee	Organisation	AgentRefN
General	Area North of Lowther Street including Rickergate	<input type="checkbox"/>		2270	Comment	059	Miss Carole Hoggan	
Comment	Save old police station Save the houses around Rickergate Save Adriano's Save Civic Tower [Needs new facade] Don't build a new shopping centre [can't fill existing shops].							
Response:	Evidence in the form of the Carlisle Retail Study supports that there is a need for additional retail units within the City Centre particularly from a qualitative perspective in terms of providing the size, form and configuration of units which accord with retailers' current high street needs. This evidence is considered to remain robust with a number of those in the retail industry, within the City and beyond, recently reaffirming its conclusions. Such new units will be a key element of any strategy going forward to retain a number of existing retailers as well as too attract new retailers to Carlisle, and ultimately to maintain the vitality and viability of the City Centre and its overall offer.							
	The Framework suggests that if a scheme were to be progressed in Rickergate a number of the buildings referred to should be retained. Only those buildings which are essential to delivery of a firm proposal would be considered for demolition in the future.							
Proposed Change	No change considered necessary.							
	Area North of Lowther Street including Rickergate	<input type="checkbox"/>		2343	Comment	065	Miss Lindsey McNamee	
Comment	Pages 6 & 7 - Option A & B							
	I feel there are no options, neither A or B leave my family home standing. We chose to live here and love our home, it is perfect for our needs [child in Trinity and we both work in the city]. We feel very safe here and all the neighbours are so nice. We can not afford to move and would never find a property like this that satisfies our family life.							
	We desperately want to live a long and happy family life in this community, without the ongoing threat of demolition. I understand your trying to bring people to the city and have to make it more appealing but it is quite laughable when major stores are closing left right and centre.							
	If you think that Primark is going to save Carlisle you are very wrong. What happens to the smaller clothes shop. International [clothing & fashion ware] has died a number of times and that was a cheap shop. There is a lot of unused space in 'the purpose built Lanes'. Reduce the rents and maybe some great stores might just survive.							
	LEAVE MY HOME ALONE.							
Response:	Comments noted. Owing to its location on the edge of the City Centre and current primary shopping area, Rickergate is an area which needs to be explored and which is considered to present a reasonable option to accommodate future retail and leisure growth. Only those buildings which are essential to delivery of a firm proposal would be considered for demolition in the future. In this context it is also considered relevant to note that a development of the size and scale envisaged would require a significant lead in time (a number of years as opposed to months) and key decisions would be well publicised. Detailed proposals would also be subject to further consultation.							
	Evidence in the form of the Carlisle Retail Study supports that there is a need for additional retail units within the City Centre particularly from a qualitative perspective in terms of providing the size, form and configuration of units which accord with retailers' current high street needs. This evidence is considered to remain robust with a number of those in the retail industry, within the City and beyond, recently reaffirming its conclusions. Such new units will be a key element of any strategy going forward to retain a number of existing retailers as well as too attract new retailers to Carlisle, and ultimately to maintain the vitality and viability of the City Centre and its overall offer. Notwithstanding this the potential displacement of existing retail occupiers within the City Centre is noted and it is acknowledged that this issue would have to be carefully managed as far as is possible within the context of the 'market'.							
	No specific end users have at this stage been identified. Those named in the report are done so merely as an example to illustrate the retail sectors which are considered to be underrepresented within Carlisle City Centre at the present time.							
Proposed Change	No change considered necessary.							

Question No	CharacterArea	Agree ?	TopicArea	RepNo	RefNo	Consultee	Organisation	AgentRefN
General	Area North of Lowther Street including Rickergate	<input type="checkbox"/>		2246	Objection	057	Mr F Blundell	
Comment	I do not think that the town centre should be extended northwards beyond Debenhams. Compact and lively is better than sprawling. At present we have Hoopers together with a number of other shops lying empty, presumably because there is no demand. While this situation continues it does not seem to me to plan for building more in an area the other side of a busy road from the present pedestrianised shopping area. I would guess that the new shops would be of the 'could be anywhere' type of shop. The consultants have identified a need for an extra 200,000 ft of floor space in the next 15 years - equivalent, I understand to half the present area of the Lanes complex. They could be right but I cannot myself see how this can possibly be so unless future trends are very different from the trends of past years. Internet shopping is likely to grow. If significantly more is going to be spent in Carlisle shops in the future compared with now, this can only be achieved through significant population growth, growth in real spending power of working people, or taking business from shops in neighbouring towns such as Dumfries, Hexham, Penrith or Workington. The population of neighbouring areas hasn't changed significantly for a long time. Workers earnings have for some time failed to keep up with inflation. House prices relative to income are much higher than they were a generation ago, putting a lot of financial pressure on young people trying to set up a home. Economic growth seems more than ever to be concentrated in the London area where expenditure on the infrastructure seems to be much higher. All in all there is nothing yet apparent to me that tells me we will see significant growth If we build too many shops we could have the depressing sight of empty shops either in the new complex or elsewhere in the town centre. Look at Penrith!							
Response:	Evidence in the form of the Carlisle Retail Study supports that there is a need for additional retail units within the City Centre particularly from a qualitative perspective in terms of providing the size, form and configuration of units which accord with retailers' current high street needs. This evidence is considered to remain robust with a number of those in the retail industry, within the City and beyond, recently reaffirming its conclusions. Such new units will be a key element of any strategy going forward to retain a number of existing retailers as well as too attract new retailers to Carlisle, and ultimately to maintain the vitality and viability of the City Centre and its overall offer.							
	The population of Carlisle and that of surrounding areas within the catchment of the City Centre are expected to grow over the fifteen year plan period. The Carlisle Retail Study which assessed future retail needs takes this expected growth into account and also took full account of retail trends and likely future changes including patterns of internet shopping. The recent rise in the use of 'click and collect' is one example of how internet shopping is working in tandem with as opposed to against high street retailers.							
	The City Council are committed to working with stakeholders to reduce the number of vacancies within the City Centre and will be proactive in using the powers available to them to assist in this objective. A good recent example of this is that the City Council agreed in January 2015 to update their Discretionary Rate Relief Policy in order to offer re-occupation relief for retail units which have been vacant for 12 months or more. The implementation of this national initiative at the local level sees such units qualify for a 50% reduction in their business rates (National Non Domestic Rates) for 18 months from the date the premises becomes occupied - and is likely to constitute a strong incentive in bringing empty units back into use.							
Proposed Change	No change considered necessary.							
	Area North of Lowther Street including Rickergate	<input type="checkbox"/>		2041	Comment	037	Mr Ian Brewis	
Comment	The Civic Centre Tower and buildings should be retained. It is a good and valuable example of this type of architecture which though not popular at present may be better appreciated in the future.							
Response:	Comments noted.							
Proposed Change	No change considered necessary.							
	Area North of Lowther Street including Rickergate	<input type="checkbox"/>		2187	Comment	051	Miss Susan Mark	
Comment	Knocking down the civic centre would be an improvement to the historic building, but to cover it with unnecessary buildings, continuation of the Council's skill at wasting money and not providing something that the City really needs.							
Response:	The City Centre Development Framework (CCDF) has been prepared as part of a plan lead approach to dealing with identified retail needs and the development of planning policies to support the future vitality and viability of the City Centre. Such an approach responds to the requirements of national planning policy to do so. Evidence in the form of the Carlisle Retail Study supports that there is a need for additional retail units within the City Centre particularly from a qualitative perspective in terms of providing the size, form and configuration of units which accord with retailers' current high street needs. This evidence is considered to remain robust with a number of those in the retail industry, within the City and beyond, recently reaffirming its conclusions. Such new units will be a key element of any strategy going forward to retain a number of existing retailers as well as too attract new retailers to Carlisle, and ultimately to maintain the vitality and viability of the City Centre and its overall offer. The CCDF responds to a need							
Proposed Change	No change considered necessary.							

Question No	CharacterArea	Agree ?	TopicArea	RepNo	RefNo	Consultee	Organisation	AgentRefN
General	Area North of Lowther Street including Rickergate	<input type="checkbox"/>		2005	Comment	003	Mr Stephen Glencross	Railway Historians
Comment	The Civic Centre buildings and area, if not broken should be left alone in our opinion.							
Response:	Comments noted. There remains a need to make the most effective use of land within the City Centre particularly in the context of responding to development needs as required by national planning policy.							
Proposed Change	No change considered necessary.							
	Area North of Lowther Street including Rickergate	<input type="checkbox"/>		2473	Comment	080	G Hanson	
Comment	Submission of an alterative layout for consideration.							
Response:	The alternative layout put forward has been carefully considered. The layout contains many similarities with the indicative schemes put forward and whilst no changes to these schemes have been made in response, the alternative nevertheless acts to demonstrate that a number of options could be pursued within the broad parameters established by the Framework. Detailed proposals would be subject to further consultation as and when these emerge in the future.							
Proposed Change	No change considered necessary.							
	Area North of Lowther Street including Rickergate	<input type="checkbox"/>		2464	Comment	079	Mrs M Heinrichsous	
Comment	Very definitely get rid of the so called 60's icon tower block which was near suited to Carlisle anyway. Build a decent hotel with conference & leisure facilities easily accessible from both north and south on that site. This would make it unnecessary for coach drivers to juggle their way round the Fisher St/Finkle St corner in order to get to Castle St and reach the Crown & Mitre. Alternatively they have been seen to reverse across both lanes of the Viaduct and then down Blackfriars Street to reach the rest of the hotel.							
Response:	Comments noted. The Framework raises the need to improve transport movement and circulation across the City Centre in its widest sense.							
Proposed Change	No change considered necessary.							

Question No	CharacterArea	Agree ?	TopicArea	RepNo	RefNo	Consultee	Organisation	AgentRefN
General	Area North of Lowther Street including Rickergate	<input type="checkbox"/>		2174	Comment	050	Mrs C Ward	
Comment	<p>I would like to know why it is necessary to demolish the Civic Centre, at great expense, & replace it with more hideous buildings, at great expense, that are not required & will be added to the ever increasing number of empty business properties through out the town centre?</p> <p>Also, where will the City Council office move to? If it is away from the city centre, that means about 200 people will no longer be spending money in the city, each day. This is not good move to get the local economy growing.</p> <p>The "Blueprint for the Future" must be a joke, surely. It is totally featureless. We keep hearing about how we need to build on our Historic City, if this is the case why do none of the new buildings that get built blend in to what we already have? The Magistrate Court for one & the ridiculous Blue student accommodation building in Caldevgate for another, how that got planning permission is a total mystery, especially as it is in the "historic" quarter.</p> <p>Carlisle should be concentrating on making good what we already have, not wasting money on more hair brained schemes, designed by people who have no idea what the people of Carlisle want - which is a permanent band stand & proper theatre. Why won't you listen to the peoples voice instead of telling us what we need?</p> <p>And as for the plan for the new County Council building on Botchergate, again it is a hideous square box that will, as usual, go well over budget & at the end of it all, won't be fit for purpose.</p>							
Response:	<p>Evidence in the form of the Carlisle Retail Study supports that there is a need for additional retail units within the City Centre particularly from a qualitative perspective in terms of providing the size, form and configuration of units which accord with retailers' current high street needs. This evidence is considered to remain robust with a number of those in the retail industry, within the City and beyond, recently reaffirming its conclusions. Such new units will be a key element of any strategy going forward to retain a number of existing retailers as well as too attract new retailers to Carlisle, and ultimately to maintain the vitality and viability of the City Centre and its overall offer. Only those buildings which are essential to delivery of a firm proposal would be considered for demolition in the future. Options for the relocation of City Council staff would be considered at a future point in time if and when a firm need to do so arises. There is no suggestion however within the Framework that City Council staff or services would be moved out with the City Centre.</p> <p>The City Centre Development Framework seeks to put a positive framework in place to guide future development. It is also considered important to acknowledge that the Framework relates to a longer time frame and in accordance with national policy there is a need to respond to meeting identified needs.</p> <p>Cumbria County Council have progressed a planning application for their proposed new offices on Botchergate and public consultation was forthcoming as part of that process to enable comments on the proposed design, amongst other matters, to be submitted.</p> <p>For the avoidance of doubt neither of the other examples of architecture referred to in the response are within the historic quarter as suggested.</p>							
Proposed Change	No change considered necessary.							
Q1	Area North of Lowther Street including Rickergate	<input type="checkbox"/>		2433	Comment	072	Mrs Jennifer Smith	
Comment	<p>Mainly North of Lowther Street: Option A is the lesser of two evils. However I do not see the need to demolish peoples homes or the fairly new courts buildings. There are areas of the city badly in need of development.</p>							
Response:	<p>Only those buildings which are essential to delivery of a firm proposal would be considered for demolition in the future.</p>							
Proposed Change	No change considered necessary.							
Q1	Area North of Lowther Street including Rickergate	<input type="checkbox"/>		2057	Objection	042	Mrs Dallas Brewis	Cycle Carlisle
Comment	<p>It seems that both options A & B for Rickergate include the demolition of the Council Chamber. This is a first class example of the best of 60/70's architecture and should be retained. There is no mention of the relocation of the City Council Offices - it would make economic since to move in with the County.</p>							
Response:	<p>Only those buildings which are essential to delivery of a firm proposal would be considered for demolition in the future. Options for the relocation of City Council staff would be considered at a future point in time if and when a firm need to do so arises.</p>							
Proposed Change	No change considered necessary.							

Question No	CharacterArea	Agree ?	TopicArea	RepNo	RefNo	Consultee	Organisation	AgentRefN
Q2	Area North of Lowther Street including Rickergate	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		2310	Support	063	Mr Ian Grey	
Comment								
Response: Comments noted.								
Proposed Change: No change considered necessary.								
<hr/>								
	Area North of Lowther Street including Rickergate	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		2128	Support	047	Mrs Margaret Backhouse	
Comment								
Response: Comments noted.								
Proposed Change: No change considered necessary.								
<hr/>								
	Area North of Lowther Street including Rickergate	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		2031	Comment	035	Jenny I Turner	
Comment: We need shops but it will cost you quite a sum to do it. Lowther Street and Portland Square can be changed, we need shops but we don't think it will work as there are people who can't get there some have no transport the town is easy for us. We need poundland.								
Response: Comments noted. The Local Plan and others including the Local Transport Plan seek to enhance the accessibility of the City Centre. It is acknowledged that a range of unit sizes and locations are required to attract a variety of end users.								
Proposed Change: No change considered necessary.								
<hr/>								
	Area North of Lowther Street including Rickergate	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		2360	Support	009	Trevor Wilson	
Comment								
Response: Comments noted.								
Proposed Change: No change considered necessary.								
<hr/>								
	Area North of Lowther Street including Rickergate	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		2382	Comment	015	Mr Viv Dodd	Revival Carlisle
Comment								
Response: Comments noted.								
Proposed Change: No change considered necessary.								

Question No	CharacterArea	Agree ?	TopicArea	RepNo	RefNo	Consultee	Organisation	AgentRefN
Q2	Area North of Lowther Street including Rickergate	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		2322	Support	064	Mrs Carol Grey	
Comment								
Response:	Comments noted.							
Proposed Change	No change considered necessary.							
	Area North of Lowther Street including Rickergate	<input type="checkbox"/>		2105	Objection	005	Mrs B A Robinson	
Comment	No							
Response:	Comment noted. In the absence of elaborating as to the reasons why the Council can not, on this occasion, comment further.							
Proposed Change	No change considered necessary.							
	Area North of Lowther Street including Rickergate	<input type="checkbox"/>		2008	Comment	001	Mr Nigel Winter	Stagecoach NorthWest Lt
Comment	Whilst the development of retail space is welcome in the City, there has to be a great concern that there is no mention of the additional capacity required for passenger transport. The West Tower Street bus infrastructure is already at capacity and of very poor quality. Increased car journeys in the area (to car parks) will further delay buses, adding costs to passenger transport services and reducing the attractiveness of the bus over the car.							
Response:	The Local Plan and proposals within it including the potential recommendations within the City centre Development Framework are being assessed for infrastructure impacts through the process of the Infrastructure Delivery Plan. Specifically the transport implications of developments across the City are also continuing to be modelled in conjunction with the County Council and necessary improvements and interventions to enable growth to happen identified and costed. Such interventions include passenger transport improvements and enhanced sustainable forms of movement alongside those to the highway network.							
Proposed Change	No change considered necessary.							
	Area North of Lowther Street including Rickergate	<input type="checkbox"/>		2394	Objection	069	Mrs Karen Atkinson	
Comment	No							
Response:	Comment noted. In the absence of elaborating as to the reasons why the Council can not, on this occasion, comment further.							
Proposed Change	No change considered necessary.							

