



Date: Tuesday, 9 March 2021

Time: 2.00 pm

Venue: THIS IS A VIRTUAL MEETING - PLEASE USE THE LINK ON THE AGENDA TO LISTEN TO THE MEETING

Contact: Emily Marshall / Shelley Davies, Committee Officer  
Tel: 01743 257717 / 01743 257718  
Email: [emily.marshall@shropshire.gov.uk](mailto:emily.marshall@shropshire.gov.uk) /  
[shelley.davies@shropshire.gov.uk](mailto:shelley.davies@shropshire.gov.uk)

## **NORTHERN 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

NORTH PLANNING COMMITTEE		
SCHEDULE OF ADDITIONAL LETTERS		
Date: 9 <sup>th</sup> March 2021		
<p>NOTE: This schedule reports only additional letters received before 5pm on the day before committee.</p> <p>Any items received on the day of Committee will be reported verbally to the meeting</p>		
Item No.	Application No	Originator
5	20/02248/FUL: School House Ifton	Applicant 01/03/2021
<p>Submission of a revised landscaping plan including outline specification notes regarding no-dig construction and a statement regarding soil volumes to address the latest comments from the tree officer.</p> <p><u>OFFICER RESPONSE:</u> The additional information and revised plans addresses the tree officer's comments such that if the application was being recommended for approval any planning conditions relating to landscaping and tree protection could be appropriately worded.</p>		
Item No.	Application No	Originator
5	20/02248/FUL: School House Ifton	Regulatory Services 01/03/2021
<p><i>Environmental Protection has reviewed the updated noise report and had discussions with the developer and noise consultant.</i></p> <p><i>The report shows that the garden areas and the façade noise levels of properties facing onto Overton Road will exceed guidance noise levels. It also shows that the rating level of industrial noise at many of the façades and garden areas to properties to the north and west of the site will exceed the background level. At these levels there is a likelihood that the council will receive noise complaints in the future.</i></p> <p><i>The developer has proposed a noise mitigation scheme that would require many of the properties to have an acoustic glazing and ventilation scheme that requires the windows to be kept shut in order to achieve acceptable internal noise standards. Whilst such a scheme can achieve the recommended internal noise environment and cooling for the properties, the fact that this cannot be achieved unless the windows are kept shut will have a detrimental impact on the quality of life for the future occupants.</i></p> <p><i>Many of the garden areas will not be able to achieve the recommended noise levels at all, and no further mitigation is feasible with the current design.</i></p> <p><i>As I have previously commented this will have a detrimental impact on the amenity of these properties and there is a likelihood that the council will receive complaints in the future. If the complaints were found to be a statutory nuisance this may impose additional burdens on the neighbouring businesses. NPPF states that existing businesses should not have unreasonable restrictions placed on them as a result of a development.</i></p>		

*As previously advised good acoustic design principles should be used to ensure optimum acoustic standards are achieved without adversely affecting the quality of life of the occupants. There is no evidence to suggest that design measures have been used to mitigate the noise for example considering site and building layout and orientation of buildings.*

**OFFICER RESPONSE:** The following additional reason for refusal is recommended:

4. Many of the garden areas will not be able to achieve the recommended noise levels and optimum noise standards and it has not been satisfactorily demonstrated that noise mitigation to provide acceptable internal noise standards could be achieved without an acoustic glazing and ventilation scheme that requires windows to be kept closed. It is considered that the proposed development would therefore have a detrimental impact on the quality of life of future occupants and would not protect the operation of neighbouring businesses and would be contrary to Local Plan policy CS6 and MD2, paragraph 180 and 182 of the NPPF and the Professional Practice Guidance on Planning and Noise (ProPG).

Item No.	Application No	Originator
5	20/02248/FUL: School House Ifton	RCA regeneration (Independent development/viability consultants)

RCA have undertaken an independent viability appraisal with the following conclusion:

*8.1. This viability assessment has considered the Full Planning Application (ref: 20/02248/FUL) which proposes 35 new build dwellings. Due to Vacant Building Credit, the scheme is only liable to provide 1 affordable unit. However, the applicant is proposing 11 affordable units, so an additional 10 above the policy requirement.*

*8.2. The applicant is of the view that retention and conversion of the school building is not viable, therefore, proposes to demolish it and replace it with 6 semi-detached units. However, the Council wishes to retain the Non-Designated Heritage Asset and would ideally like to see it converted. The school could convert into 3 units, with an additional 29 new build units to the rear (32-unit scheme).*

*8.3. We have undertaken a detailed review of both scheme options and considered the viability of both options, when assessed against a Benchmark Land Value.*

*8.4. We have advised on two BLVs, depending upon whether or not grant funding would be forthcoming for 18 units on a Rural Exception Site basis. We have determined a BLV 1 of £650,000 and a BLV 2 of £584,000.*

*8.5. We have concluded that for the 32-unit scheme to be viable, all new build units (29) need to be provided as affordable and grant funding is forthcoming on 28 of these units (additional affordable units provided above the policy requirement of 1 unit). The tenure split of the affordable units varies depending on which BLV is assumed. These appraisals are Option 4 and Option 6.*

