



Westmorland
& Furness
Council

westmorlandandfurness.gov.uk

Consultation Statement

Marina Village Residential Opportunity

Supplementary Planning Document
April 2025



Our Place... Our **FUTURE**... Join the conversation



Westmorland and Furness Local Plan



1 Introduction

- 1.1 Marina Village is a large brownfield site near to Barrow town centre, adjacent to Buccleuch and Cavendish Docks. It is allocated for housing in the Barrow Borough Local Plan 2016-2031.
- 1.2 The redevelopment of the site was a long-held ambition for Barrow Borough Council spanning more than two decades. Success has been realised at Barrow's waterfront through the completion of the Waterfront Business Park on Barrow Island, and the attraction of major offshore wind investors to the Port of Barrow, however, progress stalled on the major housing allocation following the 2008 recession and public spending austerity measures.
- 1.3 Barrow Borough Council had been working in partnership with Homes England prior to Local Government Reorganisation to develop a Strategic Outline Case (SOC) to the Brownfield Infrastructure Land Fund. Significant progress has been made in the past two years in assembling the funding package required to address site complexities and unlock the potential for development which has allowed the remediation works of phase one of the site to be successfully completed.
- 1.4 In January 2024 Westmorland and Furness Council entered into a grant funding agreement (GFA) to draw down Homes England Grant Funding contribution of £24.8m to support the remediation of the remainder of the site and the delivery of infrastructure required to de-risk the delivery of development.
- 1.5 The Grant Funding Agreement stipulated that a Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) is prepared to guide prospective developers of this strategic site to deliver the output of a minimum of 800 homes, once adopted the SPD will be a material consideration when determining planning applications for development on the site.
- 1.6 Barrow Borough Council had been working with consultants to prepare a masterplan setting out a development framework and design guide for the Site. Following internal review, the masterplan was amended and used to inform the draft SPD to guide the transformation of the site into a modern, attractive and desirable place to live. Considerable informal engagement had taken place with statutory consultees on the masterplan and this was used to develop the SPD.
- 1.7 Westmorland and Furness Council has prepared the draft Marina Village Residential Opportunity Supplementary Planning Document (SPD under the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012. This document summarises who was consulted during the consultation, the main issues raised, and how the Council has addressed these issues in the final SPD.

2 Who was consulted and how

2.1 The public consultation was held for 4 weeks from Thursday 22nd August 2024 to Thursday 19th September 2024. The SPD was available to view on the Council's website and in hard copy at The Forum, Barrow Town Hall and libraries in Barrow during their normal opening times.

2.2 The following methods of communication were used to publicise the consultation:

- Notifications to Town and Parish Councils, statutory consultees, specific consultation bodies, and individuals and interested parties on our database listed as wishing to be notified of Local Plan documents.
- Press release
- Social media campaign
- Publicise consultation documents on Council's website
- Consultation drop-in event at The Forum, Duke Street, Barrow
- Notification to Elected Members of the Authority.

2.3 Consultees were invited to give their views via a short online survey (also provided in hard copy on request). The survey asked about the Vision and Objectives for the site and the contents of the SPD.

2.4 26 responses to the consultation were received in total, 24 were received in time and 2 were received after the deadline. Responses were received from 10 local residents and from the following bodies:

- Associated British Ports
- BAE Systems
- Cumbria Constabulary
- Cumbria GeoConservation
- Electricity North West
- Friends of the Lake District
- Historic England
- Morecambe Bay Primary Care Collaborative (on behalf of Barrow Together PCN)
- National Highways
- Natural England
- Network Rail
- NHS LSCICB
- Open Spaces Society
- Orsted
- South Lakes Housing
- United Utilities

- 2.5 Those who attended the public drop in session were also able to leave comments on a comments sheet which have been summarised below:

Infrastructure and Traffic

- Is there Drainage and flooding management for the site?
- What are plans to address traffic congestion with an additional 1000+ cars?
- Traffic infrastructure improvements needed to cope with increased demand
- Idea of a hop-on, hop-off bus service covering key routes: C2V, Coast Road, Rampside Road, Furness Abbey, Marina, Walney
- Parking solutions for new residents?

Community and Recreation

- Community orchard?
- There should be an allocation of space for recreation and open community areas
- Sports facilities for children
- Idea of a sports pitch for local schools -St Georges & Sacred Heart
- Park wardens should be on foot to maintain safety
- Links to local schools?
- Potential boat trips to the Isle of Man and Blackpool?

Housing

- Preservation of the large conservation area needs to be kept
- Preference for primarily houses over flats in new developments
- There should be energy-efficient homes that are cost-effective to run
- Affordable residential units
- Should be housing options for retirees (e.g., 1-bedroom homes)
- Are there improvements planned for St. George's Square?

- 2.6 All of the responses have been considered, summarised and proposed amendments to the document have been prepared in light of the consultation. These amendments can be summarised as:

- Factual amendments
- Updates for clarification
- Technical amendments

- 2.7 The amended Draft Marina Village Residential Opportunity Supplementary Planning Document was then made available online and at Barrow Town Hall alongside this statement and schedule of amendments for an advertised period of 4 weeks to satisfy the requirements of the Regulations.

3 Consultation Responses

- 3.1 Below is a table containing all the consultee comments received on the draft Marina Village Residential Opportunity Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) and Westmorland and Furness Council's response to those comments.
- 3.2 For the first two questions we asked people to let us know if they agreed with the vision and development objectives of the site. The results of these are shown below:

Do you agree?	Vision	Development Objectives
Yes	14	10
No	5	7
Not Answered	7	9

- 3.3 As you can see the majority of respondents agree with the vision of the site and with the development objectives for the site. A number of amendments are proposed to the vision and objectives to further strengthen this section in light of the responses received. A number of respondents did not answer this question.
- 3.4 The following table lists a summary of the responses received in order of the survey questions, which follow the layout of the document.

Note: In the Council's response proposed amendments are shown in **Bold** text and deletions as ~~strike through~~ text

Vision for the Site

Do you agree with the vision of the site?

Consultee	Summary of Comments	Council Response
Individual	Hope it happens sooner rather than later.	Noted.
Individual	Hope development will create a positive addition to the town, and that the design for the site will be as innovative as the images produced for the SPD.	This SPD will help to ensure that the site will be a landmark development with a distinct sense of place. Good design is required in the NPPF, National Design Guide, Local Plan and this SPD. A Local Design Code for the District is also being prepared that will further help to facilitate good design.
Individual	Concern about density of development and provision of road and utilities. No provision made for supporting infrastructure/facilities.	The Council has engaged with infrastructure and service providers during the preparation of this draft SPD. MV13 provides guidance on contributions from the developer which will be used to support the delivery of the required local services and infrastructure to support the development.
Individual	Would like to see a marina development with restaurants and retail outlets at the Town Quay as a visitor attraction and for future residents. Provision of more shops and services nearby in	This SPD is limited to the site allocated for Residential Development within the Local Plan. In terms of restaurants and retail outlets, national planning



Consultee	Summary of Comments	Council Response
	preference to the town centre.	guidance in the NPPF and the Local Plan requires a town centre first approach for such uses. However small scale retail uses may be appropriate to support the development.
Individual	<p>Supports the provision of opportunities to</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • encapsulate the fact that Barrow-in-Furness is a seaside town. • educate people of Barrow-in-Furness' rich history of mining and engineering. • Host performances /music/ cultural events/festivals/gatherings. • Use open space to create less dense development. • Promote good design helping to create a wonderful place to live. 	<p>Noted. The SPD and other planning policy requires the development to embrace the heritage of Barrow and the site's waterside location in its design.</p> <p>This SPD will help to ensure that the site will be a landmark development with a distinct sense of place. Good design is required in the NPPF, National Design Guide, Local Plan and this SPD. A Local Design Code for the District is also being prepared that will further help to facilitate good design.</p> <p>MV4 includes the provision of a Buccleuch Dockside events space.</p>
Morecambe Bay Primary Care Collaborative (on behalf of Barrow Together PCN)	<p>Barrow Together PCN are supportive of the growth of the Town but this is tempered by the significant concerns that General Practice has faced long term under investment.</p> <p>Significant population growth further heightens concerns that</p>	MV2 requires contributions for the improvement of local education and health care provision off-site, if required. This will need to be determined depending on the scale,

Consultee	Summary of Comments	Council Response
	<p>resources will not be available to enable the strategy of sustainable healthcare to exist in Barrow.</p> <p>Practices feel it is essential the following aspects are included in the plan:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Publicly funded provision of additional primary care estates <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) this needs to build back the lost Liverpool House clinical and non clinical space b) the additional space must be right sized to also enable the planned population growth to have real additionality of infrastructure c) the increased population will require more colleagues, these workers take up to a decade to train, training space is often overlooked, and so additional space must also include space for trainees to work in practices across the full skill mix d) the change in population will drive new and different clinical needs vs. the traditional population of the area, this will have an impact on space needs for clinical care - this includes the need to consider build resources to cover the significant growth in the contractor and other transitory populations must be included in resource calculations. This may include enhanced ""walk in"" type needs - a provision local practices are not currently funded for, but could explore if resources could be added. <p>Primary care, as the gateway to the NHS recognises other local</p>	<p>mix and timing of residential development. MV13 states that "contributions from the developer will be used to support the delivery of local services and infrastructure" including "enhancement of health services" if required to support the development. These requirements are further supported by the Affordable Housing and Developer Contributions SPD.</p>

