

<b>CENTRAL PLANNING COMMITTEE</b>		
<b>SCHEDULE OF ADDITIONAL LETTERS</b>		
<b>Date: 23 November 2017</b>		
<b>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</b>		
<b>Item No.</b>	<b>Application No. 17/01612/OUT</b>	<b>Originator:</b>
5	<p>Since the publication of the officer's report, further submissions have been received.</p> <p>More objections have been received from local residents and the Shrewsbury Civic Society raising the following points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Highway access should be made from London Road from the outset. It should not be before 250 homes are built.</li> <li>•There should be no construction traffic on Preston Street. This will cause traffic/ congestion/ highway safety risks for children.</li> <li>•Extra traffic calming / new mini roundabout on Preston Street needed.</li> <li>•Insufficient planning has been made for public/ community places on the site.</li> <li>•House prices have fallen during the processing of this application. Residents will need compensation/ amelioration as a result of the works.</li> <li>•No health impact assessment was submitted with the application.</li> <li>•Many new houses are of poor quality.</li> </ul> <p>One letter has been received confirming no objection and that the consultation period has been acceptable.</p> <p>The owners of Robertson Farm have raised an objection in connection with the landscaping layout. They say a proposed hedgerow blocks access to one of their buildings. The applicants accept this is an oversight in the scheme. Condition 11 of the planning permission will address the final landscape layout in Phase 1. Nonetheless, officers have asked the applicants to contact the owners of Robertson Farm to clarify final details of the hedgerow on land adjoining their holdings before this minor element of the overall scheme is finalised.</p>	Case officer

Item No.	Application No. 17/01612/OUT	Originator:
5	<p>The agent acting for the applicants have sent in a further letter following their meeting with Shrewsbury Town Council on 21 November. Their letter makes the following points of clarification.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•The development has now been reduced to 353 homes in Phase 1; the overall number of new homes is still up to 600 in line with SAMDev.</li> <li>•The trigger for the London Road link delivery has now been reduced to 250 homes – it was originally 365 homes when the application was submitted</li> <li>•A restriction on construction starts to 290 dwellings has also been proposed</li> <li>•There is no proposed construction deliveries allowed at all during peak traffic times including school pick up and drop off – the construction will be controlled by a Construction Management Plan</li> <li>•Widening of Preston Street adjacent to Shire Hall is proposed before construction begins and other traffic calming works on Preston Street are to be delivered by 250 homes</li> <li>•A financial sum is proposed to improve Belvidere Bridge so that the precise nature of the scheme and how the money is spent can be agreed with the local community</li> <li>•The proposed public open space and recreation areas will be available to all the community at all times, new and existing residents alike.</li> <li>•The recreation areas will be managed either by the Town Council or a Management Company but to an agreed management regime with Shropshire Council</li> <li>•A car parking area for the community park will be provided in Phase 2 of the development, as too the opportunity for a footpath/cycle connection to link the site to Shrewsbury College</li> <li>•Roads will be adopted by Shropshire Council in the development - footpaths and cycleways will provide full public access through the scheme to the Park and Riverside</li> <li>•No public right of way is affected at all by the development including the existing riverside footpath or public footpath leading to it from Preston Street.</li> </ul>	Agent for the applicants

Item No.	Application No.	Originator:
6	17/05049/FUL	Conservation Officer
<p>The current scheme appears to match the earlier scheme in its ultimately revised form following on from on-site meetings with the architect and agent at that time, and in that regard, I would refer you to our earlier comments for background information and for our comments on the proposal. As part of the 2015 application, it is noted that while the Civic Society was generally supportive of the scheme, they provided additional design comments with the aim of improving the proposal, and as these suggestions have some merit, it is recommended that these suggestions are considered in this current proposal ' this includes reducing the over-wide eaves features to the glazed roof extensions, and increasing the verticality of the fenestration of the glazed extensions for more consistency with the window proportions on the original building.</p> <p>While there is generally no objection to the scheme consistent with our earlier consultee comments, subject to further refining of architectural details and agreement of materials and finishes and wider site features and surface materials, we would note that to fully accord with the requirements noted above, it is recommended that a fuller heritage impact assessment should accompany this submission given the prominent position of this building, which is considered a non-designated heritage asset, within the Conservation Area and its position relevant to designated heritage assets such as the two pairs of Grade II listed houses at 75-76 and 73-74 to the immediate north of this site, and those in the wider street scene such as the Grade II listed signal box at the railway bridge junction. This has not been fully addressed in the Planning Statement submitted with the application.</p>		
Item No.	Application No.	Originator:
6	17/05049/FUL	Case officer
<p>The application as now submitted is the same as the previous scheme that was amended to the satisfaction of the Conservation officer. The Conservation Officer considered that in this instance the horizontal cladding would work better and would give a bit of contrast to the vertically emphasised windows and tower and was happy with the eaves feature if completed to a very good finish. This eaves feature is similar to the wide eaves on the roof extension to the Pump House opposite. Conditions are recommended to require further details of all external materials.</p>		
Item No.	Application No.	Originator:
6	17/05049/FUL	Environment Agency (EA)
<p>We have no objection to the proposed development and would offer the following comments for your consideration at this time. We have also highlighted some safe access considerations to assist your determination in the interests of flood risk safety and sustainability.</p> <p>The EA letter is available to view on the file.</p>		

Item No.	Application No.	Originator:
6	17/05049/FUL	Case Officer
<p>The EA response has been received since the report was published and is much the same as that made to the identical previous application and suggests conditions. The submitted FRA indicates that 'the level of the existing ground floor is 52.93m, and it is proposed to raise the ground floor level to 54.00m, the first floor level will be 57.22m and the second floor 60.95m, therefore a ground floor level of 54.00m will be 1.78m above the highest water level recorded of 52.22m.</p> <p>The FRA also outlines that the initial level of the elevated dry pedestrian escape route over the car park is at the first floor level of 54.00m. The elevated footpath will then link up with the existing flood access route of the Benbow Quay development. This initially has an elevated footpath link across the front of the houses, then a set of steps down to the access road which has an approximate level at the bottom of the steps of 52.0m.</p> <p>The 52.22m contour is approximately 18.6m from the bottom of the steps to the elevated footpath across the front of the houses, therefore at the worst case the depth of flood water would be 0.22m, which would not go over a pair of wellington boots. From the 52.22m contour it is then a dry route all the way down the access road to Coton Hill.</p> <p>Officers recommend that the following additional condition is added to any decision notice for approval:</p> <p>Ground Finished floor levels shall be set no lower than 54.0mAOD in line with section 3.20 of Flood Risk Assessment (Sumner Consultancy, Ref 218-7 and dated 8 October 2017) unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.</p> <p>Reason: To help protect the proposed dwellings from flood risk for the lifetime of the development.</p>		