

Response to RBC Planning Officer Comments

Please see in the document below the list of conditions and associated RBC comments. All responses from the Applicant/Consultant will be noted in **Blue** and all relevant documents will be referenced and attached to the correspondence as part of the response.

Condition 9 (EV Charging Points)

The RBC Transport Development Control Manager has commented as follows:

Condition 9 (EV Charging Points)

The location and number of electrical charging points is acceptable. However, the submitted EXTERNAL ELECTRICAL SITE SERVICES LAYOUT drawings identifying the locations are not the most up to date with drawing 140 being Rev C19, drawing 141 C21 and drawing 142 Rev C19.

The RBC Natural Environment officer has commented as follows:

The location of these is shown on the External Electrical Site Services Layout plans Sheet 1 of 3 Rev C21, Sheet 2 of 3 Rev C13 and Sheet 3 of 3 Rev C12. The locations of these are inevitably close to parking spaces, as are proposed (some already planted) trees. This means their location impinges into the soft landscape bed in which the trees sit, which is not ideal but seemingly unavoidable. However, in one location, the EV point is shown in the extended root cell area adjacent to new trees and given the associated e-duct to this – I query the mutual inclusivity and comment is required:



I am also unclear why the plans don't appear to show the full extent of necessary e-ducts, i.e. route of cable to all lights and EV points?

Condition 9 (EV Charging Points) - Applicant/Consultant Response

Please see attached as part of the response, revised drawings from the MEP consultant addressing the comments above.

Revised Drawings;

- 2131-NBP-XX-XX-GA-E-140 C20 [Amenity Included]
- 2131-NBP-XX-XX-GA-E-141 C22 [Amenity Included]
- 2131-NBP-XX-XX-GA-E-142 C20 [Amenity Included]

Additionally, there is a marked-up drawing providing the EVC ducts as requested by the natural Environment officer.



Condition 15 (Bus Stop Details)

The RBC Transport Development Control Manager has commented as follows:

The submitted information only provides a technical sheet that includes several different types of shelter and no clarification has been provided as to what will be installed. My understanding from colleagues is that the bus shelter to be installed is the exact same shelter that was removed early in the project and therefore this should be confirmed as part of the submission.

As such, at present, the Highway Authority are unable to recommend the discharge of this condition.

The RBC Natural Environment officer has commented as follows:

This requires the location and design details of the relocated bus stop to be submitted. I note the Hydra Design Bus Shelter document provided and the location shown on the 'Site Plan – Location of Bus stop' drawing Rev A (which the file indicates is superseded but I can see no revised plan). I think it is a great pity that as a new bus stop that one with a green roof has not been proposed and should be considered. There are a few in the Borough and developments offer the opportunity to install these for their biodiversity benefit.

The inclusion of the bus stop was factored into Landscape plans submitted under 231252/NMA.

Condition 15 (Bus Stop Details) - Applicant/Consultant Response

Stephen Wise (Senior Transport Planner for RBC) has confirmed that the bus shelter that was previously removed from the site will be reinstalled.

In terms of specification, the shelter has a 3-panel rear glass wall, two ends, and is a non-advertising shelter as shown as one of the layout options on the attached specification sheet (Technical Specification Hydra Shelter Page. 08). It has an internal light, seat, timetable case. It does not have a flag bracket and does not have real time information.

The shelter will be regularly maintained and cleaned by JC Decaux as part of the existing bus shelter contract.

The bus stop with a green roof was considered by the client, but was ruled out due to prolonged lead in time and associated costs, due to the reasonable condition of the existing shelter the decision was made to reuse the removed shelter for the site.



Condition 22 (Pest & Vermin Control)

The RBC Principal Environmental Health Officer has commented as follows:

The bin storage area for the houses is described as enclosed but the photo shows it to be open. Can this be clarified please?

The bin storage area for the flats sounds acceptable, but can it be confirmed that there will be no gaps around the external louvred door?

The second point is required to be clarified to ensure that the doors to the bin store will be sufficient to prevent vermin accessing the bin store.

Condition 22 (Pest & Vermin Control) - Applicant/Consultant Response

The applicant has confirmed that the private refuse enclosures for the houses will not have doors or a roof but will have a solid brick enclosure to contain the bins and limit vermin access.

To clarify the flat block refuse doors, there will be no gaps around the external louver door.



Condition 24 (Boundary Details)

The RBC Transport Development Control Manager has commented as follows:

It is noted that the existing fence line along the western side of the north south road is to be retained, which reduces the footway gradually as it travels south. However, the S278/38 Agreement proposes removal of a section of garden of RBC houses and the adoption of a 2m wide footway along the full length. The submitted plans should therefore be updated to reflect this.