Consultee	Summary of Comments	Council Response
	<p>pressured services. particularly Dentistry and community pharmacy which must also be considered, however we are not well placed to comment on solutions.</p> <p>Finally, Primary Care recognises the need for expansion of acute services, to cope with increasing specialist referrals and urgent care demand, again, we will leave others to describe what is needed.</p> <p>The major concern is Primary Care infrastructure must not be considered complete by simply making a section 106 provision - this is NOT sufficient. It rarely works, funding is hard to access, and developers can also be let off around these requirements. Primary Care in the area would require a strong voice and genuine commitment around provision of additional estates and resources to meet the ambitions of the town.</p>	

Consultee	Summary of Comments	Council Response
Associated British Ports	<p>The Port is an important contributor to the local economy supporting Barrow's advanced engineering cluster, particularly for BAE Systems, and nationally and internationally important operations requiring unencumbered marine access.</p> <p>Although the port is economically important now, ABP's masterplan shows that it will play an even more important role in the town's future economy. These are the industries which will be crucial to Barrow's rebirth as a high skill, highly productive manufacturing centre in a decarbonised economy.</p> <p>Housing is going to be important to Barrow's future development. ABP recognises that the Marina Village site is an important opportunity for the redevelopment of a largely underused area within Barrow.</p> <p>Balance of safeguarding port operations and the housing development at Marina Village. Careful planning can resolve these potential conflicts to ensure both a successful port and a successful housing development at the Marina Village site.</p> <p>Page 12 - While we appreciate the reference to ensuring that the residential development is managed and compatible with the operations at the Port of Barrow, we would like to emphasise that this consideration should extend to both current and future operations.</p> <p>ABP agrees in principle with the vision for development on this site but suggests it references the industrial setting of the site given proximity to the working port. Suggest adding the following text to vision:</p>	<p>Page 12, under "Key Constraints", amend as follows:</p> <p>Manage the development of new residential alongside current and future operations at Barrow Port.</p> <p>Page 19, Amend the Vision as follows:</p> <p>A high quality, well designed waterfront neighbourhood set along Barrow's active historic docks, it will offer a new, contemporary housing choice within walking distance of Barrow Town Centre. Set within a sustainable network of vibrant and natural spaces, which support well-being, active travel and a great quality of life, it will offer homes where you can set down roots. A place where heritage, nature, community and landscape connects to Barrow's industrial future, and thrives.</p>



Consultee	Summary of Comments	Council Response
Individual	<p>Consider including creche, nursery and senior citizen sheltered housing.</p> <p>Include separated active travel (cycle, walking, running routes) that do not share space with road traffic to maximise safety and thereby regular use. The separated routes should include their extensions beyond the village to serve retail, education, town centre, work (BAE Systems) locations.</p>	<p>Noted, reference made in objectives to deliverable sustainable community focussed development to support residents throughout their lifetime and MV7 adequately addresses points on active travel and movement.</p>
Cumbria GeoConservation	<p>Cumbria GeoConservation is pleased to support the plans for a new housing development near Buccleuch Dock, Barrow. We support the clear vision for new housing in a waterfront neighbourhood, planned to be sympathetic to the local character.</p>	<p>Endorsement noted.</p>
Historic England	<p>Vision refers to the heritage of the area and the history of the docks. We strongly support its wording which grounds the historic environment as an important consideration, recognising the character of the site and area, and its role within the story of Barrow-in-Furness.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>

Development objectives for the site

Do you agree with the development objectives of the site?

Consultee	Summary of Comments	Council Response
Individual	Housing should be affordable.	Noted, numerous references made to affordability of housing supported by national and local policy requirements.
Individual	<p>Broadly supportive of development of the site.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supports Nature Conservation Area • Cavendish Dock road has to remain to allow access to the Docks/PNTL area • Supports enhanced walking routes at Buccleuch Dock • Supports reuse of The Railwaymens Club possibly as museum of the history of Furness Railway. 	Support noted.
Individual	Supportive of making the most of sites waterfront settings with restaurants, bars and coffee shops, to make Barrow more desirable for visitors and residents.	Noted.
Individual	Level of development too high for current infrastructure.	Noted. Provision of additional infrastructure outlined in SPD particularly in MV2 MV6 and MV7.



Consultee	Summary of Comments	Council Response
Associated British Ports	We agree with development objective 6 in principle. However, the proximity of the proposed public space to the dock presents significant risks, particularly regarding accidental falls into the water, especially if adequate safety measures are not in place. To mitigate these risks, any development of this area should include comprehensive water safety planning and security measures in consultation with ABP.	Noted.
Individual	The National Design Guide is referenced but this needs much more detail on how the principles of "good design" are achieved in practice. See response to MV 11.	Noted.
Friends of the Lake District	<p>The objective should be to provide a mix of homes that meet genuine local needs in respect of type, size, tenure and affordability, informed by an assessment of these needs.</p> <p>There should be an objective relating to the need for the development to protect and enhance biodiversity on the site, and the internationally designated sites immediately adjacent and otherwise close to the site.</p> <p>There should be an objective relating to the need for the development to conserve and enhance the coastal landscape and townscape.</p>	Noted. Landscape and Ecology covered in MV8 and supporting text on page 43 has been strengthened with reference to statutory designated sites of ecological importance.
South Lakes Housing	Supported.	Noted.



Consultee	Summary of Comments	Council Response
Historic England	Supportive of the SPD's Development Objectives, specifically Objective 8 which relates to local heritage; St. George's Conservation Area and listed buildings. However, we would encourage alongside the phrase 'respect local heritage', that you acknowledge the great potential that there is for development to 'enhance' these assets and also their settings.	Proposed amendment Objective 8: Respect and enhance local heritage within....
Ørsted	It is suggested that an additional development objective is added around widening of access road to Port Estate.	It is considered that this point is adequately addressed in MV7 point 13.
United Utilities Water Ltd (U UW)	The vision and development objectives should refer to the need for the design of the development to respond to the climate emergency by ensuring that the design is climate change resilient and adaptive. This includes the incorporation of sustainable water management principles - sustainable drainage and water supply efficiency measures. Suggested wording is provided – see Council Response.	Amend development objective 7 to: ...multi-functional green and blue and spaces..." and "...energy and water efficient homes...

Planning Policy Context

Do you have any comments to make on the planning policy context?

Consultee	Summary of Comments	Council Response
Environment Agency	On page 23 the section “water management” prioritises the use of SuDS. The concept of SuDS is acceptable providing that soakaway drainage is avoidable into made ground. Any developers Drainage Strategy should preferentially provide direct discharge to surface water systems with this site.	Noted.
Individual	Does not support the development of the site for housing.	Noted, however the site is already allocated for residential development in the Barrow Borough Local Plan and therefore the principle is accepted.
Cumbria Constabulary	Proposals to demonstrate compliance with Policy HC5 (and associated guidance in the Local Plan), which can be achieved by conditioning every application to achieve Secured by Design 'Gold' certification.	Noted.



Consultee	Summary of Comments	Council Response
Environment Agency	<p>On page 44 Sustainable Drainage there is reference to SuDS features that include wetlands, ponds, swales, and attenuation basins.</p> <p>We are likely to object to any such features because they rely on soakaway drainage to ground and therefore increase the risk of contaminant mobilisation and associated water quality detriment.</p> <p>Ponds and attenuation basins will require low permeability lining solutions integrated into the design with quality controls and construction quality assurance, otherwise we are likely to object to such features.</p>	<p>Amend text to ensure applicant engages with Environment Agency on proposed SuDS to agree appropriate design.</p> <p>Amend paragraph 1 page 45: ...comprising of features such as swales, raingardens, wetlands and ponds and attenuation basins in consultation with relevant statutory bodies.</p>



Consultee	Summary of Comments	Council Response
Associated British Ports	<p>Supportive of references made to Port of Barrow and ABP's rights as a statutory undertaker to carry out a broad range of activities associated with its operational requirements.</p> <p>New development, therefore, has to be sensitive to these existing uses and avoid potential issues which may prejudice the continued operation and, where appropriate, future expansion of these uses at the Port.</p> <p>We believe that it will be very important to apply the 'agent of change' principle in the practical planning of the development. The development envisaged, while allocated in the Development Plan, will still require very careful management to mitigate any impacts that might otherwise prejudice the ongoing operation of the Port.</p> <p>This will includes taking appropriate account of port operational requirements when developing the design of any future neighbourhood.</p> <p>ABP is very happy to be involved in any future discussions with the Council and developers to address these issues.</p>	Noted.



