

Copeland area Planning Department, Cumberland Council

For the attention of Christopher Harrison

Date: 22 September 2025

Your reference: 4/25/2110/0F1

Dear Christopher Harrison

CONSULTATION ON PLANNING APPLICATION

Appn: 4/25/2110/0F1
Site Address: LAND AT PARKSIDE ROAD, CLEATOR MOOR
Proposal: ERECTION OF 95 DWELLINGS WITH ASSOCIATED
INFRASTRUCTURE

Thank you for your reconsultation on the above Planning Application.

The Local Highway Authority (LHA) and Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA) has reviewed the additional and revised material and can confirm as follows. The points listed below are those taken from my previous response with updates and conclusions reflecting the revised layout / plans and documents / reports.

Local Highway Authority response:

Internal Layout and Adoption Proposals

Previous comments in *italics* with new comment

'The site is predominantly a series of cul-de-sacs and has no-loop roads. This is not consistent with the CDDG and best practice due to the increase in reversing manoeuvres. However, in this instance, due to the shape of the site it is accepted that loop roads may not be practicable whilst achieving the same number of units.' - this comment is still applicable

'I note the site has sufficient turning heads and refuse collection points to make this an acceptable layout in principle. However, the LHA need to understand which roads are intended to be adopted and which are designed as private roads.' - I acknowledge and welcome the S38 adoption proposal plans. Please also see the comments below relating to the road classification and extent of the footways. Also, the footpath between 85 and 24 to the edge of the site will not be adopted. Please resubmit the S38 plan with this shown as a private footpath.

'There are footways shown to both sides of the road which we welcome and I note the main roads (secondary status) are 5.5m wide which is desirable (over the 4.8m standard)

in this case. I note that several of the primary roads have had a footway removed from one side. This is not acceptable for primary roads (streets). All primary and secondary roads with houses on both sides must have footways on both sides.

There is some confusion over the road hierarchy. Secondary roads are show what appear to be adopted shared-space streets with ramped approaches and no footways. These secondary streets should have at least a footway to one side of the road. However, if these are to be classified as shared-space streets, that is also acceptable but he LHA would suggest Secondary Street status is more appropriate. These do show the necessary 2m wide service strip and 0.5m clearance strip required for shared street status. This needs clarification.

The first private driveway to the north has a strange location for the ramp and terminus of the footways. The ramp could be relocated more towards the junction itself. This layout should be reviewed.

The footway on the south side of the road leading to the most western cul-de-sac terminates on the ramp. This detail needs reviewing.

The visitor parking provision is acceptable in terms of locations and numbers. But the car parking per dwelling (in curtilage) is still not consistent and the lack of three spaces on some driveways may cause additional problematic on-street (and on-footway) parking. All 4 bedroom houses should have 3 driveway parking spaces. I appreciate that these have garages, but in our experience garages are not used for parking in most instances and used for storage instead. Please provide three parking spaces for plots: 08, 20, 24, 32, 41, 45, 50, 56, 78 and 88.

The pedestrian link from the far end of the second access should be upgraded to 3.7m wide to provide a route for emergency vehicles. A bollard (or similar) will be needed to control access. - noted - this has been provided. (note: bollards will have to be behind the line of the footway - i.e.>2m from carriageway edge)

Internal Permeability (pedestrian and Cycle routes)

Whilst there are some useful pedestrian link paths around the site, the overall permeability is poor. To provide more direct links for pedestrians and cyclists to access the A5086 (in both directions) the LHA request:

A pedestrian / cycle link (2.5m wide) should be explored along the northern edge of the site linking to the path (Parkside Road). noted - this has now been provided between Plots 85 and 24 (see note above regarding adoption status).

Please provide cross-sections of the eastern end of the site showing its relative relation to the A5086 and adjacent path. - noted - this has been provided and it is apparent that a

more direct path to Parkside Road may be too steep and is not significantly shorter or more convenient than using the main site access.

Access and Visibility onto the A5086

The A5086 is a high speed improved, wide derestricted road. I note the proposal to move the 30mph speed limit to the far side of the proposed new access which is necessary (distance to be agreed). The A5086 does not conform to MfS principles so adopting a 43m splay is not considered appropriate and the more robust 60m should be applied.

