

From: Richard Lord
Sent: Friday, April 12, 2024 10:14 AM
To: Ashworth, Helen
Cc: Dave Starkie - Appletons Ltd. <Haine, Jonathan>
Subject: RE: Lytham Green Drive - CEMP & Imported Materials Specification

Hi Helen,

Please find attached an updated Earthworks Plan and Cross Sections Plan. With regards to your related comments / queries, please see my responses below in blue. I have added your original comments for clarity. Hopefully you have everything you need to validate the application.

- There is a black dash dot line on the Earthworks plan that is not indicated on the key. [This is the golf course design, showing the outline of the fairway. This was not required on the earthworks plan and has now been removed.](#)
- It is unclear whether the spot heights for the proposed development are given as an increase in height above the datum level (zero) or the existing land levels. I need to be able to understand exactly what the increase in height of the land compared to the existing land level will be. For example, the highest proposed spot height appears to be 9.5m. Is this 9.5m above the datum level, or an increase in 9.5m above the existing land level in that location?

[The previous versions showed contour heights and spot heights at various locations. These were very confusing. The updated version now shows contours heights only and these are levels above ordinance datum \(AoD\). The plan is now much clearer. The brown lines are proposed soil placement contours. Black lines are the existing contours. Everything has been added to the key.](#)

[With regards to proposed heights, the attached Isopachyte Plan \(submitted with the application\) shows clearly what is being proposed, using colour coding. The table in the bottom left corner shows the colours and corresponding heights, plus the total area at each height. The height of the placed soils will be hidden by the perimeter trees.](#)

- The cross-sectional drawings do not scale correctly at the stated scale (1:750) as it states that the vertical axis has been two exaggerated for a better appreciation of the proposed profile. This also makes it difficult to interpret exactly how the final landform will appear.

[The scale of the cross sections has been amended. Hopefully these are clearer now.](#)

Regards



Richard Lord
Senior Technical Manager