Consultee	Summary of Comments	Council Response
Friends of the Lake District	<p>Support reference to the Cumbria Good Lighting Technical Advice Note and the fact that it supports the application of policy C7 in the Barrow Local Plan.</p> <p>It is vital that large, 'masterplanned' developments such as this are exemplars in good lighting design. In this case, lighting impacts on biodiversity and the statutory designations must be given close consideration, alongside wider lighting impacts.</p> <p>We would expect to see lighting information demonstrating how the TAN is being met throughout the preparation of the SPD process and in any future planning application.</p>	Noted.
South Lakes Housing	10% affordable housing is low, be great to see this aligned with surrounding areas at 30%.	Noted, 10% is a minimum in current (2024) policy.
Individual	A Local Design Code (p24) is to be produced by WFC. Will this be ready and sufficiently detailed for issue with a Design Brief to potential developers of the Marina Village.	The Design Code will be finalised in 2025.



MV1: Compliance with the SPD

Do you have any comments to make on MV1: Compliance with the SPD?

Consultee	Summary of Comments	Council Response
Cumbria Constabulary	All applications to demonstrate compliance with Policy HC5	Noted.

MV2: Land Use

Do you have any comments to make on MV2: Land Use?

Consultee	Summary of Comments	Council Response
Individual	Leave it to remain natural	Noted, however the site is already allocated for residential development in the Barrow Borough Local Plan and therefore the principle is accepted and the site is required to meet housing need.
Cumbria Constabulary	Optimum balance between buildings and private curtilage with Public Open Space to provide natural surveillance opportunities.	Noted, detailed guidance on POS provided in MV4.
Friends of the Lake District	The SPD should aim for a greater than 10% net gain. The legal requirement is for a minimum of 10%.	Noted, 10% is a minimum in line with current (2024) policy. MV2 amended to replace 'should' with 'must' for clarification.

Consultee	Summary of Comments	Council Response
Individual	The document proposes "a detailed masterplanning process" on page 29. The aspirations of the council are unlikely to be met unless there is very active involvement by the council in developing and agreeing the details.	Noted.
United Utilities Water Ltd (U UW)	Suggested changes provided for the "Utilities and Energy" section of the policy (see Council response).	<p>Under the Utilities and Energy section of MV2 add:</p> <p>The water and wastewater assets of United Utilities must be considered in the proposals for the site including any remediation / engineering works.</p> <p>A foul and surface water strategy will be required.</p>

MV3: Residential Development

Do you have any comments to make on MV3: Residential Development?

Consultee	Summary of Comments	Council Response
Individual	Affordable Housing requested.	Noted, numerous references made to affordability of housing supported by national and local policy requirements.

Consultee	Summary of Comments	Council Response
Individual	Level of development too high for current infrastructure.	Noted. Provision of additional infrastructure outlined in SPD particularly in MV2 MV6 and MV7.
Individual	Leave it to remain natural	Noted, however the site is already allocated for residential development in the Barrow Borough Local Plan and therefore the principle is accepted and the site is required to meet housing need.
Individual	Include some retail, tourism and leisure uses.	Noted, the SPD makes provision or this within MV2.
Cumbria Constabulary	Larger schemes should incorporate a mix of dwellings, enabling greater potential for homes to be occupied throughout the day. This gives increased opportunity for natural surveillance, community interaction, engagement, participation and environmental control.	Noted and addressed in MV3 point 3 and MV10.
Associated British Ports	Ensuring high quality residential development next to the intensifying uses of the port will be critical.	Noted.



Consultee	Summary of Comments	Council Response
Friends of the Lake District	<p>Point 3 - The homes provided should respond to and meet genuine local needs in respect of type, size, tenure and affordability, informed by an assessment of these needs.</p> <p>Point 4 - Future proposals should not simply 'look to encourage a mixed approach to affordable housing siting and locations' - they '...should provide a mixed approach to affordable housing...'"</p>	Agreed and noted.
South Lakes Housing	Really supportive of delivering a range of different residential dwelling typologies and tenures. Needs carefully considering against the existing housing on offer in the area, especially the affordable homes. To ensure that the affordable homes get a good range of house types, not just flats e.g. 1-bed apartments through to 4-bed houses. Again, 10% affordable is low, could this be higher. Anticipate that low cost home ownership will be popular, push for a 50% rental 50% shared ownership tenure split.	Noted, 10% is a minimum in current (2024) policy.

MV4: Public Open Space

Do you have any comments to make on MV4: Public Open Spaces?

Consultee	Summary of Comments	Council Response
Individual	Not enough money spent on leisure, roads or sports facilities.	Noted. Provision of additional infrastructure outlined in SPD particularly in MV2, MV6 and MV7.
Individual	Include provision of retail, food & beverage opportunities to enhance recreation and use of open space.	Noted, numerous references are made to inclusion of this type of provision to support and enhance the residential development.
Cumbria Constabulary	The provision of inclusively designed public open amenity space is an integral part of residential developments, it must be inclusively designed and sited with due regard for wayfinding, permeability and natural surveillance and satisfactory future management and maintenance ensured.	Noted, MV4 supports this statement.
Associated British Ports	Concerns regarding the creation of a Public Open Space along the Buccleuch Dock edge and at Buccleuch Dock Passage for safety and security reasons. Public access in these locations could lead to unauthorised access, interference with port operations, and safety hazards for both the public and port personnel. It is essential that any plans for public open spaces in these areas carefully consider these risks.	Noted.



Consultee	Summary of Comments	Council Response
South Lakes Housing	Buccleuch Dockside events space sounds great, but will need great landscaping and investment to make it successful and used by people. Consideration given to how outdoor spaces are maintained, and if there are service charges, how does this affect affordability, especially for affordable housing customers.	Noted, addressed by MV4 point 6.
Cumbria GeoConservation	Highlight the 'local character' of Barrow and protecting of geological heritage in new development. Suggest local sandstone and materials should be used in the green spaces /informal play areas.	Noted. MV4 sets out the importance of public open space and their ongoing practical management. The Design Principles on page 40 outline the importance of anchoring the development within Barrow's heritage and use of quality materials.
United Utilities Water Ltd (U UW)	Additional criterion requested, with wording provided (see Council response)	Add the following criterion to MV4: The design of any open space will need to have regard to existing utility services. The detail of any open space design will need to be agreed with the relevant utility undertaker. For example, the details of any planting near to utility assets or any changes in levels on top of utility assets.

MV5: Access**Do you have any comments to make on MV5: Access?**

Consultee	Summary of Comments	Council Response
Individual	Roose Rd is already a busy road and another access Rd onto here near Rawlinson St turning will only make it worse.	The site is accessible from the existing local street network, future connections for vehicles, pedestrians and cyclists will need to ensure they integrate with the existing network in line with Highway Authority advice.
Individual	Access will be dreadful for local community	The site is accessible from the existing local street network, future connections for vehicles, pedestrians and cyclists will need to ensure they integrate with the existing network in line with Highway Authority advice.
Individual	Access seems fine	The site is accessible from the existing local street network, future connections for vehicles, pedestrians and cyclists will need to ensure they integrate with the existing network in line with Highway Authority advice.

Consultee	Summary of Comments	Council Response
Cumbria Constabulary	<p>Vehicular and pedestrian routes should be designed to ensure that they are visually open, direct, well used and should not undermine the defensible space of neighbourhoods. Routes must serve the development, connecting places where people want to go - not merely to add to the permeability of the site.</p> <p>Whilst it is accepted that through routes will be included within development layouts, designs must ensure that the security of the development is not compromised by excessive permeability, for instance by allowing the criminal legitimate access to the rear or side boundaries of dwellings, or by providing too many or unnecessary segregated footpaths.</p> <p>Adhere to the footpath lighting guidance BS 5489-1:2020.</p>	<p>Noted, the site is accessible from the existing local street network, future connections for vehicles, pedestrians and cyclists will need to ensure they integrate with the existing network and are well designed in line with the advice of statutory consultees and the Highway Authority.</p>

Consultee	Summary of Comments	Council Response
Associated British Ports	<p>Public access to ensure safety around the Port of Barrow – cycling /walking routes made need to be closed at certain times.</p> <p>To maintain both public safety and the operational efficiency of the port, it is crucial that any future developments or changes to these routes involve consultation with us to determine the best approach for rerouting and access management.</p> <p>Cavendish Dock Road is essential for serving the commercial activities and operational requirements of the port. ABP should be consulted on the design and requirements for the new road to ensure it has the capacity for current and future operations and it is high load bearing to accommodate the weight and frequency of heavy vehicles.</p> <p>Rail access is strategically critical and will need to be retained in all future plans.</p>	Noted.
Friends of the Lake District	<p>MV5 should be reordered to reflect MV7 the need for priority to be given to sustainable transport and active travel. It should be 'vision led' as in the proposed new NPPF. The development should not be led or dominated by car-based transport.</p>	Noted, the points are not listed in priority order.



