



Date: Tuesday, 25 June 2019

Time: 2.00 pm

Venue: Shrewsbury/Oswestry Room, Shirehall, Abbey Foregate, Shrewsbury, Shropshire, SY2 6ND

Contact: Emily Marshall, Committee Officer
Tel: 01743 257717
Email: emily.marshall@shropshire.gov.uk

NORTH PLANNING COMMITTEE

SCHEDULE OF ADDITIONAL LETTERS

NOTE: This schedule reports only additional letters received before 5pm on the day before committee. Any items received on the day of Committee will be reported verbally to the meeting

This page is intentionally left blank

Agenda Item 9

NORTH PLANNING COMMITTEE		
SCHEDULE OF ADDITIONAL LETTERS		
Date: 25th June 2019		
<p>NOTE: This schedule reports only additional letters received before 5pm on the day before committee. Any items received on the day of Committee will be reported verbally to the meeting</p>		
Item No.	Application No.	Originator:
5	18/05901/FUL	Members of the public
<p>2 further letters of objection to the proposed development one from a resident of Pauls Moss Court, indicating the alternative proposals put forward by Save Pauls Moss are more favourable as these are much better in relation to overlooking and loss of privacy from balconies facing properties, as is the situation with the current scheme, over development of the site, car parking on site is a concern and the lack of it. The alternative scheme is considered better in relation to access and neighbourliness. Visually the Save Pauls Moss Court alternative is more pleasing and more in keeping with the Dodington area. The alternative scheme is also considered more sensitive to the wildlife population, especially with the retention of the trees and light pollution.</p> <p>The second letter indicates support for the alternative scheme as put forward by Save Pauls Moss.</p>		
Item No.	Application No.	Originator:
5	18/05901/FUL	Members of the public
<p>2 further letters of support indicating awareness of "Save Paul's Moss" attempting to draw up alternative proposals, but as £1million of the funding appears to be 'Time limited', doubt that it will have any chance of immediate success. It is of far more importance to build the Centre, rather than retain Paul's Moss. Health facilities, particularly GP practices, are seriously at risk if the current proposal doesn't proceed. Concerns are also raised that if the Medical Centre does not go ahead the existing Pauls Moss House will go into further decline. Comment is also made that the Save Pauls' Moss scheme does not encourage connectivity and would isolate occupants of the apartments and therefore create a situation of loneliness and especially during winter months.</p>		
Item No.	Application No.	Originator:
5	18/05901/FUL	Residents of Pauls Moss Court
<p>A Design Scheme Appraisal has been submitted on behalf of the residents of Pauls Moss Court. This is extensive in comments and its conclusions indicate: <i>'Without delving into huge depths with one particular aspect of the proposed scheme, it is clear that there is a significant lack of information and evidence to</i></p>		

support the scheme. Working through the Planning Policies at both a Local and National level raises a lot of concerns for many design aspects of the new development. From existing residents to new residents wellbeing, it is being compromised by the mass and scale of the building. The proposed plans will lead to an overdeveloped site, and a huge impact on the Conservation Area, and with the biggest impact being on an important historical building due to the demolition of Pauls Moss. There is no return from such a significant loss. The benefits of the proposals do not outweigh the negative impacts it will have. New feasibilities should be produced for the site, to limit the impact and to find a compromise which retains Pauls Moss, perhaps whilst removing some of the newer additions to the house. New plans should also enhance the green space, and provide something which can be used by new and existing residents'

Item No.	Application No.	Originator:
5	18/05901/FUL	SAVE Britain's Heritage

SAVE Britain's Heritage have indicated strong support for the alternative proposal for the Pauls Moss site. This alternative scheme demonstrates in an exemplar way that it is possible to deliver enhanced services to the local community with particular emphasis on health and well-being, while retaining the historic house and adapting it to a new use and creating a welcoming, new place for everybody in Whitchurch. The alternative scheme shows how the existing building can be converted to accommodate a community hub. The intelligent site layout creates ample space for the other functions: the health centre and new dwellings. There is also a new public activity space and a tree lined parking square. The amount of green space at the heart of the site is a gain for the whole of Whitchurch. The proposed building heights, orientation of the buildings and roof form successfully complement the conservation area.

