


<b>Urban Design Observations</b>		<b>Officer:</b>	<b>Stephen Kilmartin</b>
<b>Description:</b>	Land off Waddington Road, Clitheroe		 Ribble Valley Borough Council  www.ribblevalley.gov.uk
<b>Application Ref:</b>	2018/0181	<b>Case Officer:</b> S.K	
<b>Response Ref:</b>	2018/0181/UD/01	<b>Issue Date:</b> 10/07/18	

<b>General Observations:</b>
<p><b>1.1</b> The following observations are in relation to Sketch layout DWH-063 SK01 June2018 and following our meeting of the 2<sup>nd</sup> of July 2018.</p> <p><b>1.2</b> 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 this provision has been provided in the submission documentation. As you will note from our discussions there will be an expectation that bungalow accommodation will form part of the Older Person Housing provision.</p> <p>Bungalows solely for occupation by those over 55 years of age will have to meet the following definition:</p> <p><b><i>A unit of accommodation/dwelling that shall not be occupied by a person under the age of 55 years except that in circumstances of a married couple or civil partnership at least one person in the married couple or civil partnership is not less than 55 years of age.</i></b></p> <p><b><i>The unit of accommodation/dwelling shall provide a principle bedroom and bathroom at ground floor, in addition to and without compromising kitchen/dining and living room provision, all of which shall be designed to meet national space standards. The internal and external arrangements of the unit of accommodation shall accord with the specifications and requirements of category 2 housing as defined in M4(2) of Approved Document M (volume 1 2015) of The Building regulations 2011 (or any subsequent revisions).</i></b></p> <p><b><i>For the avoidance of doubt the ground floor accommodation shall possess the ability to be habitable without necessitating the need for access to upper floor accommodation by the user</i></b></p> <p>Further to the above any non-bungalow accommodation for occupation by those aged over 55 will</p>

have to meet the following definition:

***A unit of accommodation/dwelling that shall not be occupied by a person under the age of 55 years except that in circumstances of a married couple or civil partnership at least one person in the married couple or civil partnership is not less than 55 years of age.***

***The internal and external arrangements of the unit of accommodation/dwelling shall accord with the specifications and requirements of category 2 housing as defined in M4(2) of Approved Document M (volume 1 2015) of The Building regulations 201 (or any subsequent revisions).***

- 1.3** A significant number of back to back distances throughout the entirety of the proposal 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.
- 1.4** 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.

<b>Layout:</b>	
----------------	--

- 2.1** As stated at your meeting there will be a requirement to provide a 3m wide shared footway/cycleway throughout the site, from the sketch layout it is unclear where this route begins/terminates or if such provision exists.
- 2.2** As you will also be aware there is a requirement to provide a pedestrian and cycleway link to the Morris Homes site to the east, no such provision is evident on the sketch proposals. It is imperative that the proposed layout takes account of wider connectivity for both pedestrian and cyclists and the authority will require you to clarify, in detail, how further connectivity will be established. I would consider that any such connection should be integrated into the overall landscape strategy for the site to ensure the route provided remains attractive for users.
- 2.3** As discussed at our meeting I would request that you explore implementing a more 'organic' pedestrian route within the south easterly to north westerly 'green corridor'. I would suggest that the route be re-aligned to afford equal green margins on either side of the main pedestrian route.
- 2.4** The above referenced green corridor should also include the provision of areas of usable open space,

I would be preferable if such areas were largely 'informal' in nature and encouraged 'naturalistic play' however there will be the expectation that this area will accommodate play equipment of a form and type to be agreed.

- 2.5** I note the additional buffer margin around the periphery of the site. I also note your stated intention for this buffer area to include a site-wide pedestrian route and potential 'trim-trail'. I would request that such a route have multiple points of connectivity within the site to form holistic movement framework. Such points of connectivity could be provided at the end of a number of the turning heads adjacent the route(s). I would request that these margins also incorporate significant tree/shrub planting and hedgerow reinforcement.
- 2.6** The driveways associated with the '456' plots at the north-western extents of the green corridor should be realigned/relocated to limit their incursion into the green infrastructure associated with the most northern section of the 'green corridor'. This was discussed at our recent meeting, with agreement having been reached that the extent of driveway coming off the main spine road could be omitted and the driveways to the east (types 456, 411 and 403) should also be realigned to avoid conflict with the enhanced pedestrian route.
- 2.7** I have concerns in respect of the south easterly pedestrian linkage to back Commons. It would appear, following a repeat site visit, that the proposed pedestrian route that comes off the turning head will discharge users of the route into private residential curtilage/land rather than the adjacent highway. I would be obliged if you could provide clarification in respect of this matter.
- 2.8** I note the easement margin which acts as a constraint on site. I would consider these margins offer the opportunity for large areas of amenity landscaping/tree planting and consider, subject to the requirements of the easement, consider such planting should form part of the overall green infrastructure strategy for the site.
- 2.9** I still have significant concerns in relation to the predominance of front of plot parking at the eastern extents of the site. In its current configuration the public realm/streetscene is likely to be largely defined and typified by the parked motor-vehicle, being of detriment to the visual amenities of the area. Measures should be explored that limit front of plot parking to ensure the parked motor vehicle does not remain a dominant feature within the streetscene.
- 2.10** I have additional concerns in relation to the above point insofar that it would appear that the majority of those plots with front of plot parking are to be affordable units, resulting in a clear visual disparity between the affordable housing and that of open market housing. As stated at our meeting it is imperative that the affordable housing element is indistinguishable from that of affordable, in

terms of materials, architectural detailing and external public realm treatment to ensure long-term social cohesion.

