

Christopher Harrison

From: Sam Greig Planning
Sent: 13 July 2022 15:04
To: Christopher Harrison
Cc:
Subject: RE: Flosch Meadows, Cleator, north and south sites

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

Hi Chris

I hope all is well.

You will see that you have been copied into an email from Richard Hall to Shamus Giles. Shamus previously emailed Richard Hall direct in relation to the three applications at Flosch Meadows (4/22/2092/001, 4/21/2554/OR1 and 4/22/2255/DOC).

Richard asked the question as to whether he should respond directly to Shamus. I said that I felt this would be ok, but I asked that he copy you into the email on the basis that I would send a follow up email to you. I would be grateful if you could accept Richard's email as though it was provided by Peter and I in relation to our respective applications

Richard's reply to Shamus's email relates to all three applications. The 5th attachment to Richard's email is his response to Shamus's email.

The other attachments, which have previously been submitted alongside the applications, have been updated slightly as follows:

- a) The Drainage Strategy have been updated to include the impermeable areas plans (the latter of which has been attached separately for ease of reference) and exclude reference to the filter drains; and
- b) The SuDs Maintenance Plan for all three sites has been amended to omit reference to the filter drains;
- c) The HR Wallingford calculation has been updated to take account the full site as per Shamus's request. I perceived that this would be viewed as an additional document.

Hopefully the above is sufficiently clear, but if you do need any additional clarify please do not hesitate to ask.

Thanks alot,

Sam

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

From: Richard Hall
Sent: 13 July 2022 14:08
To: Giles, Shamus P <

Subject: RE: Flish Meadows, Cleator, north and south sites

Hi Shamus,

Please refer to the enclosed information in response to your comments below. I have included a formal planning response to each comment.

If you have any queries, please let me know.

Kind regards,

Richard Hall



Consulting Engineers
Civil : Structural : Geotechnical

T: 0191 597 7879 | **DD:** 0191 495 7701 | **M:** 07951 057572

E : www.coastconsult.co.uk

7 Silvertown Court, Northumberland Business Park, NE23 7RY.

The information contained in this e-mail message may be privileged and confidential. If the reader is not the intended recipient, or the agent of the intended recipient, any unauthorised use, disclosure, copying, distribution or dissemination is strictly prohibited.

All design information contained within this email remains the intellectual property of Coast Consulting Engineers Ltd.

If you received this communication and attachments in error, please notify the sender immediately by telephone and return this e-mail to the address above.

Coast Consulting Engineers has taken reasonable precautions to minimise the risk of virus infection. However we cannot accept responsibility or liability for the loss or damage to equipment as a result of sustained software viruses.

From: Giles, Shamus P
Sent: 08 July 2022 16:12
To: Richard Hal

Subject: Flish Meadows, Cleator, north and south sites

Richard,

I tried to give you call to discuss as I thought it would be quick and easier, but you have left for the day so maybe you can call me back on Tuesday?

I am helping Paul Telford assess the three applications (4/22/2255/DOC, 4/21/2554/OR1, 4/22/2092/001) that are in for this site and note that in combination these cover the full details and discharge of conditions for the whole site and contains a complete drainage strategy.

Thank you for answering all my queries in my previous response, and I appreciate that there has been a lot of correspondence over several years with these sites so apologise if I have missed some information and discussions / agreements to date.

There are a few fundamental outstanding matters which if you can explain satisfactorily I think we might be able to reach an agreeable strategy:

1. Regarding the 'mill races'. Despite what you say in the report and the sketch plan, I have studied the topography and old OS maps and can see no evidence of there being a mill that these could

feed, nor a watercourse that could feed these races. It is clear from old OS maps that the two mills just off the River Ehen were fed from mill races placed just above weirs as is normal for mills. So I think we will have to agree to disagree that these are mill races. They are more likely part of the land drainage system to drain the clay soil and improve the ground. In which case these would become riparian ownership drains or watercourses;

2. You state that the field drains via land drains to the culverts at present, so in principle, the land should continue to do so in the proposed design. However, having looked at the invert and cover levels more closely, the relatively flat topography and shallow culvert might be problematic for a gravity solution whilst maintaining cover. You state ' Furthermore, a number of exercises have been completed to prove that a connection to a nearby surface water network cannot be achieved without the use of a surface water pump. '. You are correct - we would not accept a SW pumped solution so understanding the constraints for a route to an existing SW system is crucial. Apart from the drainage long sections and option A and Option B design plans, is there any other information I should be reviewing? If we are satisfied that a gravity solution to the watercourse or existing SW drains is not practicable, or viable, then the proposed option would be the next available option in the hierarchy.
3. Can you send me the impermeable surfaces drawing showing the contributing areas to the surface water drainage system?
4. For the sake of clarity and simplicity can you also include a HR Wallingford storage calculation overview for the whole site (or split it into two as necessary) and show the storage volumes for the crates and over-sized carrier drains. . I note you have done the HR Wallingford Greenfield Run-off rate calculations and that is really useful.
5. I don't quite understand the four sections of filter drains for draining the road on the southern meadow layout. The LHA would not want the added burden of filter drains and I can't see why these sections of road cannot drain into the SW carrier drain. Please explain or remove.
6. I note the alignment of the perimeter land drain through the gardens and that it does not cross under the road. However, I still have some reservations over the risk that this carries into the future.

I am due to discuss this internally next week and will hopefully be able to reach a conclusion by next Friday if you can respond to these points by email or give me a call on Tuesday.

Best regards

Shamus Giles

Lead Officer | Flood & Development Management
Economy and Infrastructure | Cumbria County Council
Parkhouse Building | Carlisle | CA6 4SJ

www.cumbria.gov.uk



<http://www.cumbriastrategicfloodpartnership.org/index.html>



This e-mail contains confidential information (which may also be legally privileged) and is intended solely for the use of the intended named recipient. If you are not the intended recipient you may not disclose, copy, distribute or retain any part of this message or its attachments. If you have received this message in error please notify the originator immediately by using the reply facility in your e-mail software. Incoming and outgoing emails may be

monitored in line with current legislation. All copies of the message received in error should be destroyed. Any views or opinions expressed are solely those of the original author. This email message has been scanned for viruses, and declared to be virus free at the point of exit from Cumbria County Council's network. <http://www.cumbria.gov.uk>



Virus-free. www.avast.com