Question No	CharacterArea	Agree ?	TopicArea	RepNo	RefNo	Consultee	Organisation	AgentRefN
Q2	Area North of Lowther Street including Rickergate	<input type="checkbox"/>		2408	Objection	071	Mrs Joan Field	
Comment	The Civic Centre although of style which does not fit the architecture of the rest of Carlisle, is a prime example of 1960s architecture. As such I do not find it unattractive. The building is easy to access for pedestrians, elderly, disabled etc. A similar building [as proposed] in Botchergate would be out of the town centre for no drivers.							
Response:	Comments noted. The proposed development on William Street car park relates to Cumbria County Council offices and not those of the City Council. Options for the relocation of City Council staff would be considered at a future point in time if and when a firm need to do so arises.							
Proposed Change	No change considered necessary.							
	Area North of Lowther Street including Rickergate	<input type="checkbox"/>		2333	Objection	065	Miss Lindsey McNamee	
Comment	Although flood defences were erected, they are still at risk as said by the Environment Agency.							
Response:	The purpose of the City Centre Development Framework is to inform the Local Plan against which development proposals would have to be assessed against. The Local Plan already contains policies which deal with flood risk and the need to consider a breach scenario would be dealt with through the process of a Flood Risk Assessment required to accompany any proposal. The report will however be updated to acknowledge this approach.							
Proposed Change	Update the report to acknowledge the approach to assessing flood risk, including the testing of a flood defence breach scenario as part of the Flood Risk Assessment process.							
	Area North of Lowther Street including Rickergate	<input type="checkbox"/>		2274	Objection	060	Barry O Earp	
Comment	This includes the area North West of Lowther Street which is mainly a car park and Eden Bridge House. This could accommodate a large store with underground car parking accessed by Georgian Way and egressed via Lowther Street							
Response:	Comments noted.							
Proposed Change	No change considered necessary.							
	Area North of Lowther Street including Rickergate	<input type="checkbox"/>		2423	Objection	072	Mrs Jennifer Smith	
Comment	Civic Centre is an iconic building in Carlisle, also the Magistrates Court is a fairly new building and would cost an enormous amount to replace.							
Response:	Comments noted. Only those buildings which are essential to delivery of a firm proposal would be considered for demolition in the future.							
Proposed Change	No change considered necessary.							

Question No	CharacterArea	Agree ?	TopicArea	RepNo	RefNo	Consultee	Organisation	AgentRefN
Q2	Area North of Lowther Street including Rickergate	<input type="checkbox"/>		2297	Objection	062	Mr Hans J A Landstrom	
Comment	No							
Response:	Comment noted. In the absence of elaborating as to the reasons why the Council can not, on this occasion, comment further.							
Proposed Change	No change considered necessary.							
	Area North of Lowther Street including Rickergate	<input type="checkbox"/>		2207	Objection	053	Mrs Joyce Hetherington	
Comment	No							
Response:	Comment noted. In the absence of elaborating as to the reasons why the Council can not, on this occasion, comment further.							
Proposed Change	No change considered necessary.							
	Area North of Lowther Street including Rickergate	<input type="checkbox"/>		2435	Comment	073	Phil Gray	Green Spaces
Comment	Difficult question - the Rickergate character area is the only one that gets a detailed analysis in the document.							
Response:	A key objective of the Framework was to identify and consider which areas / sites within the City Centre could accommodate future retail growth and the evidenced quantum of new floorspace. The level of detail provided for each of the character areas is considered proportionate to the perceived degree of change.							
Proposed Change	No change considered necessary.							
	Area North of Lowther Street including Rickergate	<input type="checkbox"/>		2441	Objection	075	Mr Neil Irving	SOS
Comment	No							
Response:	Comment noted. In the absence of elaborating as to the reasons why the Council can not, on this occasion, comment further.							
Proposed Change	No change considered necessary							
	Area North of Lowther Street including Rickergate	<input type="checkbox"/>		2345	Objection	066	Mrs Sandra Stockley	
Comment	No							
Response:	Comment noted. In the absence of elaborating as to the reasons why the Council can not, on this occasion, comment further.							
Proposed Change	No change considered necessary.							

Question No	CharacterArea	Agree ?	TopicArea	RepNo	RefNo	Consultee	Organisation	AgentRefN
Q2	Area North of Lowther Street including Rickergate	<input type="checkbox"/>		2093	Objection	011	Mrs Julie Templeton	Member of Save our Stree
Comment	<p>I do not agree with the conclusions for this character area. There is no mention of the conservation area. The consultation feedback does not support the amount of development and intervention that the GVA report puts forward. In fact it is difficult to find any support for this other than looking at old plans of Carlisle Renaissance which were widely criticized at the time. The history of the Warwick Street houses to the Percy Dalton Fire Station/Police/Magistrates Court complex is ignored.</p> <p>Rickergate is designated a flood zone, how will this be addressed in the plans for major development without adding to the risk of water being re-directed to other places if the flood defences are breached. It has been explained that the plans for Rickergate are just concepts, at what stage does one point out that the plans for Rickergate take no account of the difference of street levels, the artists impression implies that the lead down from West Tower Street to the Civic Centre is all one level.</p> <p>On a windy day the area around the Civic Centre becomes a wind tunnel, these plans if implemented would create a super wind tunnel and shoppers would have difficulty staying upright. Nothing has been put forward for other uses for the Civic Centre, no mention of a retrofit or facelift. No mention of the effect of large scale demolition of the building on environmental sustainability. The Rickergate area is well known to the public as the centre for local services and the Civic Centre is easily recognized and accessible via public transport. The Civic Centre is also the only building in Carlisle that is typical of the buildings designed in the 60's, there are no illustrations showing how the building will look once integral parts of it are demolished. Therefore the public cannot make an informed decision.</p> <p>In 2008 and 2012 the council bought houses in Warwick Street for site assembly despite there being no business plan or end user in place. Great lengths were taken in 2012 to keep the acquisition of properties in Warwick Street a secret. This GVA report and lack of any attempt to involve or consult with the Rickergate community over the plans for the area add to the perception that this is already a done deal.</p>							
Response:	<p>Agree that the Conservation Area which covers this area should be acknowledged within the Framework.</p> <p>Evidence in the form of the Carlisle Retail Study supports that there is a need for additional retail units within the City Centre particularly from a qualitative perspective in terms of providing the size, form and configuration of units which accord with retailers' current high street needs. This evidence is considered to remain robust with a number of those in the retail industry, within the City and beyond, recently reaffirming its conclusions. Such new units will be a key element of any strategy going forward to retain a number of existing retailers as well as too attract new retailers to Carlisle, and ultimately to maintain the vitality and viability of the City Centre and its overall offer.</p> <p>The purpose of the City Centre Development Framework is to inform the Local Plan against which development proposals would have to be assessed against. The Local Plan already contains policies which deal with flood risk and the need to consider a breach scenario in the defences which protect this area would be dealt with through the process of a Flood Risk Assessment required to accompany any proposal. The report will however be updated to acknowledge this approach.</p> <p>The change in levels is not considered to constitute a significant constraint and in part reflects the historic nature of the City Centre. This perceived issue, which can in part be designed out, has not proven to be a deterrent in other historic cities such as York, Durham and Lincoln where to the contrary the change in levels, albeit much more significant than those experienced in Carlisle, add a level of interest and reinforce distinctiveness.</p> <p>The design of a scheme could act to address any wind tunnelling effects and could be positive in this regard in seeking to improve the existing situation.</p> <p>The Civic Centre is not being proposed for demolition for an alternative use but instead in response to exploring how identified retail needs can be accommodated within the City Centre and relate well to the existing primary shopping area. Any actual decision to demolish the building, or any in the area, would not be taken lightly and reflects that only those buildings which are essential to delivery of a firm proposal would be considered for demolition in the future.</p> <p>Whilst comments are noted with regards to the inclusion of specific sketch scheme visuals it should be noted that there will always be difficulties in pitching a document of this nature for a broad audience so they understand it, with the visuals used included on the grounds that they would help achieve an appropriate balance in this regard.</p> <p>The Framework is considered to be fully transparent with regards to ownership and it is also considered important to note that anyone can obtain land ownership details through the service provided by the Land Registry. No firm proposals are yet in place and any key decisions of that nature would be fully transparent owing to the public nature of the City Council.</p>							
Proposed Change	<p>Acknowledge within Section 13 that much of this area is within the designated City Centre Conservation Area.</p> <p>Update the report to acknowledge the approach to assessing flood risk, including the testing of a flood defence breach scenario as part of the Flood Risk Assessment process.</p>							

Question No	CharacterArea	Agree ?	TopicArea	RepNo	RefNo	Consultee	Organisation	AgentRefN
Q2	Area North of Lowther Street including Rickergate	<input type="checkbox"/>		2454	Objection	074	Mrs Jean Hall	A003
Comment	Solicitors letter on behalf of client setting out concerns regarding the proposals and the fact that the property may be compulsory purchased which would not be an option at any figure.							
Response:	A separate response was sent to the representors solicitor. It is important to stress that only those buildings which are essential to delivery of a firm proposal would be considered for demolition in the future, and that the City Centre Development Framework does not promote or make reference to the compulsory purchase of any premises.							
Proposed Change	No change considered necessary.							
	Area North of Lowther Street including Rickergate	<input type="checkbox"/>		2164	Objection	026	Elizabeth Allnutt	Save Our Streets
Comment	SOS does not agree with the conclusions of this character area. There is no mention of the Conservation Area and no mention of the historic and architectural value of the buildings in this area. There is no mention of the small businesses in the area. This is an area where rent and rates are relatively low and small businesses have an opportunity to flourish. The robustness of the local community of residents and small businesses is also ignored. The area is not under utilised; public services, such as the Civic Centre and the Magistrate's Court are in a convenient, central location which is well-served by adjacent bus stops and car parking for the city centre. There is a concentration of public services here which also defines the area – the City Council, County Council and Police in the Civic Centre, DEFRA and the Probation Service in Lowther Street. This has been ignored. The change in levels is significant; it needs emphasising and marks a change between the shopping area of Scotch Street and the civic functions below West Tower Street. The projected plans do not make this clear. The area was severely flooded in 2005 and although flood banks have been installed the Environment Agency places the area at risk. This is a serious omission from the conclusions as it will effect any development in the area.							
Response:	Agree that the Conservation Area which covers this area should be acknowledged within the Framework. Whilst the businesses which operate in this area are valued and contribute significantly to the City Centre and wider economy, their prevalence is no greater than in many of the other character areas considered and as such more detailed acknowledgement is not therefore considered necessary. Furthermore there is no apparent reason to suggest that existing homes and businesses could not happily co-exist as they do at present, with the interface between existing users an important point which would be considered if and when detailed proposals were progressed.							
	The Framework refers to aspects of this area being 'relatively' under utilised which is considered appropriate particularly with regards to the public realm and surface car parks. Given national policy there is a need to explore where retail growth could be accommodated and the exploration of under utilised land in this regard is entirely logical. Paragraphs 13.2 and 13.3 already explicitly acknowledge the strong public sector presence in this area.							
	The change in levels is not considered to constitute a significant constraint and in part reflects the historic nature of the City Centre. This perceived issue, which can in part be designed out, has not proven to be a deterrent in other historic cities such as York, Durham and Lincoln where to the contrary the change in levels, albeit much more significant than those experienced in Carlisle, add a level of interest and reinforce distinctiveness.							
	The purpose of the City Centre Development Framework is to inform the Local Plan against which development proposals would have to be assessed against. The Local Plan already contains policies which deal with flood risk and the need to consider a breach scenario in the defences which protect this area would be dealt with through the process of a Flood Risk Assessment required to accompany any proposal. The report will however be updated to acknowledge this approach.							
Proposed Change	Acknowledge within Section 13 that much of this area is within the designated City Centre Conservation Area.							
	Update the report to acknowledge the approach to assessing flood risk, including the testing of a flood defence breach scenario as part of the Flood Risk Assessment process.							

Question No	CharacterArea	Agree ?	TopicArea	RepNo	RefNo	Consultee	Organisation	AgentRefN
Q2	Area North of Lowther Street including Rickergate	<input type="checkbox"/>		2176	Objection	051	Miss Susan Mark	
Comment	Knocking down perfectly good homes with an excuse of the area being under utilised, many other more urgent thinks neglected [bigger impact Citadel Hotel], jobs and depressing appearance. A beautiful building left to rot, or Council's usual policy; listed - knock it down.							
Response:	Only those buildings which are essential to delivery of a firm proposal would be considered for demolition in the future. Efforts are ongoing to find a viable, alternative use for the premises referred to which is not however in the ownership and therefore direct control of the City Council. The accusation made is not considered to be supported by the evidence and to the contrary the City Council are considered to have a track record of valuing and seeking to enhance heritage assets in the City Centre as demonstrated through the recent PSICA scheme, in partnership with English Heritage, and the significant investment in the Old Town Hall.							
Proposed Change	No change considered necessary.							
	Area North of Lowther Street including Rickergate	<input type="checkbox"/>		2148	Objection	049	Mrs Mavis Sarginson	
Comment	No							
Response:	Comment noted. In the absence of elaborating as to the reasons why the Council can not, on this occasion, comment further.							
Proposed Change	No change considered necessary.							
	Area North of Lowther Street including Rickergate	<input type="checkbox"/>		2248	Objection	058	Mrs Joanne Swanton	JoMark House of Hair
Comment	Although I agree to regeneration of North of Lowther Street and Rickergate, Warwick Street should be considered like Corporation Road has been! It is a historic part of old Carlisle. People that live on this road [Warwick Street] love living there. Some people have lived there for 50 plus years! It is also a very good site, perfect footfall for my business which I chose to invest in [JoMark House of Hair, 9 Warwick St]. Because of future plans rumours etc I have lost 2 members of staff because I cannot say there is a long term job available when their training is complete. I am now finding it hard to find a junior/apprentice to assist me in the salon! I did have this but with the rumours etc I don't now. I have to start again staff wise. My salon is very busy it is unique in every way which is one of the reasons, the main reason, why I chose the house in the first place. None of my clients wants it to go.							
Response:	Only those buildings which are essential to delivery of a firm proposal would be considered for demolition in the future. As a tenant of the City Council should the need to relocate any business or resident arise then relocation support would be forthcoming. Whilst the City Council can empathise with the issues described regarding business planning, it is considered important to note that no firm plans are being progressed at the current time nor are any imminent. A development of the size and scale envisaged would require a significant lead in time (a number of years as opposed to months) and key decisions would be well publicised. This would afford a good degree of notice in terms of continuity and business planning.							
Proposed Change	No change considered necessary.							
	Area North of Lowther Street including Rickergate	<input type="checkbox"/>		2220	Objection	054	Mr Christopher Wheeler	
Comment	While my general conclusions are as in Q1 above [Rep Ref 2219], I feel that Botchergate and Citadel need to be prioritise much higher than a speculative new development of Rickergate.							
Response:	Comments noted but opportunities for major retail development and the ability to respond to evidenced needs are more limited in Botchergate and in the vicinity of the Citadel.							
Proposed Change	No change considered necessary.							

Question No	CharacterArea	Agree ?	TopicArea	RepNo	RefNo	Consultee	Organisation	AgentRefN
Q2	Area North of Lowther Street including Rickergate	<input type="checkbox"/>		2036	Objection	036	Ian Caruana	
Comment	No							
Response:	Comment noted. In the absence of elaborating as to the reasons why the Council can not, on this occasion, comment further.							
Proposed Change	No change considered necessary.							
<hr/>								
	Area North of Lowther Street including Rickergate	<input type="checkbox"/>		2138	Objection	048	Mrs C E Simpson	
Comment	No							
Response:	Comment noted. In the absence of elaborating as to the reasons why the Council can not, on this occasion, comment further.							
Proposed Change	No change considered necessary.							
<hr/>								
	Area North of Lowther Street including Rickergate	<input type="checkbox"/>		2058	Objection	042	Mrs Dallas Brewis	Cycle Carlisle
Comment	No							
Response:	Comment noted. In the absence of elaborating as to the reasons why the Council can not, on this occasion, comment further.							
Proposed Change	No change considered necessary.							
<hr/>								
	Area North of Lowther Street including Rickergate	<input type="checkbox"/>		2233	Objection	055	Mrs Helen Blamire	
Comment	See response 2240 & 2241							
Response:	Detailed matters raised to support objection considered and responded to in response to representations Ref. 2240 and 2241.							
Proposed Change	No change considered necessary.							