Consultee	Summary of Comments	Council Response
BAE Systems	If a bridge crossing Buccleuch Dock on the elbow where there used to be a rail crossing is considered, close engagement with BAE Systems is required to ensure it does not conflict with Submarine movements down the dock system, any material BAES need to bring to site using the dock system and dredging barges.	Noted, a pedestrian bridge is not proposed within the SPD but the requirements of MV5 and MV7 provide guidance on pedestrian connectivity and the need to balance the requirements of the operational port with those of the residential site.
Natural England	Reference made to inclusion of connectivity with the King Charles III England Coast Path (KCIIIIECP) National Trail to ensure continuous route is maintained in line with the legislation.	Text added to page 35: Opportunities should be made to connect with national walking and cycle routes including the King Charles III England Coast Path (KCIIIIECP) National Trail.

Consultee	Summary of Comments	Council Response
Ørsted	<p>The draft SPD refers to improvement to the junction at Cavendish Dock Road and the re-routing of the Eastern section of Cavendish Dock Road as it passes through the site. Ørsted would like to be consulted further on the detail relating to these elements of the development.</p> <p>Ørsted supports upgrades to the severely constrained Cavendish Dock Road that would ease the safe transportation of abnormal loads and ensure uninterrupted access between Salthouse Road and the South Side of ABP's Port Estate.</p> <p>Ørsted would like to see a widening of the full length of Cavendish Dock Road. Street furniture and lighting etc. should be movable to accommodate abnormal loads. Any changes to the routing of Cavendish Road should undergo swept path analysis. Ørsted would require uninterrupted access to ABP's Port Estate whilst the re-routing works take place. Ørsted would welcome separation between motorised vehicles and cyclists and pedestrians. Ørsted would like to see traffic measures introduced to protect pedestrians and cyclists all the way up the Cavendish Dock Car Park.</p> <p>It is noted that there is an aspiration to have a double fronted street running along Cavendish Dock Road. Ørsted would like design measures to include sound deadening landscaping and improved sound proofing of these road facing properties to minimise future complaints from residents in respect of port traffic, including Ørsted's existing and future use of the road.</p> <p>With the delivery of 800 homes, a significant increase road, footpath and cycleway users would be expected. Ørsted would</p>	<p>Noted. Ørsted will be consulted during the planning process.</p> <p>Page 17, under the heading "Accessibility", Key Constraint 1 addresses the need for larger vehicles to use the road to access the Port.</p> <p>Propose additional key constraints:</p> <p>Uninterrupted access to the Port Estate would be required whilst the re-routing works at Cavendish Dock Road take place.</p> <p>Page 17, under the heading "Accessibility", add the following key constraint:</p> <p>Measures will be needed to ensure that unauthorised access to ABP's Operational Port of Barrow is discouraged, taking account of the potential increase of road users, pedestrians and cyclists as a result of development in this location.</p>

Consultee	Summary of Comments	Council Response
United Utilities Water Ltd (U UW)	Additional criterion requested, with wording provided (see Council response)	Add the following criterion to MV5: The detail of any accesses / roads that cross utility assets will need to be agreed.

MV6: Utilities and Services

Do you have any comments to make on MV6: Utilities and Services?

Consultee	Summary of Comments	Council Response
Individual	Old ancient Sewage systems cannot cope with more housing.	Noted. Provision of additional infrastructure outlined in SPD particularly in MV2 MV6 and MV7.
Cumbria Constabulary	Consideration for the inclusion of electric vehicle charging facilities and how this will enhance casual supervision opportunities and avoidance of conflict between users/neighbours.	Noted, though this will be at planning application stage.
Individual	Extra underground service ducting should be provided in anticipation of all future utility service requirements. To prevent disturbance and unsightly spoilation of carriageway and hard standings.	Noted.



Consultee	Summary of Comments	Council Response
Electricity North West	<p>The site is adjacent to or affects ENW operational land or electricity distribution assets. Advice given on ensuring developments does not encroach on, or the right of access to, these assets.</p> <p>HSE guidance highlighted in relation to working close to underground and overground electrical assets.</p>	Noted. MV 6 point 3 draws particular attention to the electrical substation and safeguarding access to it.
Network Rail	<p>Attention drawn to protection of Network Rail assets, the operational railway presents risks/issues that are different/unique to those on none railway undertaker land. Ensure works do not impact the safe operation, stability, integrity of the railway & its boundary. Planning conditions suggested to control this.</p>	Suggestions for planning conditions noted. Network Rail will be notified during the pre-application stage and once a subsequent planning application has been submitted.
Network Rail	Amendment to the third paragraph under “Utilities, Services and Energy” requested..	<p>Add to third paragraph under “Utilities, Services and Energy”:</p> <p>Liaison with statutory undertakers will be required to ensure the existing utilities and easements that cross and surround the site will need to be are carefully considered and integrated as part of a streetscape / public realm / open space network.</p>
United Utilities Water Ltd (UW)	<p>Amendments to MV6 requested, with wording provided (see Council response).</p> <p>There is no mention of the rising sewer that passes through the</p>	<p>Amend MV6 as follows:</p> <p>1. The masterplan and development parcel should be prepared in consultation and agreed with utility</p>

Consultee	Summary of Comments	Council Response
	<p>site. Building or raising the land over this asset will not be allowed without prior agreement. When planning for remediation and engineering works near to U UW's water and wastewater assets, the approach should be agreed with U UW. Amended text is provided (see Council Response).</p>	<p>providers..." "...to support residential development. Foul and sustainable surface water arrangements will need to be agreed in full and as part of a strategy for the whole site.</p> <p>2. ...Future development will confirm the required easements to existing utility infrastructure and ensure ease of access and maintenance when required. Agreement on any approach to construction / engineering / remediation works, in the vicinity of utility assets will need to be agreed with the relevant undertaker.</p> <p>4. A comprehensive foul and surface water Drainage Strategy that sets out a full assessment of surface water hierarchy must be prepared for the site, and agreed by the Council prior to its implementation.</p> <p>Page 17, under the heading "Existing Water Services", amend as follows: The water services for the site are provided by United Utilities. The site contains one existing water main which is A large rising sewer that operates</p>



Consultee	Summary of Comments	Council Response
		under pressure passes through the site , routed down Cavendish Dock Road from Salthouse Road and follows the direction of the road through the site. United Utilities will not allow building over of their assets, including any changes in levels on top of such assets, without prior agreement.

MV7: Streets and Movement

Do you have any comments to make on MV7: Streets & Movement?

Consultee	Summary of Comments	Council Response
Individual	Busy Roose Rd. Another entrance near Rawlinson St will cause chaos and accidents.	The site is accessible from the existing local street network, future connections for vehicles, pedestrians and cyclists will need to ensure they integrate with the existing network in line with Highway Authority advice.
Individual	A large car park hopefully will be included for visitors	Noted, detailed design will be considered at planning application stage.

Consultee	Summary of Comments	Council Response
Cumbria Constabulary	<p>Ensuring that all routes remain in full view (e.g. footpaths between blank gables or adjacent to 'inactive' elevations are not permitted).</p> <p>The desire for connectivity should not compromise the ability of householders to exert ownership over private or communal 'defensible space'.</p> <p>Vehicles, cyclists and pedestrians should be kept together if the route is over any significant length – there should be a presumption against routes serving only pedestrians and/or cyclists away from the road unless they are wide, open, short and overlooked.</p>	<p>Noted, future connections for vehicles, pedestrians and cyclists will need to ensure they integrate with the existing network and are well designed in line with the advice of statutory consultees and the Highway Authority. Detailed design will be considered at planning application stage.</p>
Individual	<p>Consider how the planned cycling infrastructure along Salthouse Road can be routed through the northern boundary of the site to bypass St George's Hill. The road here is too narrow to accommodate LTN 1/20 compliant cycle infrastructure and is very uncomfortable to cycle over from a safety point of view. A cycle/footpath routed through the site would provide a flat car free alternative, removing a key physical and psychological barrier to those wishing to access the town centre.</p>	<p>Noted, future connections for vehicles, pedestrians and cyclists will need to ensure they integrate with the existing network and are well designed in line with the advice of statutory consultees and the Highway Authority.</p>



Consultee	Summary of Comments	Council Response
Individual	<p>Include for separate active travel routes with deliberate boundary level separation from vehicular travel.</p> <p>Make the village a 20mph zone for safety and to encourage use by a community with expected young families.</p> <p>Prevent parking of motor vehicles on the active travel routes by detailed design considerations</p> <p>Design out obstructions and visual blight created by carefully considered design arrangements for parking and dustbin waste collections.</p> <p>Avoid paviour construction of all highway areas. Longevity and performance often very poor and needs replacement, blighting the development.</p>	<p>Noted, future connections for vehicles, pedestrians and cyclists will need to ensure they integrate with the existing network and are well designed in line with the advice of statutory consultees and the Highway Authority.</p> <p>Consideration for refuse collection and surfacing as above.</p>
South Lakes Housing	Supportive, really like the detail and approach proposed in the SPD.	Support Noted.
BAE Systems	Requirement for movement and access to take account for BAE Systems boat programme use of the dock system for exiting the Barrow site. 2. To support a Submarine Exit, BAE utilise Number 3 and 4 berth at ABP and vehicle access to the berth will need to be maintained, this can include HGV/Crane access.	Criterion 13 of MV7 sets out that the requirements of the operational port should be taken into account in the design of streets and movement hierarchy for the residential site.

