

TWC/2019/0753

Land between Arleston Lane & Dawley Road, Arleston, Telford, Shropshire  
Erection of an Extra Care Facility containing 70no. self contained flats (Use Class C2) and associated communal/public facilities and erection of 103no. residential dwellings (Use Class C3) with associated access, landscaping and ancillary works \*\*\*AMENDED DRAINAGE INFORMATION - STRATEGY AND ADDENDUM RECEIVED\*\*\*

**APPLICANT**

Countryside Properties (UK)

**RECEIVED**

19/09/2019

**PARISH**

Wellington

**WARD**

Arleston

**THIS APPLICATION WAS DEFERRED, FOR ONE CYCLE, AT PLANNING COMMITTEE ON THE 18<sup>th</sup> DECEMBER 2019 AS MEMBERS REQUIRED FURTHER NEGOTIATIONS TO TAKE PLACE REGARDING DENSITY AND OVERDEVELOPMENT, THE CUMULATIVE EFFECT OF TRAFFIC, STAFF PARKING, HIGHWAY SAFETY, VISIBILITY SPLAYS AND DRAINAGE AND TO ALLOW A PUBLIC CONSULTATION ON THE DRAINAGE UPDATE.**

**1. DETAILS OF CONCERNS RAISED**

- 1.1 This application was heard at a previous planning committee meeting on the 18<sup>th</sup> December 2019, whereby it was agreed by Members that the application would be deferred in order to allow further negotiations to take place regarding density and overdevelopment, the cumulative effect of traffic, staff parking, highway safety, visibility splays and drainage and to allow a public consultation on the drainage update.

**2. NEIGHBOUR & STATUTORY CONSULTATIONS**

- 2.1 A full re-consultation was undertaken on the 19<sup>th</sup> December 2019. Local representation comprising 8 objections, including the concerns received regarding drainage which have been addressed within Section 3 of this report, raising the issues bulleted below:

- Increase in numbers and lack of need for this and development overall;
- Lack of need – use of brownfield over greenfield sites;
- Non-allocated greenfield site;
- Application not under wholly exceptional circumstances;
- Insufficient account taken of heritage significance;
- Increased light / noise / vehicle pollution, impact on existing properties;
- Insufficient capacity on road network;
- Inappropriate design;
- Impact on wildlife and trees;
- Loss of greenspace;
- Impact on local infrastructure (medical / education);

- Lack of due regard to objections and representations;
- Lack of EIA
- Monetary incentives issued by developer to Council projects and charities, but none to Arlestone Village residents, suggested if drainage running through the village, correct size drainage pipes should be provided and the road through the village repaired and tarmacked;
- Request increase to 2.5m wall boundary with Midfields, No. 24 Arlestone Village.

2.2 In regards to the latter request, the applicant has confirmed that a wall of 2.5m can be provided, this can be controlled through already proposed landscaping condition.

2.3 The Local Planning Authority advises that it has no awareness of the form of monetary incentives referenced; any financial contribution arising from the development needs to satisfy the tests placed upon S106 obligations, repair / tarmacking of the road through the village would not satisfy these tests, and would therefore need to be considered outside of the planning system; commentary below (Section 3) addresses the drainage concern.

2.4 All remaining issues have been addressed within the original committee report and update report.

### 3. PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

#### Density and Overdevelopment

3.1 The table below provides a comparison between the four most recent planning applications for the site:

	<i>TWC/2012/0240 - Outline Approval</i>	<i>TWC/2015/0836 previous owner Reserved Matter Approval</i>	<i>TWC/2016/1190 Redrow Reserved Matters – approved by Planning Committee (subsequently Withdrawn)</i>	<i>TWC/2019/0753 – current application</i>
<i>No. of Dwellings</i>	103	95	92	103
<i>Gross Density - DPH</i>	N/A	13.91	13.31	15.1
<i>Coverage</i>	N/A	106,069sqft	105,557sqft	104,643sqft
<i>Public Open Space</i>	34,615m <sup>2</sup> approx.	32,674m <sup>2</sup>	32,259m <sup>2</sup>	30,229m <sup>2</sup>

3.2 Here it is noted that the number of residential units is consistent with the 2012 outline approval establishing the development principles for the site; the coverage - taking into account both the number and the size of units - is lower in the current scheme

than the previous Redrow application which was considered favourably by the Authority. The amount of Public Open Space (POS) is lower in the current application. This includes the removal of the onsite LEAP, but has made more land available for an increased number of units without significantly increasing the density. The POS nonetheless still amounts to approximately 50% of the site of what is now 'whitelands' in policy terms, whilst including enhancement and protection of ecological habitats and management of woodlands and other open space.