Question No	CharacterArea	Agree ?	TopicArea	RepNo	RefNo	Consultee	Organisation	AgentRefN
Q2	Area North of Lowther Street including Rickergate	<input type="checkbox"/>		2045	Comment	039	Mr M Holliday	
Comment	Partly agree, however disagree most strongly with the idea to demolish either fully or in part the Civic Centre. This is Carlisle's only high rise building and is an excellent example of a building of its time. It serves its purpose perfectly well and is ideally located for the services it provides to the public. Where would the replacement building be located, on another car park ? If the building is under utilised, why not move the CCC staff into here. Hopefully we will have a unitary authority shortly in any case. There is a reasonable argument for developing part of this site for retail use, again with apartments above to ensure 24 hr footfall, however there is a history of resistance, however I am sure there was resistance to The Lanes, or any development come to that. This option should be pursued, but leave the Civic Centre alone.							
Response:	Preference for Development Option A noted. Only those buildings which are essential to delivery of a firm proposal would be considered for demolition in the future. Options for the relocation of City Council staff would be considered at a future point in time if and when a firm need to do so arises.							
Proposed Change	No change considered necessary.							
	Area North of Lowther Street including Rickergate	<input type="checkbox"/>		2115	Objection	046	Miss Gillian Smith	
Comment	No							
Response:	Comment noted. In the absence of elaborating as to the reasons why the Council can not, on this occasion, comment further.							
Proposed Change	No change considered necessary.							
	Area North of Lowther Street including Rickergate	<input type="checkbox"/>		2020	Comment	034	Mr Eddie Haughan	
Comment	No question certain areas of Carlisle need to be improved but this should be primarily aimed at improving the quality of life for the city's residents and tax payers. If this can be achieved while also making the place more attractive to visitors then it should be done.							
	Much is said about the aesthetic qualities of the Civic Centre but it must be noted that every town and city worldwide has buildings it's residents are not particularly proud of and Carlisle has only two, if we include the Magistrates' Court.							
	These buildings however, are both practical and functional and any proposal to demolish them, either wholly or in part, should be allowed to proceed only if that proposal can guarantee a profit for the citizens of Carlisle.							
Response:	Only those buildings which are essential to delivery of a firm proposal would be considered for demolition in the future. The consideration of any firm proposal through the process of determining a planning application would weigh up any adverse impacts which flow from the grant of consent versus the public good obtained from doing so.							
Proposed Change	No change considered necessary.							
	Area North of Lowther Street including Rickergate	<input type="checkbox"/>		2192	Objection	052	Mr Colin Latimer	
Comment	No							
Response:	Comment noted. In the absence of elaborating as to the reasons why the Council can not, on this occasion, comment further.							
Proposed Change	No change considered necessary.							

Question No	CharacterArea	Agree ?	TopicArea	RepNo	RefNo	Consultee	Organisation	AgentRefN
Q2	Area North of Lowther Street including Rickergate	<input type="checkbox"/>		2286	Objection	061	Mr David Hamilton	
Comment								
Response:	Comment noted. In the absence of elaborating as to the reasons why the Council can not, on this occasion, comment further.							
Proposed Change	No change considered necessary.							
<hr/>								
	Area North of Lowther Street including Rickergate	<input type="checkbox"/>		2079	Objection	045	Ms Kate Carvana	
Comment	Rickergate needs to be left alone - the Civic Centre is convenient for everyone where it is and the shopping area as it is at present needs the gaps filling before new areas are added.							
Response:	There are not enough 'gaps' to meet the evidenced needs particularly bearing in mind the qualitative needs in response to high street retailers current needs and expectations. Notwithstanding this the infilling of gaps and the reusing of currently vacant premises will play an important part in ensuring that the full range of needs are met going forward, in doing so contributing to the vision of a vital and vibrant city centre in its widest sense.							
Proposed Change	No change considered necessary.							
<hr/>								
Q3	Area North of Lowther Street including Rickergate	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		2015	Support	001	Mr Nigel Winter	Stagecoach NorthWest Lt
Comment	Yes, however, there must be consideration as to how extra cars and people may be accommodated without bringing the City to a halt. The former County Council offices off English Street, have great retail potential. So too the land between Lonsdale Street and Chapel Street.							
Response:	Comments noted. The Local Plan and proposals within it including the potential recommendations within the City centre Development Framework are being assessed for infrastructure impacts through the process of the Infrastructure Delivery Plan. Specifically the transport implications of developments across the City are also continuing to be modelled in conjunction with the County Council and necessary improvements and interventions to enable growth to happen identified and costed. Such interventions include passenger transport improvements and enhanced sustainable forms of movement alongside those to the highway network.							
Proposed Change	No change considered necessary.							
<hr/>								
	Area North of Lowther Street including Rickergate	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		2329	Support	064	Mrs Carol Grey	
Comment	The document doesn't make it clear what the function of 'the tower' would be if left as in option A. Depending on what its purpose is might affect my preference for A or B. However if it has no useful purpose Option B would seem the better option particularly as it would seem more likely to attract a department store.							
Response:	Option A would see the existing use retained but alternatives could be explored if and when firm proposals were brought forward.							
Proposed Change	No change considered necessary.							

Question No	CharacterArea	Agree ?	TopicArea	RepNo	RefNo	Consultee	Organisation	AgentRefN
Q3	Area North of Lowther Street including Rickergate	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		2389	Support	015	Mr Viv Dodd	Revival Carlisle
Comment	The Business Group welcomes the Council's commitment to strengthen the city centre's retail offer and their determination to resist any further out of town retail developments							
Response:	Comments noted.							
Proposed Change	No change considered necessary.							
	Area North of Lowther Street including Rickergate	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		2032	Comment	035	Jenny I Turner	
Comment	Yes, but then again there could be a problem not a lot of people can go as most of us have ills and bad legs, some can't travel, not many can walk far. It's not easy.							
Response:	Comment noted. In responding to design policies within the Local Plan all development schemes must be designed to be as inclusive as possible from an accessibility perspective.							
Proposed Change	No change considered necessary.							
	Area North of Lowther Street including Rickergate	<input type="checkbox"/>		2401	Objection	069	Mrs Karen Atkinson	
Comment	No							
Response:	Comment noted. In the absence of elaborating as to the reasons why the Council can not, on this occasion, comment further.							
Proposed Change	No change considered necessary.							
	Area North of Lowther Street including Rickergate	<input type="checkbox"/>		2406	Objection	070	Pauline Dalton	
Comment	<p>I am STONGLY OPPOSED TO the plans for the Rickergate/Civic Centre area. Firstly nothing will be served by demolishing the Civic Centre. It is a controversial building, I know, but much of the interior of the tower is of architectural merit, especially the staircase and the first floor landing. I understand it is relatively energy efficient and not inconvenient to work in. The Council Chamber is, of its period, a fine building and will ultimately prove to be one of Carlisle's historic assets.</p> <p>A department store? Why? Carlisle could not sustain Hoopers. What is not provided by House of Fraser and Debenhams?</p> <p>One of the charms of that area is that people live there and I feel it is important to keep that mix. This is another opportunity for independent retailing and there could be small scale development as a sort "infill" situation.</p>							
Response:	Comments noted. Only those buildings which are essential to delivery of a firm proposal would be considered for demolition in the future.							
Proposed Change	<p>Evidence in the form of the Carlisle Retail Study supports that there is a need for additional retail units within the City Centre particularly from a qualitative perspective in terms of providing the size, form and configuration of units which accord with retailers' current high street needs. This evidence is considered to remain robust with a number of those in the retail industry, within the City and beyond, recently reaffirming its conclusions. Such new units will be a key element of any strategy going forward to retain a number of existing retailers as well as too attract new retailers to Carlisle, and ultimately to maintain the vitality and viability of the City Centre and its overall offer. Whilst noting the suggested alternative this would not address the issue which would remain of where retail need could be met.</p> <p>No change considered necessary.</p>							

Question No	CharacterArea	Agree ?	TopicArea	RepNo	RefNo	Consultee	Organisation	AgentRefN
Q3	Area North of Lowther Street including Rickergate	<input type="checkbox"/>		2214	Objection	053	Mrs Joyce Hetherington	
Comment	I Don't think the Civic Centre should be demolished.							
Response:	Only those buildings which are essential to delivery of a firm proposal would be considered for demolition in the future.							
Proposed Change	No change considered necessary.							
<hr/>								
	Area North of Lowther Street including Rickergate	<input type="checkbox"/>		2199	Objection	052	Mr Colin Latimer	
Comment	I have lived on Warwick Street for 32 years and intend to say here as I have invested a considerable amount of money installing solar panels to give an income over the next 25 years. We are a strong community, the majority of residents living here for 30 plus years. It is a crime free area [2 crimes in the last 30 years] and we are unique in being the only houses within the old city walls with gardens front and rear.							
Response:	Comments noted. Only those buildings which are essential to delivery of a firm proposal would be considered for demolition in the future.							
Proposed Change	No change considered necessary.							
<hr/>								
	Area North of Lowther Street including Rickergate	<input type="checkbox"/>		2155	Objection	049	Mrs Mavis Sarginson	
Comment	Sort out and tidy up empty derelict premises. We already have a city centre.							
Response:	Comments noted. Whilst the responsibility of owners the City Council does put pressure and lend support where appropriate regarding empty derelict premises. The City Centre Development Framework is about guiding how the City will develop in the future and is therefore an important strategy in preserving (and enhancing) the vitality and viability of the City Centre and its overall offer.							
Proposed Change	No change considered necessary.							
<hr/>								
	Area North of Lowther Street including Rickergate	<input type="checkbox"/>		2367	Objection	009	Trevor Wilson	
Comment	I state No as this is the only shop/retail development option you have presented. I will agree that it is a reasonable use for this area. There is no mention of Hooper's, which is currently empty, anywhere in the document.							
Response:	The City Council do not own the former Hoopers building. Planning permission was recently secured by the owners for restaurant use which facilities an alternative option to its continued use for retail purposes. The City Council are committed to working with stakeholders to reduce the number of vacancies within the City Centre and will be proactive in using the powers available to them to assist in this objective.							
Proposed Change	No change considered necessary.							

Question No	CharacterArea	Agree ?	TopicArea	RepNo	RefNo	Consultee	Organisation	AgentRefN
Q3	Area North of Lowther Street including Rickergate	<input type="checkbox"/>		2430	Objection	072	Mrs Jennifer Smith	
Comment	No Botchergate and St Nicholas area would be a better area to develop.							
Response:	The areas referred to are sequentially less preferable in retail planning terms being detached from the primary shopping area. In this regard it is material to note that plans and proposals progressed by the City Council and others must accord with national guidance which requires other sites to be prioritised as far as comparison retailing is concerned.							
Proposed Change	No change considered necessary.							
	Area North of Lowther Street including Rickergate	<input type="checkbox"/>		2052	Comment	039	Mr M Holliday	
Comment	Not necessarily. The existing bus station and the area of Lowther Street Northwards of Iceland should also be seriously looked at. Parts of Rickergate do lend itself to development, but leave the Civic Centre alone. An arts centre/theatre should be located here. The Lonsdale on Warwick Road should have been the location, however the powers that be didn't act when it should have. What is it now, oh a car park for a boutique hotel – another huge mistake.							
Response:	Comments and the perceived potential of land to the north of Iceland noted. An Arts Centre (including entertainment space) is now being actively developed in the old Fire Station on Warwick Street.							
Proposed Change	No change considered necessary.							
	Area North of Lowther Street including Rickergate	<input type="checkbox"/>		2352	Objection	066	Mrs Sandra Stockley	
Comment	I think this area, with the Civic Centre and Magistrates Courts, should be developed as a civic area. The Civic Centre is an iconic building and is readily accessible to and heavily used by the public. Much money has been spent on it over the years and it seems to function well for its purpose. What if Cumbria became a Unitary Authority which is the financially sound solution to current spending constraints. What then of new City and County buildings? The terraced houses are linked to Carlisle's past industrial heritage and should be retained. The Save our Streets campaigners have expressed their solutions very clearly and must be taken into account.							
Response:	Only those buildings which are essential to delivery of a firm proposal would be considered for demolition in the future. No firm proposal is being pursued regarding a unitary authority covering Carlisle and there is a need to plan now to meet needs.							
Proposed Change	No change considered necessary.							
	Area North of Lowther Street including Rickergate	<input type="checkbox"/>		2340	Objection	065	Miss Lindsey McNamee	
Comment	NO - take it elsewhere. We chose to live here and absolutely love our home. We had no idea that you were in the process of trying to demolish it.							
Response:	Only those buildings which are essential to delivery of a firm proposal would be considered for demolition in the future. As a tenant of the City Council should the need to relocate arise then relocation support would be forthcoming. A development of the size and scale envisaged would require a significant lead in time (a number of years as opposed to months) and key decisions would be well publicised.							
Proposed Change	No change considered necessary.							

Question No	CharacterArea	Agree ?	TopicArea	RepNo	RefNo	Consultee	Organisation	AgentRefN
Q3	Area North of Lowther Street including Rickergate	<input type="checkbox"/>		2415	Objection	071	Mrs Joan Field	
Comment	This development plan concentrates on the provision of more retail provision. Currently in Carlisle shops are closing almost weekly. We have a large department store empty [Hoopers}. Why provide more shops when we cannot support the ones we have now?							
Response:	Evidence in the form of the Carlisle Retail Study supports that there is a need for additional retail units within the City Centre particularly from a qualitative perspective in terms of providing the size, form and configuration of units which accord with retailers' current high street needs. This evidence is considered to remain robust with a number of those in the retail industry, within the City and beyond, recently reaffirming its conclusions. Such new units will be a key element of any strategy going forward to retain a number of existing retailers as well as too attract new retailers to Carlisle, and ultimately to maintain the vitality and viability of the City Centre and its overall offer.							
Proposed Change	Existing vacancies are considered to be below the national average with a number of long standing vacant units such as those at the Crown and Mitre having recently reverted back into active use. Feedback from agents within the City also supports that there is relatively strong demand for vacant units within the core of the City Centre, with relatively quick turnaround achieved. Notwithstanding this the City Council are committed to working with stakeholders to reduce the number of vacancies within the City Centre and will be proactive in using the powers available to them to assist in this objective. A good recent example of this is that the City Council agreed in January 2015 to update their Discretionary Rate Relief Policy in order to offer re-occupation relief for retail units which have been vacant for 12 months or more. The implementation of this national initiative at the local level sees such units qualify for a 50% reduction in their business rates (National Non Domestic Rates) for 18 months from the date the premises becomes occupied - and is likely to constitute a strong incentive in bringing empty units back into use.							
Proposed Change	No change considered necessary.							
	Area North of Lowther Street including Rickergate	<input type="checkbox"/>		2449	Objection	075	Mr Neil Irving	SOS
Comment	No. The development of this area would if anything cause more harm to the main city centre shopping. The city centre is already suffering, many units are empty, the market hall is in massive decline(there is no mention of this at all), internet shopping is on the rise. To dilute the shopping area down a hill and away from the centre is madness. If however the lowther st area was consolidated and made more pedestrian friendly it may help the city centre. People are inherently lazy and once down in Rickergate the chance they would move up into the city centre is reduced by the ground levels, however there is already good foot traffic between lowther st and the city centre.							
Response:	Comments noted and the call for improved pedestrian linkages between the primary shopping area and Lowther Street welcomed, although is already explicitly acknowledged within the report.							
Proposed Change	The City Council are committed to working with stakeholders to reduce the number of vacancies within the City Centre and will be proactive in using the powers available to them to assist in this objective. A good recent example of this is that the City Council agreed in January 2015 to update their Discretionary Rate Relief Policy in order to offer re-occupation relief for retail units which have been vacant for 12 months or more. The implementation of this national initiative at the local level sees such units qualify for a 50% reduction in their business rates (National Non Domestic Rates) for 18 months from the date the premises becomes occupied - and is likely to constitute a strong incentive in bringing empty units back into use.							
Proposed Change	Whilst new units will be a key element of any strategy going forward to retain a number of existing retailers as well as too attract new retailers to Carlisle, and ultimately to maintain the vitality and viability of the City Centre and its overall offer, it is acknowledged that the potential displacement of existing retail occupiers within the City would have to be carefully managed as far as is possible within the context of the 'market'.							
Proposed Change	The change in levels is not considered to constitute a significant constraint and in part reflects the historic nature of the City Centre. This perceived issue, which can in part be designed out, has not proven to be a deterrent in other historic cities such as York, Durham and Lincoln where to the contrary the change in levels, albeit much more significant than those experienced in Carlisle, add a level of interest and reinforce distinctiveness.							
Proposed Change	No change considered necessary.							

