
Copeland area Planning Department, Cumberland Council

For the attention of Christopher Harrison

Date: 31 October 2025
Your reference: 4/25/2349/0R1

Dear Christopher Harrison

CONSULTATION ON PLANNING APPLICATION

**Appn: 4/25/2349/0R1
Site Address: LAND AT HARASS MOOR, WHITEHAVEN
Proposal: APPLICATION FOR APPROVAL OF RESERVED MATTERS
RELATING TO APPEARANCE, LAYOUT, LANDSCAPING AND
SCALE FOR THE ERECTION OF 300 DWELLINGS WITH
ASSOCIATED OPEN SPACE & INFRASTRUCTURE PURSUANT TO
OUTLINE PLANNING APPROVAL 4/18/2287/001 (THE OUTLINE
WAS NOT AN EIA APPLICATION)**

Thank you for your consultation on the above Planning Application.

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

Local Highway Authority response:

I understand that the reserved matters being sought for consent are: appearance, layout, landscaping and scale. This LHA response focuses on the Layout elements. However, I have included some detailed comments relating to road lighting to assist with the detailed design for the discharge of conditions.

Layout

- Shared surface streets are shown with just two clearance strips, not with a 2m wide service strip to one side as required.
- There are too many cul-de-sacs where simple short connections could make a loop road layout. A loop road layout can support more dwellings (up to 30) on a shared-surface-street. As shown, several of the cul-de-sacs have too many dwellings for a shared surface street.
- The link spine road through to the Highlands (Road 4) on Drawing 'Engineering Layout - Sheet 2 of 8' does not include footways. This will become a key link and it is critical that 2m wide footways are included on both sides of the road. However, I do note that on other drawings including 'Adopted Highway Layout' and 'Proposed Layout' this link road is shown with footways both sides. Please clarify.

- Road 4 is shown with bollards as a modal filter. These are suitable as they will not prevent all forms of cycles and wheelers. It is suggested that the cul-de-sac on Road 4 be extended to nearer the field boundary so the carriageway in front of Plot 19 is part of the cul-de-sac for maintenance purposes and more critically, the parking for Plot 18 is accessible.
- The shared surface street serving Plots 125-146 serves too many dwellings. The maximum according to the CDDG for a cul-de-sac is 20, this serves 28. This road could be made into a looped shared surface street or a secondary road with footways to accommodate the 28 dwellings.
- The two isolated speed tables are not considered necessary in the positions shown nor consistent with the majority of the site (the one for the raised crossing is appropriate though). Instead of the raised tables it is suggested that raised junctions are used instead. [location 1 on plan]
- For speed management and consistency it is considered necessary to include a raised junction on Caldbeck Road with Jubilee Road. This will need to be carried out as part of the S278 for this area. [location 2 on plan]
- On the main spine road with the offset-footway, there are some junctions where dropped crossings are not possible due to the design of the footway and verge on the radii. Please review these areas.

Servicing Proposals

The longer private driveways (>30m) will need bin collection points (BCP) within 15m of the adopted highway. Some of these driveways are shown with the bcp further from the highway than this.

Surface Water Drainage on Paths

The long winding path to Loop Road could act as a conduit for surface water which could flow out onto the highway. Measures should be included to mitigate this risk.

Adoption Proposals

The offset footway design with an avenue of trees is welcomed from an amenity point of view, but the verge and trees are elements the LHA would not be adoptable. These areas should remain private.

Parking

- no parking allocation plan has been supplied. Please provide a plan showing the following provision:
 - 2+3 bed houses = 2 driveway spaces
 - 3+ bed house = 3 driveway spaces
 - Visitor spaces at 1 per 5 dwellings, in laybys, evenly distributed around the development. I note that the areas / zones to the south of the woodland strip (plots 159+) do have sufficient visitor spaces placed evenly through the smaller zones. However, the area of Plots 1-158 have too few visitor spaces. This area needs to be reviewed and further VP places to be added.

Road Lighting

For this development there needs to be a wider lighting strategy of how this links into our existing lighting provision on the existing highway network.

Caldbeck Road – Unadopted section (to be adopted as part of the scheme)

The section of Caldbeck Road beyond Jubilee Road is unadopted at present and the lighting equipment in this location is designated as footway lighting. This equipment needs wholly replaced with a new system of road lighting using 8m columns. This is the standard required for a bus route.

Harass Road

This section of Harass Road where the proposed new junction access is shown. The existing lighting along this section of Harass Road is currently to footway lighting standard. However, it is noted that the Harass Dyke development on the north side of Harass Road includes for the replacement of these columns to the necessary specification.

Harass Road junction to U4008

Further from the development but this junction and its link to Red Lonning. There are no recorded accidents here in the last 5 years, however this junction and the U4008 appears to be becoming busier given the recent increase in developments in this area. This road does have footway lighting but may benefit from the upgrading to road lighting.

