


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/02	Issue Date:	07/11/18	

General Observations:	
1.1	The following observations are in relation to Preliminary layout drawing DWH063 – PL01 Rev: P3 received on the 2 nd of November 2018.
1.2	Following on from our discussions, you will be aware that there is a requirement to provide ‘Older Persons Housing’ on site comprising 15% of the total number of housing units constructed on site of which 50% will be Affordable Housing Units and 50% Market Housing Units. No details in respect of the mix of this provision has been provided on the submitted drawing. I am therefore unable, at this stage, to provide a viewpoint in respect of the proposed older persons housing mix.
1.3	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.
1.4	I would once again refer you to the design principles approved as part of the outline consent, it is imperative that the agreed principles inform the overall design approach to the site if the application is to be considered pursuant to the extant consent. You will note points 6.2 and 6.3 of the approved Design & Access Statement that provide a number of clear design intentions.
Layout:	
2.1	<p>A significant number of back to back distances throughout the entirety of the proposal still fail to meet the minimum 21m offset distance. Please note the authority will not support the proposal where this standard is not met on the basis of poor standards of residential amenity. I have listed the relationships/interface distances that raise cause for concern as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 01. Plots 47 to 56 a number of the interface distances with the properties under construction to the south falls significantly short of 21m. 02. Plots 98 to 100 interface distance with numbers 91 to 94 less than 21m 03. Plot 1 and 15 interface distance approximately 17m

04. Plots 2-3 and plot 13 interface distance approximately 19m
05. Plot 20 and plot 23 interface distance approximately 16-17m
06. Plots 108–110 interface distances with plots 117-119 ranges between 18-19m
07. Plots 191-192 interface distances with plots 174-175 ranges between 18-19m
08. Plots 199-200 interface distances with plots 197-198 approximately 20m
09. The interface distance between plot 58 and 9 Kirkmoor Close, whilst at an oblique angle, appears to be approximately 15m
10. It would appear plot 61 has a side on interface distance of 8-9m with primary habitable rooms of the approved apartment block to the south. This relationship would be considered as overbearing and the authority will require the minimum offset distance to be 13.5m in such instances

2.2 I have concerns regarding the nature of the connective pedestrian route with the Milton Avenue development located to the south. It would appear the route connects with what may be intended to be an area of private drive which may result in deterring the potential user from utilising the route. There exists the opportunity for the route to also branch eastward to the front of plots 62-67, following the route of the drainage constraint/easement. This would result in the route interfacing with a well-established footway at the termination point of the turning head to the north of plot 54.

2.3 The parking arrangement serving plots 6 and 7 appears somewhat anomalous. I would suggest that the parking for plot 6 be moved northward and accessed off the private drive as per the remainder of the plots to the north. In concert with this the parking for plot 7 should also be re-sited to adopt a side-drive arrangement similar to the plots adjacent to the west, this will negate the visual dominance of the parked motor-vehicle upon entry to the site.

Landscape/ Green Infrastructure:	
---	--

3.1 Due to the presence of well-established linear landscape features it is highly likely the area has significant value as an area for foraging birds/bats, therefore the potential to accommodate nesting/roosting provision upon buildings exists. In this respect, taking account of the location of the proposed site, the Local Planning Authority would seek to secure a 75% coverage ratio of bat/bird box/brick provision across the site, the locations of which to be recommended by a licenced ecologist. I would therefore request a commitment at this stage to provide provision at the aforementioned ratio or alternative provision which results in an equitable level of habitat enhancement/uplift.

- 3.2** As no detailed landscaping proposals have been presented at this stage I am unable to offer any observations in relation to these matters.
- 3.3** There are a number of 'green' areas within the public realm that do not appear to be 'on-plot' I would expect such areas to accommodate significant tree/shrub and hedgerow planting to contribute to the overall ecological/biodiversity enhancement of the site.
- 3.4** I note the inclusion of the 10m buffer around the periphery of the development site. A full planting schedule will be required in respect of the proposed landscaping of this margin. I would expect such a schedule to include a significant amount of native species tree and hedgerow/shrub planting.
- 3.5** I note that the submitted sketch layout does not appear to provide any dedicated provision for usable open space. You will note that providing such provision is a requirement not only of the outline consent but also a requirement of Policy DMB4 of the Adopted Core Strategy.
- 3.6** I am disappointed that the peripheral circular pedestrian route (within the green margin) appears to have been omitted from the proposal. I would consider that this should be reintroduced to allow for opportunities for residents and the wider community to engage with the green infrastructure to be brought forward as part of the proposal. Please refer to my previous observations in relation to arrangements/points of connection.
- 3.7** I note the introduction of sizable areas that appear to accommodate what I assume to be attenuation ponds/basins. Full details of these should form part of any revised submission package, such details should include existing/proposed cross-sections and land levels.
- 3.8** The large expanses of parking areas to the south western extents of the site (plots 178-188 and plots 201-209) should be further broken up with additional tree planting to plot frontages or within the public-realm. A similar approach should be taken to plots 33-36 and 39-42.
- 3.9** The green margin to the north of plot 90 offers an opportunity for significant amenity landscaping.
- 3.10** Tree planting should be introduced into the public realm within the courtyard area serving plots 84-96.

Housetypes:	
--------------------	--

- | | |
|------------|---|
| 4.1 | No details of proposed house-types have been issued as part of the revised package of information, I would therefore reiterate my previous observations. I would be obliged if you could forward, at your |
|------------|---|

earliest convenience, the revised proposed house-types to allow for early and expedited engagement.

4.2 I am pleased that you have included bungalows within the revised proposal, however I have fundamental concerns regarding the size of the units, their configuration and overall arrangement. Following consultation with the council's Strategic Housing Officer she has offered the following comments:

'I would have concerns about the proposed 1 bed bungalows on the scheme. Similar units at Monks Cross Whalley have been very slow to sell, and all the feedback has been it's because of the size and layout. We are now in a position that the local connection requirement has been relaxed as they have been marketed for over 16 weeks. Compared to 2 bed bungalows on other sites which are selling off plan. The Monks Cross development was different in that the units were designed to be managed as a sheltered scheme and then the revenue funding to support the scheme was withdrawn, so that was the justification behind the scheme being supported in the first place.

There is a demand for larger 3 bed bungalows to accommodate families with a disabled occupant. So would require main bathroom and bedroom on the ground floor. A reduced number of units but larger would be supported.'

I would concur with the observations offered by my colleague, the units are likely to provide a low standard of amenity (contrary to Policy DMG1) not only by virtue of their constrained size but also their lack of private amenity space and the proximity of the rear parking areas to the units themselves. It is my opinion the units are unlikely to be successful in accommodating the demographic for which they are intended and as per my colleague's observations above, this has been clearly demonstrated within the borough already.

Highways:	
------------------	--

5.1	I am aware discussions with Highways are currently on-going, I would be obliged for a written update as to the nature of these discussions and to what stage they are at.
------------	---

Concluding Comments/Observations:	
--	--

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.

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

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