
Copeland area Planning Department, Cumberland Council

For the attention of Christopher Harrison

Date: 5 August 2024

Your reference: 4/24/2246/DOC

Dear Christopher Harrison

CONSULTATION ON PLANNING APPLICATION

Appn: 4/24/2246/DOC
Site Address: LAND AT NORTH PARK, RHEDA, FRIZINGTON
Proposal: DISCHARGE OF CONDITIONS 4, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 15, 16, 18, 19, 20 AND 21 OF PLANNING APPLICATION 4/18/2426/001

Thank you for your consultation on 18 July 2024 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.

Condition 4 - Carriageways, footways etc to adoptable standards

There are a number of inconsistencies and lack of clarity on the drawings that need resolving:

1. The shared surface entrance into the development ties into a regular carriageway design of Phase 1 which will be 100mm lower. Therefore a 100mm ramp in the carriageway needs to be included.
2. The footway construction detail in the cross-sections (bituminous construction) is not to the CDDG specification and it is inconsistent with the key which says that it will be concrete block pavements (note that these paths adjacent to the carriageway are footways not footpaths). The proposed construction is not suitable for vehicles.
3. The adopted footway has no detail / cross section
4. The short linking footpath in front of Plot 12 should have 0.5m clearance strip at the south end as well as the north end marked with a change in material or pin kerb
5. The carriageway detail outside Plots 3,4,5 and 6 is very confusing and appears to have several kerb lines and other features with possible use of several paving types. It is unclear how this space will work in practice and the LHA are concerned about the number of materials used and maintenance complications. Please revisit this feature / layout to simplify the arrangement.
6. The adoption provision of service and clearance strips and verges is acceptable in principle but the extent appears to be inconsistent with the extent of the adopted carriageway. The LHA will only adopt the clearance strip / verge when it is adjacent to the adopted carriageway (i.e. see verges and strips to Plots 8-12 and 13-18). As well

as clarifications listed above, there will need to be a separate S38 Technical Approval process to go through in due course.

7. Lighting

- There appears to have been a revision to the site layout since the lighting design was completed. I would suggest that a revised lighting design drawing is submitted only. It does not require a revised lighting calculation to be supplied.
- The key on the site layout drawing does not appear to show any footways, just verges off the edge of carriageway. On the lighting layout drawing, any columns located in verges need to be a hardstanding and there may be more columns to be located in verges than is currently shown on the drawing. At all locations it does not necessarily need to be a concrete hardstanding as per the key. The LHA will accept block pavements to be used to be in keeping with the wider street scene.
- Column LC05 looks like it is outside of the extents of adoption. Due to the position and orientation of plot 13 any relocation of this column would place it directly in front of windows. The applicant should relocate this column so that it is inside the proposed adopted extents or explore the possibility of extending the adopted carriageway so that it was parallel with the current proposed location of column.
- Since the layout was amended, LC02 and LC06 are proposed in an area's setback quite far from the carriageway edge. These could potentially be difficult for MEWP access to reach for maintenance and unlikely to be included in adoption. It needs to be brought forward a few metres onto the adopted verge.
- Depending on availability of electricity services, an option could be to relocate LC08 so that it moves across the road between the two garages of plots 6 and 7. This would remove it from directly in front of the house.

As there are many outstanding details to be resolved, the LHA consider that this condition has not been met.

Condition 7 - Detailed Scheme for Road Signage

There are no road signs required.

The LHA has no objection to this condition being discharged.

Condition 8 - Construction Vehicle Management Plan

The measures in the plan are considered suitable to address the requirements of this condition. The LHA has no objections to this condition being discharged.

Condition 9 - Ramps (dropped kerbs)

The road is a shared surface street with no footways or kerbs. Therefore there is no need for dropped kerbs at crossover locations.

This condition is considered to be satisfied, I have no objection to it being discharged.

Condition 10 - Highway Surface Water Drainage System

This is suitable in principle, i.e. drainage using gullies and carrier drains to the main system, but none of the highway drainage infrastructure is actually shown on the plans.

Please provide plans showing the locations of the gullies and gully tails for adoption.

See observation below regarding the surface water SUDS design. If dry basins are used, it may be possible to drain the carriageway directly into these at certain locations over the edge rather than using gullies. i.e. in the two 'greens' or islands.

This condition should not be discharged.

Condition 11 - Hard and Soft Landscaping

No comment

Condition 12 - Landscape Management Plan

No comment

Condition 13 - Construction Method Statement and Management Plan

The measure contained in the plan address the requirements of this condition, I have no objection to this condition being discharged.

Condition 15 - Refuse Collection Arrangements

The arrangements are acceptable. I have no objection to this condition being discharged.

Condition 16 - Surface Water Drainage Scheme

The principle of the SW drainage system, i.e. a hybrid infiltration with a positive overflow to a watercourse is acceptable in principle. I note that the contributing area has been limited to the impermeable area only, based on the principle that the garden areas will be permeable. The Ground Investigation and infiltration does confirm that the underlying sub-soil has good infiltration coefficient and therefore it is likely that the soakaways at the correct depth will be successful. However, the garden area, depending on the quality and compactness of the topsoil, may not be so pervious and could result in surface water flow in extreme situations. I note and welcome the perimeter filter drain to deal with this scenario, but this does not extend to the far SW corner of the site. Please review the extent of the filter drain.

I also note the reference to an infiltration blanket feature and infiltration basin in the maintenance plan but cannot see these on the drawings. Please clarify the proposed design.

I note that the attenuation is provided by a series of underground infiltration / attenuation crates. Whilst I appreciate these do the same job as a basin, the LLFA consider these features less beneficial to bio-diversity, ecology and amenity. They could also be more difficult to maintain. Please state why the 'open' water features of swales and basins are not specified.

Having reviewed the drainage design calculations I am satisfied with the parameters and values adopted. I note that the necessary Climate Change and urban creep values have been included. I also note that the contributing area is less than a typical site, but taking into account the infiltration potential I am satisfied with this. I am also satisfied with the proposed discharge overflow rate from the site. This is much lower than for a clay site of the total site area (i.e 2 Ha) which I calculate as around 20 l/s. This reflects the proportion of surface water that will naturally infiltrate to ground.

However, In events > 1:100 years, there will be exceedance flows over the surface, especially from the flow control location. There is no plan or description how this exceedance flow is managed. Please provide an exceedance flow diagram, showing how this flow is directed away from properties and how it will end up in the correct receptor. Swales might be useful in this instance.

This condition is not considered to be discharged.

Condition 18 - Sustainable Drainage Management and Maintenance Plan

The Plan lists the maintenance requirements / proposals for several surface water drainage components including soakaways, blankets and an infiltration basin. None of these features actually appear in the drainage drawings. Instead, the drawings show several underground storage tanks with infiltration.

The condition is not fully addressed.

Please clarify the design and provide a revised Maintenance Plan as well as any necessary drawings and documents.

Condition 19 - Further Ecological Survey and Ecological Management Plan

No comment

Condition 20 - Phase 2 Ground Investigation Assessment

No comment

Condition 21 - Programme of Archaeological Works

No comment

Yours sincerely

Shamus Giles

Lead Officer - Flood & Development Management