Consultee	Summary of Comments	Council Response
National Highways	National Highways encourages development that facilitates a reduction in the need to travel by private car, focusing on sustainable locations. Development should give priority to walking, wheeling and cycle movements and facilitate access to high-quality public transport where possible. Due consideration should be given to home and street layouts, broadband infrastructure, safe and secure cycle parking, and access to local amenities and open space, while mobility or micromobility hubs should be provided in larger schemes.	<p>Agreed. The site is situated in a sustainable location, within easy walking distance of the town centre, bus routes and the proposed cycle scheme at Salthouse Road.</p> <p>Policy MV7 sets out the key movement principles that the SPD seeks to establish.</p> <p>Policy MV6 requires a utilities plan which sets out the strategy for the maintenance, installation and delivery of existing and new required services, including broadband.</p> <p>Policy MV4 requires public open space on the site.</p>
Network Rail	Proposals to open up one of the railway arches at Salthouse Road to create a new pedestrian access will need to be worked through with Network Rail to assess the feasibility.	Noted.

Consultee	Summary of Comments	Council Response
Open Spaces Society	There is a lack of green open spaces in the town centre. The SPD should ensure that the pedestrian and cycle routes at the site are within a green corridor, rather than being focused on hard landscaping, possibly using native flora found along the shoreline.	<p>Amend page 41, Streets and Movement, paragraph 4:</p> <p>However, encouraging sustainable trips linked to local every day and recreational activities should be encouraged through the delivery of high-quality pedestrian and cycle infrastructure and green routes."</p> <p>Amend MV7 point 1:</p> <p>To promote non-car movements, a quality network will need to be provided, including the delivery of green routes."</p>



Consultee	Summary of Comments	Council Response
Open Spaces Society / Ramblers Lake District Area	<p>The SPD does not recognise the route of the King Charles III England Coast Path through the site. The SPD must recognise the approved line of the England Coast Path, including the spreading room associated with the path and amenity of users.</p> <p>The England Coast Path should be included in the table of key features as an opportunity</p>	<p>Amended to make reference to the England Coast Path. See response to Natural England's comments above (under MV5).</p> <p>Also, MV7, after point 10, add additional point:</p> <p>Enhance the amenity of the England Coast Path through the site.</p> <p>Amend page 18, bullet 4:</p> <p>Opportunity to provide continuous access along Buccleuch Dock Quayside as part of the England Coast Path.</p>

MV8: Landscape and Ecology

Do you have any comments to make on MV8: Landscape and Ecology?

Consultee	Summary of Comments	Council Response
Individual	As stated previously, hopefully the work on creating the Nature Conservation Area will be one of, if not the first activity on the site in order to gain an establish ecological area when houses are becoming occupied	The provision of the Nature Conservation Area and careful response to the ecological sensitivities of the site are supported throughout the document. The Council recognises the importance of the Nature Conservation Area as integral to the masterplanning approach, to protect and enhance ecological and biodiverse environments, as part of a holistic development.
Individual	Lots of wildlife like hedgehogs, bees, butterfly's and moths need to get addressed. Plant trees and shrubs that's attract wildlife and hedgehog passages must be included in the building plan. Also swallow nesting.	Noted, MV8 sets the principles of protecting and enhancing biodiversity and ecology on the site.
Individual	Yes leave it alone	Noted, MV8 sets the principles of protecting and enhancing biodiversity and ecology on the site.



Consultee	Summary of Comments	Council Response
Cumbria Constabulary	<p>Landscaping schemes shall be designed to promote surveillance opportunities and avoiding the creation of hiding places - especially adjacent to footpaths/cycle routes.</p> <p>The choice, location and grown densities of all plant species to be carefully considered to ensure they do not obstruct views or impede the effects of street lighting, as they mature.</p> <p>It is essential that a robust maintenance programme is established, to prevent shrubs and trees becoming too overgrown and undermining these attributes.</p> <p>Planting of low-level species can be utilised to establish garden curtilages, obviously declaring the demarcation of private and public spaces and contributing to the biodiversity gain.</p>	Noted MV8 point 6 provides guidance on planting, detailed design will be considered at planning application stage.
Individual	A plan (financial and management) for careful and regular maintenance, plus protection, is essential to avoid blight, protect and encourage biodiversity and to encourage use of green spaces for wellbeing and exercise.	Noted MV4 point 6 provides guidance on management of open space.

Consultee	Summary of Comments	Council Response
<p>Friends of the Lake District</p>	<p>The biodiversity value of the site should not be assumed to be low because it is brownfield. The site is identified on MAGiC as Open Mosaic Habitat https://www.data.gov.uk/dataset/8509c11a-de20-42e8-9ce4-b47e0ba47481/open-mosaic-habitat-draft</p> <p>We welcome the inclusion of a Nature Conservation Area, but measures for biodiversity and habitat creation should be applied throughout the site, and not be limited to the Nature Conservation Area.</p> <p>The SPD should aim for a greater than 10% net gain. The legal requirement is for a minimum of 10%.</p> <p>MV8 should include specific reference to the existing internationally designated sites immediately adjacent and otherwise close to the site.</p> <p>MV8 should include reference to the need for the development to protect and enhance biodiversity on the site, and the internationally designated sites immediately adjacent and otherwise close to the site. It should also include a reference to the need to conserve and enhance the coastal landscape and to the relationship of the development to both the coast and the wider townscape.</p> <p>MV8 should state what new habitat creation will be informed by, what will be its reference points e.g. will it be informed by the LNRS, existing habitats, gaps in connectivity?</p>	<p>The biodiversity value of the brownfield site is acknowledged.</p> <p>10% biodiversity net gain is a minimum in current (2024) policy. Future development should aim to firstly achieve as much Biodiversity Net Gain on site, by creating or enhancing habitats to generate additional biodiversity, this includes but is not limited to, enhancement of the Nature Conservation Area.</p> <p>Supporting text on page 43 is amended to make explicit reference to designated sites.</p> <p>Page 43 bullet 5 to address this point.</p> <p>Suggested amendment to page 44 additional bullet point:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensure consideration of the priorities of the Cumbria Local Nature Recovery Strategy and associated local habitat map when creating and enhancing habitats.

Consultee	Summary of Comments	Council Response
Natural England	<p>Use of Nature Conservation Area as a buffer to the designated sites – need to ensure this area is sufficient to protect the wider ecological network for nature recovery.</p> <p>NE recommend additional ecological surveys are conducted alongside the full HRA. Need to understand the impact of recreational uses associated with the development on the designated sites so mitigation can be included in the HRA.</p> <p>Links to LNRS welcomed.</p>	<p>Noted, proposed additional wording to MV8 point 2: and be sufficient to protect the wider ecological network for nature recovery.</p>
United Utilities Water Ltd (U UW)	<p>Amendments to MV8 requested, with wording provided (see Council response)</p>	<p>Amend MV8 as follows:</p> <p>The design and masterplanning of the site must make space for multi-functional Ssurface water management features integrated with the landscaping for the site. The design should include ‘on plot’ and ‘off plot’ features e.g. ponds, wetlands, swales, permeable surfacing, rainwater gardens etc which should be designed to support favourable flora and fauna habitat opportunities.</p>

**MV9: Sustainable Drainage**

Do you have any comments to make on MV9: Sustainable Drainage?

Consultee	Summary of Comments	Council Response
Individual	Must be addressed for flooding reasons. Roose Rd has often had floods in bad weather.	Noted, MV9 requires a site wide Flood Risk & Water Management Strategy will be required for the development which will need to be agreed by the statutory bodies and consultees.

