


Urban Design Observations		Officer:		Stephen Kilmartin	
Description:	Land East of Chipping Lane				
Application Ref:	2016/0193	Case Officer:	S.K	 Ribble Valley Borough Council www.ribblevalley.gov.uk	
Response Ref:	2016/0193/UD/01	Issue Date:	24/03/15		

General Observations:

N.B. The following observations include the agent/applicant response (Red) and further LPA response (Blue).

It should be noted that the original observations were made solely on the basis of pre-application submission content.

1.1 Condition 05 of the original outline consent 3/2014/0764 required the following:

*The development hereby approved shall be carried out in accordance with the principles established on the Parameters Masterplan (e*SCAPE drawing reference 013-008-P017 Rev E), the Parameters Landscape Strategy (e*SCAPE drawing reference 013-008-P020 Rev D), Design Code (Tyler Grange reference 2001/P60c) and within the Design and Access Statement (dated August 2014).*

1.2 I Have noted that the provision of a 5m (minimum) landscape buffer (As indicated within Design Code reference 2001/P60c) adjacent the properties fronting Inglewhite Road, appears to have been omitted. I have also noted from Vincent Ryans email of the 17th of June 2015 that 'A *minimum landscape buffer of 5m is provided, increasing to approximately 40m. This will provide scope for landscaping between the existing dwellings at 62-76 Inglewhite Road and the proposed development*'. I do not consider that the LPA would accept such a buffer to be incorporated into the residential curtilage of the proposed dwellings, if that is the intention.

1.3 (Applicant response) Apologies for the confusion as there is no buffer shown on the masterplan submitted with the planning application, however it was always our intention to provide screening along this boundary in order to both protect the privacy of the neighbouring dwellings and also enhance the biodiversity of the development going forward. The problem that we have is that a separate buffer devoid from any private curtilage causes serious management issues as the buffer would effectively be sat in a 'no mans' land. We have had situations like this before and the areas become sterile and over time die. The way the development is designed there would effectively be a fence up against the buffer zone on either side in order to protect the landscaping and there is little or no possibility for a meaningful maintenance access point which would make the maintenance difficult if not impossible. Add to that the 2 fence boundaries would restrict sunlight to the buffer meaning over time it would simply wither and die. It would be our preference that the buffer be

designed into the end of the properties gardens and a clause within the contract/lease agreement to stipulate its maintenance and prohibit removal. This way we get to keep the desired buffer along the southern boundary and it fills its purpose going forward. Please can you consider this as a solution?

1.4 I am currently engaged in discussion on similar matters on a number of other sites. I am aware that you may intend to stipulate maintenance and prohibit removal through the use of contractual agreements however in my experience, given the buffer would fall within private residential curtilage, it is likely that residents will inevitably remove any such planting over the lifetime of the development. Given the buffer is to be 5m wide (minimum) I would suggest that this is more than adequate for some selective tree planting and hedgerow including a maintenance route. I note your comments regarding fencing, the option could be explored to erect a high level fence adjacent the existing boundary fences (To rear of properties fronting Inglewhite Road), planting margin then low level fencing, potentially post and rail/wire to the southern extents of the actual residential curtilage of the proposed dwellings, this would allow for adequate sunlight to reach any proposed planting within the margin.

1.5 Given the proposed layout does not appear to accord with the approved Design Code details/parameters in that no buffer is provided to the southern boundary it is considered the layout is in direct conflict with the requirements of condition 05 of the outline consent and further consider that the submitted layout could not be considered to be pursuant to the outline consent.

1.6 (Agent response) See above.

1.7 Noted see point 1.4.

1.8 The approved Design Code (Reference 2001/P60c) included for the provision of a minimum 9m landscape buffer to the Chipping Lane Frontage, I have note that at some points this 'buffer' including the shared footpath/cycleway appears to be less than 9m in width.

1.9 (Agent response) I measure this as being 9m at its minimum. We will check this and ensure this is adhered to.

1.10 Noted.

1.11 I have also noted that the aforementioned documentation proposes enhancement of field vegetation and a landscape buffer of approximately 10m to 45m, which does not appear to be indicated on the submitted layout. I am aware that such a buffer could be delivered as part of subsequent phases but

given the intention is to reinforce existing field boundary vegetation, would expect an element of this to be provided within the red edge of the phase 01 application.

1.12 (Agent response) It was always our intention to allow this within the landscape architects' remit, which to date is only structural designs. We will ensure that this is captured on the revised information. Also to date we are still awaiting comments on proposed landscaping designs.

