

## Christopher Harrison

---

**Subject:** FW: App. Ref. 4/20/2432/0F1 Land at Howbank Farm and Former Orgill Infant School, Egremont.

---

**From:** Simon Blacker  
**Sent:** Friday, January 26, 2024 3:53 PM  
**To:** Christopher Harrison  
**Cc:** David Wright  
**Subject:** Re: App. Ref. 4/20/2432/0F1 Land at Howbank Farm and Former Orgill Infant School, Egremont.

**CAUTION: External email, think before you click!**  
Please report any suspicious email to our [IT Helpdesk](#)

Hi Chris,

Further to the below, please find further comment on the issues in [blue](#), and attached plan/details.

Kind regards,

Simon

Simon Blacker MRTPI



Planning & Development Consultancy

---

**From:** Christopher Harrison  
**Date:** Friday, 19 January 2024 at 09:14  
**To:** Simon Blacker David Wright  
**Subject:** RE: App. Ref. 4/20/2432/0F1 Land at Howbank Farm and Former Orgill Infant School, Egremont.

Hi Simon,

Thanks for the below.

Please see my comments below in [red](#) for ease of reference etc..

Kindest regards,

Chris

Please note that the advice in this email is given in good faith on the basis of the information available at the present time. The advice may be subject to revision following further examination

or consultation, or where additional information comes to light, and is therefore not binding on any future recommendation which may be made to the Council or any formal decision by the Council.

**Chris Harrison**

Principal Planning Officer | Development Management  
Thriving Place and Investment | Cumberland Council  
The Market Hall | Market Place | Whitehaven | CA28 7JG

cumberland.gov.uk



**From:** Simon Blacker

**Sent:** Thursday, January 18, 2024 9:32 PM

**To:** Christopher Harrison

; David Wright

**Subject:** Re: App. Ref. 4/20/2432/0F1 Land at Howbank Farm and Former Orgill Infant School, Egremont.

**CAUTION: External email, think before you click!**  
Please report any suspicious email to our [IT Helpdesk](#)

Hello Chris,

Thank you for the below, I know David's spoken to you about how to deal with the below, but we've just been discussing the specifics of the comments below.

I would firstly agree that the drainage can be addressed as suggested. **Noted and understood.**

With the highway comments, again a lot can be addressed with conditions as noted. I'm just reviewing the original highway comments in line with the below and have a few queries:

On the part about the footways or narrowing the road, I can't find reference to that in the highways comments? Apologies if I'm just missing something here.

See attached.

*☒ No service strips, margins, kerb radius, road widths or pedestrian crossing points shown on the Site Plan MJG/PL-111. An early indication of street lighting layout would be welcomed, please see Appendix 4 Highways in CDDG for guidance on the above issues.*

*The plans still do not clearly show the service strips, margins, footway widths (must be 2.0m wide) and crossing points etc. Some of this detail could be secured by way of conditions, but it would be very useful if a coloured s38 adoption plan could be submitted at this stage to remove any doubt over the highway boundaries etc.*

*In order to provide 2m footways it may be necessary to alter the layout or alternatively the road could be narrowed from 5.5m to 4.8m on certain sections where there are fewer than 50 houses -*

*☒ beyond the third cul-de-sac*

*☒ the first cul-de-sac could be shared-use*

the main spine road could have the western kerb moved to provide a 2m footway and 5.5m carriageway

We've run through the plan with the architect and the layout has been amended to either accommodate 2m footways, or the road reduced in width to 4.8m. See attached.

Is the clearance strip on the first cul-de-sac a necessity to include on the drawing? There is space to the site boundary, the topo overlay doesn't really help as with the parking to plot 21 below. It may be that this can be explained and a measurement of the spaces available shown, removing the requirement for a revision.

A clearance strip will be drawn on the above plan to the first cul-de-sac. There is sufficient space, some of the existing hedge as detailed from the survey may need to be cut back.

From memory, the architect had tried to increase the width of driveway to accommodate this, although admittedly not all look well-spaced. I'll have check with him about that detail. Noted.

See attached detail from plot 4. On the submitted plan, every driveway that includes tandem parking has a large width along the parking space to allow for access to the front door. I've attached Plot 4 as an example of this on the plan. I did think that we had addressed this point, it may just hasn't been picked up on.

We can get the Orgill visibility splays on a plan to you. I actually thought it was, but I can't see it on any. Noted.

See attached layout plan which details the Orgill visibility splay. It details a 60m visibility splay rather than the 43m requested.

While I would agree the parking for Plot 24 isn't ideal, I'm not sure it requires a redraw at this point. Yes Plot 21 is ok, again the drawing probably doesn't help with this. I shall leave it with you to determine if you wish to address or not; however, it risks that highways maintain that it unsatisfactor. I anticipate that it is easily resolved via the relocation of the parking spaces. The locating of parking to the rear is relatively common on corner plots etc..

Please also find a Sequential Test document for the proposed development.

Kind regards,

Simon

Simon Blacker MRTPI



Planning & Development Consultancy