Within the proposed development

There are lots of remote pathways offering key links into the existing adopted highway network and therefore should be lit to promote active travel during the hours of darkness.

Active Travel Comments

There is a good network of paths and active travel routes shown, which we welcome, most of which are as requested by the LHA and required by the conditions, however there are still areas where the internal active travel connectivity and layout could be improved as follows (please refer to the accompanying plan for reference to the list)

- a) The applicant is advised to provide a continuous active travel route at the end of the turning head as shown. Under the proposed layout cyclists and pedestrians would join Road 11 in an area where they are likely to encounter reversing and parked vehicles. There is also a risk that parked vehicles would block access / egress to the pedestrian cycle link from Road 2.
- b) The applicant is advised to provide a pedestrian and cycle link from the Road 2 to link to the site boundary on Harass Moor Road. Active Travel England Standing Advice Note recommends physically separating walking and cycling routes from motor traffic where possible.

- c) The applicant is advised to provide pedestrian / cycle connectivity to the pedestrian and cycle route from Road 6. This should allow for users to head towards the A595 and also eastwards. There is a path indicated in the area of plot 67 but this curves to the west. A more direct line is suggested on the Proposed Layout.
- d) The applicant should provide a pedestrian / cycle link as shown between these two private shared driveways as this is likely to be a desire line.
- e) The pedestrian and cycle link transition to internal road network in the area of plot 75 is partially obscured by the vehicle parking bay. The applicant is advised to review and redesign this transition to allow clear sightlines and full width transition. Cyclists should be able to access / egress the pedestrian and cycle link without being obscured or obstructed by parked vehicles.
- f) The applicant is advised to provide a surfaced connection to the pedestrian and cycle link from this road to enable residents and visitors to access the route.
- g) There is no link between plots 165 and 165. The applicant is encouraged to provide a connection for cyclists.
- h) Road 10 lacks footway provision from it's junction with Road 1. The applicant is advised to provide footways along both sides between the junction and plots 166 / 175 by making this into a secondary road.
- i) Visitor parking bays on Road 14 are in close proximity to the pedestrian and cycle link. Paragraph 6.5.6 in Chapter 6 of Local Transport Note 1/20 – Cycle Infrastructure Design advises a buffer strip of 1.0m or more is desirable between parked vehicles and parking bays. This is felt achievable given this is a new development and the bays / cycle lane are on the edge of an area of open space.
- j) The applicant is advised to review the transition of the pedestrian and cycle link to road 1 in the area of the junction with road 14 / SD21. There are multiple vehicle movements in this area which would pose a risk to cyclists.
- k) The pedestrian and cycle link from would benefit from an extension from it's current termination point opposite SD21 to connect to the Red Lonning Active Travel link. This could follow the alignment of the footway west of Road 15. A buffer strip would need to be provided adjacent to the visitor parking bays. This would also enable access to the Winchester Driver active travel link via Road 16. I note both the Red Lonning and Winchester Drive Active Travel links are 3m wide which is welcomed.
- l) The applicant is also encouraged to extend the active travel link south along Road 1 from it's current termination point opposite SD21 to the site boundary.

- m) The pedestrian and cycle links junction immediately northwest of the attenuation pond adjacent to Road 9 TH2 involves dog leg cycle movements with sharp turns. The layout will be more challenging for cyclists and will likely result in pedestrians taking the desire line rather than following the current dog leg between Road 7 TH and High Grove. The applicant is advised to amend the layout to feed all routes into a single roundabout.
 - n) The applicant is advised to increase the width of the main pedestrian and cycle link connecting from the A595 to Road 1 to 4m. Please also provide long-sections to demonstrate gradient. Are resting places / level platforms required to comply with accessibility guidelines? (this detail can be resolved at Discharge of Conditions stage)
 - o) The applicant is requested to provide an active travel connection to the turning head in the area of No 84 Laurel Bank. This will improve over all porosity of the site and reduce the need for people in the adjoining site to use the connection at Road 4.
 - p) A 3m wide active travel link link should be provided through to Red Lonning to improve permeability and routes to schools.
- The areas of public greenspace will be destinations in their own right. The applicant is encouraged to review cycle parking provision in these areas.
 - Cycle parking may be a challenge in house types without a garage. The applicant is requested to provide information on how secure cycle parking will be provided for House Types 155-6, 250, 252, 254, 256, 350, 352, 360, 365, 366, 450, 451, 455 and 461.
 - The applicant is encouraged to think about the potential future addition of bus services through the development and the interaction of bus stops with the pedestrian and cycle links, identifying possible and suitable bus stop locations.

Review of Planning Conditions

There is no 'Access and Movement Parameters Plan' as required by Condition 7. Please provide this plan.

Lead Local Flood Authority response:

There are no surface water drainage details submitted for approval under this reserved matters application.

Yours sincerely

Shamus Giles

Lead Officer - Flood & Development Management