Question No	CharacterArea	Agree ?	TopicArea	RepNo	RefNo	Consultee	Organisation	AgentRefN
Q3	Area North of Lowther Street including Rickergate	<input type="checkbox"/>		2255	Objection	058	Mrs Joanne Swanton	JoMark House of Hair
Comment	It would not hurt to leave all the residents out of the plans. North Warwick Street and South Corporation Road could be transformed without taking out the unique housing. Carlisle is struggling to fill retail buildings in main square i.e. Hoopers for one. The lanes is also not fully rented out, neither is Botchergate which still has room for improvement - Moods etc. To take out existing housing and building more 150m is MAD and a waste of tax payers money!							
Response:	Existing vacancies are considered to be below the national average with a number of long standing vacant units such as those at the Crown and Mitre having recently reverted back into active use. Feedback from agents within the City also supports that there is relatively strong demand for vacant units within the core of the City Centre, with relatively quick turnaround achieved. Notwithstanding this the City Council are committed to working with stakeholders to reduce the number of vacancies within the City Centre and will be proactive in using the powers available to them to assist in this objective. A good recent example of this is that the City Council agreed in January 2015 to update their Discretionary Rate Relief Policy in order to offer re-occupation relief for retail units which have been vacant for 12 months or more. The implementation of this national initiative at the local level sees such units qualify for a 50% reduction in their business rates (National Non Domestic Rates) for 18 months from the date the premises becomes occupied - and is likely to constitute a strong incentive in bringing empty units back into use.							
Proposed Change	Only those buildings which are essential to delivery of a firm proposal would be considered for demolition in the future. No change considered necessary.							
	Area North of Lowther Street including Rickergate	<input type="checkbox"/>		2122	Objection	046	Miss Gillian Smith	
Comment	No							
Response:	Comment noted. In the absence of elaborating as to the reasons why the Council can not, on this occasion, comment further.							
Proposed Change	No change considered necessary.							
	Area North of Lowther Street including Rickergate	<input type="checkbox"/>		2089	Objection	027	Elizabeth Allnutt	
Comment	No. There are more appropriate sites elsewhere in the city – Caldew Riverside, Citadel and Lowther St/Portland Square. The Rickergate community should be recognised and supported as a valuable asset to the city centre. The City Council and Magistrate’s services should be located right in the centre of town where they are convenient for everyone. The history, heritage and buildings of the city should be left intact. The Conservation Area should not be ignored. There is considerable risk from flooding.							
Response:	The other sites referred to do not have the capacity to accommodate growth, including within the required timeframes, with most also sequentially less preferable in retail planning terms being detached from the primary shopping area. In this regard it is material to note that plans and proposals progressed by the City Council and others must accord with national guidance which requires other sites to be prioritised as far as comparison retailing is concerned. Owing to its location on the edge of the City Centre and current primary shopping area, Rickergate is an area which needs to be explored and which is considered to present a reasonable option to accommodate future retail and leisure growth. There is no reason to suggest that existing homes and businesses could not happily co-exist as they do at present, with the interface between existing users an important point which would be considered if and when detailed proposals were progressed. The purpose of the conservation area is not to preclude development but instead to ensure character is maintained and enhanced and redevelopment could actually present an opportunity to enhance and strengthen its character. The purpose of the City Centre Development Framework is to inform the Local Plan against which development proposals would have to be assessed against. The Local Plan already contains policies which deal with flood risk and the need to consider a breach scenario would be dealt with through the process of a Flood Risk Assessment required to accompany any proposal. The report will however be updated to acknowledge this approach.							
Proposed Change	Update the report to acknowledge the approach to assessing flood risk, including the testing of a flood defence breach scenario as part of the Flood Risk Assessment process.							

Question No	CharacterArea	Agree ?	TopicArea	RepNo	RefNo	Consultee	Organisation	AgentRefN
Q3	Area North of Lowther Street including Rickergate	<input type="checkbox"/>		2077	Objection	044	Richard Hawkins	
Comment	<p>If we are to accept the consultants recommendation that Carlisle City Centre requires so much more non-food retail space by the year 2030, which is dubious based on the current number of empty units, then the question is where. Having visited the exhibition in the Civic Centre my views are as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. As I recall, there has been proposals to site a new transport hub at or near the Pools. If this is still true, then siting a new retail development at the opposite end of the City Centre is surely nonsense. It would be a long, mainly uphill, slog for shoppers to carry what they purchased in the new shops in Rickergate all the way to the transport hub. 2. Carlisle is renowned for, amongst other qualities, have a compact retail area centred around the market cross/old town hall. Here we see markets, fairs, busker, outside cafes and numerous other attractions. It is clearly a gem to have this at the centre of our retail area and must not under any circumstances be compromised. Building a major retail development in Rickergate will extend the retail area disproportionately north and together with the planned arts and eateries, will probably detract from the City's natural centre. 3. Demolishing the Civic Centre in Rickergate and rehousing the City Council Staff will cost the taxpayer a fortune. Carlisle City Council offices must remain in the City and not be relocated to Kingmoor or some other out-of-town location. There have been reports in the local press that the Council could occupy existing empty, or soon to be vacated, office space in Carlisle. However, Cumbria County Council is building a new headquarters behind Botchergate because they have found that current use of old, individual buildings in Carlisle is expensive and inefficient. Are we to have a City Council in inefficient and costly premises or will they demolish yet another car park to build a new Civic Centre? Either way, for the sake of the tax payers Carlisle City Council should remain in the current Civic Centre. <p>From my above views it should be evident that to site the new retail development in Rickergate is wrong. If we must have a new retail development consideration should be given to the Lowther Street/Bus Station/Iceland car park are which is in much need of a revival and would not attract the negatives associated with Rickergate.</p>							
Response:	<p>Even if firm proposals for a new transport hub near the rear of the Railway Station emerge this would not preclude services serving the remainder of the City Centre in the manner that they do presently.</p> <p>There is a need to respond to identified needs and the City Centre Development Framework has sought to explore where these could be accommodated by logically extending and therefore relating well to the existing core. The Local Plan will seek to build on key aspects of the City Centre Development Framework to ensure that an appropriate balance between key areas and opportunities prevails, through putting into effect an appropriate policy framework which places protecting the vitality and viability of the City Centre at its heart.</p> <p>Only those buildings which are essential to delivery of a firm proposal would be considered for demolition in the future. Options for the relocation of City Council staff would be considered at a future point in time if and when a firm need to do so arises. There is no suggestion however within the Framework that City Council staff or services would be moved out with the City Centre. Regarding costs, relocations costs (associated with the Civic Centre) and other costs such as demolition, if these were to be encountered, would be accounted for as a 'development cost' associated with pursuing a given proposal, and factored into the viability assessment of any scheme.</p> <p>Comments noted regarding aspects of Lowther Street. Whilst the development framework does not preclude redevelopment here, it highlights some of the barriers to extending in this direction which proposals and wider initiatives should seek to address. It must be recognised however that there are currently a number of uncertainties regarding the availability and ability to accommodate major retail development across the areas referred to and as such they are not currently considered to present a realistic option which can be wholly relied upon. Notwithstanding this the Council remain committed to enhancing and better integrating this important area with others in the City Centre.</p>							
Proposed Change	<p>No change considered necessary.</p>							

Question No	CharacterArea	Agree ?	TopicArea	RepNo	RefNo	Consultee	Organisation	AgentRefN
Q3	Area North of Lowther Street including Rickergate	<input type="checkbox"/>		2267	Objection	059	Miss Carole Hoggan	
Comment	Too many empty shops all over Carlisle. This would not be helped by a new retail development. We do not need any more food places.							
Response:	Evidence in the form of the Carlisle Retail Study supports that there is a need for additional retail units within the City Centre particularly from a qualitative perspective in terms of providing the size, form and configuration of units which accord with retailers' current high street needs. This evidence is considered to remain robust with a number of those in the retail industry, within the City and beyond, recently reaffirming its conclusions. Such new units, including complementary leisure uses which could include restaurants, will be a key element of any strategy going forward to retain a number of existing retailers as well as too attract new retailers to Carlisle, and ultimately to maintain the vitality and viability of the City Centre and its overall offer.							
Proposed Change	Existing vacancies are considered to be below the national average with a number of long standing vacant units such as those at the Crown and Mitre having recently reverted back into active use. Feedback from agents within the City also supports that there is relatively strong demand for vacant units within the core of the City Centre, with relatively quick turnaround achieved. Notwithstanding this the City Council are committed to working with stakeholders to reduce the number of vacancies within the City Centre and will be proactive in using the powers available to them to assist in this objective. A good recent example of this is that the City Council agreed in January 2015 to update their Discretionary Rate Relief Policy in order to offer re-occupation relief for retail units which have been vacant for 12 months or more. The implementation of this national initiative at the local level sees such units qualify for a 50% reduction in their business rates (National Non Domestic Rates) for 18 months from the date the premises becomes occupied - and is likely to constitute a strong incentive in bringing empty units back into use.							
Proposed Change	No change considered necessary.							
	Area North of Lowther Street including Rickergate	<input type="checkbox"/>		2135	Objection	047	Mrs Margaret Backhouse	
Comment	No							
Response:	Comment noted. In the absence of elaborating as to the reasons why the Council can not, on this occasion, comment further.							
Proposed Change	No change considered necessary.							
	Area North of Lowther Street including Rickergate	<input type="checkbox"/>		2108	Objection	005	Mrs B A Robinson	
Comment	The houses on Warwick Street should be left. They fit in well with the area. There are so many empty shops in the city centre - WHY build more in Rickergate? The plans for the shopping area show development that - looks like a filling station, not in keeping with a historic town at all.							
Response:	Evidence in the form of the Carlisle Retail Study supports that there is a need for additional retail units within the City Centre particularly from a qualitative perspective in terms of providing the size, form and configuration of units which accord with retailers' current high street needs. This evidence is considered to remain robust with a number of those in the retail industry, within the City and beyond, recently reaffirming its conclusions. Such new units will be a key element of any strategy going forward to retain a number of existing retailers as well as too attract new retailers to Carlisle, and ultimately to maintain the vitality and viability of the City Centre and its overall offer.							
Proposed Change	Existing vacancies are considered to be below the national average with a number of long standing vacant units such as those at the Crown and Mitre having recently reverted back into active use. Feedback from agents within the City also supports that there is relatively strong demand for vacant units within the core of the City Centre, with relatively quick turnaround achieved. Notwithstanding this the City Council are committed to working with stakeholders to reduce the number of vacancies within the City Centre and will be proactive in using the powers available to them to assist in this objective. A good recent example of this is that the City Council agreed in January 2015 to update their Discretionary Rate Relief Policy in order to offer re-occupation relief for retail units which have been vacant for 12 months or more. The implementation of this national initiative at the local level sees such units qualify for a 50% reduction in their business rates (National Non Domestic Rates) for 18 months from the date the premises becomes occupied - and is likely to constitute a strong incentive in bringing empty units back into use.							
Proposed Change	The plans included in the draft report are purely indicative to help the public understand how development could look.							
Proposed Change	No change considered necessary.							

Question No	CharacterArea	Agree ?	TopicArea	RepNo	RefNo	Consultee	Organisation	AgentRefN
Q3	Area North of Lowther Street including Rickergate	<input type="checkbox"/>		2436	Comment	073	Phil Gray	Green Spaces
Comment	Not qualified to comment, but in previous studies there has been a lot of emphasis on Botchergate, which still needs a deal of regeneration [although I guess the County office proposal will help].							
Response:	Comments noted. The City Centre Development Framework acknowledges Botchergate as an important area of the City Centre.							
Proposed Change	No change considered necessary.							
<hr/>								
	Area North of Lowther Street including Rickergate	<input type="checkbox"/>		2240	Objection	055	Mrs Helen Blamire	
Comment	Do not force people from their homes just to build shops and restaurants. Even big name brands are closing in town centre and many more empty shops in city centre so why build more. At meetings, city council has mentioned Primark as the anchor store - is this really the tone the council wants to set? Carlisle will just become a city of cheap, nasty shops and charity shops! And why build more restaurants - there's an abundance of eateries and bars in this town and you want to put 3 more in Hoopers. If you want to build something, build a decent venue for rock and pop bands.							
Response:	Only those buildings which are essential to delivery of a firm proposal would be considered for demolition in the future.							
	Evidence in the form of the Carlisle Retail Study supports that there is a need for additional retail units within the City Centre particularly from a qualitative perspective in terms of providing the size, form and configuration of units which accord with retailers' current high street needs. Whilst noting that there are a number of vacant units within the City Centre these do not currently, nor is there considered any scope for these in the future to, meet this full range of future needs. This evidence is considered to remain robust with a number of those in the retail industry, within the City and beyond, recently reaffirming its conclusions. Such new units, including complementary leisure uses which could include restaurants, will be a key element of any strategy going forward to retain a number of existing retailers as well as too attract new retailers to Carlisle, and ultimately to maintain the vitality and viability of the City Centre and its overall offer.							
	No specific end users have at this stage been identified. Those named in the report are done so merely as an example to illustrate the retail sectors which are considered to be underrepresented within Carlisle City Centre at the present time.							
	He new Arts Centre on Warwick Street in the Old Fire Station is considered to constitute a flexible exhibition and entertainment space/venue that they will add significantly to the leisure offer within the City Centre.							
Proposed Change	No change considered necessary.							
<hr/>								
	Area North of Lowther Street including Rickergate	<input type="checkbox"/>		2064	Objection	042	Mrs Dallas Brewis	Cycle Carlisle
Comment	I think it would ruin the Northern approach to the city.							
Response:	Comments noted. Any proposal would have to afford careful consideration to its prominence in terms of the northern approach to the City Centre and this is acknowledged within the Framework.							
Proposed Change	No change considered necessary.							

Question No	CharacterArea	Agree ?	TopicArea	RepNo	RefNo	Consultee	Organisation	AgentRefN
Q3	Area North of Lowther Street including Rickergate	<input type="checkbox"/>		2281	Objection	o60	Barry O Earp	
Comment	No need for new shops at the current time and with on line shopping possibly no need in the future. Plenty of empty retail units 2014/15. Possible large retail store to locate North West Lowther Street [theatre site plus adjacent properties]							
Response:	Evidence in the form of the Carlisle Retail Study supports that there is a need for additional retail units within the City Centre particularly from a qualitative perspective in terms of providing the size, form and configuration of units which accord with retailers' current high street needs. This evidence is considered to remain robust with a number of those in the retail industry, within the City and beyond, recently reaffirming its conclusions. Such new units will be a key element of any strategy going forward to retain a number of existing retailers as well as too attract new retailers to Carlisle, and ultimately to maintain the vitality and viability of the City Centre and its overall offer.							
Proposed Change	Existing vacancies are considered to be below the national average with a number of long standing vacant units such as those at the Crown and Mitre having recently reverted back into active use. Feedback from agents within the City also supports that there is relatively strong demand for vacant units within the core of the City Centre, with relatively quick turnaround achieved. Notwithstanding this the City Council are committed to working with stakeholders to reduce the number of vacancies within the City Centre and will be proactive in using the powers available to them to assist in this objective. A good recent example of this is that the City Council agreed in January 2015 to update their Discretionary Rate Relief Policy in order to offer re-occupation relief for retail units which have been vacant for 12 months or more. The implementation of this national initiative at the local level sees such units qualify for a 50% reduction in their business rates (National Non Domestic Rates) for 18 months from the date the premises becomes occupied - and is likely to constitute a strong incentive in bringing empty units back into use.							
Proposed Change	No change considered necessary.							
	Area North of Lowther Street including Rickergate	<input type="checkbox"/>		2084	Objection	045	Ms Kate Carvana	
Comment	It's liable to flood. There are lots of homes and small businesses here which are valuable to the City Centre life and need support and freedom from threat.							
Response:	The purpose of the City Centre Development Framework is to inform the Local Plan against which development proposals would have to be assessed against. The Local Plan already contains policies which deal with flood risk and the need to consider a breach scenario would be dealt with through the process of a Flood Risk Assessment required to accompany any proposal. The report will however be updated to acknowledge this approach.							
Proposed Change	Owing to its location on the edge of the City Centre and current primary shopping area, Rickergate is an area which needs to be explored and which is considered to present a reasonable option to accommodate future retail and leisure growth. There is no reason to suggest that existing homes and businesses could not happily co-exist as they do at present, with the interface between existing users an important point which would be considered if and when detailed proposals were progressed.							
Proposed Change	Update the report to acknowledge the approach to assessing flood risk, including the testing of a flood defence breach scenario as part of the Flood Risk Assessment process.							
	Area North of Lowther Street including Rickergate	<input type="checkbox"/>		2027	Comment	034	Mr Eddie Haughan	
Comment	Like many Carlisle residents I am concerned about the proposal to create new retail units in Rickergate when there are so many empty units already in the city centre. These units cost money to build and there is little evidence to suggest they would provide long term income from rents.							
Response:	Evidence in the form of the Carlisle Retail Study supports that there is a need for additional retail units within the City Centre particularly from a qualitative perspective in terms of providing the size, form and configuration of units which accord with retailers' current high street needs. This evidence is considered to remain robust with a number of those in the retail industry, within the City and beyond, recently reaffirming its conclusions. Such new units will be a key element of any strategy going forward to retain a number of existing retailers as well as too attract new retailers to Carlisle, and ultimately to maintain the vitality and viability of the City Centre and its overall offer.							
Proposed Change	Existing vacancies are considered to be below the national average with a number of long standing vacant units such as those at the Crown and Mitre having recently reverted back into active use. Feedback from agents within the City also supports that there is relatively strong demand for vacant units within the core of the City Centre, with relatively quick turnaround achieved. Notwithstanding this the City Council are committed to working with stakeholders to reduce the number of vacancies within the City Centre and will be proactive in using the powers available to them to assist in this objective. A good recent example of this is that the City Council agreed in January 2015 to update their Discretionary Rate Relief Policy in order to offer re-occupation relief for retail units which have been vacant for 12 months or more. The implementation of this national initiative at the local level sees such units qualify for a 50% reduction in their business rates (National Non Domestic Rates) for 18 months from the date the premises becomes occupied - and is likely to constitute a strong incentive in bringing empty units back into use.							
Proposed Change	It would be for the private sector to determine how attractive an investment proposition any development proposal was in considering whether to progress it.							
Proposed Change	No change considered necessary.							