The boundary plan also identifies that 3 square areas are to be provided to the east of Irving Court car park, within the landscaped area, to facilitate the location of the lamp columns. However, this has progressed and the southerly square area is not to be provided as illustrated given that the retaining walls in that area have already been constructed. As such, an area of the amenity space is to be adopted and paved to facilitate the location of the column and access for future maintenance. The proposed boundary treatment proposal is therefore not acceptable.

In the south westerly corner where the new path is proposed, this includes a retaining wall and railing. However, the boundary treatment plan only identifies the retaining wall and, as such, this must be updated.

Along the northern section of the site there are pedestrian crossings where the kerb detail stipulates that an upstand kerb is proposed. However, this should be provided as a dropped kerb to aid pedestrian movement and the plan(s) should be updated to reflect this.

The Highway Authority are therefore presently unable to recommend the discharge of this condition.

GS Ecology, RBC's Ecology consultants, have commented as follows:

The applicant has submitted three plans : External Levels Sheets 1 to 4 (M43794-JNP-90-XX-DR-C-2011 Rev C07, M43794-JNP-90-XX-DR-C-2012 Rev C08, M43794-JNP-90-XX-DR-C-2013 Rev C11, M43794-JNP-90-XX-DR-C-2014 Rev C09) Boundary Treatment Site Plan Pages 1 to 3 (RBC-WLR_HTA-A_XX_00_DR_1120 rev D, RBC-WLR_HTA-A_XX_00_DR_1121 rev D, RBC-WLR_HTA-A_XX_00_DR_1122 rev D) and Hard Surfacing Site Plans Sheets 1 – 4 (M43749-JNP-90-XX-DR-C-2019 C07, M43749-JNP-90-XX-DR-C-2020 C05, M43749-JNP-90-XX-DR-C-2021 C09, M43749-JNP-90-XX-DR-C-2022 C07)

None of the above show any mammals gaps and the conditions should not be discharged until the plans are updated to show these. If it is the case that these cannot be installed, this should be clearly stated with reasons.

The RBC Natural Environment Officer has commented as follows:

As per Ecology comments, none of the above show any mammals gaps which should therefore be included (positions and size) unless sound reasons for omission are provided.

You are provided with an opportunity to respond to the queries raised by both RBC Transport and the combined comments from GS Ecology and RBC Natural Environment.

Response to RBC Planning Officer Comments

Wensley Road Phase 1 – Conditions 9, 15, 22, 24, 25, 37 (PL/24/1431)



Condition 24 (Boundary Details) - Applicant/Consultant Response

Response to the RBC Transport Development Control Manager

North South Road

The applicant has clarified that they are not proposing the removal of a section of garden of RBC houses as part of the S278/38 Agreement.

The applicant has confirmed that the Highways Officer has accepted the western footpath as constructed and the Highways Agreement drawings have been updated as part of the NMA Application (231252/NMA)

Please refer to the latest plans are part of the NMA Application.

Irving Court car park

Please see attached as part of the response, the revised boundary treatment drawings, this includes the update to the southerly square area being adopted and paved to facilitate the location of the column and access for future maintenance.

Revised Drawings;

- RBC-WLR_HTA-A_XX_00_DR_1120 rev E
- RBC-WLR_HTA-A_XX_00_DR_1121 rev E
- RBC-WLR_HTA-A_XX_00_DR_1122 rev E

South Westerly Corner Railings

Please see attached as part of the response, the revised boundary treatment drawings, this includes the addition of the railings to the retained wall in this location.

Northern section of the site - Pedestrian Crossing

Please see attached as part of the response, the revised boundary treatment drawings, this includes an update to the kerbs, showing the correct dropped kerb in this location for pedestrian movement.

Response to RBC's Natural Environment Officer & RBC's Ecology consultants

Please note, the Submitted Plans (Boundary Treatment Site Plan Pages 1 to 3 (RBC-WLR_HTA-A_XX_00_DR_1120 rev E, RBC-WLR_HTA-A_XX_00_DR_1121 rev E, RBC-WLR_HTA-A_XX_00_DR_1122 rev E) have been updated to note the inclusion of mammal gaps in the garden wall types and their general locations. Additionally, a Garden Wall type drawing (RBC-WLR_HTA-A_XX_SE_DR_8050 rev B) has also been submitted to show construction detail and to cross reference the boundary treatment plans.

Exact location and position of the Mammal gaps would need to be observed on site.



Condition 25 (Landscape Management Plan)

GS Ecology, RBC's Ecology consultants, have commented as follows:

The 5 year Landscape Management Plan (HTA, 2023) appears to be acceptable, subject to comments from the Natural Environment Team. The document also includes a proposed planting list which appears to be acceptable and, as such, there would be no ecology related objections to the discharge of this condition.

