
Copeland area Planning Department, Cumberland Council

For the attention of Christopher Harrison

Date: 28 June 2023

Your reference: 4/23/2164/PIP

Dear Christopher Harrison

CONSULTATION ON PLANNING APPLICATION

**Appn: 4/23/2164/PIP
Site Address: LAND TO THE REAR OF 108 VICTORIA ROAD, WHITEHAVEN
Proposal: A TECHNICAL DETAILS CONSENT (TDC) APPLICATION FOR
THREE DWELLINGS PURSUANT TO A PLANNING-IN-PRINCIPLE
PERMISSION GRANTED ON APPEAL ON 9TH JULY 2020 UNDER
REFERENCE APP/Z0923/W/20/3246227 (COPELAND BOROUGH
COUNCIL REFERENCE 4/19/2246/PIP). THIS TDC APPLICATION
SEEKS TO PROVIDE THE NECESSARY TECHNICAL DETAILS TO
SUPPORT DEVELOPMENT OF THE SCHEME.**

Thank you for your consultation on 15 June 2023 regarding the above Planning Application.

Cumberland Council as the Local Highway Authority (LHA) and Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA) has reviewed the above planning reference and our findings are detailed below.

Local Highway Authority response:

Overall i can confirm that the LHA has no objection to the proposals. The geometric design of the access road and entrance complies with the standards for a Private Shared Driveway in the CCC DDG. It has the necessary width, gradient, service strip, visibility splay and forward visibility requirements and drainage.

The only area that I need some clarity and further information is on the following points:

1. The road construction and design must be to a suitable standard as it has to provide access for refuse vehicles and emergency services. In this respect we will be asking for a condition to provide suitable details for approval by the LHA (not to be adopted though). To avoid a pre-commencement condition to the effect, please provide carriageway construction details

-
2. I note that the lower geo-cellular attenuation tank is sited beneath the carriageway which means that access for maintenance could be a problem with blocking the road, especially since the road is only 4.1m / 3.7m wide. Vehicles may end up queuing out onto the public highway. Please explain how maintenance will be carried out, and is there any alternative arrangement or location for the drainage infrastructure?
 3. I note the turning circle has been designed for a fire tender, and I also note previous advice regarding refuse collection has been included. However, the design guide does allow for refuse vehicles to access private shared driveways / roads if the distance and gradient make it difficult or impracticable to take bins to the roadside. In this case the total distance to the houses is >45m stated in the DDG so the refuse vehicle will need access to the top of the driveway. Please show that the road and turning head are designed accordingly.

Lead Local Flood Authority response:

- I note that the NPPF drainage hierarchy has been followed and the conclusion is that the only realistic drainage discharge destination is the combined sewer. However, I cannot see the results of the percolation tests carried out which would support this. Please can you provide BRE365 testing results?
- As mentioned above, the location of the geo-cellular tanks is not ideal from an maintenance access point of view. Maintenance arrangements or relocation of the tanks to outside the carriageway need to be explored.
- I note that there is a private cut-off drain on the site which leads to the combined sewer in Victoria Road. I cannot see how this is dealt with in the scheme proposals. Is it within the red-line boundary? In which case the owners / management company will become the riparian owners. Please explain what happens to this drain?
- What precautions and provisions are included to manage overland flows from off-site? Properties may be at risk of flooding, especially if the site levels dictate that the slope to the SE corner is being cut into and retaining walls to the rear of properties are proposed.

Conclusion:

On review of the further information requested I will be able to make a full assessment.

Yours sincerely

Shamus Giles

Lead Officer - Flood & Development Management