Item No.	Application No.	Originator:
5	18/05901/FUL	Applicants

The Whitchurch Allotment and Community Orchard Association state 'Our concern is that with the large amount of building to take place, and the percentage of permeable (green) surface to decrease from 50% to 22%, there will be considerably more run off onto the Park, and the water table will become higher.'

We and our Consulting Engineers can confirm that there will not be considerably more surface water run-off onto the Park. There will be an increase in runoff from the proposed development site, however, the means of discharge from the site is via a combination of 2 methods: designed soakaways (located within the site) and a connection into the Welsh Water surface water sewer. The drainage strategy has been designed such that the proposed drainage system collects and controls surface water run-off from within the site. No surface water from the site has been designed to runoff into the adjacent Park.

The Allotment Association go on to say "The applicant's plans actually state that their flood plain will lie on the Park, therefore we are assuming that flooding will be an issue at some point."

Again we refute this and would confirm that the current drainage strategy plan does not show a flood plain on the Park. The plan shows a finite volume of flooding (7.77m³) at manhole S12. The hydraulic modelling shows that this flooded volume only occurs in the extreme 1 in 100 year storm event, accounting for an additional 40% increase for Climate Change. The design intention is for this flooded volume to be held within the adjacent landscaped area of the site i.e. detailed levels and threshold drainage provision would be provided such that the flooded volume is contained within the site, infiltrating into the landscaped area. The design intention is that this flooded volume will not run on to the adjacent site.

The two objections relating to changes in ground conditions and water levels are therefore factually incorrect.

With regard to the issue of connectivity between sites we would take this opportunity to confirm that we requested meetings with the Queensway Park Committee on a number of occasions but unfortunately our invitation to meet and discuss how best to possibly connect with what is public open space for all the residents of Whitchurch to enjoy was rejected.

As a well-established and successful provider of affordable Extra Care schemes we fully appreciate the importance of well designed and implemented open space and the social benefits, including improved health and wellbeing, that open spaces can bring. Our existing schemes across Shropshire, Staffordshire and Telford & Wrekin provide well managed, sustainable outdoor spaces that are accessible and multifunctional for all our resident's.

Officer's comments

Drainage matters are not a reason for refusal in relation to this application and it is noted the Council's drainage expert does not object to the proposed development.

With regards to access into the adjoining Queens Park, whilst comments from the applicants with regards to engagement and social interaction with the local community are acknowledged, it is clear in accordance with communications from the Queensway Park Committee that no access from the application site into the Park have been agreed. Further still it is also acknowledged by Officers that the section of the Park adjacent to the application site is ecologically sensitive and wet in nature and that access for occupiers of the development on site through this would not be ideal owing to the nature of the vegetation.

Item No.	Application No.	Originator:
5	18/05901/FUL	See below.

In response to the above Whitchurch Allotment and Community Orchard Association have responded indicating: (Response summarised, full copy is available for inspection on the application website).

There has never been access to the Park from the location of the application site because it is not considered safe or suitable. The land is boggy for most of the year and an access would be under water. The land on the Park has been left as grass throughout as it is peat land, such as that at Whixhall Moss, and is how the

Pauls Moss House got its name, as Edward Philips Thompson named his home after the field of the same name (now Queensway Playing Fields), which was part of his estate. We feel a great historical connection and the removal of the House would be a huge loss to that. Thompson built his gardener's cottage alongside the Park along with his chauffeur and butler's cottages. The Park is central to that historical context, but the grandeur of the heritage would be completely lost without the main House.

Item No.	Application No.	Originator
5	18/05901/FUL	Richard Buxton Solicitors

Letter received raising concerns/objections with regards to the proposed development and outlining a proposal for an alternative scheme for the site. Letter highlights importance of the Conservation Area in which the site is located within and also objections received to the application from Historic England, the Council's Conservation Team and 'Save Britain's Heritage'.

A full copy of this letter is available on the Council's application website for inspection.