The RBC Natural Environment Officer has subsequently commented as follows:

- 5.2 'New Tree Planting' lists one of the reasons for pruning as: 'To reduce the risk of tree-related subsidence damage to buildings by limiting trees' foliage area and subsequent water demand'. This implies that either new build has not been designed with new trees in mind and/or that species have not been selected in view of soil type and foundations – is this the case? The pruning reason does imply, of course, that the soil is a clay type soil – is this the case? I also wonder who / how RBC are going to determine how much pruning will be required to prevent the potential risk as it is far from an exact science? Responses are required in relation to all matters raised.

HTA Landscape Comments: This is a standard note within our management and maintenance documentation. As with all projects, consideration of tree species and location as been a key part of the decision process, as well as following best practice guidance for planting and planting in relation to services and built structures. We are not aware of any specific issues with subsidence; however, it is not possible to rule out the occurrence of subsidence in the future on any site. As such we have made provision for this in the standard clauses.

- 5.2 goes on to say that street trees should be removed if, along with other reasons: 'As a result of an insurance claim where evidence has been presented implicating a tree and no other practical steps are available to resolve the problems'. Comments as above. This is not a normal element to see included in a landscape management plan. Hence, I wonder if there is a high incidence of tree-related subsidence claims in Wensley Road? If so, considerable thought should have gone into tree selection and foundation design. Clarification and responses are required.

HTA Landscape Comments: Again, this is a standard note within our management and maintenance documentation. As with the point above it is not possible to rule out instances where a tree could be the cause of an insurance claim, as such again provision is made within the management and maintenance schedule to cover the possibility.

- Typical 5 year Maintenance Schedule – largely acceptable, but it would be helpful to add some watering amounts for trees please?

HTA Landscape Comments: This can be added to the management and maintenance schedule.

- Planting Schedule and landscape plans – the landscape plans, hence schedule I assume, are not consistent with that submitted under 231252/NMA which I assume are the latest planting plans (albeit I'm not clear where that application is at). Please clarify?

HTA Landscape Comments: Please refer to the 231252/NMA schedules, which note the latest information.



Condition 37 (External Lighting)

The RBC Transport Development Control Manager has commented as follows:

The submitted EXTERNAL ELECTRICAL SITE SERVICES LAYOUT drawings identifying the locations of all the lighting are not the most up to date with drawing 140 being Rev C19, drawing 141 C21 and drawing 142 Rev C19, which includes revisions to lighting locations etc. It should be noted that the latest versions identified above do not have the luminance levels indicated on them and therefore further revisions may be required so that these can be accurately assessed by wider colleagues than Highways. The Highway Authority are therefore currently unable to recommend the discharge of the condition.

The RBC Principal Environmental Health Officer has commented as follows:

I don't have concerns about the proposed street lighting but the choice of light for the residential frontages is not ideal, as in eyelid lights there is an exposed luminaire which can create glare. I would advise they be changed for down lights if possible.

The RBC Natural Environment Officer has commented as follows:

With reference to External Electrical Site Services Layout plans Sheet 1 of 3 Rev C21, Sheet 2 of 3 Rev C13 and Sheet 3 of 3 Rev C12 and the SSE plan dated 6/6/2023:

It is unhelpful that these plans shows all trees (removed or proposed) which makes it very difficult to pick up potential conflicts. Really, they should be based on the latest landscape layouts and certainly not show trees that have / will be removed. The applicant should undertake an exercise to ensure lighting columns are not proposed under existing trees or directly adjacent to new trees (on the various sites so comparison with multiple landscape plans is required submitted under different applications).

As per my comment for Condition 9, the plans don't appear to show the full extent of necessary e-ducts, i.e. route of cable to all lights and EV points?

GS Ecology, RBC's Ecology consultants, have commented as follows:

The applicant has submitted a document entitled External Lighting Proposals (Norman Bromley, July 2024). This document includes a list of proposed luminaires which includes the Holophane VNx2 Street lighting luminaire. The documents states that these will be at 2700k, as we had previously requested. The plans provided in the report differ from those we have previously been supplied with as the reference in the legend to the lighting at 2700k has been removed. Further, the specification sheet for this product indicates that it is only available in 3000k, 4000k and amber. Could the applicant clarify what they mean by 2700k? Are these in fact amber lights that will be installed or is this a customised lighting fitting?

Condition 37 (External Lighting) - Applicant/Consultant Response

Please see attached as part of the response, revised drawings and report from the MEP consultant addressing the comments above.

Revised Drawings & report;

- *External Lighting Proposals (Rev. 10 - Dated January 2025)*
- *2131-NBP-XX-XX-GA-E-140 C20 [Amenity Included]*
- *2131-NBP-XX-XX-GA-E-141 C22 [Amenity Included]*
- *2131-NBP-XX-XX-GA-E-142 C20 [Amenity Included]*

Additionally, there is a marked-up drawing providing the EVC ducts as requested by the natural Environment officer.