


Urban Design Response			Officer:	Stephen Kilmartin
Description:	Phase 2 Lawsonsteads Whalley			 Ribble Valley Borough Council www.ribblevalley.gov.uk
Application Ref:	2018/0914	Case Officer:	S.K	
Response Ref:	2018/0914/UD/01	Issue Date:	09/11/18	

General Observations:	
<p>1.1 The observations contained within this response are made in relation to the information submitted in support of the current application ref: 3/2018/0914.</p> <p>1.2 As conveyed in my previous telephone conversation with R. Haslam of Savills I would be obliged if you could clarify the extents of ownership as indicated on the Proposed Unit Mix Plan, it would appear the red edge of the site boundary differs from that as shown on other submitted information in the location of the attenuation pond to the north of Woodlands Park. I also note that the extent of the aforementioned pond on a number of the submitted drawings appears to extend outside of the red edge of the application.</p> <p>1.3 You will be aware that consent has now been granted for the location and nature of the routes/play equipment and landscaping around the proposed attenuation ponds (3/2018/0491). I would therefore be obliged if you could familiarise yourself with this consent to ensure that your submitted details reflect that which has been approved. I will ensure the approved details are made available at the following link: https://www.ribblevalley.gov.uk/planningApplication/29696</p> <p>1.4 In relation to the above you will also note the approved details (3/2018/0491) show the southern link road as having a 3m shared cycleway on its western side in addition to a standard footway on its eastern side. It is imperative that the southern parcel is linked to the remainder of the development by way of 3m cycleway provision, something which appears to have been omitted from the currently submitted details.</p> <p>1.5 Given the linear country park falls within the red edge of your application I will require details to be provided in respect of the 'Playground to be provided by Redrow' and details of all proposed trim-trail/natural play located within its vicinity.</p> <p>1.6 I note that no justification for the northern access to the adjacent Oakhill College land has been provided in respect of the application and no details of the interface with adjacent land have been provided despite my previous advice/request. If this is to form part of an access integral to the application then the above details should be provided at this stage or I would request that the access</p>	

point be omitted from the application.

1.7 No details of the proposed culvert appear to have been submitted at this stage.

1.8 I am awaiting feedback for the Council's Strategic Housing Officer in respect of the proposed affordable housing mix and intend to provide detailed comments in respect of these matters imminently. It is likely such feedback will also cover matters relating to the internal configuration of some of the specialist housing.

Highways Issues:

2.1 As you will be aware matters relating to Highways issues remain outstanding at this stage, I will forward on any observations received from the Highways Development Control Section as they are received.

House-type Design

3.1 Integral and detached single garages must have a minimum internal depth of 6m and width of 3m to be counted towards usable parking provision within the development.

3.2 There appears to be a fundamental lack of chimney detailing to the majority of plots within the southern development parcel. I consider that such detailing will ensure vertical delineation, particularly on terrace blocks, and would also ensure that the roofscape in this area benefits from adequate animation/articulation.

3.3 I remain unconvinced in respect of the austere nature of a number of the elevational styles proposed and their relationship to the wider context, in particular the lack of elevational detailing to the rear elevations where they may be afforded a level of visibility from the public realm. It will be my intention to follow on from this response with a number of sketch elevations for your consideration to enable further design dialogue in respect of the proposed house-types.

Layout

4.1 I have fundamental and significant concerns in respect of the proximity of the southern-most dwellings with the rear residential curtilages of the existing properties fronting Sydney Avenue. It would appear a number of the dwellings are within proximities ranging from 6-7m. You will be aware

that the 21m back to back interface distance required between properties is also in addition to the requirement to provide a 10.5m separation distance between proposed dwellings and existing neighbouring curtilage extents.

