


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/03	Issue Date:	04/12/18		

General Observations:	
1.1	The following observations are in relation to Preliminary layout drawing DWH063 – PL01 Rev: P4 received on the 23 rd of November 2018.
1.2	I am disappointed that a number of observations have not been adequately addressed and that a number of queries remain outstanding, I will reiterate these matters within the response below for the purposes of clarity along with additional observations.
1.3	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. (Matters still outstanding)
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. (Matters still outstanding)
1.5	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. I would request that you submit a supporting statement that clearly conveys how you consider that these overall design principles have informed the design approach in respect of the current reserved matters proposal.
Layout:	

- 2.1** The revised layout appears to result in a number of plots being located less than 21m from the adjacent properties on Brungerley Avenue. It would also appear your layout fails to take account of additions/extensions that have been undertaken to the aforementioned properties. The authority will not support any proposal where the 21m interface distance standard is not met.
- 2.2** Plots 95 and 6 appear discordant when considering the overall arrangement and patten of adjacent proposed housing by virtue of its forward projection. These plots should be revised to respond more positively to the inherent crescent building-line established by adjacent proposed built form. **(Please see attached annotated layout)**
- 2.3** Plots 176 – 179 appear anomalous when read in context with the overall pattern of development and suggest that these units/or this configuration be omitted from the revised layout. The remainder of the development parcels have an inherent and well defined building line that is contained within an overall clearly legible block form - the current layout in this area undermines the overall legibility and cohesion of the development pattern in the area. **(Please see attached annotated layout)**
- 2.4** In respect of the south-western extents of the site, I have fundamental concerns regarding the overall arrangement for plots 175 – 190 and 202 – 210 in respect of waste management arrangements. A number of the plots are significantly remote from the highway and do not appear to have a dedicated route/provision for taking waste receptacles from private garden area to a potential pick-up point. This is of particular concern given a number of these units are apartments.
- 2.5** In respect of the above plots, it would also appear the courtyard car-parking provision falls significantly short of what would be considered as an acceptable level of provision.
- 2.6** There are a number of plots that still fail to meet the 21m offset/interface distance. Please note the authority will not support any proposal where this standard is not met. I would also be obliged if you could dimension rear to rear interface distances on any revised layout plan.
- 2.7** 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. **(Matter not addressed) (Please see attached annotated layout)**

2.8 Further to the above point I would request the route that will front plots 67 – 74 be made more attractive for the user. I would suggest a footway be provided on the western side of the drive that will connect to the Milton Avenue connective footpath. [\(Please see attached annotated layout\)](#)

2.9 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.

(See point 2.5)

2.10 In relation to the above point, I note this area has been revised, however I consider the revisions have resulted in an overall arrangement that appears both discordant and anomalous. I also note that this may be the result of additional units being added within this development parcel. It is my opinion that this parcel revert back to a more crescent arrangement as shown on layout PL01-P3 whilst being mindful of my previous observations regarding the parking configuration in this area (2018/0181/UD/03 Point. [\(Please see attached annotated layout\)](#))

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 equatable level of habitat enhancement/uplift. **(Matter not addressed/outstanding)**

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. **(Matter not addressed/outstanding)**

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. **(Matter outstanding)**

- 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. **(Matter outstanding)**
- 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. The LPA will be unable to support the proposal where there is a fundamental failure to provide adequate on-site usable open space. **(Matter outstanding)**
- 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. I would also request you explore the potential for the inclusion of trim trail equipment in these areas. Please refer to my previous observations in relation to arrangements/points of connectivity. **(Matter not addressed/outstanding)** [\(Please see attached annotated layout\)](#)
- 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. **(Matter outstanding)**
- 3.8** Tree planting should be introduced into the public realm within the courtyard area serving plots 84-96. **(Matter not addressed/outstanding)**
- 3.9** 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. [\(Please see attached annotated layout\)](#)

Housing Provision:		
<p>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. (Matter not addressed/outstanding)</p> <p>4.2 I have noted that the overall bungalow arrangement has been revised and amenity space is now provided to each unit. In the absence of internal floorplans for the aforementioned units I am unable to provide any view as to whether they would meet the current spatial standards adopted by the authority or meet identified need in the area. I would therefore once again urge that you contact the Councils Strategic Housing Officer Rachael Stott in this respect.</p> <p>4.3 I note a number of the house-types fail to meet the National Space Standards. As you are aware, the LPA has resolution from Committee to utilise for the purposes of Development Management. In respect of this matter I would request a written statement as to why you consider such standards should not be adhered to in this instance. I also note at our meeting of the 29th of November you stated that counsel's advice has been sought in respect of such matters. I would be obliged if you could share such advice or summarise the nature of the advice given.</p>		
Highways:		
<p>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 as they progress. (Matter outstanding)</p>		
Concluding Comments/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