Question No	CharacterArea	Agree ?	TopicArea	RepNo	RefNo	Consultee	Organisation	AgentRefN
Q3	Area North of Lowther Street including Rickergate	<input type="checkbox"/>		2145	Objection	048	Mrs C E Simpson	
Comment	No							
Response:	Comment noted. In the absence of elaborating as to the reasons why the Council can not, on this occasion, comment further.							
Proposed Change	No change considered necessary.							
<hr/>								
	Area North of Lowther Street including Rickergate	<input type="checkbox"/>		2227	Objection	054	Mr Christopher Wheeler	
Comment	A major development in Rickergate will draw footfall away from the PSA [especially given the change of levels], and even more so from Botchergate, which will become even more of an unsightly backwater. Improvement of the station/Citadel area [and Botchergate] is a much higher priority.							
Response:	The Framework seeks to put in place a positive framework to enhance a number of key character areas throughout the City Centre. From a retail planning perspective however it is important to note that opportunities for major retail development and the ability to respond to evidenced needs particularly within the plan period in other areas such as Botchergate and the Citadel are limited. Some of these other areas are also sequentially less preferable in retail planning terms being detached from the primary shopping area. In this regard it is material to note that plans and proposals progressed by the City Council and others must accord with national guidance.							
	The Local Plan, which the CCDF will in part inform, contains a wide suite of policies which seeks to promote the City Centre for a wide range of appropriate uses in order to preserve and where possible diversify its offer and enhance its overall vitality and viability. Other areas of the City Centre will therefore be strongly promoted where opportunities exist in a bid to ensure that a balanced approach to the growth and regeneration of the City Centre prevails.							
	Whilst noting comments regarding the change in levels between the core of the City Centre and Rickergate, these are not considered to constitute a significant constraint and in part reflect the historic nature of the City Centre. This perceived issue, which can in part be designed out, has not proven to be a deterrent in other historic cities such as York, Durham and Lincoln where to the contrary the change in levels, albeit much more significant than those experienced in Carlisle, add a level of interest and reinforce distinctiveness.							
Proposed Change	No change considered necessary.							
<hr/>								
	Area North of Lowther Street including Rickergate	<input type="checkbox"/>		2293	Objection	061	Mr David Hamilton	
Comment	Object Unless - popular names such as John Lewis were to show a commitment and if LOCAL business were encouraged to fill the vacant shops, with incentives such as lower rentals.							
Response:	Comments noted. The City Council are committed to working with stakeholders to reduce the number of vacancies within the City Centre and will be proactive in using the powers available to them to assist in this objective. A good recent example of this is that the City Council agreed in January 2015 to update their Discretionary Rate Relief Policy in order to offer re-occupation relief for retail units which have been vacant for 12 months or more. The implementation of this national initiative at the local level sees such units qualify for a 50% reduction in their business rates (National Non Domestic Rates) for 18 months from the date the premises becomes occupied - and is likely to constitute a strong incentive in bringing empty units back into use.							
Proposed Change	No change considered necessary.							

Question No	CharacterArea	Agree ?	TopicArea	RepNo	RefNo	Consultee	Organisation	AgentRefN
Q3	Area North of Lowther Street including Rickergate	<input type="checkbox"/>		2183	Objection	051	Miss Susan Mark	
Comment	The number of shops vacant, becoming vacant and have been vacant for A LONG TIME, will only increase. People are shopping on the internet and the numbers will only increase. Somebody should be working hard to fill many large shops with businesses and we definitely are not short of cafes and restaurants.							
Response:	Existing vacancies are considered to be below the national average with a number of long standing vacant units such as those at the Crown and Mitre having recently reverted back into active use. Feedback from agents within the City also supports that there is relatively strong demand for vacant units within the core of the City Centre, with relatively quick turnaround achieved. Notwithstanding this the City Council are committed to working with stakeholders to reduce the number of vacancies within the City Centre and will be proactive in using the powers available to them to assist in this objective. A good recent example of this is that the City Council agreed in January 2015 to update their Discretionary Rate Relief Policy in order to offer re-occupation relief for retail units which have been vacant for 12 months or more. The implementation of this national initiative at the local level sees such units qualify for a 50% reduction in their business rates (National Non Domestic Rates) for 18 months from the date the premises becomes occupied - and is likely to constitute a strong incentive in bringing empty units back into use.							
Proposed Change	No change considered necessary.							
	Area North of Lowther Street including Rickergate	<input type="checkbox"/>		2455	Objection	074	Mrs Jean Hall	A003
Comment	No							
Response:	Comment noted. In the absence of elaborating as to the reasons why the Council can not, on this occasion, comment further.							
Proposed Change	No change considered necessary.							
	Area North of Lowther Street including Rickergate	<input type="checkbox"/>		2304	Objection	062	Mr Hans J A Landstrom	
Comment								
Response:	Comment noted. In the absence of elaborating as to the reasons why the Council can not, on this occasion, comment further.							
Proposed Change	No change considered necessary.							

Question No	CharacterArea	Agree ?	TopicArea	RepNo	RefNo	Consultee	Organisation	AgentRefN
-------------	---------------	---------	-----------	-------	-------	-----------	--------------	-----------

Q3	Area North of Lowther Street including Rickergate	<input type="checkbox"/>		2171	Objection	026	Elizabeth Allnutt	Save Our Streets
-----------	--	--------------------------	--	------	-----------	-----	-------------------	------------------

Comment No. There are more appropriate sites elsewhere in the city – Caldew Riverside, Citadel and Lowther St/Portland Square. The disruption to residents and the local community, the severe disruption to public services and the loss of history and heritage is too great in Rickergate.

1. Disruption to local residents

The demolition of Warwick Street will destroy eight good family homes and one business premises restored to a high quality after the floods of 2005 and enhanced with further improvements since. There is fierce resistance to the proposed demolition of houses from the residents in Warwick St. There is still a strong connection with the Fire Service; the houses were originally built for employees of the Fire Service.

Warwick St resident's lives have been continually disrupted with the floods of 2005 and the threats of Carlisle Renaissance and recently renewed worry that demolition may be threatened again. This is making their lives difficult, particularly those who are older and/or in poor health.

Warwick Street residents also make a valuable contribution to the wider Rickergate community. They would be sadly missed and the wider community would be diminished. This strong community on the edge of the city centre is a valuable asset to city centre life, particularly after 5pm, and should be valued and supported, not diminished for commercial expediency.

The new shopping development would also have an effect on the small businesses in Rickergate. Parking, footfall, proposed road closures and disruption during construction would all effect business. Have these issues been considered and looked at properly? The Council should be helping small and medium business enterprises not making obstacles for them.

2. Disruption to public services

If the scheme were to be implemented the City Council, as well as the County Council and Police services currently located in the Civic Centre, and the Magistrate's Service would need to move elsewhere. At present their location in the city centre is convenient for everyone – those accessing the services and those working there. The location also contributes to the economy and life of the city centre and emphasises that the city centre is not just about shopping and has a life beyond retail.

The scheme has made no provision for and makes no indication where these important public services would be located if the area were to be given over to a large retail scheme. Relocation would be costly and inconvenient – have these costs been factored in? No other location for these services would be as convenient for the public as they are at present with easy access from bus services and parking at hand. There is also a strong case to be made for Rickergate as a "Civic Quarter". (The consultant's style of nomenclature is better avoided but will serve in this instance as an easy explanation.) The City Council, Police and County Council services in the Civic Centre are also supported by the DEFRA offices and the Probation Service close by in Lowther Street. This would seem to have been ignored.

3. Conservation Area - loss of historic buildings and the city's heritage

Rickergate is home to many buildings of historical and architectural interest and this is recognised by the Conservation Area status which applies to all of the neighbourhood. The complex of the Fire Station/Police Station and Magistrates Court and houses in Warwick St were designed and built by the local Dalton/Laing partnership which was responsible for much of the public building in Carlisle. They are excellent examples of this work and pleasing in their own right as well as being of significant interest and importance locally. The view west up Warwick St from Rickergate with both sides of the street framing the castle is particularly good. This complex of buildings should be kept as a whole; all the buildings together are worth much more than the sum of their parts and need to be considered as a group. Reducing this group by the destruction of the houses in Warwick St is not acceptable in a Conservation Area.

The Civic Centre is a similar case where the council chamber and the suite of offices on two stories complement and make sense of the main tower. Again the complex as a whole is greater than the sum of the parts and it is not acceptable to take it apart piecemeal when it is in a Conservation Area. Love it or loathe it, the building is now 50 years old, a good example of 60's architecture and very much a part of the Carlisle sky line and psyche. There is no need to demolish it.

The proposed development also makes no reference to the architecture of Corporation Rd and Peter Street. The terraces are pleasing to look at, well-built and of historic value to the city, contributing to visitor and tourist attraction by making a pleasant approach from parking areas to the city centre or Bitts Park. The streets would be dwarfed by an inappropriate development adjacent to them.

Response: Whilst noting preferences for major retail development to be focussed on alternative sites, the other sites referred to do not have the capacity to accommodate growth, including within the required timeframes, with some aspects of them also sequentially less preferable in retail planning terms being detached from the primary shopping area. In this regard it is material to note that plans and proposals progressed by the City Council and others must accord with national guidance which requires other sites to be prioritised as far as comparison retailing is concerned.

The value and importance of the Rickergate Community, alongside the many other communities across the City Centre and indeed District, is acknowledged and not questioned. Owing to its location on the edge of the City Centre and current primary shopping area however, Rickergate is an area which needs to be explored and which is considered to present a reasonable option to accommodate future retail and leisure growth. There is no reason to suggest that existing homes and businesses could not happily co-exist as they do at present, with the interface between existing users an important point which would be considered if and when detailed proposals were progressed. In this regard it is important to note that only those buildings which are essential to delivery of a firm proposal would be considered for demolition in the future.

Paragraphs 13.2 and 13.3 already explicitly acknowledge the strong public sector presence in this area. All of the operations referred to are however continuing to contract with government departments continually under pressure to rationalise their premises and property portfolios. Options for the relocation of City Council staff would be considered at a future point in time if and when a firm need to do so arises. There is no suggestion however within the Framework that City Council staff or services would be moved out with the City Centre, or necessarily out with the area.

Comments regarding the heritage of the area are noted and would be a material consideration in the determination of any planning application for firm proposals. The conservation area status of the Rickergate area is similarly acknowledged and the report will be amended to be more explicit in this regard. The purpose of a conservation area is not however to preclude development but instead to ensure character is maintained and enhanced. In this regards redevelopment could, if properly designed and responsive to its setting, present an opportunity to enhance and strengthen the character of the conservation area.

Proposed Change Acknowledge within Section 13 that much of this area is within the designated City Centre Conservation Area.

Question No	CharacterArea	Agree ?	TopicArea	RepNo	RefNo	Consultee	Organisation	AgentRefN
Document	Area North of Lowther Street including Rickergate	<input type="checkbox"/>	Character Area Analysis & Option Development	2490	Comment	o83	Michael Barry	Cumbria County Council
Comment	<p>It is noted that this site is proposed to be a focus for new retail development in Carlisle. There is considered to be a risk that locating such a large quantum of retail floorspace on a single site could be prejudicial to the overall balance of commercial development across the City Centre. We have concerns that the focus for new commercial activity is increasingly to the north of the City, and it is important that further development here is not detrimental to the economic well-being of locations elsewhere in the City Centre, in particular the southern end and Botchergate.</p> <p>To address this issue, it is considered that the scale of new development in the City should be reflective of an up to date retail assessment and the role and timing of any development at Rickergate be complementary to the operation of the City Centre and the delivery/reuse of other key development sites across it. In addition to this, it is recommended that through the Development Framework, consideration is given to what alternative sites may accommodate a proportion of the requirement for new town centre development.</p> <p>The County Council considers that there are other sites that could incorporate an element of the City Centre's retail requirement in the short term, potentially reducing the scale of development at the Rickergate site. These could include land at Courts/English Street as part of a wider redevelopment and the existing allocation at Lowther Street.</p> <p>We have concerns regarding the transport implications of the level of development proposed at the Rickergate site. At this stage, it is difficult to quantify what the impact the proposals are likely to be. However initial highways and transport modelling work undertaken in April 2014 indicated that junctions in this area will be operating close to capacity without any further development in the City Centre. The proposed development will have to be tested as part of the modelling work that is scheduled to support the Local Plan.</p> <p>It is expected that the highways and transport improvement needed to support the Local Plan will be subsequently set out with the Infrastructure Delivery Plan. Cumbria County Council will assist with the preparation of the Infrastructure Delivery Plan and we welcome the recognition of this principle within the City Centre Development Framework. It is through this process that consideration can be given to the feasibility of the suggestion to access this site from Georgian Way and to pedestrianise Rickergate. In advance of such work, it is important to make it clear that these are only options, and not necessarily the preferred or deliverable solution.</p>							
Response:	<p>The Local Plan will seek to build on key aspects of the City Centre Development Framework to ensure that an appropriate balance between key areas and opportunities prevails, through putting into effect an appropriate policy framework which places protecting the vitality and viability of the City Centre at its heart. The Framework identifies that not all of the required floorspace would be met through development in the Rickergate locality therefore allowing for flexibility and other areas to accommodate some development. The framework does not nor will policy preclude such development in other appropriate locations within the City Centre. The allocation of specific quantum's to specific areas is however considered too prescriptive an approach with a more flexible approach governed by broad principles, and the identification of a preferred broad location, deemed to be a more flexible response better able to respond to circumstances across the plan period.</p> <p>The evidence in the form of the Carlisle Retail Study which supports that there is a need for additional retail floorspace within the City Centre is considered to remain robust with a number of those in the retail industry, within the City and beyond, recently reaffirming its conclusions. Soft market testing has also been undertaken to support the City Centre Development Framework. Consequently it is not considered that there is a need to update this evidence at this time.</p> <p>Transport modelling to support implementation of the Local Plan remains ongoing and consultants have recently been appointed jointly by the City and County Councils to undertake an assessment of necessary interventions and improvements. This study will be published shortly and will inform the Infrastructure Delivery Plan which will act to prioritise the investment in infrastructure needed to support growth in its widest sense. The continued offer of assistance from the County Council with regards to developing the Infrastructure Delivery Plan is very much welcomed.</p>							
Proposed Change	No change considered necessary.							
	Area North of Lowther Street including Rickergate	<input type="checkbox"/>	Character Area Analysis & Option Development	2472	Comment	010	Emily Hrycan	English Heritage North
Comment	<p>This area clearly represents a major opportunity to extend the existing primary shopping area northwards. However, the urban design, townscape and setting implications need to be carefully considered. Both options put forward in paragraphs 13.10-13.16 and in greater detail in Part 3 ('Preferred Option and Way Forward') show a large service yard for the anchor store against the main road. The concern here would be the need to avoid presenting a rear or service elevation to a major gateway into the City Centre. The design of the streetscape between Debenhams and the multi-storey car park, and the potential impact of traffic volumes on West Tower Street also need to be considered, in terms of the effect they may have in reducing connectivity between the existing pedestrianised area and the new development. There may also be some archaeological implications of development in this area; early assessment of these implications would be advisable.</p>							
Response:	Comments noted. All of the points raised are considered valid and it is acknowledged that these would have to be addressed as firm proposals were developed and brought forward.							
Proposed Change	No change considered necessary.							

