

THE VICTORIAN SOCIETY The champion for Victorian and Edwardian architecture

Your reference: 21/04356/FUL

Our reference: 177159

6th December 2022

Dear Mr Holt,

RE: 21/04356/FUL | Redevelopment of the former Woodlands and Masters House site retaining the Masters House and associated ancillary buildings; demolition of the former care home; the erection of a central residential block ranging in height from three to 14 storeys, and peripheral development of 2-4 storeys in height, to provide residential units, together with servicing, disabled parking, cycle parking, landscaping, new public realm, a new vehicular and pedestrian access, and associated works. Information for the purposes of consultation: The development would include 126 residential units comprising 14 x studio, 53 x 1-bed, 50 x 2-bed, 7 x 3-bed units and 2 x 4-bed units Reason for reconsultation: The proposed development has been revised

Thank you for continuing to consult the Victorian Society on this application. The amendments have not addressed our previous comments regarding the proposal and therefore our **objection** remains.

As stated previously, we are not in principle opposed to the redevelopment of the Woodlands Nursing Home site. However, at 14 storeys proposed building A remains a tall building which would harm the significance and setting of nearby listed buildings. This concern is noted in the planning appeal report which states at paragraph 33: 'The proposed tower, despite its architectural quality but given its height and scale, would not respect the existing character of the surrounding area and would not contribute to the future character of the wider area.' It is unfortunate that despite those comments and our own previous objections no substantial amendments have been made to the height of the proposed building.

Furthermore, the harm is increased by the closeness of building A to the listed buildings. We raised this concern in our previous objection stating that this would increase the new building's domination over the former Water Tower and Master's House and therefore harm their significance. An acceptable proposal must envisage a building on a much smaller scale, a sufficient distance from the listed buildings.

Similarly, there have been no substantial amendments to the scale of the lower proposed blocks around the perimeter of the site. In our previous objection we wrote:

This concern over the height and density of development also extends to new lower blocks and their proximity to buildings on Renfrew Road. Although these blocks are of medium height they would be discernibly taller than surrounding historic buildings and would overbear he smaller scale urban fabric here.

This concern has not been addressed and therefore our objections remain.

Finally, we reiterate our concern about energy efficiency of tall buildings, especially in the time of a climate emergency.

The NPPF states clearly that heritage assets are an 'irreplaceable resource' (para 189) and that the sustaining and enhancement of their significance is desirable (para 190a). Likewise, it states that 'Local planning authorities should look for opportunities for new development within Conservation Areas and World Heritage Sites, and within the setting of heritage assets, to enhance or better reveal their significance.' These proposals do not enhance the significance of the heritage assets within and bordering the site, nor do they better reveal the significance of the Conservation Area. The height and density of development would rather detract from their significance, dominating the heritage assets and the existing low-rise character of the Conservation Area. The Victorian Society continues to **object** to the proposals.

I would be grateful if you could inform me of your decision in due course.

Yours sincerely,

Conservation Adviser