Please revise the visibility splay drawings to show 2.4m x 60m in each direction from both accesses. - this still needs to be shown.

Off-site improvements S278 works and S106 Contributions

Due to the high standard of the A5086 and speed, the LHA recommend that a gateway or similar traffic calming feature is provided at the 30mph limit to highlight the change in speed limit to 30mph before the access. This gateway should include the Cleator Moor boundary / town sign and lane narrowing road markings.

As documented in the approved Transport Improvement Study (TIS), there are three identified improvements considered necessary for this site to provide the necessary safe routes to employment, education and retail offerings / locations. These improvements will also provide residents with routes to walk, cycle and wheel for their own health and wellbeing.

The LHA will be seeking a S106 contribution or require that the following improvements are delivered via a S278 Agreement by the applicant:

1. A speed limit + gateway feature with road markings and signs to the NE of the access. Details to be confirmed.
2. Widening and surfacing of the old Parkside Road along the site frontage, NE as far as the property known as Avalon.
3. Pedestrian refuge and centre road hatching to provide a crossing point to the bus stops.
4. Two bus stops with layby and shelters near to the site access.
5. Widening of the footway on the A5086 from the SW site boundary to the junction with Greystone Avenue.

Please see the enclosed concept layouts for the above measures.

The LHA welcome direct discussions with the applicant over the above matters to reach a satisfactory resolution / approach.

Transport Statement & Travel Plan - Active and Sustainable Travel

(Note - the TS has not been revised in the latest submission of documents)

The applicant has submitted a TS, when due to the size of the development a TA would be more appropriate. However, the vehicle impact is not considered to be significant on the network from the trips combined with background baseline traffic so will suffice in this regard.

However, the active travel aspect of the development, links and user friendly and safe routes has been glossed over, stating that the existing highway provision provides for these trips due to distances alone. The TS makes no reference to current best practice guidelines (i.e. LTN 1/20) and does not include any ambitious, future proofing proposals to improve the pedestrian and cycle links to key infrastructure, services and leisure activity routes. The TS does note that the NCN Route 71/72 runs 'between the site and Whitehaven' and that it is 'nearby'. This is not the case and is slightly misleading NCN is actually only linked to the site via an existing narrow footway (the old Parkside Road) which is in need of an upgrade (widening and resurfacing) to bring it up to the appropriate standard.

The parallel footway on the A5086 (Parkside Road) is a useful link to the NCN to the north. This path can provide a useful leisure link but also a commuting route to the Leconfield Estate.

Travel Plan

A Framework Travel Plan has been submitted. My comments are as follows:

- The 3 overarching objectives are sensible
- The modal shift aims are somewhat un-ambitious (depending on the timescale between surveys). These targets should be reviewed in the final TP once the initial baseline survey has been completed. With the recommended measures to incentivise residents and make alternative modes of travel more attractive and easy, these targets could be increased.
- With the walking, cycling and bus travel, the accessibility to services and amenities is judged purely on distance from the site. This is a poor methodology and is very simplistic approach ignoring the perceived or real danger and inconvenience that will deter residents from switching from driving.
- These sustainable modes need to be made more attractive with higher standard provision to current National Standards and access to services brought to the residents where possible (i.e. closer bus stops).

The LHA expect the final TP to reflect the improved features, route options in its marketing and awareness campaigns to highlight the time to make these journeys on foot, bike or bus, with the various routes to the main services and amenities.

The applicant should revisit the TS and TP and address the above Active Travel aspects, taking into account the technical advice / design Standards LTN 1/20 and schemes and recommendations in the Copeland Transport Improvement Study.

Lead Local Flood Authority response:

No further comments. The Outline Drainage Strategy is considered to be acceptable in principle, subject to infiltration testing and satisfying the requirement of the conditions made in my previous response. A full assessment and design taking into account the National SUDS Drainage Standards will be required for approval in due course.

Yours sincerely

Shamus Giles

Lead Officer - Flood & Development Management