Consultee	Summary of Comments	Council Response
Associated British Ports	<p>Surface water drainage plans that involve the dock system could have several potential impacts on the dock, which is why it is crucial that any such plans be agreed upon by ABP and BAES. The key concerns include:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Water Quality: Improperly managed surface water drainage could introduce pollutants, sediments, or debris into the dock, affecting water quality. This could have environmental consequences, harm marine life, and potentially disrupt port operations. 2. Flooding Risk: If the drainage system is not properly designed, it could lead to an increased risk of flooding within the dock area, especially during heavy rainfall. This could impact port infrastructure and the safety of operations. 3. Hydrodynamic Changes: Alterations in the drainage system might affect the flow patterns of water within the dock, potentially leading to erosion of dock walls, siltation, or changes in water levels that could interfere with vessel movements and berthing. 4. Structural Integrity: Inadequate drainage management could lead to waterlogging or subsidence around the dock infrastructure, undermining the structural integrity of docks, quays, and adjacent roads. <p>Given these potential impacts, it is essential that any drainage plans involving the dock system be thoroughly reviewed and agreed upon by ABP and BAES to ensure that they do not negatively affect the dock's operations, safety, or environment.</p>	<p>Noted, MV9 requires a site wide Flood Risk & Water Management Strategy will be required for the development which will need to be agreed by the statutory bodies and consultees.</p>



Consultee	Summary of Comments	Council Response
Network Rail	Safeguard against flooding of railway land/assets from failed or poorly maintained drainage features.	<p>Amendment proposed to page 45 paragraph 1: Open spaces across the masterplan site can also facilitate SuDS features and below ground drainage facilities as required.</p> <p>Consideration should be given to the maintenance and renewal of new and amended drainage features to ensure longevity and mitigate against risk of flooding elsewhere.</p>
United Utilities Water Ltd (U UW)	<p>Amendments to MV9 requested, with wording provided (see Council response)</p> <p>Regarding criterion 4, U UW suggest that the Council discusses this further with the LLFA. If surface water discharges direct to the adjacent docks, a higher rate of discharge may be an option.</p> <p>Suggest that the design of any surface water discharge into the docks would need to appropriately consider the risk associated with hydraulic locking as a result of tidal changes.</p>	<p>Amend MV9 as follows:</p> <p>1. Development should be planned in a way that restricts surface water run off into existing water systems, as part of a site wide Flood Risk and Water Management Strategy. Surface water must be discharged in accordance with the surface water hierarchy. The sustainable drainage shall be multi-functional, in accordance with the four pillars of sustainable drainage, in preference to underground piped and tanked storage systems, unless there is clear evidence why such techniques are not possible. The</p>

Consultee	Summary of Comments	Council Response
		<p>sustainable drainage must be integrated with the whole of the landscaped environment and the strategy for biodiversity net gain.</p> <p>2. Space must be made for a A variety of on plot and off plot SuDS features that should must form positive and integrated features as part of the wider landscape strategy for the site, providing ecological benefits, providing habitat for local flora and fauna. e.g. ponds, wetlands, swales, permeable surfacing, rainwater gardens, tree pits, bioretention areas etc.</p> <p>5. The foul and SuDS strategy should be holistic, covering the whole of the site to ensure a comprehensive solution. A co-ordinated approach to any pumping will be required which avoids a proliferation of pumping stations.</p> <p>6. Any Surface Water Discharge into Buccleuch Dock needs further</p>

Consultee	Summary of Comments	Council Response
		<p>investigation and engagement with stakeholders. will need to be prepared in consultation with stakeholders and include a treatment train that demonstrates no unacceptable impact on the habitat of the receiving body.</p> <p>The Council has liaised with the LLFA regarding criterion 4, and they are satisfied with the wording.</p>

MV10: Density and Scale

Do you have any comments to make on MV10: Density and Scale?

Consultee	Summary of Comments	Council Response
Individual	Too many houses in small space	MV10 sets out guidance for development density across different parts of the large (24ha plus) site.



Consultee	Summary of Comments	Council Response
Associated British Ports	<p>The current figure suggests Increased of density towards the port boundary and BAE systems.</p> <p>All density plans should be subject to safeguards on dust, noise and traffic, which are intended to protect the interests of residents, whilst not constraining future industrial development.</p>	Noted.
South Lakes Housing	Agree with proposal put forward.	Noted.

MV11: Development Sustainability

Do you have any comments to make on MV11: Development Sustainability?

Consultee	Summary of Comments	Council Response
Individual	Again too many houses. It was supposed to be Marina not housing estate. What happened to the idea of boat galas etc	This SPD is limited to the site allocated for Residential Development within the Local Plan. MV10 sets out guidance for development density across the site.

Consultee	Summary of Comments	Council Response
Individual	<p>I believe that Westmorland and Furness Council are missing out on a great opportunity by not thinking about future sustainability and losing visitors and residents to other areas which may provide better facilities that you would expect for a marina development with restaurants and retail outlets. This would also attract a lot of people to the area instead of locals with money to spend, leaving the area to go to other coastal towns or cities. All across the UK, Cities and towns have enhanced their towns with Marina Villages that have cinemas, restaurants etc.. and this has never deterred people from still using the Town Centre shops and restaurants. There will be an influx of people to Barrow over the next 30 years and if this village just remains a residential area with parks and possible 'pop ups' then it could essentially become a 'posh' Barrow Island..... it needs to be a Hub too. If I was purchasing a very expensive waterfront apartment, I would prefer to have an artisan cafe, bakery or restaurant on my doorstep, as an option to walking into town.</p>	<p>This SPD is limited to the site allocated for Residential Development within the Local Plan. In terms of restaurants and retail outlets, national planning guidance in the NPPF and the Local Plan requires a town centre first approach for such uses. However small scale retail uses may be appropriate to support the development.</p>
Cumbria Constabulary	<p>Constructing well designed places, buildings and communities that promote both sustainable communities and health and wellbeing is an objective that Secured by Design widely supports; however, it is imperative that they must also be safe, secure, and accessible. Mitigating the opportunities for crime is not only about reducing and preventing injury and crime, but it is also about building strong, cohesive, vibrant and participatory communities.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>

Consultee	Summary of Comments	Council Response
Individual	<p>Concern over the delivery of the scheme by developer of delivery partner being driven by profit over quality of design and outcomes, including achieving longevity for the development.</p> <p>It is therefore vitally important that the council's future design brief issued to developers gives clear and detailed definitions of such terms as "well designed", "good design", "high quality design", ""sustainable"", "durability" and "longevity" – soft, undefined words and terms that typically litter policy statements (both government NPPF and WFC planning policy statements).</p> <p>To help achieve high quality and distinctive design and ensure sustainability and future management. The council's design brief to developers should include a statement to the effect of:</p> <p>"The Council will expect the detailed masterplanning process and output to be led by a specialist masterplanning/ architectural/ urban design company, acting in conjunction with the developer and the council. Successful examples of their work in waterside and sustainable developments shall be submitted with the developer proposals."</p> <p>Will the council include a "buy British", where available, condition in its design brief. This again is a key element in sustainability - reducing air/sea miles of imported goods and stimulating UK socio-economics.</p> <p>Will the council include a requirement by the developer to provide apprenticeships and training to local people and where possible use local services/supplies?</p>	<p>Noted. At this stage the developer/delivery partner is not known.</p> <p>The Council's recently prepared Social Value in Commissioning and Procurement Statement will guide this process.</p> <p>Additional objective 10 is added as below:</p> <p>Embed the principles of social value to ensure additional outcomes from the delivery of the development which provide social and environmental benefits, improve skills and educational outcomes for residents, whilst broadening opportunities and supporting the local the economy.</p>



Consultee	Summary of Comments	Council Response
Friends of the Lake District	<p>We recognise the reference at point 4, but MV11 should make clear that all new buildings will be expected to maximise provision of roof-top solar PV, and that clear justification and alternatives will be required for any that do not. Likewise battery storage so that the power generated can be stored for use when needed. Simply stating that solar PV should 'be incorporated' into the development could technically be met by including a single solar panel.</p> <p>MV11 should include a reference to sustainable and active travel. Whilst we recognise this is covered elsewhere in the SPD, it is a crucial element of development sustainability.</p> <p>Water efficiency should be referred to.</p>	<p>Amend MV11 point 4 to: Microgeneration of renewable energy through the installation of Photovoltaic (PV) Panels and associated battery storage should be incorporated.</p> <p>Add new point 8. Ensuring proposals incorporate water efficiency measures.</p>
South Lakes Housing	Very supportive of the sustainability measures proposed and great to see this defined at an early stage.	Support noted.
National Highways	For the UK to achieve net zero carbon status by 2050, action is needed to support a modal shift away from car travel. The NPPF supports this position. Also, the use of low carbon materials and products, innovative design solutions and construction methods to minimise resource consumption. These considerations should be taken into account within any relevant Local Plan policies to ensure that future planning decisions are in line with the necessary transition to net zero carbon.	Agreed. Policy MV11 sets out how development should minimise its impacts on the environment.



Consultee	Summary of Comments	Council Response
United Utilities Water Ltd (U UW)	Additional criterion requested, with wording provided (see Council response).	Add the following criterion 8 MV11: All new dwellings must achieve, as a minimum, the optional requirement set through Building Regulations Requirement G2: Water Efficiency or any future updates. All major non-residential development shall incorporate water efficiency measures so that predicted per capita consumption does not exceed the levels set out in the applicable BREEAM 'Excellent' standard.

