


Urban Design Response			Officer	Stephen Kilmartin
Description:	Kirk Mill Chipping			 Ribble Valley Borough Council www.ribblevalley.gov.uk
Application Ref:	2014/0183	Case Officer:	S.W	
Response Ref:	2014/0183/UDR/01	Consult Date:	N/A	
Meeting Date:	N/A	Issue Date:	08/07/14	
OFFICER REFERENCE ONLY				

01 - 'Kirk Mill Hotel' General Comments/Observations

N.B All comments to be read in conjunction with statutory/non-statutory responses and comments From A. Dowd Conservation & Design Officer.

01. I have fundamental concerns regarding the proposed alterations/additions to the south facing elevation of Kirk Mill. The proposed 'orangery' element, in terms of horizontal proportioning appears to visually dominant the primary elevation and appears to obscure a large amount of historic fabric/features. The elevational language of the orangery element also appears to conflict with and undermine the inherent value of the primary elevation through its materiality, elevational repetition and relationship/alignment with the elevation/proportions found on the existing elevations.
02. