


| | | | | |
|----------------------------------|-------------------------------------|----------------------|-----------------|--|
| Urban Design Observations | | | Officer: | Stephen Kilmartin |
| Description: | Land off Waddington Road, Clitheroe | | |  Ribble Valley Borough Council www.ribblevalley.gov.uk |
| Application Ref: | 2018/0181 | Case Officer: | S.K | |
| Response Ref: | 2018/0181/UD/05 | Issue Date: | 14/01/18 | |

| | |
|------------------------------|---|
| General Observations: | |
| 1.1 | The following observations are in relation to the revised submission details received on the 17th of December 2018. |
| 1.2 | You will be aware of the current LLFA response, this matter should be addressed in concert with any revised submission documentation submitted to the authority. (Matters still outstanding) |
| Layout: | |
| 2.1 | The revised layout appears to result in a number of plots being located less than 21m from the adjacent properties on Brungerley Avenue (Numbers 9-15). It would also appear the submitted layout fails to take account of or show accurately additions/extensions that have been undertaken to the aforementioned properties. The authority will not support any proposal where the 21m interface distance standard is not met. (Matters still outstanding) |
| 2.2 | In respect of the south-western extents of the site, I have fundamental concerns regarding the overall arrangement for plots 179 – 191 in respect of waste management arrangements and access to parking provision. A number of the plots are significantly remote from the highway and do not appear to have a practical or usable dedicated route/provision for taking waste receptacles from their private garden area to a potential pick-up point. |
| 2.3 | The above referenced arrangement also does not appear to allow for ease of access to parking provision on foot. The shared bin collection point in this area would also be considered inaccessible for a refuse vehicle, I also query the size of the collection point given the number of dwellings it is likely to serve. |
| 2.4 | Concerns remain in respect of the configuration of the above units, not only in respect of the above referenced access arrangements but also in respect of their overall relationship with the remainder |

of the adjacent proposed housing.

- 2.5** The omission of plot 182 may allow the remainder of the block (183-186) to be moved northward to lessen its southern projection. This would also allow for the parking provision requirement to be met and allow for a more well-considered dedicated movement margin for residents in respect of waste management.
- 2.6** Plots 200-202 would cumulatively result in a parking requirement for 6 vehicles. It would appear provision is only provided for 3 vehicles (north of plot 200). I also query the practicality of the arrangement, with the occupier(s) of plot 202 not only having to walk a significant distance to their vehicle but also a significant distance to allow for roadside collection of refuse receptacles.
- 2.7** Plot 127 does not appear to benefit from any dedicated parking provision.
- 2.8** The garage associated with Plot 203 appears discordant and anomalous by virtue of its degree of physical and visual separation from the dwelling it serves. I also have concerns as to how the front curtilage of the property (including the garage) will be delineated.
- 2.9** Concerns remain (as per observations 2018/0181/UD/02 Point 2.1-09) in respect of the relationship of plot 59 and that of 9 Kirkmoor Close. It would appear the proposed interface distance falls significantly short of the required 21m.
- 2.10** Clarification is sought regarding the double-tandem parking arrangement to the north of plot 60.

Landscape/ Green Infrastructure:

- 3.1** The proposed landscaping details fail to show or convey on-plot landscaping (plot frontages) or landscaping within the public realm within the main body of the housing development.

Housing Provision:

- 4.1** As discussed I have enclosed a number of sketch elevations in respect of the proposed house-types. The sketch proposals convey a number of suggested elevational amendments that will allow for the proposed dwellings to respond more positively to the character of the area and the local vernacular.
- 4.2** The sketch elevations aim to convey additional window detailing (heads, sills, jambs) and the introduction eaves detailing on a number of units. I am also concerned regarding the over-use of the

proprietary GRP porches/door-surrounds across the Barratts range, which cumulatively is likely to result in the proposed housing appearing somewhat homogenous. You will note I have only produced a small number of examples to assist in further design dialogue and to convey an approach that could be reflected throughout the house-type range.

4.3 It would appear that the Alverton house-type submitted as part of the revised submission does not form part of the proposed layout.

4.4 I note the inclusion of a number of hipped roof forms, I also note that you make mention of their introduction in your email of the 14th of January 2019. I do not recall requesting the inclusion of such roof-forms and cannot find any mention of such treatments within my previous observations. Whilst there are a limited number of properties in the vicinity that benefit from hipped roofs, the majority of adjacent development that the proposal will be read in conjunction with are of a gabled roof-form.

Concluding Comments/Observations:

5.1 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.

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

Officer:

Stephen Kilmartin