- 4.2** Further to the above point I have noted from my site visit that there are significant differences in land levels between the gardens associated with properties fronting Sydney Avenue and the land to be developed to the north, with the latter benefitting from higher existing levels. In respect of this, it is imperative that an additional margin of separation, over and above 10.5m, be implemented to negate the likelihood of proposed dwellings directly overlooking existing garden areas from an elevated position, particularly when considered overlooking from first floor windows. You will note that the previous consent maintained a 15m standoff (measured from first floor window) with the existing southern boundary - I would expect a similar degree of separation to be replicated in the current application. You will note that I do not consider the LPA could support the current configuration and consider it is likely to result in significant detriment to existing residential amenity.
- 4.3** Existing and proposed land levels will be required to be provided as part of the current application, this will allow for an accurate assessment as to how the development will assimilate into the landscape and also how the development will respond to existing built-form. Where the proposal directly interfaces with existing dwellings, particularly the southern development parcel, I would request that existing and proposed sections through the site be provided including details of the height, scale and location of proposed housing in relation to adjacent existing development/built form. You will note that I consider such matters integral to the determination of the application and do not consider such matters should be secured through the imposition of condition.
- 4.4** A number of properties on Woodlands Park benefit from significant rear extensions that do not appear to have been shown on the proposed site layout when taking account of offset distances. Whilst such matters may not be of prime importance where bungalows are proposed (dependant on land levels), I do consider that the presence of such extensions will have to be taken into account where two-storey dwellings have direct facing relationships with existing properties.
- 4.5** The proximity of plot 151 to the neighbouring boundary to the west raises concerns when taking account of the solar orientation of the site. Given the property is two-storeys in height it is likely that number 28 Woodlands Park will suffer significant loss of light to its private garden area at certain points during the day.
- 4.6** I have significant concerns regarding the overall density of the development parcels in a number of areas. Of particular concern is the southern development parcel. I consider that the perceived

density of this area fails to respond positively to the inherent pattern and density of surrounding development. I also consider such concentrated densities to be more akin to that of an inner-urban area than that of a semi-rural village.

4.7 A number of plots raise significant concerns in respect of substandard size/area of associated private amenity space. The following plots raise significant concerns and would be considered to be in direct conflict with Policy DMG1:

1. Garden size/depth for plots 8-10
2. Garden size/depth for plot 4
3. Garden size for plot 54 and 56
4. Garden size for plots 58-59
5. Garden depths for plots 60-67
6. Garden size/depth for plots 104 and 106-110
7. Garden size/depths for plots 143-150
8. The majority of the plots within the central block within the southern development parcel appear to have garden areas that would be considered substandard. In addition to this I also consider that there will be direct overlooking of private curtilage at close proximity by virtue of the minimal depths afforded to the gardens.

4.8 I am disappointed that you have failed to provide a green margin or buffer between the dwellings proposed in the southern development parcel and existing housing. You will note my previous observations in relation to this matter (Point 4.3 2018/ENQ/0002/UD/01).

4.9 As per my previous observations, footways should be provided on both sides of the southern link-road with one accommodating a shared cycleway/footway.

Green Infrastructure, Landscape & Ecology

5.1 Key statement EN4 requires that all proposals should, as a principle, result in overall net enhancement in biodiversity. I am disappointed to note that the submitted ecological appraisal fails to recommend any significant or robust enhancement/mitigation measures that would be considered to result in overall enhancement. I also note that the report concludes that further survey work will need to be undertaken. The authority will require provision for building dependant species (bats/birds) to be integral to the proposal and would expect a high proportion of such provision to be building mounted or integral to the design of dwellings. As a rule of thumb the LPA will expect no less than 75% coverage within the development. The LPA will not be in a position to support an

application where an overall net enhancement in biodiversity cannot be demonstrated.