MV12: Planning Application Requirements

Do you have any comments to make on MV12: Planning Application Requirements?

Consultee	Summary of Comments	Council Response
Individual	Hedgehog tunnels required. Bird, butterfly, bee, moth and bat friendly planting. Installation of bird and bat boxes	Noted, MV8 sets the principles of protecting and enhancing biodiversity and ecology on the site.
Cumbria Constabulary	Applications conditioned to achieve Secured by Design 'Gold' certification.	Noted.

Consultee	Summary of Comments	Council Response
Friends of the Lake District	<p>We note that the local validation requirements do not specifically refer to the information required by the Cumbria Good Lighting Technical Advice Note (TAN).</p> <p>They also imply that only proposals "involving floodlighting in the vicinity of residential property, a listed building or a conservation area, ecologically sensitive areas or watercourses" need an external lighting assessment. This approach would not comply with the TAN and the local validation requirements should be updated.</p> <p>As relying on the current validation requirements would not ensure this, MV12 should state that the information sought by the TAN will also be required in any application relating to the Residential Opportunity site.</p>	<p>Noted, comments will be passed to Development Management regarding the local validation requirements.</p>

MV13: Infrastructure Requirements**Do you have any comments to make on MV13: Infrastructure Requirements?**

Consultee	Summary of Comments	Council Response
Individual	Additional infrastructure requirements should include: Facilities for residents and visitors, toilets, visitor centre/cafe, some small retail outlets and cafes and or restaurants in the form of a Marina Village as you would expect....	In terms of restaurants and retail outlets, national planning guidance in the NPPF and the Local Plan requires a town centre first approach for such uses. However small scale retail uses may be appropriate to support the development MV2.



Consultee	Summary of Comments	Council Response
NHS LSCICB	<p>I note that developer contributions will be sought for the improvement of Health Care off site. The Alfred Barrow Health Centre and Duke St surgery is within walking distance of the proposed site and will be the location where new residents are likely to register for General Medical Services. The Health centre is home to 3 GP practices who are already at capacity along with Duke St surgery and the ICB is working very closely with all 4 surgeries to increase clinical capacity at these sites. Using ONS data for approximate occupancy levels an 800 dwelling development is likely to generate an additional 2000 or so patients at the site. More accurate calculations will be undertaken once house types are determined.</p> <p>The ICB will be seeking a financial contribution from the development to support local Health care in Barrow. The contribution received will be utilised to boost additional clinical capacity being created at existing surgery sites closest to the site. Without financial assistance from the proposal local NHS services will not be able to process and care for the anticipated growth in this area. The ICB is also aware of the planned increase in population locally as a result of the Team Barrow scheme at nearby BAE systems. The cumulative impact of these large proposals will create a burden on local health care services that requires a recognised monetary response for further clinical accommodation. The ICB is not against the principle of the development but without a secure developer payment that the ICB will request at planning application stage then the ICB will have no choice but to object to any emerging application.</p>	Noted, MV13 and supporting text sets out the approach to developer contributions and the Council acknowledges the impact on health care and associated infrastructure.



Consultee	Summary of Comments	Council Response
<p>Morecambe Bay Primary Care Collaborative (on behalf of Barrow Together PCN)</p>	<p>Local GP Practices that make up Barrow Together PCN are supportive of the growth of the Town. This enthusiasm for growth and socio-economic improvements is tempered by the significant concerns regarding the need for material improvement to public sector infrastructure.</p> <p>General Practice has faced over a decade of under investment. The recent Darzi review makes clear the need for growth of primary care services to meet current needs, as populations age and prevention (primary and secondary) becomes key to financial sustainability of health and social care. The track record of national and local commissioning decisions does not give any hope to practices that this shift of resources will occur.</p> <p>As locally practices are now looking at significant population growth, this further heightens concerns that resources will not be available to enable the strategy of sustainable healthcare to exist in Barrow.</p> <p>Practices feel it is essential the following aspects are included in the plan:</p> <p>1) Publicly funded provision of additional primary care estates a) this needs to build back the lost Liverpool House clinical and non clinical space</p>	<p>Support noted along with the concern that the positive impacts of the development must not exacerbate deficiencies in current local provision.</p>

Consultee	Summary of Comments	Council Response
	<p>b) the additional space must be right sized to also enable the planned population growth to have real additionality of infrastructure</p> <p>c) the increased population will require more colleagues, these workers take up to a decade to train, training space is often overlooked, and so additional space must also include space for trainees to work in practices across the full skill mix</p> <p>d) the change in population will drive new and different clinical needs vs. the traditional population of the area, this will have an impact on space needs for clinical care - this includes the need to consider build resources to cover the significant growth in the contractor and other transitory populations must be included in resource calculations. This may include enhanced ""walk in"" type needs - a provision local practices are not currently funded for, but could explore if resources could be added.</p> <p>As a potential solution, we note the closest primary care building is Alfred Barrow, and building designed to be 3 stories tall, an additional floor could therefore be added on the same footprint. Running costs, staffing costs and wider need for primary care input into planning and detailed mobilisation of new services would be crucial in making this a success.</p> <p>Primary care, as the gateway to the NHS recognises other local pressured services. particularly Dentistry and community pharmacy which must also be considered, however we are not</p>	

Consultee	Summary of Comments	Council Response
	<p>well placed to comment on solutions.</p> <p>Finally, Primary Care recognises the need for expansion of acute services, to cope with increasing specialist referrals and urgent care demand, again, we will leave others to describe what is needed.</p> <p>The major concern is Primary Care infrastructure must not be considered complete by simply making a section 106 provision - this is NOT sufficient. It rarely works, funding is hard to access, and developers can also be let off around these requirements. Primary Care in the area would require a strong voice and genuine commitment around provision of additional estates and resources to meet the ambitions of the town.</p> <p>Primary Care is keen to see the positive impacts of the development, but this must not be at the cost of the health of local people.</p>	

Consultee	Summary of Comments	Council Response
Associated British Ports	<p>Subject to planning approval, the Barrow Energy Dock project, involves the installation of a 32 MWp floating solar array on Cavendish Dock. We are working to address health, safety, and environmental concerns to ensure the project can be implemented while preserving Cavendish Dock as potential recreational space.</p> <p>It would be helpful to see explicit mention of this project in the SPD, or reference to the wider future development of Cavendish Dock, in order that housing development is not used as a reason to obstruct the future provision of renewable energy at Cavendish Dock.</p>	<p>Noted. Reference is not included to this potential future development outwith the residential site however support is given to the recreational importance of Cavendish Dock and reference made to environmental sustainability and energy generation.</p>

Consultee	Summary of Comments	Council Response
National Highways	<p>National Highways will work with the Council to understand the transport implications of development options. This will include assessing the cumulative and individual impacts of proposals on the ability of the road links and junctions affected to accommodate the forecast traffic flows in terms of capacity and safety.</p> <p>National Highways will work with the Council and developers to identify opportunities to introduce travel plan and demand management measures through the SPD. These will be based on existing and proposed patterns of development in a manner that will support sustainable transport choice and retain capacity within the transport network to provide for further development in future Plan periods.</p> <p>The A590 is the main movement of traffic from the M6 into Barrow Town Centre. Considering the number of proposed houses which will look to meet housing needs, it is important to ensure ongoing communication and liaison continues as the SPD progresses.</p>	Agreed and noted.

Any other comments

Do you have any other general comments to make on the SPD?

Consultee	Summary of Comments	Council Response
Environment Agency	<p>Page 15 Flood Risk</p> <p>The first paragraph refers to 'Areas Benefitting from Defences' (ABD). Since we were last consulted on this site the Environment Agency have taken the decision to retire this (ABD) dataset and remove it from the Flood Map for Planning portal.</p> <p>Please refer more correctly to 'Reduction in Risk of Flooding from Rivers and Sea', where applicable and not in this case.</p> <p>Therefore remove reference to ABD from document.</p> <p>N.B. This site is not in an area indicated at Reduction in Risk of Flooding from Rivers and Sea</p>	<p>Amend page 15 Column 1 paragraph:</p> <p>The majority of the site is located in Flood Zone 1 according to the Environment Agency Flood Zone maps with small areas of the site falling into Flood Zones 2 and 3 and 'Areas Benefitting from Defences'.</p>



Consultee	Summary of Comments	Council Response
Environment Agency	<p>Page 15 Flood Risk - any assessment of tidal flood risk will have to assess Sea level allowances as a result of climate change. The coastline will be subject to sea level rise in the future. The science is unequivocal on this.</p> <p>Correct the wording to be more reflective of the guidance and the reality of Climate Change driven Sea Level Rise.</p>	<p>Amend page 15 Flood Risk, Column 1 paragraph 2:</p> <p>The site is not at risk from tidal flooding, though the coastline could will be subject to sea level rise in the future.</p> <p>Assessment of tidal flood risk will have to assess sea level allowances as a result of climate change.</p> <p>Westmorland and Furness Council have embarked on a Level 1 SFRA study. The SFRA will include information on tidal flood risk and provide a more accurate picture of Tidal Flood Risk and Sea Level Rise and this should be taken into account.</p>
Environment Agency	<p>Page 15 Flood Risk- Reference is made to Phase 1 planning application assessment it is not clear what design flood these levels are based on.</p> <p>As acknowledged in key constraints, careful design and flood risk mitigation consideration will need to be given to the potential to transfer flood risk into the urban area to the north of the proposal and north of Salthouse Road, A5087, Cavendish Dock Road and the Docks side.</p>	Noted.