1.13 Noted, the application for Reserved matters has not been accompanied by a detailed landscaping proposal therefore I cannot provide any observations at the time of writing this response.

Observations: Layout	
-----------------------------	--

2.1 The primary entry point to the site appears to propose an entrance feature which I assume benefits from a transitional surfacing arrangement. I would request that the details of this element be discussed with LCC Highways regarding its potential for future adoption if that is the intention. As you will be aware LCC Highways no longer offer free pre-application advice under the umbrella of our consultation and would therefore advise you engage directly with the relevant officer/department.

2.2 (Agent response) Any designs utilising nonstandard materials such as block paving will be discussed at length with the highways adoption team unless these areas are to be privately deeded. It is our intention to design a scheme with easily maintainable materials.

2.3 It is imperative that such issues are addressed at this stage and prior to the determination of the application. The LPA must be assured that what is proposed is what will be delivered on site, I would therefore urge you to engage directly with LCC Highways in respect of this matter and involve myself in any such discussions. The treatment of the public realm cannot be treated as an afterthought and is integral to the determination of the current application.

2.4 The approved Illustrative Masterplan and Landscape Strategy proposed a number of 'squares' and 'focal points' within the Phase 01 parcel. I see no evidence of such being incorporated in to the layout as submitted.

2.5 (Agent response) These will be added as part of the revised layout pack.

2.6 Noted, at the time of writing no such features have been included as part of the Reserved Matters submission.

2.7 A number of the plots fail to achieve a 21m back to back off set distance notably the following relationship fall significantly short of this requirement:

- Relationship between plot 37 and 57
- Relationship between plot 38 and 56
- Relationship between plot 39 and 55
- Relationship between plots 10-12 and 5-6
- Relationship between plot 96 and plots 103-104

2.8 (Agent response) We've looked at these and would agree in most, and will look to amend for the revised planning layout pack.

2.9 Noted, further comments will be provided following the receipt of amended plans.

2.10 I have concerns in relation to potential the oblique overlooking issue resultant from the proximity of plots 105-108 (Foxton) to the residential curtilage of plot 110. I have noted that there is the intention to plant trees in this location but it is likely that it would be a significant period of time before any such tree planting would provide adequate visual mitigation. I have also noted that plots 105-108 propose windows to the side elevations which would result in the direct over-looking of the private residential curtilage of plot 109.

2.11 (Agent response) The apartment block (Plots 105 – 108) is only 2 stories in height and is located the required distance from plot 109 so I'm unsure how this differs from any situation whereby the gable of a dwelling resides at 90 degrees to the street? The tree planting is proposed to alleviate the transition from the affordable plots to open market sale and also to enhance the area by way of soft landscaping.

2.12 The proximity and elevated overlooking from first floor windows directly into the private residential curtilage of plot 110 at oblique angles is considered unacceptable. You have failed to address my concerns regarding side windows and further impacts upon plot 109, in its present form the current arrangement will not be supported by the LPA.

2.13 No details of communal refuse storage have been provided for the Foxton units, I have noted that there appears to be an outbuilding within the parking area associated with the apartments and consider that this building, if to be used for refuse storage, should also include for the provision of the storage of cycles despite the units being for over 55's to encourage sustainable methods of transport especially given the evidenced increased mobility of 'elderly persons'.

- 2.14** (Agent response) The intention was for a refuse/ cycle housing to be allowed. The design of this will be issued as part of the revised planning pack.
- 2.15** Noted, further comments will be provided upon receipt of revised information.
- 2.16** The parking provision associated with the Foxton and over 55's units should include the provision of parking bays for those that may be mobility impaired.
- 2.17** (Agent response) All spaces have been designed to meet part M or the building regulations in terms of the disabled parking bay dimensions. Please can you confirm that this is sufficient?
- 2.18** I have noted the introduction of block paved margins which may allow for disabled bays to be accommodated.
- 2.19** Plot 20 (Inglewhite frontage) appears to benefit from a boundary treatment to the frontage and side of the property; I would consider that this would have to be low-level to preserve a sense of openness on this corner.
- 2.20** (Agent response) This boundary is to be a 750mm high wall to match the material of the surrounding dwellings. The boundary treatment drawing indicates this. Please can you confirm that this is sufficient?
- 2.21** Noted and agreed, it may be beneficial if the wall benefited from a radius/curve to soften its western corner, I would also suggest the frontage area outside of private residential curtilage be accompanied by a robust landscaping proposal.
- 2.22** Any submission of reserved matters should be accompanied by a site plan detailing the stand-off buffer with the existing cricket ground as it is likely that Sports England will be consulted as part of the process.
- 2.23** (Agent response) It was always our intention to allow this within the landscape architects' remit, which to date is only structural designs. We will ensure that this is captured on the revised information. Also to date we are still awaiting comments on proposed landscaping designs. Any comments will be fed back to Tyler Grange
- 2.24** Noted, further comments will be provided upon receipt of revised information, no landscaping information/details have been put before the LPA.