**Landscape/Ecology:**

**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 equatable 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** I would request that as part of the overall public realm/ green infrastructure strategy that particular consideration is given to boundary treatments serving or delineating residential curtilages, with a particular focus being put on those that directly front the public realm, those that are afforded a high level of visibility or occupy peripheral locations. It is suggested in such locations, throughout the site, that you explore non-standard proprietary fencing products and consider utilising 'instant green-screen' or similar. This will allow the peripheral locations of the site to benefit from a more subtle visual transition into areas of P.O.S and adjacent open countryside and also add further animation within the streetscene when used within the main body of the proposal. Such treatments also assist in ecological/biodiversity uplift and will aid in reinforcing the overall 'semi-rural' language that the proposal should be seeking to convey.

**3.4** The illustrative layout appears to show tree planting within rear residential curtilages. I would be obliged if you could confirm as to whether these are to form part of the landscaping proposals and how they will be afforded future protection from felling by occupiers of the dwellings if this is the case.

**Housetypes:**

**4.1** As discussed I would request that the materials palette for the proposal be simplified to a range of

materials that will allow the proposed house types to more successfully reflect the transition into the defined open countryside to the north-west of the site. I would therefore request the omission of red-brick which typically has more urban connotations. I would suggest that the materials to be implemented as part of the development are restricted to that of reconstituted stone, render and potentially antiqued or buff brick. In this respect it may be worthwhile for yourselves to familiarise the materials approved under the umbrella of 3/2015/0875 I would also suggest you familiarise yourself with the materials agreed on the Standen Strategic Site given its similarities with the Waddow View site.

- 4.2** I have a number of concerns in relation to the proposed house types and their overtly generic appearance which I consider fails to respond to the local vernacular or the character of the area and site context. In this respect I would suggest the following be explored:
- 4.3** Omission of the GRP Flt Roofed Porches/Surrounds and Pilasters. I would suggest that recon stone surrounds/heads and alternative porch detailing be explored that reflects more appropriately the local vernacular. The detailing of the above elements at present is overtly generic and will result in the proposal as a whole be read as mono-cultural and homogenous.
- 4.4** The majority of the housetypes significantly lack any form of architectural detailing or consideration towards the site context. This is particularly evident in that the majority of the housing models lack any form of window detailing, with some adopting what appears to be a 'detached rased-head' detail which appears anomalous and discordant. The use of stone heads, jambs and sills should be introduced throughout the proposal and brick headers should also be omitted.
- 4.5** Where stone surrounds have been introduced (for example the Derwent Classic), it would appear the jambs are disproportionately bulky giving the openings they serve a proportionally squat appearance.
- 4.6** The window proportions throughout the proposal should be addressed to allow for a more vertical proportion and appearance.
- 4.7** I have significant concerns regarding the Hertford H470 house type and its appropriateness given the site location. I would request that this housetype be omitted given its disproportionate roof compared to that of the remainder of the proposal. I also consider that the roof proportion and dormer window introductions do not respond positively to the character or context of the area. I also consider that the Bayswater will appear equally as incongruous and request that it be omitted.
- 4.8** A number of the dwellings do not benefit from any form of eaves detailing, I would suggest that exposed rafter feet (cosmetic only) or projecting corbelling beneath the fascia/gutter-line be

explored to add additional visual interest. You will also not that such detailing is prevalent within Clitheroe and within the vicinity.

**4.9** Roof animation/articulation should be considered with variation in the roof scape provide through the introduction of chimney stack detailing on a number of key plots including those that may benefit from an outward aspect into the defined open countryside and those that occupy a gateway/primary frontage location.

**4.10** At our previous meeting I provided yourselves with a number of housetype sketches that I recommended should be used as an 'elevational suite', I advised that a similar language should be adopted throughout the proposal to allow the development to more successfully reflect the local character/vernacular and site context. Should you require me to resend these elevations to assist in addressing the above points please do not hesitate to inform me.

#### Highways:

**5.1** The Highways development Control section have offered the following initial observations:

*There are a number of issues with the proposed layout particularly in respect of the parking provision for the development. I am concerned that a number of the properties have substandard parking provision both on the drives and the dimensions of the proposed garages which could lead to vehicles overhanging and obstructing the footway. Parking should be provided at the following levels commensurate with the size ( number of bedrooms per property)*

- *1 bed - 1 parking space*
- *2 to 3 beds - 2 parking spaces*
- *4+ beds – 3 parking spaces.*

*Spaces provided on drives should be a minimum length of 5.6m rising to 6m when abutting a garage door width 2.4m. Garages should be a minimum of 6m x 3m to be regarded as parking spaces*

*In the original application (3/2014/0597) there was provision for a bus link into the site from Kirkmoor Road, the draft layout submitted does not appear to acknowledge this requirement nor the routeing through the site.*

*Before I am in a position to raise no objection to the proposal I would need to see amended plans addressing the above concerns*

**5.2** In respect of the vehicular route and public transport connection to Back Commons/Kirkmoor Road the Highways Development Control section have stated that *'it would appear that under S31 of the Highways Act it has been deemed to be dedicated as highway ( albeit not maintainable at public expense) and therefore open to traffic. Whether or not a bus company would be interested in a route through the estate is another matter.'* As previously advised, I would urge you to discuss this matter direct with LCC Highways as a matter of priority.

**5.3** You will also note the requirements of condition 16 (3/2014/0597) in relation to the aforementioned access point should it be deemed by highways that a circular bus route must be provided. Notwithstanding this need there is a highways requirement for an emergency vehicle access point (controlled) in this location and once again suggest you discuss this with the Highways Department direct.

<b>Concluding Comments/Observations:</b>	
--	--

<b>6.1</b>	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.
------------	---

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

<b>Officer:</b>	<b>Stephen Kilmartin</b>
-----------------	--------------------------