

CENTRAL PLANNING COMMITTEE		
SCHEDULE OF ADDITIONAL LETTERS		
Date: Thursday 15 th February 2018		
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		
Item No.	Application No.	Originator:
5	17/01612/OUT Weir Hill	Residents
<p>This report gives an update on community objections received and the outcome of a meeting between the applicants and the Weir Hill Action Group.</p> <p>216 additional standardised letters of objection have been submitted. The objections cover the following four topics.</p> <p><u>No construction traffic at any time on Preston Street</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is no excuse for the developer not to do so. • Preston Street is already busy at school times. It is not like London Road. • Construction traffic would cause extra pollution, traffic chaos, increase accidents for cyclists, prevent parents from walking with children to school, damage roads and underground pipes. • Construction traffic would affect residents for years – extra noise, mud on road etc. • Very few houses on Preston Street have double glazing. • Preston Street needs weight restrictions. • Entrance and exit road to the site should be on London Road first thus avoiding major impact to Preston Street • Road surface in Preston Road not adequate for the extra capacity • Pedestrian crossing is too close to the island • Traffic already builds up along Preston Road and to the Column this will just add to the problem • <p><u>The London Road access must be built first before any homes are built</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It's a top priority, not negotiable. It will avoid a bottleneck at Preston Street and onto London Road. It would reduce accidents, air quality damage. Two accesses are needed from the outset for safety reasons. • Government advice to deliver infrastructure first. It's normal practice to put the roads in before you build the houses. • Preston Street too far from Mereside School. Need a link in first to make it easier for parents to get to school. Would prevent residents from driving. • Link road technically easy to do. Could be temporary, a road track. In developers' interest to build it – would allow traffic to access from A5. • Building the road would show the developer was doing the right thing by the community, being considerate and responsible. The developers can afford this. • The Housing Minister, is on record as saying that to carry the community with them new housing developers should build the necessary infrastructure first in order to avoid traffic problems. This is so true for such a large proposal as that at Weir Hill and something the Planning Officer seems to be ignoring. • Lack of footpath and cycle way to London Road • Traffic already builds up along London Road and to the Column this will just add to the problem 		

- Extra traffic on Meol Brace Island and the link to Dobbies Island – this is already busy without adding construction traffic to the list

The number of dwellings to be served from Preston Street must be limited to 150 to reduce the impact of traffic for new and existing residents

- There are already traffic problems locally. I have waited for 19 cars to pass before going onto the London Road.
- It would reduce pollution.
- We were promised this at SAMDev. Developer should abide by the original plan.
- A development of 600 homes would generate an additional 1,300 cars on Preston Street. Residents will need triple glazing.
- To allow full access through the new Wier Hill housing estate will create a new short cut to Emstry Island thus increasing the traffic
- Belvidere Avenue and Belvidere Road are used by many schoolchildren every day, and their walk and cycle to school should not be put at greater risk by the unnecessary addition of higher volumes of traffic.

Other reasons for objecting

- Lack of thought about this development.
- Belvidere Road already too busy. Difficult for fire engines/ ambulances. Why add to existing on street parking problems? Will affect bus services too. Add to speeding issue on this road.
- Need to make sure London Road is in place at the start or it may not be built.
- This development will impact on services like GPs, schools, water pressure, sewerage. Schoolchildren on this estate will go to St Giles, not Mereside.
- Need to have a community facility on site. No shops.
- Green land being built on/ loss of ancient field, harm to wildlife. Air pollution in area already exceeds WHO safety limits.
- There are other brownfield sites that could be built on instead.
- Development too dense, poor quality housing, poor aesthetics. It will destroy the town.
- Lack of playing fields and sports facilities on the site. Severn Way needs to be wider. People deserve better.
- Housing will not benefit local people. People moving in not likely to be local. No jobs on the site for them.
- Preston Street should be maintained as a “quiet”, select residential area.
- The decision should be made by the Council with local people and not by developers/ big business.
- Council won't be able to enforce planning conditions.
- Council refused permission for a sixth form centre on London Road for lack of infrastructure. Why not refuse this?
- Why is the Council going to change weight restrictions for this development?
- Inadequate money for traffic management.
- Traffic survey incorrect.
- Applicants have told half truths.
- Unstable electric supply and low water pressure – the proposal will impact further
- STW have not yet modelled the impact of the proposed development on the foul sewer network, will Preston Street need to be opened up to lay a new larger sewer?
- Increase traffic onto Portland Crescent at same time Children are entering and leaving school.
- Increase pressure on local schools.
- Increase traffic to Cromwell Road and Belvidere Road railway bridge

