


Urban Design Observations			Officer:	Stephen Kilmartin
Description:	Rowan Cottage			 Ribble Valley Borough Council www.ribblevalley.gov.uk
Application Ref:	2017/0920	Case Officer:	S.K	
Response Ref:	2017/0920/UD/02	Issue Date:	23/10/17	

General Observations:	
1.1	In respect of the above application I have the following observations which have been offered by the Highways development Control Section of Lancashire County Council:
1.2	<i>It is appreciated that the installation of garages will overcome concerns expressed by my colleague that the remote parking was presently used by locals so there would be some concern as to how this facility could be retained for the occupants of the new dwellings. The garages will also address the follow up observation that the parking area was not directly over looked by residential dwellings and therefore vehicles parked in this area could be a target for criminal or antisocial behaviour.</i>
1.3	<i>The proposed garages will be of sufficient size to meet modern standards in that there is enough internal space to accommodate both a family car and some cycles and therefore would assist the sustainability of the development. The position of the garages indicates that there is 8m between the doors and kerb line of St Pauls place and so will allow the garages to be functional even when cars are parked adjacent to No 3 Saint Pauls Street. Considering these design factors I would not have highway issues with the garages as long as they were built with roller shutter or similar doors that remain within the confines of the garage.</i>
1.4	<i>The houses that are included on the plan for this application are considerably larger and in different positions from those indicated on the final amended plan that gained outline planning permission, (3/2015/0312). The plan indicates that there will be parking bays in front of the dwellings at right angles to Back St Pauls Street. Scaling the supplied plan the bays are 5.6m long and 3.0m wide with an available width of Back St Pauls Street of 3.5m. To allow for safe reverse parking to these bays the Back St Pauls Street reversing distance would need to be 5.5m wide. I would have to say that the parking bays that are in front of the individual properties are, according to the standards (Residential Roads and Footpaths Design Bulletin 32), not accessible and therefore cannot be counted towards the parking requirements of these houses. As each 3 bedroom dwelling would have only one parking place in the form of a remote garage I would have to object to this development as it is presently set out.</i>

- 1.5** *Subject to an acceptable layout being provided I would not have raise objections on highway grounds subject to notes and conditions, similar to those requested at the time of the outline application, being attached to any permissions that your council is minded to grant.*
- 1.6** In relation to the remainder of the proposal, in particular development Management Considerations, I have the following observations/comments:
- 1.7** I would request that you provide a vehicle tracking diagram for the turning of a refuse vehicle within the site to ensure adequate manoeuvrability for servicing vehicles.
- 1.8** Provide details of boundary treatments to each of the plots and their extents (front and rear), to ensure visibility I would advise the rear boundary treatments be low in nature and either be of a matching brick construction or delineated by hedgerows.
- 1.9** I would consider the boundary treatment to Plot 05, due to its extent, could utilise a green screen treatment to aid in softening the visual impact of the extents of any boundary.
- 1.10** Please confirm on the drawn information the retention extents of the southernmost wall (or any alterations)
- 1.11** Consider utilising an integral bin storage solution or provide a bespoke enclosure that is incorporated into the external elevations of the buildings to negate the need for refuse storage receptacles to be stored outside the properties in visible locations.
- 1.12** Plot 02 appears to have no allocated bin storage area.
- 1.13** I would ask you consider revising the 'rear' (north) facing elevation of plot 01 to incorporate a front door as per the remaining plots to ensure visual continuity within the terrace.
- 1.14** Reduce the size of the window serving the bathroom on the side elevation (east) of plot 01 and confirm that both windows on this elevation will be obscure glazed.
- 1.15** I have attached some sketch proposals for your consideration in respect of the elevational treatment of the proposal with the main points to be conveyed as follows:

- Introduce a vertical projecting element on the front and rear elevations to provide vertical delineation and differentiation between the units. Either through a vertical recessed brick element or projecting brick, perhaps accommodating downpipes within the recess.
- Introduce projecting brick/corbellings at eaves level below gutter.
- Potentially employ tile to verge eaves detail at gable ends.
- Provide porch to 'rear' elevation to provide a clear ordering and visual interest.
- Introduce stone jambs and mullions to window arrangements to allow the proposal to respond positively to the archetypes found within the vicinity.

Concluding Comments/Observations:	
--	--

2.1	The above observations have been provided on the basis of the level of revised 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 the application.
------------	---

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

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