


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/02	Issue Date:	19/12/18	

General Observations:	
1.1	The observations contained within this response are made in relation to the interim revised details submitted in support of the application on the 4 th of December 2018 and our subsequent meeting of the 6 th of December 2018.
1.2	To reiterate, 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. As you will appreciate, should consent be granted, this will result in two parallel consents being in existence on site with either having the ability to be implemented, as such, details will have to be provided at this stage or an acceptance that these matters be conditioned.
Highways Issues:	
2.1	As you will note, at our meeting of the 6 th of December we discussed terminating the northern Oakhill link road at the northern extents of the driveway for plot 30. I would be obliged if this could be reflected in any revised submission documentation.
2.2	I note that you have amended the internal highway configuration in-line with LCC Highways comments. I will engage in re-consultation with the highways department regarding these amendments when revised information is submitted formally.
House-type Design	
3.1	I have enclosed a number of sketch elevations for your consideration in respect of the proposed house-types and following on from our recent discussions.
Layout	

- 4.1** I note that you have increased the offset/interface distances between the proposed dwellings in the southern parcel and the existing neighbouring properties on Woodlands Park and Sydney Avenue. I also note the submission of cross-sections that take account of changes in topography. I would request that such information forms part of any formal resubmission package.
- 4.2** A number of plots still 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. The constrained nature of the gardens associated with plots 3-5
 2. The constrained nature of the gardens associated with plots 12-14
 3. The constrained nature of the gardens associated with plots 104-108
 4. The constrained nature of the gardens associated with plot 56 and the properties oblique interface distance with plots to the east give rise for concern.
 5. Plots 60-63: Overlooking distance at first floor into adjacent residential curtilage is still below the 10.5m standard
 6. Plots 175-176 and 185-186: The garden areas associated with these properties will be significantly overlooked from properties to the east and west to an extent, cumulatively, that the garden areas are unlikely to benefit from any sense of privacy.
 7. Plots 139-142: Consider moving these properties and assorted parking court northward to increase the offset margin between the neighbouring boundary to the south.
 8. The interface distance, albeit oblique, between plots 2 and 6 is significantly short of the 21m standard.
- 4.3** I remain 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). In relation to this matter and as discussed, the LPA does not consider that a landscaping margin within private residential curtilage could be affordable any reasonable long-term prospect of protection, either through enforcement powers that could be exercised by the authority or through clauses within the title-deeds of the relevant properties. I would also consider it onerous and unreasonable to dictate what planting/vegetation be retained within private curtilage.
- 4.4** At our recent meeting we discussed the need for bespoke consideration to be given to the eastern boundary of the southern parcel given its visual relationship with the open countryside to the east. As you will recall, green-screen treatments or low level treatments were discussed. I would be

obliged if you could provide clarification as to whether such matters have been further explored.

Green Infrastructure, Landscape & Ecology	
--	--

- | | |
|--|--|
| <p>5.1 Following on from our recent meeting I would encourage you to explore introducing a higher proportion of tree planting along the easterly 'trim-trail' route. As discussed I would suggest that linear arrangements are avoided and would encourage pockets of dense tree-island planting. This will allow for a varied user experience for those utilising the route.</p> <p>5.2 I would also suggest that such planting arrangements are utilised to lessen the linear visual appearance of the outer access road serving plots 68-84. I note from your comments that you intend to 'retain views out from properties'. However, I would consider that the lessening of the linear visual effect of the road alignment and building arrangement upon the landscape to be of a higher priority.</p> <p>5.3 As per our meeting of the 6th of December I would be obliged if you could provide details of the interface between the proposed pedestrian routes and that of the existing PROW. Given it is likely the PROW will experience increased footfall as a result of these connections I would also be obliged if you could provide details of any surfacing improvements proposed on the PROW. You will note that DMB5 requires compensatory enhancements that will result in a net improvement in the Public Right of way network.</p> <p>5.4 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.</p> | |
|--|--|

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

- | | |
|---|--|
| <p>6.1 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.</p> <p>6.2 Should you wish to discuss any of these matters further please do not hesitate to contact me.</p> | |
|---|--|

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