- On consideration for bike users.
- Increase noise, traffic jams and pollution
- Loss of residents parking on streets, already a problem from Shirehall staff parking in streets.
- There will be a further permanent and irreversible loss of green land in an already over-developed town, with blighting to the remaining stretch of open land alongside the river. Shrewsbury has already lost huge tracts of much-needed green open space to housing and retail development;
- Severn Way runs alongside of the proposal and will lose this quiet and tranquil walk, not to mention the loss of wildlife including otters.
- How does Shropshire Council enforce breaches in planning conditions and deter repeat non-compliance with the Construction Environmental Management Plan, as there is no evidence of prosecutions, unlike other Local Authorities?
- How can quantitative or qualitative deficits or surpluses of open space have been measured in this application, in the absence of an adopted 'Public Open Space and Recreation Needs Assessment'?
- Why was the impact of the use, at peak times, of the Pedestrian Crossing on Preston Street on traffic not measured nor modelled? Allied to this, why were the junctions of Belvidere Rd with Belvidere Avenue and Belvidere Avenue with Preston Street not modelled?
- Why do the modelling diagrams (drawing 501D) on HGV access/egress from the site show HGVs using Portland Crescent?
- If the Traffic Assessment has taken account of the DoT White Paper on Cutting Carbon why are we proposing to take HGVs round a long route involving Dobbies and Meole Brace roundabouts when early provision of the link road would cut mileage, time and emissions?
- Have any dilapidation surveys been undertaken on the road network and especially on Preston Street prior to their use by HGV's and other construction traffic?
- Why have no amenity impact assessments of HGVs on current residents been carried out? And, how do planners account for the contradictory statements made in their November report to committee where it is stated that 'no consideration has been given to the amenity impact of the construction traffic' yet 6 paragraphs later stating that 'requiring all construction traffic to come off the London Rd access could have amenity impacts for residents near this access'? How is that likely to be more of an impact than routing HGVs via town and Preston Street?

The applicants and five representatives of the Weir Hill Action Group met on 8 February 2018. Two ward councillors attended too. A discussion took place which focused on the logistics around releasing the London Road entrance to the site and the Construction Environment Management Plan (CEMP). The developers were asked to consider the following two additional conditions:

- Agreeing to open the London Road access within 18 months of the grant of planning permission.
- Agreeing to delay the start of the development by six months to enable work to start on undergrounding overhead cables.

Officers have considered both matters and advise that conditions covering these matters are not necessary for planning reasons. The development could operate safely with the cap of 225 homes from Preston Street before the London Road access is opened provided development is controlled by means of a CEMP.

The planning case officer also attended this meeting. He told the representatives of the Weir Hill Action Group that the Council would consult on the CEMP when it is submitted.

A further briefing note has been received by Weir Hill Action Group on 13.02.18 and follows in full:

We have carried out a near 'forensic' analysis of the Traffic Assessment and the attached Briefing Note outlines our findings. In summary these are:

- The current proposal to allow access to Preston Street from 600 dwellings is based on a flawed Transport Assessment and the assessed impact is not supported by the raw data.
- The raw data shows that 2026 traffic plus 600 homes increases queue length on Preston Street by 6.5 times and delays increase 4 fold at peak times.
- We have found that the ATC data taken on Preston Street was not used in the models. Therefore comparisons with the manual counts taken in 2009 (discussed last month) are not valid. This has been confirmed by MEC.
- The model has used Hubert Way, Herongate as a local comparator. This is not appropriate. Hubert Way is not close to any businesses, any shops, any schools, no college, no Shirehall and most importantly no pedestrian crossing.
- The pedestrian crossing is the principal cause of large queues and delays at peak times. On Monday 22 January we counted 201 pedestrians and 26 cyclists on the crossing between 0800 and 0900hrs. That's one every 15 seconds on average.
- The effects of the pedestrian crossing were neither measured nor modelled nor were the junctions of Belvidere Road, Belvidere Avenue and Preston Street.
- The impact of HGV's has not been quantified or modelled nor have the likely amenity, health and environmental impacts on current residents assessed.
- It is surely irrefutable that routing all construction traffic through the link to London Road would be a far better solution for all stakeholders rather than routing via Dobbie's island, Meole Brace, Reabrook etc.
- The traffic speed data taken on Preston Street is not truly representative as it was taken close to the bend with Portland Crescent. What is more, accident data is incomplete and understates the number of accidents on Preston Street/Portland Crescent.
- We conclude that the link road must be built first or at the very least a temporary haul road to prevent HGVs accessing Preston Street by an extended route through town and that the pedestrian crossing is the principal cause of delays and queues on Preston Street and Belvidere Avenue.
- Following a meeting between ourselves, the developers and Vincent Maher it is evident that with careful, coordinated planning the link road can be built concurrently with the Western Power cabling work reducing the amenity impact on current residents.