5.2 I am disappointed that a number of the detailed observations offered at pre-application stage in relation to green infrastructure have failed to have been taken into account. I will reiterate a number of these observations and also have a number of additional concerns/suggestions as follows:

1. Robust landscape buffer to the east of the northern 'Oakhill Link Road'. Such a buffer should include hedgerow and tree planting complimented with native shrub species. I would advise that any proposed landscaping be 'organic' in layout and form to counter the linear nature of the road.
2. Significant landscape buffer/planting to the east of the road fronting plots 68-84. Such landscaping should assist in the visual transition from the linear built form to that of the adjacent greenfield open countryside land. I would suggest islands of clustered tree planting (organic in overall layout/plan-form) be implemented to counter the linear layout of the road alignment and dwellings.
3. Significant landscaping to the south of the eastern development parcel to soften the largely linear and abrupt termination of plots 84-86 and 109-110 and associated highway/drives. Once again I would request that any such landscape visual mitigation be largely organic in its overall layout/plan-form.
4. Additional pockets of tree/woodland planting to accompany the 'Trim Trail' route to the eastern extents of the site.
5. Explore the potential use of green screens to delineate the rear curtilages of plots 118-128. This will ensure a softer visual transition into the adjacent open land than that which would be achieved by proprietary or standard fencing products.
6. The southern parcel does not appear to benefit from sufficient amenity landscaping within the streetscene.
7. There appears to be only item of natural play equipment/seating (P) serving the entirety of the proposal. Given the cumulative quantum of development to be brought forward I would consider this wholly inadequate.
8. The provision of Trim Trail equipment within the proposal should be increased significantly and dedicated areas to accommodate the equipment should be shown as per the previous reserved matters consent for the site.
9. The Trim Trail fails to provide a coherent circular route that interfaces with the southern link road and wider pedestrian movement network.
10. Tree planting should be significantly increased, in particular to the eastern extents of the site to complement existing woodland planting.

11. Increase amenity landscaping and tree-planting within the public realm, particularly where large expanses of unrelieved boundary treatments directly front the public realm/highway.

12. Where boundary treatments such as walls/fencing directly front the footway/public realm a green margin including tree/shrub planting should be employed to ensure such areas benefit from adequate animation.

5.3 There appears to be a number of 'limestone paths' within the proposal that appear to be of such a narrow width that they may be rendered unusable and also appear to be narrower than other similar routes within the proposal, of particular note is the route to the northern extents of the site, the 'spring wood' route and the routes in the central area of the linear country park.

5.4 No details of any improvements to be made to the existing PROW have been provided in support of the application in accordance with Policy DMB5 of the Core Strategy.

5.5 No details of the proposed trim-trail equipment have been provided at this stage despite requesting this to be submitted as part of the application. For the purposes of public consultation I consider such details should form part of the submission.

Financial Contributions

6.1 A financial contribution will be sought by the Local Planning Authority in respect of a contribution towards leisure/play facilities within Whalley. The contribution sought will be based on the following occupancy ratios at a rate of £216.90 cost per person:

1. 1 bed unit - 1.3 people
2. 2 bed unit - 1.8 people
3. 3 bed unit - 2.5 people
4. 4 bed unit - 3.1 people
5. 5 + bed unit - 3.5 people

I note no such commitment to meet this requirement is contained within the Heads of Terms submitted with the application. You will note that this contribution relates to 'leisure facilities' and is not a contribution towards usable public open space. Therefore the provision of open space on site cannot be relied upon as a basis for not providing such a contribution.

Concluding Observations:	
---------------------------------	--

- | | |
|--|--|
| <p>7.1 To assist in conveying a number of the observations in relation to layout matters, particularly matters relating to green infrastructure/movement I would be obliged if you would consider sharing the DWG file for the 'Green Infrastructure Plan'. This would allow direct mark-up of drawings (including additional suggested movement routes/connections and landscaping) which would then be re-issued to accompany these written observations. This may assist in expediting matters and aid in avoiding abortive works/amendments.</p> <p>7.2 You will note from these observations that there are a significant number of fundamental concerns with the proposal. I am of the view the authority could not support the proposal in its current form unless these concerns are suitable addressed.</p> <p>7.3 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.</p> <p>7.4 Should you wish to discuss any of these matters further please do not hesitate to contact me.</p> | |
|--|--|

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