# **Bullock, Steph**

From: Development Management

Subject: FW: LCC/2022/0049 - Cottam

Attachments: Response to HW comments.docx

From: Wilson, Grace

**Sent:** 17 April 2023 15:08 **To:** Ashworth, Helen

Subject: LCC/2022/0049 - Cottam

Hi Helen,

So sorry for the delay on this again! It's been sat waiting for me to have the time to pull it together. Below are details of Alans responses to the outstanding objections.

#### **Canal & Rivers Trust**

#### **Construction Traffic**

It would be the Councils intention to limit construction traffic as far as reasonably practicable from using Quaker Bridge. Haul roads will be constructed from both Lea Road and the newly built Cottom Link road to access the compounds on either side of the canal as the means of access to construct the proposed bridge. Large items of plant such as piling rigs, HGVs and the like will use the haul road, however Quaker Bridge does not have a weight limit and could be used for smaller vehicles.

### UU

### **Drainage**

We will not have the detailed drainage plans assembled before determination and would expect to produce this for the planning authority as a condition therefore these will not be available for UU. We will be happy to furnish them the plans once they are approved. Discharge will not be into UU assets.

## Plan in relation to sewer and water connections

Alan will get this plan put together to show where the road etc location is relative to the sewer and water connection, but it should be noted that UU currently have a proposal to move the position of the sewer and if they keep to program the sewer will have move prior to our commencement of the road. We are also in discussion with UU contractor who is undertaking the works to determine best working practices whilst the diversion is taking place.

### <u>EA</u>

### **Foul Drainage**

Whilst a temporary foul drainage system is proposed it would be preferable to connect to the public sewer once the nearby housing development comes forward. However this should be conditioned on the proviso that the developer grants access, if the developer refuses then it would not be reasonable to remove the rights to have the temporary system.

#### **Contaminated Land**

If significant contamination was encountered, then testing would be carried out.

#### **BNG**

A culvert will be required under the car park. (other BNG comments to be addressed separately)

### **Surface Water Disposal**

The car park runoff will be designed by others who should show within the design the proposal for dealing with runoff.

For the road scheme the amount of land being taken is severely restricted by surrounding developments and as such the potential to include swales is limited, the discharge will be restricted in line with all guidance and as shown within the drainage strategy.

#### **Highways**

Please see attached highways comments addressed in detail. I have chased Alan for the outstanding plans required.

Glad Natural England have no objections regarding the sHRA. That is that part dealt with. Have Atkins provided their outstanding comments on Ecology Matters? Let me know if I have missed anything, from memory the only action you had was to chase Atkins.

Thanks,

Grace

Grace Wilson (She/Her)
Senior Planner
Infrastructure Delivery Team
Planning and Environment
Lancashire County Council
Tel (01772) 530604
www.lancashire.gov.uk