Weir Hill Action Group Briefing Note
(Application Reference 17/01612/OUT)

Following the deferral of the above scheme in January we have had Engineers within our

community as well as others carry out a near 'forensic' analysis of the Traffic Assessment and indeed the letter to Councillors from Jason Tate dated 2nd February 2018 along with the technical note from MEC the highway consultant's ref AB/21643. Our findings are outlined below:

1. Current proposals to allow access to Preston Street from all 600 dwellings are based on a flawed Transport Assessment. The conclusion reached that all 600 houses could access Preston Street without significant impact - is not supported by the raw data. Nor with the evidence we all see on the ground today and every day in Preston Street.
2. Statements are made about statistical significance without there being any evidence presented of proper statistical analysis. In short, rather than being robust, we believe there are significant flaws.
3. Having carried out a deeper analysis, we now believe that the ATC data reported and discussed at the last meeting (sited close to the proposed access road to the development) was not used in the subsequent modelling. The wording in the report is ambiguous (TA Part 1 para 7.5). The 2015 manual count taken on the roundabout accords reasonably well with the 2009 manual data also taken on the roundabout albeit with an increase in traffic in the 6 years of between 6.5 and 8%.
4. However, since that time the Prayer Centre, Column House Gardens, Sainsbury's and the Pedestrian Crossing have created, in combination, significant new traffic impacts.
5. Raw data for Preston Street shows that 2026 traffic with an additional 600 homes increases queue length on the roundabout by 6.5 times and delays increase 4 fold (TA Part 2, App M, p250). Hardly insignificant but, this is only part of the story.
6. What's more, the model has been validated by using Hubert Way, Herongate as a local comparator (TA Part 1, para 7.17). This is a totally inappropriate and an invalid comparator for Preston Street! Hubert Way is a single entrance/exit to the Herongate estate off the Ellesmere Road with no cut-through.
7. Hubert Way has no businesses close by, no shops, no schools, no college, no crematorium, no business park, no Shirehall and most importantly no pedestrian crossing.
8. A simple on-site study would show that it's the crossing that causes significant queues and delays irrespective of whether the bottom end of Preston Street is widened. Video traffic counts taken on the roundabout did not count pedestrians nor cyclists on the crossing.
9. The crossing causes delays and queues in the morning peak back up Preston Street beyond Belvidere Avenue and back to the Belvidere Avenue/Belvidere Road Junction. Crucially, these latter two junctions were not modelled. Why not?
10. The use of the crossing is extended during the morning and afternoon traffic peaks due to flexitime at Shirehall and staggered timetables at the College. We counted 201 pedestrians and 26 cyclists on the crossing on a wet Monday between 0800 and 0900. That's one every 15 seconds! No wonder there are delays now. What will an extra 600-1200 cars add?
11. The impact of HGV's has not been quantified or modelled nor have the likely

amenity, health and environmental impacts on current residents assessed. The Planning Officers report in November (Para 6.5.8) states that 'no consideration has been given to the amenity impact of the construction traffic'. However, in the same report, Para 6.11.1 contradicts this and states, despite the claim above, that '...requiring all the construction traffic to come off the London Road access could have amenity impacts for residents near this access'

12. It is surely irrefutable that routing all construction traffic through the proposed access at the bottom end of London Rd, would present less of an amenity, environmental and health impact in an area with little to no housing when compared to Preston St. In addition, Point 21 of Appendix 1 states that 'the reasoning behind the 250 house limit is in the interests of highway safety and to protect the amenity of residents in the vicinity of Preston Street'. If this is the case why is this not a problem in the first 2.5 to 3 years? These contradictory statements are neither logical nor rational. Nor do they strike the right balance for all stakeholders.