Question No	CharacterArea	Agree ?	TopicArea	RepNo	RefNo	Consultee	Organisation	AgentRefN
General	Area North of Lowther Street including Rickergate	<input type="checkbox"/>	High Potential	2418	Comment	071	Mrs Joan Field	
Comment	<p>Re Station - some of the proposals are vague e.g. 'limited physical intervention of Station Square'. - Meaning?</p> <p>The station is a very big problem. If one wishes to set down/see off a relative/friend or indeed meet someone off a train it is [at times] IMPOSSIBLE TO PARK. All of these problems only started when a concrete ticket barrier was installed in the station car park.</p> <p>One can park for 30 mins in station car park but if over 30 mins one has to pay £4 [weekends] or £8 weekdays. It might be possible to provide a few more spaces to park in the square by using obsolete public convenience area. It is not easy to find solutions to this problem.</p>							
Response:	<p>It is agreed that the term regarding 'limited physical intervention of Station Square' could be better explained and the report will be amended in this regard accordingly. The report already acknowledges the need for improved access to (and car parking) in the vicinity of the railway station.</p>							
Proposed Change	<p>Amend the report to better explain what is meant by 'limited physical intervention of Station Square'.</p>							
	Area North of Lowther Street including Rickergate	<input type="checkbox"/>	High Potential	2258	Objection	058	Mrs Joanne Swanton	JoMark House of Hair
Comment	<p>Rickergate Options A & B - Plots 1,5,8,9 The plots are residential and my business at present [JoMark House of Hair 9 Warwick St - 10 yrs lease] proposed plot 1! I find it crazy to build new residential homes from existing residential planned to be demolished. I have lost 2 members of staff due to rumours that I'm closing down soon and I cannot guarantee any long term employment. My salon is hectically busy, perfect location and in no danger of going bust! I make a good turnover and have accounts to prove it.</p> <p>I object to the plots being sited on Warwick St area. Reason city could save money and leave people happy. Easy change sites plots to be on proposed residential site, corporation Road you are only upsetting a wall there. Done to be different, leave an island of history and a wonder for visitors. No 9 side garden could be developed and a car park West Tower Street [small retail Arts & Crafts or small sidewalk cafe].</p> <p>I think it is important to show that people lived in the centre close to the Market Hall and that is just wasn't just surrounded by pavement and stone and glass! Show Carlisle doesn't stop when the shops close and still here to be seen by visitors to enjoy and wander about. Carlisle is unique with its park and wet land through its City Centre and a history that goes back but don't wipe out completely what is more recent history forever. It is nice to have reminders to be seen by visitors as well as Carlisle people. Variety is the flavour of the people, don't make it look all the same they will stay away with uninteresting concrete you can see anywhere.</p>							
Response:	<p>Only those buildings which are essential to delivery of a firm proposal would be considered for demolition in the future. Whilst the City Council can empathise with the issues described regarding business planning, it is considered important to note that no firm plans are being progressed at the current time nor are any imminent. A development of the size and scale envisaged would require a significant lead in time (a number of years as opposed to months) and key decisions would be well publicised. This would afford a good degree of notice in terms of continuity and business planning.</p> <p>New development would be required to respond adequately to the local context and also to positively incorporate and interpret historic features of value. The emerging Local Plan recognises the importance of diversifying the offer of the City Centre if it is to prosper going forward and seeks to put in a place a positive policy framework to help achieve this objective. The City Centre Development Framework has helped to inform this policy development with the identification of development opportunities to accommodate new retail floorspace a key element of the strategy for the City Centre that the Local Plan seeks to take forward.</p>							
Proposed Change	<p>No change considered necessary.</p>							

Question No	CharacterArea	Agree ?	TopicArea	RepNo	RefNo	Consultee	Organisation	AgentRefN
Q3	Area North of Lowther Street including Rickergate	<input type="checkbox"/>	High Potential	2101	Objection	011	Mrs Julie Templeton	Member of Save our Stree
Comment	<p>No. There are far more suitable sites within the city. Sites such as Caldew Riverside, Lowther St/Portland Square and the Citadel. Rickergate is a thriving community made up of residents and small business owners. There is a lot of history and heritage in the area which should be protected. The residents of Warwick Street are part of the Rickergate community and the houses are part of the Laing/Dalton complex of Fire Station/Police Station and Magistrates Court buildings. This community fought back from the floods in 2005, fought against demolition plans of Carlisle Renaissance and are part of a strong community who add to the vitality of the city centre. Rickergate is in a Conservation area, the Warwick Street houses should be protected as they also form part of the history of this area. The Civic Centre is also part of the history of the area and office space could be made available to other businesses or charities. To say nothing of the cost of demolishing it.</p>							
Response:	<p>The value and importance of the Rickergate Community, alongside the many other communities across the City Centre and indeed District, is acknowledged and not questioned. Owing to its location on the edge of the City Centre and current primary shopping area however, Rickergate is an area which needs to be explored and which is considered to present a reasonable option to accommodate future retail and leisure growth. There is no reason to suggest that existing homes and businesses could not happily co-exist as they do at present, with the interface between existing users an important point which would be considered if and when detailed proposals were progressed. In this regard it is important to note that only those buildings which are essential to delivery of a firm proposal would be considered for demolition in the future.</p> <p>Whilst noting preferences for major retail development to be focussed on alternative sites, the other sites referred to do not have the capacity to accommodate growth, including within the required timeframes, with some aspects of them also sequentially less preferable in retail planning terms being detached from the primary shopping area. In this regard it is material to note that plans and proposals progressed by the City Council and others must accord with national guidance which requires other sites to be prioritised as far as comparison retailing is concerned.</p> <p>The conservation area status of the Rickergate area is acknowledged and the report will be amended to be more explicit in this regard. The purpose of a conservation area is not however to preclude development but instead to ensure character is maintained and enhanced. In this regards redevelopment could, if properly designed and responsive to its setting, present an opportunity to enhance and strengthen the character of the conservation area.</p> <p>Any demolition and indeed relocations costs (associated with the Civic Centre), if these were to be encountered, would be accounted for as a 'development cost' associated with pursuing a given proposal, and factored into the viability assessment of any scheme.</p>							
Proposed Change	<p>Acknowledge within Section 13 that much of this area is within the designated City Centre Conservation Area.</p>							

Question No	CharacterArea	Agree ?	TopicArea	RepNo	RefNo	Consultee	Organisation	AgentRefN
Document	Area North of Lowther Street including Rickergate	<input type="checkbox"/>	Preferred Option	2459	Objection	078	F & C REITT Asset Mana	A004

Comment Background and context given regarding the Lanes Shopping Centre within submitted representation.

The representations contained in this letter specifically consider the Preferred Option set out in the Draft Development Framework and how this may meet the retail requirements for Carlisle and the Retail Study undertaken in 2012.

As set out in the Draft Development Framework, there is significant potential within Carlisle City Centre to enhance the existing shops and services provided through the allocation of strategic sites for future retail development over the course of the new Local Plan period, given the large rural catchment area of Cumbria and the Borders.

The Framework acknowledges the challenges and threats to the City Centre in paragraph 1.9, citing the competition from out of centre retail destinations. As you know, our client shares this concern and is of the view that out of centre retail should be resisted. We understand that despite our formal objections, St Nicholas Gate Retail Park was given planning permission to increase retail floorspace in June 2014 through the provision of mezzanine floors and to widen the sale of goods at the retail park. This will inevitably have a detrimental impact on the Primary Shopping Area in the City Centre, given the close proximity of the retail park to the City Centre. We would strongly urge the Council to resist any other planning applications of this nature.

The Preferred Option set out in the Draft Development Framework identifies the area to the north of Lowther Street, including Rickergate, as having high potential for change / intervention. However, the Preferred Option document states that its potential for change and the redevelopment of this area which would trigger the release of sites is dependent on alternative accommodation being identified.

In terms of the proposed Option A and Option B for this area, we consider that the Primary Shopping Area will extend too far north and the proposals will consequently weaken the City Centre core and retail function. To extend the Primary Shopping Area to the north, it would be likely that Carlisle's shopping area becomes a linear Shopping Area which would have an impact in terms of distance from public transport modes and pedestrian accessibility.

The redevelopment of this location will deter linked trips due to the increasingly steep slope down Scotch Street, which is unattractive to shoppers who will not wish to climb back towards the train station and bus station, and other destinations within the City Centre. This area of Scotch Street is currently dominated by lower grade retailers and hot food takeaways, which is not appealing to fashion and lifestyle retailers that are seeking premises in Carlisle.

The proposals in this location would also have an impact on the current established City Centre core, resulting in a split retail centre with two distinct destinations that will weaken the strength of the current compact and easily negotiated central retail core.

We are also concerned that the extension of the Primary Shopping Area to the north will be dependent on the identification of alternative accommodation for the Council-owned Civic Centre and associated buildings. Given that alternative accommodation will need to be in place prior to redevelopment of the buildings, this may result in delays to the redevelopment and consequent extension of the Primary Shopping Area, which would have a detrimental impact on the future of Carlisle City Centre.

In contrast, by extending to the east, and forming an extension to The Lanes, permeability and connectivity will be enhanced in the City Centre and provide immediate links to the Citadel, Botchergate and Primary Shopping Areas. Our Client therefore proposes an alternative option to enhance the City Centre and the retail core, which is detailed in Rep No 2460.

Summary and Conclusions:

The Carlisle City Centre Draft Development Framework concerns the future growth of Carlisle. The Preferred Option for the extension of the Primary Shopping Area to the north, encompassing the redevelopment of the Civic Centre, which is detached, some distance down an ever increasingly steep hill, and contingent on the release of sites for redevelopment once alternative accommodation has been secured for the Council.

It is considered that the Preferred Option will potentially weaken what is currently a strong retail core through reducing the connectivity within the City Centre, whilst creating a dual centre retail destination, threatening to further weaken the secondary retail pitch of English Street towards the Citadel.

It is our view that a far better option would be the extension of the Primary Shopping Area to the east, in the form of an extension to The Lanes through the acquisition of Lowther Street car park would result in a more realistic delivery of an extension on the same topographical plane as the existing primary retail core.

We would welcome the opportunity to discuss the proposals enclosed with this letter further and consider that a meeting with relevant Planning Officers would be most opportune to identify how our Client and Carlisle City Council can work together to deliver the most appropriate extension of the Primary Shopping Area.

Response: Comments regarding the significant potential within Carlisle City Centre to enhance the existing shops and services through the allocation of strategic sites for future retail development over the course of the new Local Plan period are noted, which align with the evidence which underpins the Framework. Concerns are also noted with regards to the threat that out of centre retail poses to the City Centre, which in accordance with national policy will be a key issue that the emerging Local Plan seeks to address drawing on the evidence within the City Centre Development Framework.

Concerns regarding the linear nature that pursuing Option A or B as presented would entail are noted, but these concerns are not shared. To the contrary the extension of the City Centre in this direction offers an opportunity to better integrate with the parks beyond, the Sands Centre (as a key leisure hub), the new Arts Centre (and entertainment venue) and the car parks at the Sands and Swifts which many visitors from the north currently use. The options have also been informed and are supported through the soft market testing which has been undertaken which supports that a number of retailers would see an extension of the primary shopping area in this direction as the most attractive option from a retail and footfall perspective.

The change in levels is not considered to constitute a significant constraint and in part reflects the historic nature of the City Centre. This perceived issue, which can in part be designed out, has not proven to be a deterrent in other historic cities such as York, Durham and Lincoln where to the contrary the change in levels, albeit much more significant than those experienced in Carlisle, add a level of interest and reinforce distinctiveness. It should similarly be noted that this area is, like the majority of the City Centre, currently well served by public transport, with no reason as to why this could not continue to be the case, with proximity to actual hubs not therefore a key determinant in isolation.

Whilst noting concerns regarding the relocation of services currently provided, should the need for a firm proposal emerge which requires occupation of the entirety of the current Civic Centre site, this is not considered to constitute a significant constraint. This in part reflects that the availability of alternative premises is currently good, with a number of options which could be explored and pursued should the need arise.

Whilst the potential of instead extending to the east is noted, this is not without its challenges particularly with regards to permeability and the decisive nature of Lowther Street. Soft market testing casted

Question No	CharacterArea	Agree ?	TopicArea	RepNo	RefNo	Consultee	Organisation	AgentRefN
Document	Area North of Lowther Street including Rickergate	<input type="checkbox"/>	Preferred Option	2477	Objection	o81	John Kelsall	Carlisle District Civic Tru
Comment	Part of the Draft considers the alterations/adaptation or removal of the 1960's Civic Centre building. The Trust is opposed to this proposal upon the quality of consideration and justification of the Draft Framework. It is an iconic building, highly regarded in its day and it represents the spirit and times of a period in history that will not be repeated. It does not command such quality and protection in perpetuity, however, it is considered significantly enough to be of greater value than replacement by such ephemeral and short term development as a retail floor plate when there are arguably better options available as considered previously. Re-use and upgrading will be a necessary part of its near future but doubt as to its future is believed to be unwarranted and should be removed from the current options.							
Response:	The options put forward suggest that the retention of the Civic Centre may be possible but equally it may need to make way owing to the sequential preference afforded to Rickergate. Any decision to demolish the building would not be taken lightly. This reflects that only those buildings which are essential to delivery of a firm proposal would be considered for demolition in the future. Retention of reference to the potential demolition is considered, in the context of the evidence, to be appropriate and justified.							
Proposed Change	No change considered necessary.							
Document	Area North of Lowther Street including Rickergate	<input type="checkbox"/>	Preferred Option	2380	Comment	o09	Trevor Wilson	
Comment	<p>If you are going to do this then do Option B.</p> <p>The pedestrian experience needs to be enhanced and ideally Drovers Lane and the short stretch of Scotch Street should be closed to all traffic except to emergency vehicles. But the buses need to go somewhere so keep it open for buses as many people get off and on at West Tower Street.</p> <p>The stretch of Scotch Street should be made a huge pedestrian crossing and such that buses will not be permitted to stop on that stretch of Scotch Street.</p> <p>You will need to relocate the bus layover bay on the north end of Debenhams which is used by the Arriva 685 buses - why thy cannot layover in the bus station I do not know as the 685 is joint with Stagecoach.</p> <p>I understand the proposed new stores will be 3 stories high. Make them 5 stories to height align with Debenhams. This will give more floor space and better flexibility for the new multi story car park (comments coming on this). Note - the existing Civic Centre is already above 5 stories so there should not be a planning issue.</p> <p>And make the whole of the site one homogenous building and not one anchor store, a car park entrance and some other store units stuck on.</p> <p>To reduce the skyline impact, the top floor could:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - have a 90 degree curved outer wall/roof - as per the indicative drawing on page 7 of the Summary Boards - or could be set back 3m or 4m to create an outdoor cafe (or other space) <p>You could also set back the main front structural frame by, say, 1m so that a more 'flexible' and attractive front (or false front) or cladding can be installed and thus not having strict vertical and horizontal lines.</p> <p>On the top floor, allow space for a cafe facing west and north - this would give some good views across the roof tops to the park. Part of the cafe could be outdoor or have a sliding or flexible roof - see comment earlier about roofline mitigation.</p> <p>Allow space for green shrubs on the roof - again to mitigate the roof line. And impose planning constraints so the roof line looks nice and not a collection of stuck on boxes (for lifts, water and air conditioning)</p> <p>The car park currently goes down to ground floor level. No. It should start at the 3rd floor thus giving height underneath for 2 shop floors and lorry service bay access. The Lanes multi story car park starts at a higher level. By increasing the new development to 5 floors you will gain floor space back for the car park. You could also run the car park all over the site at level 4.</p> <p>As you travel north along Lowther Street, past The Lanes car park entrance the road descends slightly. After the Drovers Lane junction, Lowther Street continues to descend - change it to a full width up ramp for the new multi story car park.</p> <p>Service lorries should not use Lowther Street - and they wont be able to if the new multi story car park access ramp is there.</p> <p>So you have to go for the drawing option which shows Additional Access Points onto Georgian Way. Which is good because it will not impose extra traffic onto Lowther Street.</p> <p>Maybe the office occupied by the Rural Payments Agency (according to Google Earth) has to go! Or the next one occupied by the Probation Trust (according to Google Earth)!</p> <p>And on the end wall facing Hardwick Circus, install a long large LED screen for council advertising or other. Or even a green wall!</p>							
Response:	Comments and preference noted, particularly with regards to the proposed design of the redevelopment of Rickergate. It is recognised that permeability for vehicles and transport, as well as for pedestrians, would have to both work to ensure any proposed extension of the primary shopping area would integrate effectively with the existing area without disrupting wider traffic and public transport flows. With regards to the design of any redevelopment, it should be noted that the proposed designs within the document are indicative and firm proposals may differ. Consideration will be afforded to the appropriateness of the suggested area to also accommodate retail or an alternative form of redevelopment.							
Proposed Change	No change considered necessary.							

Question No	CharacterArea	Agree ?	TopicArea	RepNo	RefNo	Consultee	Organisation	AgentRefN
Document	Area North of Lowther Street including Rickergate	<input type="checkbox"/>	Preferred Option	2476	Objection	o81	John Kelsall	Carlisle District Civic Tru
Comment	Given the considerations above [rep 2475] the options put forward in the Draft Framework appear too limited and restricting. The expectation of major redevelopment on Rickergate is too damaging for the City long term. Insufficient weight has been given to the redevelopment of the Citadel area where it is considered lease timing to existing proprietors is not an encumbrance to 'deliverability' as the retail study is only identifying the major expansion toward the end of the planned period. Retaining Rickergate 'in the mix' for developers' consideration seems wise but the Trust's view is that further consideration to scope potential for larger stores formed out of the original Lanes is also appropriate and only then directing developers/retailers to investigate the potential of the Citadel probably before Rickergate.							
Response:	Comments noted. There is no getting away however from the need to deliver within the plan period and in this regard availability is a key determinant of 'deliverability'. Whilst the Citadel can play an important part in strengthening the City moving forward, being an important opportunity for additional reasons which extend beyond simply meeting new retail floorspace needs, the nature of the uncertainties are such that it is not considered to represent a robust preferred option in comparison to Land to the North of Lowther Street including Rickergate.							
Proposed Change	No change considered necessary.							
General	Area North of Lowther Street including Rickergate	<input type="checkbox"/>	Preferred Option	2419	Comment	o71	Mrs Joan Field	
Comment	We really need a medium sized theatre and arts centre in Carlisle. No mention of this in your proposals. I don't think the old fire station meets the criteria.							
Response:	Comments noted. The new Arts Centre on Warwick Street in the Old Fire Station is considered to constitute a flexible exhibition and entertainment space/venue that they will add significantly to the leisure offer within the City Centre.							
Proposed Change	No change considered necessary.							
	Area North of Lowther Street including Rickergate	<input type="checkbox"/>	Preferred Option	2204	Comment	o52	Mr Colin Latimer	
Comment	There has been no consultation between GVA and residents. There does not seem to be a financial costing for this area. Loss of use of Arts Centre. Building on a flood plain. The cost of relocation of the Magistrates Court [Crown Property cannot be compulsory purchased]. A similar recent build in Cheltenham was £11.5M. What will be the cost of relocating civic centre. If building work does go ahead, Arts Centre will be unusable for the duration.							
Response:	The City Centre Development Framework has been subject to two well publicised stages of consultation and has therefore sought to be as inclusive as possible. The Arts Centre on Warwick Street which is being developed within the Old Fire Station is to be retained and this is made clear in the report and indicative design work. The purpose of the City Centre Development Framework is to inform the Local Plan against which development proposals would have to be assessed against. The Local Plan already contains policies which deal with flood risk and these concerns would be dealt with through the process of a Flood Risk Assessment required to accompany any future firm proposal(s). Initial albeit high level viability appraisals were undertaken in support of the options development with no significant concerns arising with regards to the proposed redevelopment of Rickergate. It is recognised however within the report that more detailed viability work would be prepared as part of progressing firm proposals. Discussions with the Ministry of Justice have indicated that they are willing to explore relocation, and like many public sector bodies regularly review their asset management plans.							
Proposed Change	No change considered necessary.							