- 3.3 It is accepted that the gross density is higher than previous approvals, however, it is nonetheless still low in relative terms with the National Planning Policy Framework seeking to provide development at around 35dph. The increase in density is largely led by the provision of more but smaller units as evidenced by the coverage distinction between applications. This is backed by the viability evidence for the application with a reduction of three residential units from the eastern parcel during the course of the application with no scope for a further reduction without significantly impacting on the planning obligations for the proposal, this option has not been pursued by the LPA.
- 3.4 The applicant has identified that the quantum of the Extra Care (EC) has increased from 50 to 70 units in order to make it viable. Notably this is the first time that a Registered Provider has wholly designed the Extra Care, and thus the viability of previous schemes was not truly understood and when it was the provider withdrew. The current EC equates to 25% larger in terms of footprint in comparison to TWC/2015/0836 (Helical). At its maximum the ridge height is only 400mm higher than TWC/2016/1190 (Redrow). The form of the building to previous schemes is key, whereby a much more consistent ridgeline applied, whilst the current scheme provides much more variation. This is in conjunction with varied elevational projections and setback, a U-shape configuration with a centralised landscaped courtyard to break up its mass, having been relocated to a lower part of the site, and compliance with required separation distances.
- 3.5 The applicant advises that they have previously asked the extra care provider H21 to look at providing a smaller scheme of between 50-60 units. However a scheme of 60 units would have a funding gap of £1m+, which is identified as needing to be plugged by the Council / Care Commission as it is understood that there is no available funding other than from Homes England (grant scheme), with the land gifted to H21 (a not for profit company) with no financial upside (or downside) to Countryside from the number of Extra Care units entailed.
- 3.6 The increase in the level of development from previous proposals for the site is led by a viability case. The principle of 103 dwellings was however established through the grant of Outline Consent (TWC/2012/0240).
- 3.7 The current level of development represents a reduction to that sought at the outset. Any further reduction on numbers would have an impact on the level of financial contributions to education and recreation. The site provides a balanced approach with varied densities, including retention of a lower density where more closely aligned to Arleston Village, Arleston Manor and neighbouring residential

development, alongside retention of approximately 50% of the site as public open space, and a design approach to reduce the massing of the extra care building. On balance, the level of development and layout proposed is considered acceptable.

Extra care staff parking, highway capacity, road safety, and visibility

- 3.8 Concern as to a deficiency of staff parking serving the Extra Care facility was raised by Members. Whilst the Local Highways Authority (LHA) had not raised objection to the level of provision, with no specific figure for extra care uses identified in TWLP Appendix F, recognising Member concern, additional parking has been sought and now stands at 45 car parking spaces with 6 allocated staff spaces now provided to the west. H21 advise that a maximum of 4 staff would be on site per shift and this includes all admin and corporate staff. Officers are seeking further clarification which will be reported to members. This nonetheless, alongside would provide 1 space per 2 units for residents and 10 staff spaces. In addition, the presence of 5 visitor spaces are positioned opposite the extra care. This enhanced provision is considered appropriate.
- 3.9 Regarding the cumulative effect of development traffic, particularly at the Cock Hotel junction, the LHA are aware that capacity is an issue at this junction, and in the locality. However, the level of additional traffic generated from the increased level of development is not identified as material, and under the terms of the National Planning Policy Framework as severe, and therefore is not justifiable as a reason for refusal.
- 3.10 It is understood that improvements to the Cock Hotel signal crossroads are possible, the principles of which have been agreed relating to the provision of land at Christopher's / Swan Hotel (TWC/2017/0706, awaiting completion of S106) comprising a new improved road junction with an additional left stacker turn onto Watling Street at the traffic lights through Section 278 works.
- 3.11 Regarding highway safety concerns, the Transport Assessment (TA) considered publicly-available records of personal injury accidents over a wide study area and within a 5-year period. The available collision data provides no evidence of specific local accident problems that might be related to traffic conditions or road geometry. The TA demonstrates that the proposed development is not forecast to materially increase in the risk of road traffic accidents in the local area.
- 3.12 Notwithstanding this conclusion, the TA proposes highway improvements in the form of new footways and pedestrian crossing provision on Dawley Road, which are expected to significantly enhance road safety for all road users. In addition the internal road network has been designed to create a safe and low-speed environment that gives priority to pedestrians and provides safe walking routes. It is therefore considered that the road safety implications of the scheme have been appropriately considered and that satisfactory provision has been made. No objection is raised by the LHA in this respect with conditions imposed to secure offsite works.
- 3.13 Visibility splays at the proposed Dawley Road site access have been assessed in accordance with measured vehicle speeds, using the accepted methodology set out

in the Manual for Streets. The access scheme as presented shows that the required visibility splays can be achieved. The proposed sightlines have also been checked on site, with due regard to the vertical alignment of Dawley Road, and confirmed as achievable.

- 3.14 In accordance with TWC design guidance and the Manual for Streets, the proposed internal road layout would seek to limit vehicle speeds to a maximum of 20mph, for which the specified visibility distances can be achieved. This should address any concern regarding vehicular conflict between the proposed residents and those accessing the existing two properties, factory and footpath. No objection is raised by the LHA in this respect, with provision of the required visibility splays controlled through condition.