13. Modelling of the entrance and exit of HGV's from the site shows them coming via Portland Crescent past the Primary School – surely this can't be right? Drawing 501D (loaded to the Portal) revised in October 2017 shows that vehicles exiting left to Preston Street cannot make the turn without clipping the opposite verge compromising traffic and pedestrian safety in both directions.

Modelling (Drawings 500E and 502E on the portal) also shows that HGVs, Refuse Lorries and Buses will be unable to turn round once on the site in order to exit via Preston Street.

14. The CEMP will need to be amended to re-route HGV's the long way round via the roundabouts at Dobbie's Island, Meole Brace Retail Park, Meole Brace, Sutton Park, Reabrook and Haycock Way to the Column. Resulting in disruption, pollution and noise over a much wider area. This is unnecessary, unwarranted and would attract further criticism about the lack of locality led, responsive planning in our town. Furthermore have any dilapidation surveys been undertaken on the road network and especially on Preston Street?

15. The ATC counts (measured close to the sharp bend where the development access is off Preston Street) were used for assessing traffic speed (TA Part 2, App E, page's 171-178) but these are likely to be a gross underestimate of traffic speed as vehicles will need to have slowed in order to take the bend at this point. The ATC also confirmed that the second peak of the day occurred in the afternoon (1500-1600) but modelled counts were done in the evening on a third lesser peak (1700-1800) missing the School Peak.

16. Accident data on Preston Street/Portland Crescent is incomplete. The resident of 2 Reynaulds Close has, over the past 5-6 years, logged and reported to the Council 16 separate accidents on the bend where vehicles have impacted his property (2 were reported to police). Speed is likely to have been the major contributory factor – None of these are shown (TA Part 4, Shropshire Council Drg2, p61)!

17. Conclusions

- The TA shows that capacity on Preston Street is not adequate to take traffic from an extra 600 homes. The link road must be built.
- That the Pedestrian Crossing is the principal cause of delays on Preston Street/Belvidere Avenue at peak times. Pedestrians and the effects they cause on traffic were not modelled. We counted 227 crossings in a 60 minute period. One every 15 seconds on average.

- It is possible to commence building the link road concurrently with the Western Power cabling work. The cabling work is likely to take 10 months with a 6 month build time for the road. Having met the developers and being assured that there are no insurmountable barriers to early provision of the link road we urge that the recommendations shown in (19) below are implemented to the benefit of all stakeholders.
 - We must not allow Preston Street to set a precedent for Shrewsbury for major developments to proceed without access roads at the outset. This is in line with the view of the Housing Minister, Dominic Raab who stated, in an interview on BBC Radio Shropshire on 1st February 2018 that “roads and infrastructure need to be built first to cope with extra traffic so as not to inconvenience local people.”
18. Questions?
- Why was the impact of the Pedestrian Crossing on traffic flow not measured or modelled?
 - Why were the junctions of Belvidere road with Belvidere Avenue and Belvidere Avenue with Preston Street not modelled?
 - Why do the modelling diagrams (drawing 501D) on HGV access/egress from the site show HGVs using Portland Crescent?
 - If the Traffic Assessment has taken account of the DoT White Paper on Cutting Carbon why are we proposing to take HGVs round a long route involving Dobbie's and Meole Brace roundabouts when early provision of the link road would cut mileage, time and emissions?
 - Why did the model not use the afternoon peak associated with school traffic which was shown by the ATC data to be higher than the evening peak?
 - Why is there a difference in the timings shown in Jason Tait's letter which states that the work to divert the cables is a 10 month programme (re-iterated by the developers in our meeting) yet the Development Management Report states “this will take in excess of a year?
 - Have any dilapidation surveys been undertaken on the road network and especially on Preston Street prior to construction traffic using these roads?
 - Where is the Stage 2 Road Safety Audit Report?
 - How do planners account for the contradictory statements made in their reports to committee on the amenity impacts of the construction traffic (para 12 and 13 above)?
19. Our recommendations are:
- The construction of the access to London Road must be available at the outset, if not a temporary haul road be provided.
 - No construction traffic on Preston Street or Portland Crescent Policy so as to comply with CS6 which seeks to ensure that residential amenity is protected.
 - In the unlikely and in the view of our residents totally unacceptable event ,that these are not deemed appropriate then there must be a time limit set of 10 months (i.e. not based on houses built, sold or occupied which is too open ended) from the date of approval until the provision of the link road.