Officer's comments.

Issues raised in relation to the application under consideration are largely covered in the report.

Whilst Officers acknowledge an alternative scheme has been put forward on behalf of the Save Pauls Moss Action Group and is subject to separate pre-application advice by the Council, this is a separate planning consideration and these plans as proposed do not form part of the application presently under consideration. Therefore whilst acknowledging there could be suitable alternatives, all considerations by members must be focused on the application as presented to Committee.

Item No.	Application No.	Originator
5	18/05901/FUL	Applicants

Letter received from applicants indicating The Wrekin Housing Trust operate a number of very successful Extra Care schemes both within and outside of Shropshire which provide less outdoor amenity space than proposed at Pauls Moss.

The most recent example of this is at the Extra Care scheme in Ellesmere. The outdoor amenity area at this operational scheme is 2143sqM and with 114 bed-spaces it results in 18.8sqM external amenity space per bed-space.

The Planning Officer for the Ellesmere scheme (Ref: 14/05343/FUL) stated that they were happy to accept a reduced area of open space because the area was

well served by POS (as is the case at Pauls Moss) and that The Wrekin Housing Trust had provided a statement regarding the level of open space requirements for the Extra Care facility and this was considered satisfactory.

This was also a new build scheme on a previously undeveloped site which falls under the Council's Interim Guidance on Open Space.

The Pauls Moss Planning Application is for the re-development of an existing housing scheme.

The current Pauls Moss scheme proposes 29.9sqM of outdoor amenity space based on 3384.5sqM and 113 bed spaces. This calculation is based on the same site analysis appraisal as undertaken on the Ellesmere Road Extra Care site where 18.8sqM per bed-space is provided and which includes communal open gardens, paths, planting beds, roof terraces, but not car parking areas, roadways etc. and which was supported by Planning Officers at the time.

The LPA's guidance recognises that every site is different and it cannot take into account the individual circumstance of every development site. As such we would draw your attention to the fact that the LPA have granted approval for an Extra Care scheme with significantly less open amenity space than currently proposed at Pauls Moss based on historical operational data from The Wrekin Housing Trust and the demographic of the building's user group.

Our Client fully accepts the importance of well designed and implemented open space and the social benefits, including improved health and wellbeing, that open spaces can bring. As a successful provider of Extra Care schemes across Shropshire, Staffordshire and Telford & Wrekin they provide well managed, sustainable outdoor spaces that are accessible and multi-functional. At Pauls Moss they have also endeavoured to engage in a dialogue regarding improved links to the adjacent public amenity space in order to maximise connectivity and accessibility for all. The Trust's invitation to meet on a number of occasions with key POS stakeholders has been rejected thus far The Trust would still welcome the opportunity to meet and discuss possible ways forward with the Queensway Park Committee.

In light of the amount of open space being provided at Pauls Moss and the precedent of Ellesmere Road we would ask Officers to remove their objection stating that the current Application proposes insufficient open space and landscaping provision.

Officer's comments.

Both sites referred to by the applicants were brownfield sites and neither were located within a Conservation Area.

There has also been significant policy changes since the processing of the applications referred to.

With regards open space requirements the proposal under consideration falls well

short of that required by current policy and is in any case also for use by the public, (Café alongside the only usable open space provision on site to which info indicates will be available for users of the cafe). Highlighting paths as being open space etc is not considered appropriate and usable open space is clearly limited and the plans even indicate open space as a terrace within Queens Park which is clearly outside the application site red line!

Pauls Moss site is alongside Queens Park, however it has been made clear in comments to the application that access into this from the site is not going to be agreed and further still the part of Queens Park adjacent to the site is not suitable for provision of public access owing to its ecological nature.

The Ellesmere Road scheme was a more mixed residential use site. The extra Care facility is a stand along with its own parking provision. This is significantly different to the Whitchurch proposal.

Pauls Moss site is within a Conservation Area and scale and mass is of concern in relation to this and open space and landscape and visual impact contribute to this matter.