2.25 I have not been provided with any details of the Morpeth house type however I note that in a number of locations it benefits from a forward projection in relation to the inherent/adjacent building line and assume that it may be affording an inanimate elevation an undue level of visual prominence on approach or within the street scene. For example plot 68, approach from northwest.

2.26 (Agent response) This was submitted through the planning portal however I have attached again for your information. The main focus of the Morpeth type is to articulate the corners or junctions or to be cited in focal locations. The dwelling (as you will see from the attached) is a dual aspect house which has good natural surveillance over the street reducing exposed blank gables. In most cases the Morpeth has been utilised to create a narrower pinch point to the junction which we feel is necessary to instil the character of the scheme (especially with the addition of the squares), so in bringing these in to create this they do seem fragmented in the street scene. That said we don't feel that that causes any concern as the materials are picked out on these buildings as being legibility points thus allowing them to stand away from the remainder of the street. We feel strongly about this and would ask that you consider our approach for these areas.

2.27 I will provide detailed comments in respect of the revised house type designs and forward further sketch proposals to assist in design dialogue. It would assist in expediting matters if you could facilitate the sharing of your house type suites in Autocad format, this would allow me to quickly add 'sketch overlay' suggestions. Please note I am currently engaging with other applicants/developers and utilising similar work methods/ file sharing and both parties have found this to aid in frequent and rapid exchanges of concise dialogue on design matters.

Observations: Housing Mix / Tenure	
---	--

3.1 The Local Authority's Strategic Housing Officer has offered the following observations:

3.2 The draft affordable housing proposal for Chipping Lane Longridge has been considered in terms of addressing housing need in Longridge, with the current offer of house types as follows;

- 15 x 2 bed
- 12 x 3 bed
- 4 x older persons bungalows
- 4 x older persons apartments
- 35 affordable housing units

3.3 The number proposed meets the 30% affordable housing requirement as stated in Addressing Housing Needs document and the 15% provision for older persons. However the offer could be improved particularly with regard to meeting the needs of older persons in the locality .The following affordable housing offer would better meet housing needs;

- 11 x 2 bed
- 8 x 3 bed
- 8 x bungalows
- 4 x older persons apartments
- 4 x general needs apartments
- 35 units in total

3.4 Reducing the number of 2 and 3 beds delivered on the site would be appropriate as there have been 33 new affordable units developed in the past 2 years in Longridge. This has meant a significant proportion of demand for general needs housing has been met. In terms of the increased bungalow and older persons request, the housing waiting list currently has 64 households registered for a bungalow in Longridge and therefore there is strong evidence of housing need for this house type and therefore an increased number of bungalows would address this need in the locality.

3.5 Demand for older person’s apartments in Longridge is also significant, 31 households are registered requiring this housing type. The SHMA identifies a need for single person’s accommodation and therefore the additional provision of 4 x general needs apartments would be welcomed.

3.6 There is concern about the size of the units, all the affordable housing falls well below the nationally described space standards. The affordable 3 bed house is 100 sq.ft. smaller than the market 3 bed house and the affordable bungalows are over 280 sq. ft. smaller than the market bungalows. We would not expect affordable housing to be significantly different in either size or quality within the Addressing Housing Needs document it states, ‘Affordable housing units provided within a residential development should be visually indistinguishable and of a similar size and quality to the open market housing’.

Observations: House types	
----------------------------------	--

4.1 I have attached to this response a number of sketch elevations based on the house type information submitted. These should be treated as a starting point for dialogue and are not intended to be

explicit in their recommendations. I do have a number of concerns relating to the house types proposed and their failure to reflect the transition into the semi-rural context of the site.

4.2 It should be noted that at the time of the writing of this response full details of the compliment of house types proposed have not been provided to the LPA for comment.

4.3 Given the site location and taking into account future phases I would recommend that the dwelling to be located to the periphery of phase 01 reflect the transition into the open countryside through changes adopting a materials palette in these locations that is predominantly render, reconstituted stone and/or buff brick.

Concluding Comments/Observations:

5.1 Given the level of concerns in relation to the proposal I do not consider in its current form that the Local Planning Authority could support the application for the reasons stated above.

5.2 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.

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

Officer:

Stephen Kilmartin