8.6. *We have concluded that for the 35-unit scheme to become viable, when adopting BLV 1, then a small reduction in profit will need to be made. The 35-unit scheme is viable if BLV 2 is adopted.*

8.7. *Our report details our assessment and provides a range of options for the Council to consider when determining this planning application.*

**OFFICER RESPONSE:** The Benchmark Land Value (BLV) is the value of the land assuming that a scheme for development of this site would be acceptable having regard to adopted local plan policy and national planning policy and guidance. It is considered that it has not been satisfactorily demonstrated that an alternative development to the proposed scheme that included retention and conversion of the part of the school considered to be a non-designated heritage asset to three or four dwellings and/or that included substantially more affordable housing would not be viable.

Item No.	Application No	Originator
5	20/02248/FUL: School House Ifton	Applicant 03/03/2021

*Requests that the 'Northern Planning Committee consider a deferral of the Ifton Heath planning application to allow Cornvii Development Limited an opportunity to consider and address the draft reasons for refusal and consider the viability assessment undertaken by RCA consulting'.*

Item No.	Application No	Originator
5	20/02248/FUL: School House Ifton	Conservation 04/03/2021

**Details:** Additional information has been submitted by Cornvii's heritage consultant. Having reviewed this information we do not agree with many of the assertions made within the text regarding the advice given by Historic England in its designation selection guidance. The guidance does not specifically advise "... *that the significance of individual schools is usually judged in a national context and is closely related to the work of a renowned architect, age, architectural form, detailing and technical innovation.... Historic association with prominent individuals or education movements may also figure. Its completeness in terms of original features fittings and setting is similarly relevant.*" (CJ Richards, undated). Indeed the selection guidance advises "The rarest survivals can be very humble, especially pauper and factory schools, and may be easily overlooked because they are plain and have no distinctive plan form. Their very humility lends them significance, and they should not be judged against grander schools. The survival of internal fittings is likely to add interest." Also, the selection guidance states "Preservation and degree of survival will be relevant, alongside architectural interest, planning, earliness of date, and the rarity of the type of school in question. External architectural quality is usually the most striking feature of schools of this period, and is a fundamental criterion for listing. Some school boards (especially in the major cities) consistently produced designs of great interest, but a school does not necessarily have to attain these high standards for designation to be warranted: regard should be given to the local context, and the sort of school that is being considered. Interiors matter too: fixtures were generally plain and most plans were formulaic and increasingly standardised: exceptions are thus of interest. (Historic England designation guidance, 2017).

The report also comments, stating that the building encouraged good ventilation and cross air flow through the class rooms (via the large sash windows on both front and

rear elevations), the arched roof trusses remain (currently hidden by the suspended ceilings) and original joinery and flexible folding partitions remain in workable order. All of these qualities are considered by the HE Team to be reasons to retain and reuse the building as it does have significance, character and is a landmark building in the streetscape and also within the community.

With regard to the design of the proposed dwellings. No further alteration or amendment has made to improve the design of the proposed dwellings and thus they remain bland and uninteresting.

We would also note that the plots that are proposed to replace the school building do not face the road and have their private gardens facing the road with only a low wall indicated (TBC). This would not appear to be a satisfactory or useable secure space to serve three and four bed dwellings.

It is also noted that there is a blank elevation opposite the entrance to the development which is uninteresting in terms of design Plot 35 (this was noted in previous comments as plot 40). Some house types along the frontage do not appear to have been submitted 3SE?

Pavements are still noted on both sides of the accesses road, even in certain shared no-through zones. needed on both sides of the road all of the way through the development?

Previous comments were made regarding the costs analysis and it would appear that no further update has been received in this regard.

**RECOMMENDATION:** There is insufficient information submitted and justification provided which clearly evidences that demolition is the only option for the identified buildings.

There is concern regarding the total loss of the identified buildings and this will need to be considered in the planning balance under para 197 of the NPPF where consideration of the loss of embodied energy should be a factor when looking at the overall benefits of the scheme. We would also consider that the scheme does not comply with the other policies noted above.

Officer response: The third recommended reason for refusal states the following:

*3 Whilst the scale, design and layout of the development is acceptable the applicant's noise assessment recommends that a 1.8m acoustic fence be provided along the front boundary to mitigate against noise and no details have been provided and it is considered that this would be visually prominent and would have an adverse impact on the character and appearance of the locality contrary to Local Plan policies CS6, CS17, and MD2.*

Details of the acoustic fence proposed along the front boundary have not yet been received. If the proposal could be amended so that the houses along the front (or a proposal that included retention and conversion of the front part of the school) could be orientated so that the development that fronts the road has mainly non-habitable windows in this road facing elevation (typically this means having kitchens, utility rooms, entrance halls, bathrooms and landings facing the noise source) and with private gardens situated to the rear, this might address some of

the concerns regarding noise mitigation for the houses at the front and the visual impact of the proposal.

This page is intentionally left blank