Additional Comments received from the Agent – 14/02/18

As you know, my clients have been continuing to engage with local residents, Councillors and interested stakeholders in the delivery of this allocated site in the Council's adopted SAMDev Plan. A particular concern has been the timing for the deliveries of the London Road access and the minimisation of construction activities and deliveries on the residents on Preston Street. In this regard, I have now received confirmation from my clients that notwithstanding the technical evidence supporting the application and without prejudicing their position should permission not be granted, we have taken on board the strong view of local residents regarding this matter and after further consideration we are prepared to deliver the London Road access before the occupation of 150 dwellings.

Item No.	Application No.	Originator:
7	17/05234/FUL	Local Resident
Objection letter regarding the size of the root protection area (RPA) for the Lime tree T1 being incorrect. Full correspondence including diagrams attached.		
Item No.	Application No.	Originator:
7	17/05234/FUL	County Arboriculturalist Martin Sutton
<p>Notwithstanding comments previously made on this application by consultee tree officer Andrea King, I have had opportunity to consider the recent objection received by email from J Gill (7 February 2018) and I would offer the following comments by way of response.</p> <p>I agree with their concern that the root protection area (RPA) of lime tree T1 is not likely to be circular and that the area should be modified in shape to take account of the existing constraints to root development posed by the wall and hard standing to the south and east of the tree. I do not agree that the RPA is likely to be a simple rectangle as shown on the drawing attached to J Gill's email, and also I consider that some root development will have occurred under the hardstanding, but nevertheless I believe the principle to be correct.</p> <p>There is also a worrying discrepancy revealed by comparison of the tree survey undertaken for the outline application (12/00620/OUT) and the current tree survey – the former found the lime tree T1 to have a stem diameter of 768mm whilst the current report states it to be 620mm, some 148mm smaller. The difference needs to be explored and the true stem diameter confirmed – 148mm corresponds to a change of some 1.8m in radius (of a circular RPA), meaning that the RPA of the lime tree could actually extend further into the site and thus the proposed impact of development be greater than assumed.</p> <p>Given also the statements in the current tree report (see sections 10.1.6 and 10.1.27) that development within the RPA of T1 could result in a decline in its condition, even with all the precautions and working methods designed to mitigate damage, I would recommend that all these factors taken together suggest a redesign be considered with regard to plot 1 and potentially plot 2.</p> <p>(As a point of order, I would point out that tree T1 is not actually protected as stated in the objection email – none of the trees on the site are currently protected; but I would recommend that once the final arrangements of any approved development are confirmed, that significant retained trees should be made the subject of a TPO).</p> <p>I would also offer a comment regarding the sustainability of the scheme as proposed, given the proximity of retained mature and maturing trees to the proposed new houses. I note that the acceptability of the scheme relies in part upon the removal or pruning of several trees along the western site boundary, some of which are not in the ownership and therefore not under the control of the applicant (trees 8, 10, 19, 21 and 22).</p> <p>Whilst pruning of overhanging trees is a common law right, felling a third party tree, or lopping it to the extent that it may result in the death of the tree, or rendering it so unsafe</p>		

that it requires felling, is a different matter which could result in legal dispute with the tree owner. I would therefore suggest a Grampian type condition be applied to relevant parts of the proposed scheme, such that affected properties can only be constructed if the necessary and specified off site tree felling takes place. This would apply to plots 5, 6, 15, 16 and 17.

The Tree Team would be happy to discuss the proposed layout further with the applicant and their agents, in order to address the concerns raised.

Item No.	Application No.	Originator:
9	17/06119/FUL	Local Resident
Objection received 13 th February as follows: The two letters of objection are so eloquent, I need not add to them. Suffice to say please resurface these, keeping at least one court as a permanently free and open facility for public use with the other, if it must be, for occasional car park overspill use. It is a great shame that almost all former open spaces in Shrewsbury have either been built upon or have had high security fencing around them. This actively discourages children to explore the outside world, to the huge detriment to their health		