Question No	CharacterArea	Agree ?	TopicArea	RepNo	RefNo	Consultee	Organisation	AgentRefN
Q3	Area North of Lowther Street including Rickergate	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Preferred Option	2317	Support	063	Mr Ian Grey	
Comment								
Response:	Comments noted.							
Proposed Change	No change considered necessary.							
Q4	Area North of Lowther Street including Rickergate	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Preferred Option	2390	Support	015	Mr Viv Dodd	Revival Carlisle
Comment	We believe that this will be the best option to resist further out of town development							
Response:	Comments noted.							
Proposed Change	No change considered necessary.							
	Area North of Lowther Street including Rickergate	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Preferred Option	2318	Support	063	Mr Ian Grey	
Comment								
Response:	Comments noted.							
Proposed Change	No change considered necessary.							
	Area North of Lowther Street including Rickergate	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Preferred Option	2016	Support	001	Mr Nigel Winter	Stagecoach NorthWest Lt
Comment	Yes, but don't allow a huge multi storey car park, insist S106 money is spent to develop Park & Ride for the City. This development is an excellent opportunity to establish Park & Ride for Carlisle.							
Response:	Comments noted. There is no evidence however to currently support that there is a need for park and ride sites although transport modelling to support the Local Plan, including the testing of possible interventions, remains ongoing.							
Proposed Change	No change considered necessary.							
	Area North of Lowther Street including Rickergate	<input type="checkbox"/>	Preferred Option	2282	Objection	060	Barry O Earp	
Comment	The civic centre in an iconic building of its decade. If demolished where would the City Council be located, a new site and a new building [£25M for the new county council building] or are we to share a building with the County council? Unitary government for Cumbria?							
Response:	Only those buildings which are essential to delivery of a firm proposal would be considered for demolition in the future. Options for the relocation of City Council staff would be considered at a future point in time if and when a firm need to do so arises. There are currently no plans for a unitary authority in Cumbria.							
Proposed Change	No change considered necessary.							

Question No	CharacterArea	Agree ?	TopicArea	RepNo	RefNo	Consultee	Organisation	AgentRefN
Q4	Area North of Lowther Street including Rickergate	<input type="checkbox"/>	Preferred Option	2228	Objection	054	Mr Christopher Wheeler	
Comment	<p>1. I am opposed to the demolition of the existing homes. 2. While I would welcome the demolition of the civic centre eyesore, I do not believe that Rickergate should be redeveloped at all [See Q3 Rep Ref 2227]</p>							
Response:	Comments noted. Only those buildings which are essential to delivery of a firm proposal would be considered for demolition in the future.							
Proposed Change	No change considered necessary.							
<hr/>								
	Area North of Lowther Street including Rickergate	<input type="checkbox"/>	Preferred Option	2450	Objection	075	Mr Neil Irving	SOS
Comment	<p>To start with, why am I only asked if I agree with option 'B', massive bias again. No, I do not agree with option A or B, as both demolish residential property and give no alternative. This gives the public no benchmark of what could be achieved if Warwick street was kept in a development. There is the demolition of 2 key parts of the 60's civic centre design, do the consultants have no idea about architectural design of the past?.These are integral parts of the civic centre. There is no reason why these buildings if opened up to public access would be very popular . The rotunda would be a wonderful exhibition area, or even a acoustic music venue. The civic centre itself could be opened up to the public. Why not have a restaurant on the top floor, roof top garden, reclad the exterior with solar panels or plate glass. Do a well thought out 'Retrofit'. Figure 16 There has been no thought what so ever by the consultants as to the civic centre, because of this they have only produced artists impressions with the civic centre demolished. Yet again a huge bias to not give the public options. Quite clearly there are no options in this report other than what the consultants want or what the have been told to do. They should be independent but they quite clearly(in my opinion) are not. They have taken no account of the strong winds that can blow through Rickergate. The narrowing of this area would create a wind tunnel, not the best place to sit and drink coffee and read the Financial Times. Figure 17 Here again they only show option B with civic demolished. But what I find even worse is the levelling out of the foreground to imply an easy and flat access to Rickergate. This is not the case and the artists impression has been altered to produce an incorrect view, yet again creating a bias to deceive the viewing public. I also take exception to the residential quota for the area. Why are there only Apartments listed. This is a good residential area with easy access to the park , river , sports centre and running track and yet the consultants give no thought to provide family homes. Carlisle is not Manchester, Leeds or Liverpool. It has its own character which must not be lost in what the consultant propose.</p>							
Response:	<p>The Framework has identified and subsequently considered what are considered to be the reasonable options for addressing known key issues going forward. The options presented are considered to be justifiable by virtue that they represent what is considered to be the reasonable options for addressing the documented key issues going forward. The plans included in the draft report are however purely indicative to help the public understand how the options could look if developed out. Only those buildings which are essential to delivery of a firm proposal would be considered for demolition in the future. Notwithstanding this soft market testing undertaken to date supports that even with retrofitting the Civic Centre, its retention is likely to be unattractive to the retail market.</p> <p>Whilst acknowledging that Carlisle is not one of the major cities suggested it must equally be recognised that it still has to respond to its own needs and issues in the same way that any city has to if it is to continue to prosper.</p>							
Proposed Change	<p>The proposed apartments are again indicative only and family housing could equally be introduced through a firm proposal. Regarding the preservation of the character of the area, policies are in place within the Local Plan to ensure that development responds to the local context.</p> <p>No change considered necessary.</p>							

Question No	CharacterArea	Agree ?	TopicArea	RepNo	RefNo	Consultee	Organisation	AgentRefN
Q4	Area North of Lowther Street including Rickergate	<input type="checkbox"/>	Preferred Option	2085	Objection	045	Ms Kate Carvana	
Comment	These are not options - It's Rickergate or Rickergate and neither is acceptable. The Civic Centre is a useful building and means a lot to the Carlisle people - why should it be demolished?							
Response:	Owing to its location on the edge of the City Centre and current primary shopping area, Rickergate is an area which needs to be explored and which is considered to present a reasonable option to accommodate future retail and leisure growth. Only those buildings which are essential to delivery of a firm proposal would be considered for demolition in the future.							
Proposed Change	No change considered necessary.							
	Area North of Lowther Street including Rickergate	<input type="checkbox"/>	Preferred Option	2172	Objection	026	Elizabeth Allnutt	Save Our Streets
Comment	No. Neither scheme is an option; they are two variations on a theme with no alternative proposal. Neither scheme is acceptable for the reasons given in the response to Q4. There has been no attempt made to reuse and retrofit the Civic Centre building. Demolition is not sustainable.							
Response:	Owing to its location on the edge of the City Centre and current primary shopping area, Rickergate is an area which needs to be explored and which is considered to present a reasonable option to accommodate future retail and leisure growth. Soft market testing supports that even with retrofitting the Civic Centre is likely to be unattractive to the retail market. Only those buildings which are essential to delivery of a firm proposal would however be considered for demolition in the future.							
Proposed Change	No change considered necessary.							
	Area North of Lowther Street including Rickergate	<input type="checkbox"/>	Preferred Option	2123	Objection	046	Miss Gillian Smith	
Comment								
Response:	Comment noted. In the absence of elaborating as to the reasons why the Council can not, on this occasion, comment further.							
Proposed Change	No change considered necessary.							
	Area North of Lowther Street including Rickergate	<input type="checkbox"/>	Preferred Option	2136	Objection	047	Mrs Margaret Backhouse	
Comment								
Response:	Comment noted. In the absence of elaborating as to the reasons why the Council can not, on this occasion, comment further.							
Proposed Change	No change considered necessary.							

Question No	CharacterArea	Agree ?	TopicArea	RepNo	RefNo	Consultee	Organisation	AgentRefN
Q4	Area North of Lowther Street including Rickergate	<input type="checkbox"/>	Preferred Option	2268	Comment	059	Miss Carole Hoggan	
Comment	Knock down Civic Centre Keep Adriano's Keep Old Fire Police Station Keep Existing housing Built Hotel of Theatre Yes Keep Civic Tower [needs a new facade] Yes Police Station to be a Arts Centre Keep Courts - work needed inside.							
Response:	The Framework suggests that if a scheme were to be progressed in Rickergate a number of the buildings referred to should be retained. Only those buildings which are essential to delivery of a firm proposal would be considered for demolition in the future.							
Proposed Change	No change considered necessary.							
	Area North of Lowther Street including Rickergate	<input type="checkbox"/>	Preferred Option	2241	Objection	055	Mrs Helen Blamire	
Comment	As a system built structure, I suspect civic centre is full of asbestos - you expect the tax payer to fund removal/demolition. Having just moved to the street, I don't relish the thought of new housing [probably low cost] being erected right opposite my home, blocking out light and potentially leading to properties being let which from experience will lower the tone of the area. If you can't fill all retail units in town, why build more? We certainly don't want a Primark at the end of our road.							
Response:	Only those buildings which are essential to delivery of a firm proposal would be considered for demolition in the future. Any demolition and indeed relocations costs (associated with the Civic Centre), if these were to be encountered, would be accounted for as a 'development cost' associated with pursuing a given proposal, and factored into the viability assessment of any scheme.							
	The introduction of new housing is considered a positive which could add to strengthen the small residential community in the Rickergate area. Policies within the Local Plan would require a mix of dwelling types, if appropriate and feasible, and tenures. Policies in the Local Plan also act to protect existing amenity in terms of the interface between proposed new housing and existing.							
	Evidence in the form of the Carlisle Retail Study supports that there is a need for additional retail units within the City Centre particularly from a qualitative perspective in terms of providing the size, form and configuration of units which accord with retailers' current high street needs. This evidence is considered to remain robust with a number of those in the retail industry, within the City and beyond, recently reaffirming its conclusions. Such new units will be a key element of any strategy going forward to retain a number of existing retailers as well as too attract new retailers to Carlisle, and ultimately to maintain the vitality and viability of the City Centre and its overall offer.							
	No specific end users have at this stage been identified. Those named in the report are done so merely as an example to illustrate the retail sectors which are considered to be underrepresented within Carlisle City Centre at the present time.							
Proposed Change	No change considered necessary.							
	Area North of Lowther Street including Rickergate	<input type="checkbox"/>	Preferred Option	2028	Objection	034	Mr Eddie Haughan	
Comment	No							
Response:	Comment noted. In the absence of elaborating as to the reasons why the Council can not, on this occasion, comment further.							
Proposed Change	No change considered necessary.							

Question No	CharacterArea	Agree ?	TopicArea	RepNo	RefNo	Consultee	Organisation	AgentRefN
Q4	Area North of Lowther Street including Rickergate	<input type="checkbox"/>	Preferred Option	2256	Objection	058	Mrs Joanne Swanton	JoMark House of Hair
Comment	Just too much! Why have these chain restaurants here when in every other city they are at railway station exits. First impressions and services for visitors count. If plots 1,5,8,9, were omitted from the plan and swapped with residential proposed on Corporation Road? I would agree fully with the plan. Why do you want to build housing when housing is already in that area that can be kept? 1,000's of pounds could be saved to put back where it is really needed in the Citadel.							
Response:	Owing to its location on the edge of the City Centre and current primary shopping area, Rickergate is an area which needs to be explored and which is considered to present a reasonable option to accommodate future retail and leisure growth. Only those buildings which are essential to delivery of a firm proposal would be considered for demolition in the future.							
Proposed Change	Whilst comments regarding the Citadel are noted, opportunities for major retail development and the ability to respond to evidenced needs particularly within the plan period are limited there. No change considered necessary.							
	Area North of Lowther Street including Rickergate	<input type="checkbox"/>	Preferred Option	2033	Comment	035	Jenny I Turner	
Comment	We see lots of people in the city town centre going to Farmfoods & Iceland and Poundland and Asda. Easy for us to shop and it is cheaper, we don't want change.							
Response:	Comments noted.							
Proposed Change	No change considered necessary.							
	Area North of Lowther Street including Rickergate	<input type="checkbox"/>	Preferred Option	2090	Objection	027	Elizabeth Allnutt	
Comment	No: Neither scheme is an option; they are two variations on a theme with no alternative proposal. Neither scheme is acceptable for the reasons given to previous questions.							
Response:	Comments noted.							
Proposed Change	No change considered necessary.							

Question No	CharacterArea	Agree ?	TopicArea	RepNo	RefNo	Consultee	Organisation	AgentRefN
Q4	Area North of Lowther Street including Rickergate	<input type="checkbox"/>	Preferred Option	2018	Objection	033	David Kershaw	
Comment	Please register my vote against such a scheme. Reasons: 1. We can't even support the present number of retail outlets. 2. A huge waste of money 3. Don't once again hassle those home owners who live in the area indicated that these homes could be flattened. A good city has people living within the city centre 4. The civic Centre is an iconic building of the sixties, whether you like it or not and it is one of very few examples of 1960's architecture within the city boundaries 5. When the floods came it stood proudly there with the circus traffic lights continues to work despite no traffic. 6. I may well be in the minority and if the majority say 'AYE' and are 'pro', then all best wishes to your scheme.							
Response:	Evidence in the form of the Carlisle Retail Study supports that there is a need for additional retail units within the City Centre particularly from a qualitative perspective in terms of providing the size, form and configuration of units which accord with retailers' current high street needs. This evidence is considered to remain robust with a number of those in the retail industry, within the City and beyond, recently reaffirming its conclusions. Such new units will be a key element of any strategy going forward to retain a number of existing retailers as well as too attract new retailers to Carlisle, and ultimately to maintain the vitality and viability of the City Centre and its overall offer.							
	In recognising the value of city centre living the indicative proposals illustrate how new housing could be introduced into the area. Only those buildings which are essential to delivery of a firm proposal would be considered for demolition in the future.							
	The City Centre Development Framework (CCDF) has been prepared as part of a plan lead approach to dealing with identified retail needs and the development of planning policies to support the future vitality and viability of the City Centre. Such an approach responds to the requirements of national planning policy.							
Proposed Change	No change considered necessary.							
	Area North of Lowther Street including Rickergate	<input type="checkbox"/>	Preferred Option	2039		036	Ian Caruana	
Comment	It is outrageous to propose demolishing good houses in Warwick Street.							
Response:	Only those buildings which are essential to delivery of a firm proposal would be considered for demolition in the future.							
Proposed Change	No change considered necessary.							
	Area North of Lowther Street including Rickergate	<input type="checkbox"/>	Preferred Option	2341	Objection	065	Miss Lindsey McNamee	
Comment	NO - there is no Option B You still want to knock down hour homes. Option B should be 'shall we leave the families of Warwick Street alone and take our plans elsewhere'!!!!							
Response:	Owing to its location on the edge of the City Centre and current primary shopping area, Rickergate is an area which needs to be explored and which is considered to present a reasonable option to accommodate future retail and leisure growth. Only those buildings which are essential to delivery of a firm proposal would be considered for demolition in the future.							
Proposed Change	No change considered necessary.							

Question No	CharacterArea	Agree ?	TopicArea	RepNo	RefNo	Consultee	Organisation	AgentRefN
Q4	Area North of Lowther Street including Rickergate	<input type="checkbox"/>	Preferred Option	2200	Objection	052	Mr Colin Latimer	
Comment	Objections same as Rep No 2199							
Response:	Comments noted and response provided in direct response to representation 2199.							
Proposed Change	No change considered necessary.							
	Area North of Lowther Street including Rickergate	<input type="checkbox"/>	Preferred Option	2353	Objection	066	Mrs Sandra Stockley	
Comment	I believe that the Class A1 Department Store is Primark. But does the City Council have to adhere to their specification? Primark has done its research and identified Carlisle as potentially successful; if they really want to come they could be given a different site to develop in accordance with the City's requirements. I always feel the Civic Centre is quite a distance from the main shopping areas of English St, Lowther Street and The Lanes							
Response:	There are no firm proposals at this stage and therefore no end users signed up. Those named in the report are done so merely as an example to illustrate the retail sectors which are considered to be underrepresented within Carlisle City Centre at the present time. In the absence of opportunities to meet identified needs in the main shopping area, there is a need to consider extensions to it.							
Proposed Change	No change considered necessary.							
	Area North of Lowther Street including Rickergate	<input type="checkbox"/>	Preferred Option	2053	Objection	039	Mr M Holliday	
Comment	Definitely not, the Civic Centre should remain.							
Response:	Only those buildings which are essential to delivery of a firm proposal would be considered for demolition in the future.							
Proposed Change	No change considered necessary.							

