

Christie Burns

From: Glen Beattie
Sent: 27 June 2023 08:14
To: Christie Burns
Cc: Nigel; Michael Sandelands
Subject: 4/23/2076/001 - Land off Dalzell Street, Moor Row, Egremont
Attachments: Location Plan 01a).pdf; REVISED Transport Statement.pdf; REVISED RSA1 Report.pdf; REVISED Designer's Response to S1 RSA.pdf; REVISED Access Junction drawing 0001 P05.pdf

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

Hi Christie,

Following recent discussions with Egremont Town Council I am now in a position to respond to their comments which will also address the HA consultee comments.

I have attached the following revised information for your formal re-consultation.

- Location Plan – now drawing 01a). This has been amended to show the approximate position of a new link to the NCN72. I have also highlighted the existing path which traverses across the southeast corner of the site and currently forms an informal connection between the NCN72 and NCN71 and is within the application red line boundary. This arrangement is also indicated on the Landscape Parameters Plan submitted at the onset of the application.
- Revised Transport Statement.
- Revised Stage 1 RSA.
- Revised Designer's Response in relation to the Stage 1 RSA.
- Revised Access Junction Plan – now drawing no. 0001 P05.

Brief summary.

The important point to note in the above amended drawings/ documents, is that Egremont Town Council did not in any way want to see the development encouraging pedestrians and cyclists to pass over the former railway bridge which crosses the NCN72. Instead the preference was to create a direct link from the development to the NCN72 for pedestrians and cyclists. The previously proposed/ approved footpath over the former railway bridge has therefore been removed from the submitted details and a direct link to the NCN72 has been created. These amendments also address the first bullet point on the HA letter dated 27/04/23.

Other HA comments.

The comments regarding highway surface water issues in the second bullet point are noted and understood. Please accept this email as formal confirmation that we are happy to connect the gulley referred to into the surface water system within the development. The details of this can be controlled by planning condition and dealt with post-outline consent.

The third bullet point refers to exact details of the traffic calming and their location. This can also be controlled by planning condition and dealt with post-outline consent and via the s.278 process.

I don't see the relevance of the fourth bullet point to this application when we are proposing direct link to the NCN72. The suggestion of a financial contribution to something that does not directly affect the application is both unreasonable and unjustified.

LLFA response.

The comments are noted but we have already debated the red/ blue lines in relation to the SW attenuation basin (email exchange on 05/04/23) and concluded that it is acceptable for the attenuation basin to be within the blue line being land that will be owned/ controlled by the applicant.

I trust all the above is in order and look forward to hearing from you.

Regards,
Glen