The existing Pauls Moss Housing on site to which the more recent development does not enhance the Conservation Area is of far less mass and does not represent over development in the context that the proposed development does.

The quote that ‘a dialogue regarding improved links to the adjacent public amenity space in order to maximise connectivity and accessibility for all’ based on comments received in relation to the application clearly is not going to happen.

A refusal reason based on insufficient open space and landscaping is considered by Officers a valid reason for refusal

Item No	Application No.	Originator
5	18/05901/FUL	Applicants.

My sincere apologies we had not appreciated that you had posted revised comments on the Council’s portal regarding the soft landscaping design and only realised that there remained objections following receipt of the Planning Officer’s draft Committee Report on Monday.

To this end we have addressed where possible your comments and we are pleased to submit the following revised supporting information:-

- *BEA Landscape Architects Drawing Number 18_140_001 Rev A – Proposed Soft Works Plan*

As we corresponded on previously, unfortunately neither T5 Yew or T15 Lime can be retained. However, as you will see from the attached revised soft landscaping plan prepared by Landscape Architect’s Bea Landscape Design Limited the loss of these trees has been mitigated by increased new tree planting proposals. The

planting of 38no. new trees will mitigate the loss of existing trees to be removed and are made up of the following tree species are requested:-

- *Paperbark maple (Acer griseum)*
- *Birch (Betula pendula)*
- *Birch (Betula 'Grayswood Ghost')*
- *Corylus colurna (Turkish Hazel)*
- *Ginkgo biloba (Maidenhair Tree)*
- *Liquidambar styraciflua (American Sweet Gum)*
- *Pyrus 'Chanticleer' Ornamental Pear*
- *Quercus 'Fastigiata Koster' Fastigate Oak*
- *Taxus baccata (Yew)*

With regard to existing tree T12 Norway Maple (Category B) adjacent to the bin store we have modified the design of the car parking and bin store in order to retain T12 as requested.

Likewise with regard to existing tree T18 Silver Birch (Category B) adjacent to the external raised terrace we have modified the path to allow its retention. The possible future connection to the adjacent Public Open Space is in abeyance.

The revised Tree Protection Plan indicating the necessary zone of protection for T12 and T18 will be submitted under separate cover.

The removal of the existing Weeping Willows in G19 was to allow for the construction of an external raised terrace from the Extra Care scheme as opposed to the possible future link to the adjacent POS. Our Client is happy to retain as many of the Willows as possible subject to the construction methodology of the on-site terrace. Perhaps this items could be 'Conditioned' to allow further discussions to take place on site should the Application be Approved by Members?

I trust the above meets with your approval and addresses your concerns. As you can appreciate we are keen to resolve as many of the reasons for objection as possible to the current Planning Application. The draft Officer's Report currently states the following:-

4. The application does not provide adequate mitigation/compensation for loss of trees on site, many of which are considered worthy of retention and contribute positively to the character of the location and the Conservation Area. The application is considered contrary to Policies CS6 and CS17 of the Shropshire Core Strategy, Policies MD2 and MD12 of the SAMDev and the National Planning Policy Framework on this matter.

In light of the retention of T12 and T18, and the revised tree species proposals for the 38 number replacement trees which are now in line with your suggestions, we hope that you will agree that adequate mitigation and compensation has now been provided.

I trust the above meets with your approval and would welcome your feed-back on

the revised design submission at your earliest opportunity.

SC Tree Manager has responded indicating:

In response to a request for further clarification the Council's Tree Officer has responded indicating:

Thank you for inviting me to comment on the revised BEA Landscape Architects Drawing Number 18_140_001 Rev A – Proposed Soft works

I acknowledge that you have gone a long way to address some of the points raised in my original comments, including choice of species and retention of two more of the existing trees T12 and T18 with modifications to the car park and bin store.

However the revised landscape scheme does not fundamentally address the concerns of the current layout for long term sustainability of the proposed planting scheme and loss of the 2 best trees on site T5 Yew and T15 Lime.

The layout provides insufficient open space to allow the proposed 38 new trees to achieve maturity, some of which are located in constrained planting areas with limited room for full canopy and root development.