

Waverley Viaduct — Special Joint Neighbourhood Forum

7 September 2011

Welcome and Introductions

Councillor Ian Stockdale welcomed everyone to the special joint Neighbourhood Forum. He explained that this topic covered several other forum areas and Councillors from each of these areas were present at the meeting.

He introduced David Ramshaw who would be giving the forum a presentation on the history of the viaduct and plans for its future.

Questions and Answers

- As the bridge is the responsibility of BRRB is it not their responsibility?

Yes - the bridge is a Grade II listed building, BRRB are responsible for its maintenance and upkeep but they are not responsible to develop any footpaths or access.

- The current planning application is to extend the life of the security barriers at either end - can this be used as a tool for BRRB to accept the alternative proposal?

Chris Hardman from Carlisle City Council confirmed that it is possible to negotiate an alternative to the current proposal via the planning process. He advised he is currently in discussions with BRRB with regard to their application and it is a proposal that could be put forward.

- What are the costs of alternative fencing?

The current proposal to create a fenced central footway across the centre of the bridge approximately 3m wide is estimated at approximately £12,000 to supply and fit.

- Why is there opposition to this?

There is no opposition to this either from a political perspective or from an officer viewpoint. There is however certain criteria that we need to bottom out to make the proposal workable. The new fencing would require appropriate planning permission in place. Funding to supply and erect the new style fencing need to be sourced. The issue with access / exit on the north side of the bridge has to be resolved. Who is the private land owner on the north side of the bridge? All of the above are not impossible to achieve and a working group could be established to achieve these aims.

- Could a site of historic interest be developed?

Yes, in the long term, in the short term the initial objective is to secure and open the footpath.

- We must ensure disabled access and accessibility?

Yes • We must ensure disabled access and accessibility?

Agreed this must also be an objective of the route.

It was unanimously agreed at the meeting that all attending were in favour of working in partnership to achieve the goal of developing and opening a footpath across the bridge and that future objectives were to develop the history/historical interest sites in the area to link into the nature reserves north of the bridge and to work towards improving and developing disability access provision.

The Meeting closed at 8.05 pm.

Notes: Paul Carrigan.