JohnsonMowat
Planning & Development Consultants

Garry Simmonette
South Tyneside Metropolitan Borough Council
Town Hall and Civic Offices
Westoe Road
South Shields
Tyne and Wear
NE33 2RL

Telephone 0113 8870120
Email joe@johnsonmowat.co.uk

Our ref.
Your ref.

22 January 2025

PRIVATE AND CONFIDENTIAL

Dear Garry,

LAND OFF BROCKLEY TERRACE, BOLDON COLLIERY
FULL PLANNING APPLICATION FOR REDEVELOPMENT OF SITE TO PROVIDE A BRAIN INJURY REHABILITATION SERVICE COMPRISING OF A CARE HOME BUILDING (USE CLASS C2) WITH EXTERNAL AMENITY SPACE, LANDSCAPING AND OTHER ASSOCIATED WORKS

Many thanks for your patience in regard to the aforementioned development proposal, it is greatly appreciated.

Before the festive period, you sent me a list statutory consultees responses and outlined that the proposal required further information / amendments / clarifications with regards to the following matters:

- Ecology / BNG
- Surface water drainage
- Highways and parking
- Design

The project team have since been revising the scheme in align with your comments.

For the avoidance of doubt, the revised submission pack consists of the following plans and documents:

- Design and Access Statement – October 2024 – Rev. A
- Minor Design Amendment – January 2025 (to be used only for informational purposes only)
- Drainage Strategy – Dwg. No - 24321-DCE-XX-XX-D-C-100 – Rev. P02
- Drainage Calculations with appendices – Ref. 24321-DCE-XX-XX-T-C-002 – Rev. P03

- Transport Statement – Ref. 22921
- Ecology Response – Ref. FE452 (to be used for informational purposes only)
- Proposed Site Plan – Dwg. No - 44/2404/PL_1010 – Rev. A
- Proposed Ground Floor – Dwg. No - 44/2404/PL_1100 – Rev. A
- Proposed First Floor – Dwg. No - 44/2404/PL_1101 – Rev. A
- Proposed Roof Plan – Dwg. No - 44/2404/PL_1102 – Rev. A
- Proposed Elevations 01 – Dwg. No - 44/2404/PL_1200 – Rev. A
- Proposed Elevations 02 – Dwg. No - 44/2404/PL_1201 – Rev. A
- Proposed Sections – Dwg. No - 44/2404/PL_1300 – Rev. A
- Proposed Landscaping Plan – Dwg. No - 44/2404/PL_1400 – Rev. A

Ecology

The project team's ecologist has addressed comments from Shaun Hollern (Ecologist) on the submitted Preliminary Ecological Appraisal (PEA) and Biodiversity Impact Assessment (BIA), dated October 2024.

Key points include:

- The baseline habitat area is 0.16 Habitat Units (not 0.08 as previously mentioned). The habitats were classified as 'Ruderal/Ephemeral' and 'Modified Grassland' in 'Poor' condition. The site's former hardstanding areas are unsealed and degraded, and even if classified as 'Vacant or Derelict Land', the baseline would remain 0.16 Habitat Units due to the low distinctiveness of the habitats.
- There was a misinterpretation in the metric tool where the proposed modified grassland was listed as 'Good' condition instead of 'Poor,' which has now been corrected. The mixed scrub habitat is expected to meet the criteria for 'Moderate' condition, though it may not meet all criteria due to size and location limitations.
- The landscaping plan used for the Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) calculations has been updated. Tree T02 and hedgerows previously shown are no longer included, aligning the BNG calculations with the revised plan, which now proposes 2 small trees and no hedgerows.
- Further target condition assessment details are included in the attached ecology response letter.

The Ecologist response letter is only to be used for informational purposes and for discussions with Shaun Hollern to demonstrate our ecologist's rationale to Shaun's response.

Design

The architect has provided a minor design amendment for the southern elevation of the building, addressing the raised comments, justifying the proposal, and enhancing the design.

Key points include:

- **Scale and Proportion**: The south elevation references the local building vernacular, with a recessed pitched gable entrance that separates the mass from the low-pitched elevation, creating a welcoming street-facing entrance. The eaves align with neighbouring building heights to integrate into the local context.

- **Architectural Details:**

    - Canopy: The entrance canopy provides shelter and draws from the domestic canopied entrances in the area. It is integrated with the main roof structure for a more robust design.