Question No	CharacterArea	Agree ?	TopicArea	RepNo	RefNo	Consultee	Organisation	AgentRefN
Q4	Area North of Lowther Street including Rickergate	<input type="checkbox"/>	Preferred Option	2055	Objection	040	David Kay	
Comment	My comment relates to the proposal to demolish the Civic Centre and construct more retail units in it's place.							
	<p>I would like to question the logic behind this proposal for the following reasons;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Town centre retail is in trouble generally - not just in Carlisle but nationally and even internationally - outside the wealthy cities like London, Manchester and Leeds. This has been widely reported in the media. Carlisle town centre already has many empty shops ranging from the former Bulloughs to units in the Lanes, the covered market, Crown & Mitre, Botchergate etc. The growth of online retail has been dramatic and shows no sign of letting up, there is no reason to think that it won't continue. It is certainly a huge threat to high street shopping throughout the country. - The Civic Centre provides excellent office accommodation in a superb location at reasonable cost. Any surplus accommodation has been easy to let at market rates and there is great potential to let even more should it become available, providing much-needed income to the Council. - In my opinion – based on alternative accommodation exercises I have been involved in as part of my professional work at the council - it would be very difficult to acquire equal or better accommodation at the same cost. - The Civic Centre is a major asset for the Council both for the excellent low-cost accommodation it provides and as a potential source of income. The loss of it for whatever reason would be a major blow to the Council's financial situation in terms of the cost of providing alternative accommodation and the loss of potential income from rent. <p>So to sum up – I don't see the sense in spending a lot of money to demolish a resource that is in great demand and replace it with one for which there is little or no demand. It flies in the face of national trends and defies common sense.</p>							
Response:	<p>Whilst retail patterns and activity are changing, and have indeed been subject to continual change for some time, evidence supports that there is a need to keep pace with such changes and the requirements of operators if the vitality an viability o f the high street is to be preserved and hopefully enhanced. Evidence in the form of the Carlisle Retail Study supports that there is a need for additional retail units within the City Centre particularly from a qualitative perspective in terms of providing the size, form and configuration of units which accord with retailers' current high street needs. This evidence is considered to remain robust with a number of those in the retail industry, within the City and beyond, recently reaffirming its conclusions. Change in this regard is therefore deemed necessary.</p> <p>The Carlisle Retail Study was prepared in 2012 and took full account of retail trends and likely future changes including patterns of internet shopping. The recent rise in usage of 'click and collect' is one example of how internet shopping is working in tandem with and influencing the activities of high street retailers.</p> <p>Existing vacancies are considered to be below the national average with a number of long standing vacant units such as those at the Crown and Mitre having recently reverted back into active use. Feedback from agents within the City also supports that there is relatively strong demand for vacant units within the core of the City Centre, with relatively quick turnaround achieved. Notwithstanding this the City Council are committed to working with stakeholders to reduce the number of vacancies within the City Centre and will be proactive in using the powers available to them to assist in this objective. A good recent example of this is that the City Council agreed in January 2015 to update their Discretionary Rate Relief Policy in order to offer re-occupation relief for retail units which have been vacant for 12 months or more. The implementation of this national initiative at the local level sees such units qualify for a 50% reduction in their business rates (National Non Domestic Rates) for 18 months from the date the premises becomes occupied - and is likely to constitute a strong incentive in bringing empty units back into use.</p> <p>Only those buildings which are essential to delivery of a firm proposal would be considered for demolition in the future. Options for the relocation of City Council staff would be considered at a future point in time if and when a firm need to do so arises. If any relocations costs were to be encountered these would be accounted for as a 'development cost' associated with pursuing a given proposal, and factored into the viability assessment of any scheme.</p>							
Proposed Change	No change considered necessary.							
	Area North of Lowther Street including Rickergate	<input type="checkbox"/>	Preferred Option	2330	Comment	064	Mrs Carol Grey	
Comment	Undecided: The document doesn't make it clear what the function of 'the tower' would be if left as in option A. Depending on what its purpose is might affect my preference for A or B. However if it has no useful purpose Option B would seem the better option particularly as it would seem more likely to attract a department store.							
Response:	Option A would see the existing use retained but alternatives could be explored if and when firm proposals were brought forward.							
Proposed Change	No change considered necessary.							

Question No	CharacterArea	Agree ?	TopicArea	RepNo	RefNo	Consultee	Organisation	AgentRefN
Q4	Area North of Lowther Street including Rickergate	<input type="checkbox"/>	Preferred Option	2146	Objection	048	Mrs C E Simpson	
Comment								
Response:	Comment noted. In the absence of elaborating as to the reasons why the Council can not, on this occasion, comment further.							
Proposed Change	No change considered necessary.							
	Area North of Lowther Street including Rickergate	<input type="checkbox"/>	Preferred Option	2102	Objection	011	Mrs Julie Templeton	Member of Save our Stree
Comment	No. This is no option at all, who decided that there would only be two options put forward, both of which call for the demolition of the business and houses of Warwick Street. Why wasn't there an option of a retrofit or facelift for the Civic Centre.							
Response:	Owing to its location on the edge of the City Centre and current primary shopping area, Rickergate is an area which needs to be explored and which is considered to present a reasonable option to accommodate future retail and leisure growth. Soft market testing supports that even with retrofitting the Civic Centre is likely to be unattractive to the retail market. Only those buildings which are essential to delivery of a firm proposal would however be considered for demolition in the future.							
Proposed Change	No change considered necessary.							
	Area North of Lowther Street including Rickergate	<input type="checkbox"/>	Preferred Option	2456	Objection	074	Mrs Jean Hall	A003
Comment	No							
Response:	Comment noted. In the absence of elaborating as to the reasons why the Council can not, on this occasion, comment further.							
Proposed Change	No change considered necessary.							
	Area North of Lowther Street including Rickergate	<input type="checkbox"/>	Preferred Option	2416	Objection	071	Mrs Joan Field	
Comment	This development plan concentrates on the provision of more retail provision. Currently in Carlisle shops are closing almost weekly. We have a large department store empty [Hoopers}. Why provide more shops when we cannot support the ones we have now?							
Response:	Evidence in the form of the Carlisle Retail Study supports that there is a need for additional retail units within the City Centre particularly from a qualitative perspective in terms of providing the size, form and configuration of units which accord with retailers' current high street needs. This evidence is considered to remain robust with a number of those in the retail industry, within the City and beyond, recently reaffirming its conclusions. Such new units will be a key element of any strategy going forward to retain a number of existing retailers as well as too attract new retailers to Carlisle, and ultimately to maintain the vitality and viability of the City Centre and its overall offer.							
	The City Council are committed to working with stakeholders to reduce the number of vacancies within the City Centre and will be proactive in using the powers available to them to assist in this objective. A good recent example of this is that the City Council agreed in January 2015 to update their Discretionary Rate Relief Policy in order to offer re-occupation relief for retail units which have been vacant for 12 months or more. The implementation of this national initiative at the local level sees such units qualify for a 50% reduction in their business rates (National Non Domestic Rates) for 18 months from the date the premises becomes occupied - and is likely to constitute a strong incentive in bringing empty units back into use.							
Proposed Change	No change considered necessary.							

Question No	CharacterArea	Agree ?	TopicArea	RepNo	RefNo	Consultee	Organisation	AgentRefN
Q4	Area North of Lowther Street including Rickergate	<input type="checkbox"/>	Preferred Option	2156	Objection	049	Mrs Mavis Sarginson	
Comment	No							
Response:	Comment noted. In the absence of elaborating as to the reasons why the Council can not, on this occasion, comment further.							
Proposed Change	No change considered necessary.							
	Area North of Lowther Street including Rickergate	<input type="checkbox"/>	Preferred Option	2368	Objection	009	Trevor Wilson	
Comment	NO: Depends upon how much detail one is required to agree to at the moment. In principle, it does seem a reasonable approach. More specific detail comments later on suggested improvements. It needs more work.							
Response:	Comments noted.							
Proposed Change	No change considered necessary.							
	Area North of Lowther Street including Rickergate	<input type="checkbox"/>	Preferred Option	2215	Objection	053	Mrs Joyce Hetherington	
Comment								
Response:	Comment noted. In the absence of elaborating as to the reasons why the Council can not, on this occasion, comment further.							
Proposed Change	No change considered necessary.							
	Area North of Lowther Street including Rickergate	<input type="checkbox"/>	Preferred Option	2431	Objection	072	Mrs Jennifer Smith	
Comment								
Response:	Comment noted. In the absence of elaborating as to the reasons why the Council can not, on this occasion, comment further.							
Proposed Change	No change considered necessary.							
	Area North of Lowther Street including Rickergate	<input type="checkbox"/>	Preferred Option	2305	Objection	062	Mr Hans J A Landstrom	
Comment	See my opinion about the Civic Centre in Q1 [rep no 2296]							
Response:	Comments noted and response provided in direct response to representation 2296.							
Proposed Change	No change considered necessary.							

Question No	CharacterArea	Agree ?	TopicArea	RepNo	RefNo	Consultee	Organisation	AgentRefN
Q4	Area North of Lowther Street including Rickergate	<input type="checkbox"/>	Preferred Option	2065	Objection	042	Mrs Dallas Brewis	Cycle Carlisle
Comment	I think it is worse than Option A							
Response:	Comments noted.							
Proposed Change	No change considered necessary.							
<hr/>								
	Area North of Lowther Street including Rickergate	<input type="checkbox"/>	Preferred Option	2184	Comment	051	Miss Susan Mark	
Comment	Neither. It looks like a hideously ugly cement building is going to be replaced by a lot of cement being uses. If more flats are needed, making supermarkets provide flats above their premises would be a much better idea, wasting such a large area of land. Extending the park, improving the beauty of the city. Parking could be hidden underground.							
Response:	Comments noted. The proposals are indicative and if and when firm proposals were brought forward these would be subject to consultation affording an opportunity to influence design and layout.							
Proposed Change	No change considered necessary.							
<hr/>								
	Area North of Lowther Street including Rickergate	<input type="checkbox"/>	Preferred Option	2294	Objection	061	Mr David Hamilton	
Comment	Object Unless - popular names such as John Lewis were to show a commitment and if LOCAL business were encouraged to fill the vacant shops, with incentives such as lower rentals.							
Response:	Comments noted. The City Council are committed to working with stakeholders to reduce the number of vacancies within the City Centre and will be proactive in using the powers available to them to assist in this objective. A good recent example of this is that the City Council agreed in January 2015 to update their Discretionary Rate Relief Policy in order to offer re-occupation relief for retail units which have been vacant for 12 months or more. The implementation of this national initiative at the local level sees such units qualify for a 50% reduction in their business rates (National Non Domestic Rates) for 18 months from the date the premises becomes occupied - and is likely to constitute a strong incentive in bringing empty units back into use.							
Proposed Change	No change considered necessary.							
<hr/>								

Question No	CharacterArea	Agree ?	TopicArea	RepNo	RefNo	Consultee	Organisation	AgentRefN
Q4	Area North of Lowther Street including Rickergate	<input type="checkbox"/>	Preferred Option	2402	Objection	069	Mrs Karen Atkinson	
Comment	<p>I object to the preferred option for a number of reasons – I have listed some of them below: Firstly having witnessed the outcomes of these types of “regeneration” plans, yes they create limited areas of shiny new shopping space, but please consider the cost for the rest of the city. I’ll cite Liverpool as a key example – the regeneration and creation of Liverpool One did nothing but move the existing shopping area from the previous bustling centre, right on the doorstep of the train and bus stations, to an area further away; destroying part of the existing area which is now nothing but a shabby, abandoned mess - but still the first thing anyone to arrive by train or bus sees. Why in Carlisle would you focus large scale redevelopment on an area buried in the middle of town, which doesn’t have a great deal wrong with it – whilst ignoring some fairly significant and shabby approach areas like Botchergate and Lowther Street? Secondly why would you propose to build in an area with so many issues, key in my mind the demolition of people’s homes - particularly after the controversy of the last “renaissance” plan? Do you not consider that the creation of the arts centre and Bitts Park improvements will themselves lead to small scale regeneration of the area – but that bigger scale regeneration should be spread around the city, lifting and improving numerous areas and not focussed just on one small area? Third – what is your plan and budget for the relocation of the City Council staff and service areas?</p>							
Response:	<p>The Framework seeks to put in place a positive framework to enhance a number of key character areas throughout the City Centre. From a retail planning perspective however it is important to note that opportunities for major retail development and the ability to respond to evidenced needs particularly within the plan period in other areas such as Botchergate are limited. Some of these other areas are also sequentially less preferable in retail planning terms being detached from the primary shopping area. In this regard it is material to note that plans and proposals progressed by the City Council and others must accord with national guidance.</p> <p>The key thrust of the proposals are not about regeneration but instead about meeting how retail needs can be accommodated albeit in a way that maximises wider benefits. Owing to its location on the edge of the City Centre and current primary shopping area, Rickergate is an area which needs to be explored and which is considered to present a reasonable option to accommodate future retail and leisure growth. Only those buildings which are essential to delivery of a firm proposal would be considered for demolition in the future.</p> <p>Options for the relocation of City Council staff would be considered at a future point in time if and when a firm need to do so arises. If any relocations costs were to be encountered these would be accounted for as a 'development cost' associated with pursuing a given proposal, and factored into the viability assessment of any scheme.</p>							
Proposed Change	<p>No change considered necessary.</p>							

Question No	CharacterArea	Agree ?	TopicArea	RepNo	RefNo	Consultee	Organisation	AgentRefN
Document	Area North of Lowther Street including Rickergate	<input type="checkbox"/>	Priorities	2001	Objection	030	Mrs Pauline Latimer	
Comment	<p>I have been a resident in Warwick Street in the pleasant urban village that is Rickergate since September 1982 and since then we have seen many changes to Carlisle City Centre. We have lived through the dust, noise and disruption of the Lanes and the Debenhams developments, both of which, I must say, have enhanced the city enormously. The Botchergate development worked at first however, in these days of economic hardships it is starting to revert back to the dilapidation of former years and is still, I feel, an uninviting approach to the city centre. The city centre itself with all the empty retail units at present and the former Central Plaza building stinking and falling apart at the seams is starting to feel the same way.</p> <p>I agree that Carlisle needs something of a boost and some kind of development is necessary for the future of the city. However, it seems to me, as a resident, that these plans for Rickergate are as much of a waste of money as it did when the Renaissance plans reared their ugly head just after the stresses and hardships of the floods in 2005. We have heard at the Renaissance consultation meetings about how these plans will make Carlisle a better, more prosperous place. How is this to be achieved especially in this economic climate? If the Rickergate development (or in fact any other development within the city centre) in its entirety goes ahead can you guarantee that this will not end up in the same way as Botchergate after a few years? Have you managed to source businesses willing to come here and stay here to enhance our city? Who are they? The council at present cannot encourage businesses to come into the city centre and take the empty units we have already. I know the recession will not last forever however, it seems, from the residents point of view, there is no hope of filling the proposed new buildings if we have no guarantees of this nature.</p> <p>This and the fact that the only way Carlisle City Council think they can achieve this is by demolishing perfectly good residential properties to make way for more of the same is quite upsetting. I hope these comments and concerns are helpful to the Planning Policy Team and I will be very interested to hear the outcome of the consultations in due course.</p>							
Response:	<p>Comments noted. The City Centre Development Framework (CCDF) has been prepared as part of a plan lead approach to dealing with identified retail needs and the development of planning policies to support the future vitality and viability of the City Centre. Such an approach responds to the requirements of national planning policy and in this regard a clear distinction can be made between the CCDF and previous Carlisle Renaissance efforts.</p> <p>Evidence in the form of the Carlisle Retail Study supports that there is a need for additional retail units within the City Centre particularly from a qualitative perspective in terms of providing the size, form and configuration of units which accord with retailers' current high street needs. This evidence is considered to remain robust with a number of those in the retail industry, within the City and beyond, recently reaffirming its conclusions. Soft market testing has also been undertaken to support the City Centre Development Framework. Such new units will be a key element of any strategy going forward to retain a number of existing retailers as well as to attract new retailers to Carlisle, and ultimately to maintain the vitality and viability of the City Centre and its overall offer.</p> <p>The City Centre Development Framework seeks to put in place a positive framework to protect and enhance the character and attractiveness of Botchergate.</p> <p>Only those buildings which are essential to delivery of a firm proposal would be considered for demolition in the future.</p>							
Proposed Change	No change considered necessary.							
General		<input type="checkbox"/>		2042	Comment	037	Mr Ian Brewis	
Comment	We do not need more car parking. Whatever happened to Park and Ride?							
Response:	Comments noted. There is no evidence to currently support that there is a need for park and ride sites although transport modelling to support the Local Plan, including the testing of possible interventions, remains ongoing.							
Proposed Change	No change considered necessary.							