

## Christopher Harrison

---

**Subject:** FW: 4/22/2219/DOC. West Cumberland Hospital  
**Attachments:** WCHPH2-CUR-VV-XX-RP-C-92004.pdf.zip; 4-22-2219-DOC Planning Conditions Responses.docx

---

**From:** Emmanuel Akintayo  
**Sent:** 02 August 2022 15:28  
**To:** Christopher Harrison <Christopher.Harrison@copeland.gov.uk>  
**Cc:** Andrew Goodwin ; Kieran Grayken < > Paul Greenwood  
**Subject:** RE: 4/22/2219/DOC. West Cumberland Hospital

Hi Chris,

Thanks for all your help with this application. Please see below additional information regarding Condition 5 and United Utilities' Queries.

Regarding infiltration testing:

*The site is overlain by clay and made ground with poor infiltration characteristics. Underlying sandstone at 1-3.5m BGL also has generally poor infiltration. One test result showed seemingly good infiltration results, but this was not in an area we can drain the full site to under gravity and is considered to be an anomaly due to a fissure in the bedrock, rather than indicative of good infiltration potential. We cannot reasonably quantify the size and locations of further fissures across the site and, as discussed with the LLFA, consider infiltration into unknown fissures on a site elevated about dense residential development to be a high-risk strategy due to the likelihood of water re-emerging downstream without control. We stand by the conclusion that infiltration is not the right drainage solution for this site and do not propose to carry out further testing to confirm this as the risks and limitations remain.*

Appendix D

*This is included in document WCHPH2-CUR-VV-XX-RP-C-92004*

Regarding Sneckyeat Car Park

*Sneckyeat Car Park has been removed from the proposed drainage strategy and is no longer referenced in the report, other than to mention that the system has capacity for a connection from the car park but is subject to a separate planning application and will require modelling of the downstream network to re-specify the flow control devices.*

Greenfield 100 year event - please provide justification for this? Has this been agreed with the LLFA?

*Q100 greenfield has been used for the proposed discharge rate as this is industry standard for brownfield sites, is as per the requirements given in the Non-Statutory Technical Standards for Sustainable Drainage Systems (March 2015) document that is referenced in condition 5 and has been approved by the LLFA.*

Please do let me know if there are any additional queries. Could you also please advise when we should expect any more feedback or approval?

Attached is the revised drainage report for condition 5.

 [8060p - Planning Conditions Submission](#)

Kind regards,  
**Emmanuel Akintayo**  
Architectural Technologist

