


Urban Design Observations			Officer:	Stephen Kilmartin
Description:	Abbey Works Whalley			 Ribble Valley Borough Council www.ribblevalley.gov.uk
Application Ref:	2015/0794	Case Officer:	A.D	
Response Ref:	2015/0794/UD/01	Issue Date:	09/03/16	

General Observations:	
1.1	I will defer to yourself in respect of assessing the harm resultant from the proposal, if any, to the surrounding designated heritage assets and whether the proposed development will lead to substantial harm to or total loss of significance of a designated heritage asset and whether such substantial harm or loss (if identified) is necessary to achieve substantial public benefits that would outweigh any such identified harm or loss.
1.2	I have noted the application proposes the demolition of a number of existing buildings that would leave a number of elevations of attached buildings exposed. No details have been provided in respect of any remediation works that may be required to the aforementioned elevations that will be exposed as a result of the demolition works.
1.3	The application appears to propose work adjacent existing trees that are identified as being 'Important Tree Groups' within the defined Whalley Conservation Area. No information has been submitted in support of the application that would demonstrate the potential impact upon trees as a result of the development. It is my opinion that such information is necessary and integral to the determination of the application and it could be argued that on this basis the application could be refused on insufficient information and failure to adequately demonstrate/assess the potential impact upon trees that are considered to be of significance and of high landscape visual amenity value.
1.4	I have noted that the submitted details propose a 'pedestrian only' access to the northern extents of the site. No details have been provided in respect of this area and furthermore no details have been provided in terms of a movement strategy that shows wider connectivity to King Street and if this route crosses third party land. I also have concerns that no consideration has been given to this area in terms of a transitional or alternative surfacing material that would act as a wayfinding device and clearly delineate it as a pedestrian route.
1.5	Whilst I recognise that there may be wider community benefits being brought forward that may alleviate on-going traffic/parking issues along King Street I do have fundamental concerns that that

little or no consideration has been given in terms of a public realm strategy or the 'user experience' within the parking area.

- 1.6** I am also of the opinion that very little or no consideration has been afforded to the role the site could play in terms of overall enhancement, given the sites location within the designated Conservation Area and its proximity to adjacent Listed Buildings I do not consider that the proposal, as submitted, would result in overall enhancement regardless of the obvious comparisons to be made in respect the what currently occupies the site.
- 1.7** The proposed site plan appears to propose a structure enlacing what appears to be Sheffield bicycle stands. No elevational details of the structure have been provided in support of the application. I also consider that the quantum of bicycle provision may be insufficient. I also note that it is the intention to retain a structure for the housing of electrics, no information or elevational details have been provided in respect of this.
- 1.8** It would appear that for adequate access to be provided off Back King Street there may be the need for TRO's, I would request clarification is this matter has been considered/explored.
- 1.9** No details of surfacing have been provided, particularly where areas appear to be solely for use by pedestrians on foot. Please note that I would expect permeable/block surfacing to be utilised to delineate between vehicle parking areas/highway and the footway. I further consider, given the sites location, that the use of block surfacing should be explored within the main body of the proposal to ensure it contributes, in some way to the current and future public realm strategies that may be formulated for King Street, it is imperative the site is considered holistically and not in isolation.
- 1.10** It is my opinion that some form of amenity landscaping be incorporated within the proposal in the form of low lying shrubs and tree-planting. As you will be aware the LPA has been negotiating extensively with a number of applicants within the Borough and has been successful in securing the inclusion of such features across a range of sites and would request that you engage with the current applicant to secure the inclusion of landscaping elements should it be recommended for approval.
- 1.11** Parking bays 34, 35, 53 and 01 raise concerns in respect of their practical usability in that no margin appears to be provided to the east of the bays that would allow for rearward manoeuvring to then leave in forward gear. It should be noted that this concern also relates to bay 04, with a potentially inadequate manoeuvring margin provided to the south.
- 1.12** Parking bay 45 does not benefit from a 6m reversing distance and conflicts with what appears to be

an island/kerb.

- 1.13** The submitted site plan shows an area indicated as 'possible' motorcycle parking. The plan should clearly denote a dedicated area and provide information in respect of the number of motorcycles the area/bay can accommodate.

Concluding Comments/Observations:	
--	--

- 2.1** Given the level of concerns in relation to the proposal and fundamental lack of information that is considered to be fundamental to the determination of the proposal I do not consider in its current form that the Local Planning Authority could support the application for the reasons stated above.

- 2.2** The above observations have been provided on the basis of the level of information submitted and the comments contained within this response represent officer opinion only, at the time of writing, without prejudice to the final determination of any application submitted.

- 2.3** Should you wish to discuss any of these matters further please do not hesitate to contact me.

	Officer:	Stephen Kilmartin
--	-----------------	--------------------------