Consultee	Summary of Comments	Council Response
Environment Agency	Page 15 Flood Risk Column 2 Bullet 2- We support the approach to manage surface water in a sustainable way and to enhance blue green infrastructure. Be clear what is driving the SUDS proposal.	Amend text bullet 2: Opportunity for use of Sustainable Urban Drainage and through design of landscape features to mitigate impacts of flooding to manage surface water and surface flood risk on the site in a sustainable manner.
Individual	Does not support the development of the site for housing.	Noted, however the site is already allocated for residential development in the Barrow Borough Local Plan and therefore the principle is accepted.
Individual	Does not support the development of the site for housing on the grounds of the natural beauty of the site appreciated by local people.	Noted, however the site is already allocated for residential development in the Barrow Borough Local Plan and therefore the principle is accepted.
Cumbria Constabulary	Pre-application consultation and adoption of site specific crime prevention advice and Achievement of Secured by Design certification will demonstrate Westmorland and Furness Council's objective in implementing policy that contributes to a safe and secure environment.	Noted.
Individual	Comment on name of site (Marina Village) as there is no longer a Marina planned.	Noted



Consultee	Summary of Comments	Council Response
Associated British Ports	<p>Cavendish Dock</p> <p>As set out in the ABP masterplan (Sept 2024) the combination of the Energy Dock project with wider environmental & leisure improvements could create an animated, environmentally sensitive and zero carbon exemplar project that could show how economic, environmental and social developments can be delivered.</p>	Noted, Cavendish Dock is out with, but adjacent to, the development site. The Council would be keen to work with ABP as proposals for Cavendish Dock develop.
South Lakes Housing	Great draft SPD, really succinct and clearly communicates the aspirations for the site. More than happy to feed in further thoughts from a housing providers perspective.	Support noted.
Historic England	<p>Supportive that the Design Principles recognise the importance of views, which will help 'anchor the development within Barrow's heritage'.</p> <p>Overall we feel that heritage is strongly embedded within the Marina Village Residential Opportunity SPD.</p>	Support noted.
Natural England	Advise that a HRA will be needed for the development of the site.	Noted.
Network Rail	<p>Early engagement with Network Rail is requested at the planning application and commencement of works stages.</p> <p>A Basic Asset Protection Agreement (BAPA) is required between the developer and Network Rail.</p>	Noted. Network Rail remain a statutory consultee and will be notified in relation to any proposals within close proximity to their assets.

Consultee	Summary of Comments	Council Response
Open Spaces Society	<p>Recreational green space should be designated e.g. Village Green status. Planting should use native species.</p> <p>The identified nature conservation area should respect native species. Also, this is an opportunity rather than a constraint.</p> <p>Welcome the retention of the Morecambe Bay Cycle route through the site.</p> <p>There is no reference to horse riding. There is potential for this use, taking account of the link to Roose and Rampside. The principal cycle routes should be added to the map of Public Rights of Way, identified as bridlepaths, therefore indicating that they can be used by horse riders. The principal footpaths should be dedicated as public footpaths.</p>	<p>The allocation of green space will be considered as part of the Local Plan process. MV8 makes reference to the use of native species.</p> <p>The creation of new habitats is identified as an opportunity in the SPD. However, the proposed Nature Conservation Area's proximity to new residential development could be a constraint if access is not properly managed.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>The proposed route adjacent to Buccleuch Dock is in close proximity to residential areas and is within the proposed public open space along the dock frontage, with potential uses including community events and pop-up markets. Taking account of these factors, it is not considered appropriate to identify the route as a bridleway.</p>

Consultee	Summary of Comments	Council Response
Open Spaces Society / Ramblers Lake District Area	<p>There should be a strong policy that seeks partnership working with Natural England, the Open Spaces Society, the Local Access Forum and Ramblers to look for positive opportunities which enhance the England Coast Path through the site by removing potential areas of user conflict, such as where it uses the road.</p> <p>Access from Michaelson Road Bridge to the dock side via steps is challenging, particularly for disabled people. A policy which seeks to use planning gain to construct a more accessible path here would be welcomed.</p>	<p>Partnership working will be crucial in the delivery of the SPD. The Council will seek to work with a wide range of bodies through the planning and development process to ensure that the opportunities associated with the site are maximised.</p> <p>Agree that access from Michaelson Road Bridge to the dockside is poor and that a more accessible path here would be welcomed. However, this issue is outside the remit of this SPD.</p>

4 Habitats Regulation Assessment – December 2024

- 4.1 Internal review identified that an update to the Habitats Regulation Assessment for the site should be produced ahead of the adoption of the SPD due to its proximity to National Site Network sites and Ramsar sites of international importance (i.e. European sites), designated for their nature conservation value.
- 4.2 European Sites within the Zone of Influence (Zol) for the development (determined as a 5.6km radius from the proposed Marina Village development site) have been considered in the assessment. The European Sites considered within the assessment comprise: Morecambe Bay and Duddon Estuary SPA, Morecambe Bay SAC, Morecambe Bay Ramsar and Duddon Estuary Ramsar.
- 4.3 A small number of amendments to the SPD were proposed as mitigation against likely significant effects on the integrity of the nature designations, these are set out in the Schedule of Amendments to the draft SPD. A 4 week consultation was undertaken in relation solely to these additional amendments in March 2025. Four responses were received before the deadline and one response after the deadline and are noted in the table below, one requires a minor update to the text of the document and the others are noted.
- 4.4 The suggested mitigation measures are now included within the final adoption version of the SPD and it can be concluded that there will be no residual impacts of the SPD and no adverse effects on the integrity of the European Sites within the zone of influence of the Marina Village Residential Opportunity Site.

Comments received on HRA Update Amendments

Consultee	Summary of Comments	Council Response
Cumbria Police	<p>The provision of wildlife habitat within the built environment is acknowledged as an important issue within 'Secured by Design'. Abundant wildlife is a factor that brings enjoyment and sustainability to a place, frequently – although not exclusively – delivered by the landscaping scheme. Consequently, the arrangement and layout of a wide choice of landscaping elements will have an effect on the establishment and profusion of animal species.</p> <p>I refer to my previous comments in the SPD Consultation Statement (particularly MV2, MV4 and MV8) which highlight how:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • careful design will avoid the landscaping scheme from undermining the overall security of the development • planting can be utilised to separate semi-private and public spaces and contribute to biodiversity • Public Open Space will be enjoyed by residents and visitors <p>The provision of an exemplary street lighting scheme will also support local wildlife populations, whilst protecting 'Dark Skies' attributes (As referred to by Friends of the Lake District in the Technical Advice Note).</p>	Noted



Consultee	Summary of Comments	Council Response
Environment Agency	Please refer to previous SPD response	Noted
National England (received late)	<p>Welcomes the production of the HRA Update and acknowledges the recommendations and commitments within the report.</p> <p>NE agree the subsequent planning application requires a project level HRA and recommend that the commitment to securing upfront mitigation is a requirement of any forthcoming planning application for residential development.</p> <p>NE would like to start conversations with the developer and the Council as soon as possible and make recommendations on the specialist advice which should be sought to support subsequent planning applications.</p>	Noted.
National Highways	We refer back to our representations made in September 2024 (attached) and note these have been picked up as part of the previous consultation. National Highways therefore have no further comments to make in relation to the amendments presented in the Habitats Regulation Assessment Update.	Noted
Connecting Cumbria	I have reviewed the documents from the point of view of digital infrastructure. It is good to see that broadband provision is referenced in the MV6 section on utilities – we would suggest that this be modified to reference gigabit capable broadband to ensure that new builds in this area	<p>Noted, although not directly related to the HRA Update the text of MV6 point 5 will be factually updated to read</p> <p>..., and gigabit capable broadband</p>

Consultee	Summary of Comments	Council Response
	keep pace with wider UK policy on broadband. Regarding the Electrical Vehicle (bike and car) charging. It needs to be noted that such charging units/provisions need to have coverage from all four (soon to be 3) mobile networks to allow users to sign onto the units and the units to link to their networks for updates. Ideally we encourage installers of EVC to link the units to gigabit capable fibre as well as having the mobile coverage.	