
Copeland area Planning Department, Cumberland Council

For the attention of Christie M Burns

Date: 9 May 2025

Your reference: 4/25/2149/DOC

Dear Christie M Burns

CONSULTATION ON PLANNING APPLICATION

Appn: 4/25/2149/DOC
**Site Address: LAND TO THE SOUTH OF DALEVIEW GARDENS, EGREMONT
CA22 2LW**
**Proposal: DISCHARGE OF CONDITIONS 3, 4, 5, 7, 8, 11 AND 12 OF
PLANNING APPLICATION 4/23/2313/0F1**

Thank you for your consultation on the above Discharge of Conditions Application.

The Local Highway Authority (LHA) and Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA) can confirm as follows:

Condition 3 - Surface water drainage scheme and a foul water drainage scheme

I have noted the following which needs clarification or further details:

- The exceedance route plans for the surface water network need to clearly show flow routes resulting from rainfall in excess of a 1 in 100 year rainfall event. I imagine that it will be the flow control features that will be overwhelmed first due to the capacity restrictions. Are these designed with overflows or grid covers or will the exceedance take place from the basins? In which case there should be an engineered low point on the crest. Please clarify.

This condition is not considered to be satisfied.

Condition 4 - Construction surface water management plan

This plan is comprehensive and contains all the necessary measures that could be deployed to protect watercourses and minimise pollution run-off from the construction activity. This includes minimising the topsoil strip, retaining vegetation, providing silt fencing, temporary discharge points, silt mats and headwall protection.

I note that settling ponds may be used but these are not shown on the drawings. These ponds could be a key element in the management of surface water unless it is intended to use the permanent basins, in which case they will need cleaning out before final

commissioning. The areas downstream and in the vicinity of the wheel wash (location not shown) should be well catered for with measures to be included in the plan.

The above points should be mentioned / accommodated in the plan to provide added reassurance that all possible risks to uncontrolled SW run-off and all sources of potential watercourse pollution are included and mitigated.

This condition is not considered to be satisfied.

Condition 5 - Carriageway, footways, footpaths and cycleways design

I have noted the following which needs clarification or further details:

- There is no highway lighting design submitted, despite there being a key on the S38 adoption drawing.
- The carriageway and footway construction cross-section details are not in accordance with the CC Standard Details in various aspects. However, since these details will be reviewed at the S38 adoption technical review stage there is no need for these details to be addressed through this DoC.
- The S38 adoption plan does not reflect the agreed plan from the Full application. The loop road between Plots 127 and 133 has been omitted and this is considered a functional public asset which will be key to a circulatory route especially for deliveries and refuse collections. Also, please note that this loop road section should have a footway to one side or at the very least a 2m wide service strip.
- Some sections of the 0.5m clearance strip have been omitted from the S38 area.
- The S38 plan does not clearly show the extent of the adopted highway drainage infrastructure. It is shown as blue in the key but there is no blue drainage on the plan.
- The colour coding of the S38 drawing is incorrect.

This condition is not considered to be satisfied.

Condition 7 - Construction Traffic Management Plan

Temporary Construction Access

I note the proposed construction and delivery access is from the southern access (the future EVA). This would cause an unnecessary and unreasonable amount of inconvenience, noise, dust and mud disruption to residents of No's 1-16 Uldale View. There is the main site access to the north that can be utilised that would cause far less harm and inconvenience to those residents.

Considering much of the construction and delivery traffic will be low loaders, HGVs etc it is even possible that with the residential on-road parking on Uldale View that parking would have to be suspended to accommodate manoeuvres, causing even more inconvenience.

The LHA consider the proposed construction access/delivery access proposal unacceptable.

Wheel Washing and Road Sweeping Provision

I note and welcome measures in the CTMP for keeping the highway clear of mud and dust. However, it is felt that these could be more robust. I note that site vehicles will only use hard site surfaced areas which will help keep mud and dust from the spreading onto the highway.

The wheel wash relies on the driver using a bowser and stiff brush, but is questionable how much this will be used if the weather is poor and the drivers are under time pressure. Is there a more automated / pressure washing system that could be employed?

Also, there is an allowance for a daily road sweep if necessary. Please include an allowance for more frequent sweeping as deemed necessary by the LHA.

The nearby residents could be blighted by mud and dust for over 5 yrs from the construction activity and the highway authority wants robust and reactive measures to minimise the mess. I do appreciate and welcome dust monitoring by the site manager in conjunction with daily weather reports and the wind direction to determine the requirement for damping down the site with particular attention being paid to the school timings of breaks and outdoor events.

This condition is not considered to be satisfied.

Condition 8 - Construction Environmental Management Plan

No comment

Condition 11 - Programme of archaeological work

No comment

Condition 12 - Phasing Plan

This is acceptable. The LHA has no objection to this condition being discharged.

Yours sincerely

Shamus Giles

Lead Officer - Flood & Development Management