    - Chimney: The chimney, a key feature in the local context, has been updated to incorporate ductwork as part of the building's M&E strategy. The chimney's height has been increased to better define the entrance, align with neighbouring building proportions, and distinguish it from the entrance canopy.

    - Materials: Red masonry brick, inspired by the local context, is the primary material.

Design Changes Summary: The chimney height amendment serves to define the entrance, integrate with the building's ventilation strategy, align with neighbouring proportions, and visually separate from the canopy. This change, along with other design improvements, strengthens the entrance façade and contributes positively to the surrounding area.

The attached Minor Design Amendment document is for informational purposes only, with the revised proposed elevations showing the alteration to the southern elevation of the building.

Surface Water Drainage

We have had productive discussions with NWL regarding their initial comments and have updated our drainage scheme accordingly. The revised drawing is attached and will be resubmitted for consideration in the current planning application.

Key updates to the drainage strategy include:

- A new drainage scheme using a 900mm chamber with flow control, fitting within the available space on the east side of the building.

- A revised discharge rate of 5l/s, providing a 50% improvement over the existing impermeable area, which has been agreed with NWL but will still require LLFA sign-off through the planning process and an updated submission.

- A new surface water sewer, adopted under S104, extending from our site to the sewer at Manhole 3211. We will also connect any highway gullies on our side to this new sewer as per NWL's request.

- This revised scheme will result in increased costs and will require formal S104 approvals. Unfortunately, there is no alternative as NWL has insisted we cannot connect to the existing combined water sewer. Additional GPR surveys in Brockley Terrace will be needed, along with the appropriate work permits before construction.

The Drainage Strategy and Drainage Calculations with appendices have both been revised accordingly.

Highways and parking

1. We have provided a 2m footway (DBM flexible construction alongside the western frontage of the development, connecting the existing footways at the northern and southern ends, including inclusive mobility compliant pedestrian dropped kerbs at any changes in level and/or where required. This will facilitate pedestrian movements to/from the western boundary of the site avoiding conflicts with vehicles, in the interests of pedestrian (and cyclist) safety and in accordance with NPPF. N.B. – It also ensures that the finished levels of the building and DPC reflect the raised levels and cross-fall of the reinstated higher footway. We have revised the proposed ground floor plan, proposed first floor, proposed roof plan, proposed elevations 02, Design and Access Statement and proposed landscaping plan accordingly. Additionally, we believe that a detailed footway design drawing could be secured through a condition, which the applicant is consent to accept as such a condition.

2. We have delineated four parking spaces (6 metres in length) along the northern part of the western boundary of the site to optimise the use of the available space. As a result, we have revised the following plans: proposed site plan, proposed ground floor plan, proposed first floor plan, proposed roof plan, proposed elevations 01, proposed elevations 02, Design and Access Statement, proposed sections, and proposed landscaping plan. It is our understanding that the new footway and parking bays would be secured through a Section 278 agreement, as both fall within the adopted highway boundary. Additionally, we understand that the marking out of the parking bays can be carried out as part of standard highway works, outside of a Traffic Regulation Order (TRO), assuming these will be free parking bays. Our transport consultants are currently seeking clarification from your colleague, Chris Thompson. If you could kindly follow up with him regarding whether marking out these free parking bays falls under simple highway works, it would be greatly appreciated.

3. Our highways consultant has also inquired with Chris Thompson about whether you have a standard detail for wall foundations that would ensure any new boundary walls adjacent to the highway do

not encroach onto the public highway. If you could kindly raise this matter with him and let me know his response, it would be greatly appreciated.

4. We have addressed the hinge and opening arrangements for doors on the western elevations (Plant, Refuse Store, and Courtyard areas) to ensure they do not swing into the public highway, preventing encroachment and safeguarding pedestrian safety. The Proposed Site Plan, Proposed Landscaping Plan, Design and Access Statement and Proposed Ground Floor Plan have been updated accordingly.

5. Initially, the highways officer requested a draft s247 Stopping Plan for areas of highway land potentially created through historic use, specifically along the eastern boundary (paved area between the footway and original building). However, since the site boundaries extend up to the adopted highway, no stopping up is necessary. Instead, a Dilapidation Plan has been included in Appendix B of the revised Transport Statement, outlining paving remediation within the adopted footway to the south of the site, currently enclosed by Heras fencing.

Overall, it is considered that the revised technical drawings and documents adequately address the revisions previously outlined by the relevant statutory consultees.

Yours sincerely,

[redacted]

Joseph Fisher
Graduate Planner