#### Drainage

- 3.15 Members requested that additional time be allowed for residents to consider the detail of the further drainage information submitted by the applicant. An additional period of formal consultation duly followed Planning Committee. Local representation on this point principally raises concern with the regard to the capacity of the existing foul and surface water drainage infrastructure to accommodate the development without detriment to existing residents. Within this context two incidents (August and December 2019) are referenced where the external areas of two properties have been subject to foul sewage flooding further to blockages in the sewer system in the village road, causing backfilling and flooding.
- 3.16 In this regard, the applicant has confirmed that a connection would be sought relating to the Network B area (drainage system for the central area of the site) to the mains foul system operating through Arleston Village. Here Severn Trent Water (STW) have a statutory duty to provide sufficient infrastructure to serve development under Section 106 of the Water Industry Act 1991. The applicant continues to engage in discussions with STW in such a respect.
- 3.17 Relating to surface water, the application evidence shows that there is potential for a greater volume of surface water from Network B under certain conditions. However, this volume will be retained on the site in an attenuation basin designed to meet the TWLP Policy ER12 requirements – this is a managed approach with ongoing responsibility for maintaining the condition of the attenuation features controlled through condition, and only released at restricted rate. This approach is supported by TWC Drainage.

## **4. DETAILED RECOMMENDATION**

- 4.1 Based on the update above, the updated recommendation to the Planning Committee on this application is that DELEGATED AUTHORITY be granted to the Development Management Service Delivery Manager to **GRANT FULL PLANNING PERMISSION** subject to the following:

A.) The applicant together with Housing 21 entering into a Section 106 agreement with the Local Planning Authority (terms to be agreed by the Development

Management Service Delivery Manager) relating to the following:

- i. Education - £340,720 towards nearby primary and secondary educational facilities
- ii. Open Space - provision of open space and an off-site play area contribution of £150,000 the Windsor Road play area, and / or John Broad Avenue play area, and / or Watling Community Centre play area
- iii. Highways - £10,000 towards improvements works to three bus stops along Kingsland, £5,000 provision of support and monitoring of the required Travel Plan, £7,000 towards re-location of the 40mph speed limit along Dawley Road covering the costs associated to the necessary amendments of associated signing and lining and amendments to the Traffic Regulation Order
- iv. Provision of a Landscape Management Plan and transfer to / appointment of a Management Company relating to the retained open space
- v. Marking out and safeguarding of the land to be used for the Extra Care Facility, the Owner entering into a contract with Housing 21 for the transfer of the Extra Care Land from the Owner to Housing 21 prior to commencement of development, prior to the Occupation of the 50<sup>th</sup> dwelling the transfer of the complete Extra Care Land to Housing 21, who following the transfer covenant that they shall provide the Extra Care Facility, inclusion of a Local Lettings Plan.

B.) The following conditions (with authority to finalise conditions and reasons for approval to be delegated to Development Management Service Delivery Manager):

1. A04: Time limit – Full
2. B010: Details and samples of materials (notwithstanding details submitted)
3. B011: Sample brick panels
4. B032: Road design
5. B036: Off-site highways (details to be approved)
6. B045: Travel Plan (Extra Care Facility)
7. B049: Details of Public Rights of Way works
8. B057: Land contamination (implementation of remediation scheme, reporting of unexpected contamination)
9. B059: Retaining structures
10. B059: Coal Authority
11. B061: Scheme of surface water (including Micro drainage models in .mdx format)
12. B076: SUDS Management Plan
13. B079: Exceedance flow routing
14. B086: Details of extraction (extra care facility restaurant kitchen)
15. B110: Programme of archaeological work
16. B121: Landscaping Design (notwithstanding details submitted) – to include details of removal of planting replacement planting scheme for buffer zone and W39, details of landscaping for extra care, footpath details, provision of a 2.5m brick wall serving No.24 Arleston Village (Midfields)
17. B126: Landscape and Habitat Management Plan
18. B131: Trees – services root protection
19. B145: Lighting Plan
20. B149: Badger Disturbance Licence

21. B150: Construction Environmental Management Plan (including on-site construction details, dust management plan, Japanese Knotweed removal and treatment)
22. C13: Parking, loading, unloading and turning
23. C14: Visibility splays 2.4m x 65m
24. C050: Completion of noise attenuation
25. C074: Tree Protection
26. C079: TPO Tree – suitable contractor
27. C089: Trees – works in accordance with Arboricultural Method Statement (section 6)
28. C101: Erection of ecology boxes
29. C109: Ecological Method Statement – working in accordance with (bats and badgers)
30. C38: Development in accordance with deposited plans (materials, soft and hard landscaping plans, levels and sections not agreed)
31. D03: Domestic garage restriction on residential use urban area
32. D06: Restriction on use of Extra Care facility