


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/03	Issue Date:	11/02/18	

General Observations:	
1.1	The observations contained within this response are made in relation to the revised details received by ourselves on the 25 th of January 2019.
House-type Design	
2.1	I have enclosed a number of sketch elevations to aid in further design dialogue and for your consideration in respect of the proposed house-types and subsequent revisions to which I still have fundamental concerns.
2.2	The proposed housing, throughout the entirety of the proposal, adopts an elevational palette that is severely limited in variation. Taking into account the quantum of development proposed, the limited elevational suite/palette raises fundamental concerns insofar that it is likely the development will largely be read as visually mono-cultural.
2.3	It would appear that all of the house-types utilise the same window/door detailing, window types (fenestrational style) and almost identical window proportions throughout the entirety of the proposed development. I do not consider this an appropriate response to the site, it is my opinion that the limited elevational variations, in concert the quantum of development proposed, is likely to result in a sense of overwhelming ‘placelessness’ – this is a result of the largely homogeneous appearance of the development when considering the package of house-types as a whole.
2.4	In addition to the above, I also consider that the elevational language proposed is more appropriate to that of a more inner-urban or suburban setting and do not consider that the adopted architectural language reflects a sympathetic or well-considered response to the edge of village location of the site. Furthermore, I do not consider that the proposed house-types represent an appropriate or sympathetic response to adjacent existing development or the local vernacular of the area.
2.5	In respect of the attached sketch proposals (2018/0914/UD/03 – UD/04), these have been produced to assist in exploring a more appropriate response to the site/local area whilst introducing elevational

variations within the house-types that reflect a semi-rural/village vernacular. You will note I have only focused on five of the house-types but consider that the variations in detailing/language that are illustrated within the attached sketches could easily be applied to the other remaining housing types.

Layout

3.1 My concerns in respect of the overall density of the southern development parcel remain. It is my opinion that the overall density and concentration of development in this area fundamentally fails to respond to the pattern of inherent development found in the area. Furthermore it remains my opinion that the densities proposed in the southern parcel fail to appropriately or positively respond to the semi-rural and peripheral nature of the site in respect of its relationship with the remainder of the village.

Green Infrastructure, Landscape & Ecology

4.1 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. **(Matter outstanding, no details of interface/improvements provided)**

4.2 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. **(Matter outstanding, no elevational details provided)**

Concluding 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