

Oliver Hoban

From: Colin Aimers - Kingmoor Consulting
Sent: 16 December 2024 10:17
To: Sarah Papaleo
Subject: FW: Response To Application Number 4/24/2386/DOC at UNITS 1, 2 & 3 JOE MCBAIN AVENUE, MORESBY PARKS
Attachments: 24-471r001 Drainage Report_compressed.pdf

CAUTION: External email, think before you click!
Please report any suspicious email to our [IT Helpdesk](#)

Sarah

Enclosed response to comments and updated documents for various conditions

| | |
|---------------------|---|
| Project : | New Warehouse, Joe McBainAve, Moresby Parks, Whitehaven |
| Project No : | 24-471 |
| Date : | 16th December 2024 |
| Response : | C Aimers |

| Comments | Response |
|---|--|
| CUMBERLAND COUNCIL | |
| <p>Condition 5 - The LHA and LLFA have reviewed the submitted information in support of this application, to which we have no objection in principle to the proposed but would like the following point addressed before condition 5 can be discharged, Although the car park includes accessible parking bays no motorcycle bays or bicycle parking has been included in the detailed plan, the LHA requires these additional modes of transport to be included in the parking plan. Please refer to the Cumbria Development Design Guide below for requirements.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">- Accessible Parking = 1 space or a number equivalent to 3% of car requirement whichever is greater.- Motorcycles = a number equivalent to 5% of the car requirement when more than 20 car spaces necessary.- Pedal Cycles = a number equivalent to 10% of the car requirement with minimum spaces of 2. | <p>Additional bays for motorcycles and pedal cycles have been added to drawing, 24-471 DWG001 Revision C</p> |

| | |
|--|--|
| <p>The LHA and LLFA have reviewed the submitted information in support of this application, to which we have no objection in principle to the proposed, but would like the following points addressed before condition 8 can be discharged,</p> <p>The LLFA have concerns regarding the surface water pipe from manhole S1 to manhole S6 as this runs through the building and could cause potential problems in the future for the occupant of the unit if ever a blockage happened. The LLFA would like to see all surface water sewers outside of the proposed units.</p> | <p>Note concerns regarding S1 to S6 and S16 to S17 and from falls available and site levels, we do not consider this an issue. Both drainage runs beneath the building are roddable from each end and any site wide drainage would be subject to maintenance undertaken by the landlord.</p> |
| <p>Although the yard surface has not been agreed it has been noted that no road side gullies have been installed as part of drainage design, if this design is to remain as proposed the yard surface cannot be an impermeable surface.</p> | <p>Gullies are noted at S21, S22, S14, S13, S12 and S11 alongside Acco drains to entrances and building entrances. The yard surface is non permeable and considered in the volume calculations provided.</p> |
| <p>Condition 10 -</p> <p>The LHA and LLFA have reviewed the submitted information in support of this application, to which we have no objection in principle to the proposed, but would like the following point addressed before condition 10 can be discharged,</p> <p>The LHA request that Highway access North has a footway on both sides of the access road to allow safe passage onto the site as pedestrians accessing the site from north would not cross the access road and walk on the opposite footway to gain access to Unit 3 they would walk up the carriageway which is highway safety issue.</p> | <p>Noted an additional footway applied to the northern entrance.</p> |
| <p>UNITED UTILITIES</p> | |
| <p>Further to our review of the submitted Drainage Statement (ref 24-471r001, dated Nov 2024), United Utilities recommends that condition 8 is not discharged. This is because the proposals are not clear with respect to the surface water discharge rate. The report states surface water will be restricted to the Greenfield QBAR runoff rate, however the rate shown on the drainage plans is much higher. The rate used in the hydraulic calculations is different again. Finally, the greenfield runoff rate appears to have been calculated using an area which is considerably larger than the actual drained areas for this site.</p> | <p>Noted and we have updated the greenfield calculations across all documents.</p> <p>At present the greenfield area is based on the site boundary as we consider that the land within the site boundary drains formally via land drains into the site which shall be considered for the discharge. Existing informal discharge arrangements from the site shall be removed and controlled via the hydrobrake.</p> |

Kind regards

Colin Aimers, CEng MICE CEnv
Director
Kingmoor Consulting Ltd