
Copeland area Planning Department, Cumberland Council

For the attention of Christie M Burns

Date: 26 June 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. Please note this is a revised response.

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

- 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 their 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.
- The revised plans do show exceedance routes everywhere instead of just from the point in the system which is overwhelmed by the volume of a >1:100 yr storm. I expect the overflow from the flow control chambers or basin (lowest point on the system prior to the flow restriction probably) as explained above but this is not clearly shown.
- The plan seems to show exceedance routes flowing down driveways and also not always from the lowest points on the road.
- I am concerned that if the exceedance flows are not directed / engineered down a 'safe' route away from driveways etc, damage to the infrastructure and flooding could occur.
- I welcome direct discussion with the applicant to resolve this

This condition is not considered to be satisfied.

Condition 4 - Construction surface water management plan

The plan now addresses the outstanding issues.

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

Condition 5 - Carriageway, footways, footpaths and cycleways design

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

- The lighting columns locations are acceptable. These must be in the hard-standing areas of the footway. The engineering / lighting details / specification of the adopted columns will be reviewed through the S38 process.
- 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. I note this layout has not changed but the LHA cannot insist on the adoption of this link and it is designed to acceptable standards so the LHA has no objections to this element.
- The S38 plan has been revised as per the previous comments.

This condition is now considered to be satisfied. I have no objection to this condition being discharged.

Condition 7 - Construction Traffic Management Plan

This condition has the following requirements:

1. **A pre-construction road condition established by a detailed survey for accommodation works within the highways boundary conducted with a Highway Authority representative; with all post repairs carried out to the satisfaction of the Local Highway Authority at the applicants expense**
 - A full highway dilapidation survey is proposed in the plan as required.
2. **Details of proposed crossings of the highway verge;**
 - The revised routing plan shows no other accesses across the verge except for the main site access
3. **Retained areas for vehicle parking, manoeuvring, loading and unloading for their specific purpose during the development;**
 - These areas are shown satisfactorily on the TMP

- 4. Cleaning of site entrances and the adjacent public highway;**
 - Road sweeping is included as necessary
- 5. Details of proposed wheel washing facilities;**
 - Wheel washing facilities are included in the plan
- 6. The sheeting of all HGVs taking spoil to/from the site to prevent spillage or deposit of any materials on the highway;**
 - There is no specific mention of this requirement. The plan should be amended to state this will be complied with.
- 7. Construction vehicle routing;**
 - I note the temporary construction access is routed through the northern (main) access. This is acceptable to the LHA
- 8. The management of junctions to and crossings of the public highway and other public rights of way/footway;**
 - There is no specific mention or allowance of the management of the footways and junctions near the site. It is likely that some footways and junctions will be disrupted / temporarily or partially closed during the works and there should be some statement explaining the process / method to ensure disruption and inconvenience to the general public using the highway is minimised.
- 9. Details of any proposed temporary access points (vehicular / pedestrian);**
 - The revised routing plan shows no other accesses across the verge except for the main site access
- 10. Specific measures to manage and limit the impact on the school, including working hours, any special measures to accommodate pedestrians
[Note: deliveries and movement of equipment on the road network surrounding the site must not take place during school muster times in the interests of road safety].**
 - There is no reference to this specific and important requirement. It is critical that this provision is accommodated in the CTMP.

The CTMP is lacking information in relation to points 6, 8 and 10. The CTMP should be revised as necessary to address these points. This condition is not considered to be satisfied and should not be discharged.

Yours sincerely

Shamus Giles

Lead Officer - Flood & Development Management