

Christopher Harrison

Subject: FW: Application Ref. 4/21/2554/OR1 Land to the north of Flosch Meadows

From: Sam Greig Planning
Sent: 20 June 2022 14:14
To: Christopher Harrison <Christopher.Harrison@copeland.gov.uk>
Cc: 'Richard W Mulholland'
Subject: Application Ref. 4/21/2554/OR1 Land to the north of Flosch Meadows

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

Good morning Chris

I refer to the above application and our previous discussions/correspondence regarding amendments to the scheme.

The starting point for those discussions was your email dated 7th February 2022, which highlighted a number of issues under the sub-headings Highways; LLFA; Landscape; Open Space Provision, and General Comments.

I have intentionally not sought to respond to each point in turn, in part as we have already discussed many of the details. I have, however, provided a suite of amended details that should be sufficient to address the points raised by you and the relevant consultees. These details will be forwarded separately via dropbox. I have provided some general comments under the same sub-heading referenced above:

Highways

The layout of the development has previously been discussed between the engineer and the Highway Authority; the latter of whom raised no issues with the layout in relation to the s.38 agreement. The engineers are satisfied that the layout complies with the Cumbria Design Guide.

In relation to reducing vehicles speeds (principally on the western estate road) a speed table is proposed (opposite Plots 22-25). The layout of the eastern access road is fixed by the scheme approved under Application 4/20/2218/OR1.

Whilst the Highway Authority has made reference to footpath connectivity between the eastern and western estate roads I considered that it will be of limited benefit and is likely to be underutilised given the number of dwellings it would serve. For the reasons outlined in my email dated 22nd February 2022 I did not consider that the pedestrian link would create and foster the sense of community that you were concerned might not otherwise be created. On balanced you concluded that whilst the footpath link might be beneficial, given the scale of the development, it is not consider essential.

It is my understanding that the Council would use these details to discharge the relevant pre-commencement conditions attached to the Outline consent where applicable.

LLFA

The principal change to the drainage strategy from the Outline approval relates to proposal to discharge surface water to the combined sewer as opposed to the man-made culvert. The reasons for this change are outlined in the

Drainage Strategy document and this change has been agreed by the engineer in consultation with the LLFA and United Utilities.

The suite of amended plans and documents relate largely to the drainage details.

Again, it is my understanding that the Council would use these details to discharge the relevant pre-commencement conditions attached to the Outline consent where applicable.

Landscape

The amended landscaping details are shown on the amended Proposed Site Layout, which should be read in conjunction with the Landscape and Maintenance Scheme (Revision 2).

The Landscape and Visual Amenity Issues Brief Report that accompanied the Outline application advocated additional hedge planting to the perimeter of the site (where hedgerows were absent) and additional hedgerow planting to fill the gap in the hedgerow along the field boundary, located outwith the application site, that continues northwards along the western boundary of the site. In addition it proposed the provision of hedgerows within the site itself and additional tree planting.

The landscaping shown on the Proposed Site Layout Plan accords with the principles outlined in the Landscape and Visual Amenity Issues Brief Report in so much as it follows its recommendations. The gap in the hedgerow to the north of the western boundary is to be planted with a new Hawthorn hedge and a new Hawthorn hedgerow is proposed along the northern boundary of the application site; both of which will help filter views from Jacktrees Road (in addition to the intervening hedgerows).

Within the development itself, new Hawthorn hedgerows are proposed along boundaries that front the highway. These hedgerows extend back to the proposed side boundary fences that separate the front and rear gardens. The exception to this approach is Plot 22 where the proposed hedgerow extends to the rear boundary of the site, principally as there is no boundary that separates the front of the plot from its rear garden due to the size of the plot.

The fences that separate the front and rear gardens of the plots will be a typical 1.8 metre high vertical boarded fence. It is considered that the provision of hedgerows to the rear of these dividing fences will be of limited visual benefit when passing through the development as the hedgerows would be screened from view. The applicant's preference is to provide a blank canvas for future occupiers of the development to landscape their rear gardens as suits their preferences/requirements.

Within the front gardens of each plot that fronts onto the eastern and western road it is proposed that individual trees are proposed. The intention is to create the effect of providing a 'tree lined' street without those trees encroaching onto the adopted highway itself. Species have been chosen according to the anticipated mature size that the tree and larger trees have been provided where the plots can accommodate them (and vice versa). The provision of the trees will, once matured, add to the stock of mature trees in the vicinity of the site.

Open Space Provision

In previous correspondence we have agreed the principle of making a £10,000 off-site contribution to be used by Cleator Moor Town Council towards the improvement/maintenance of the Prospect Row play area. It is understood that the payment of the financial contribution is subject to support for this approach from Cleator Moor Town Council who manage the Prospect Row play area.

As requested I have attached a document that explains the methodology for arriving at the level of contribution proposed. The document also identifies the phasing of the payments which, in our view, is proportionate to the increased use of the play area that would arise as a consequence of this development.

Assuming that Cleator Moor Town Council are supportive of this approach it is my understanding that the Council will require a deed of variation to the original s106 agreement. Once the Council are happy with the amended scheme as a whole I would be grateful if you could progress the DoV.

General Comments

The general comments included a number of observations, all of which are noted. In light of previous discussions I didn't feel that it was necessary to respond to those observations at this stage.

I would be grateful if you could confirm when you have received the amended details and should you have any questions regarding those details or the commentary above please do not hesitate to contact me directly.

Thanks alot,

Sam

Sam Greig, BA (Hons), Dip.T.P., M.R.T.P.I.

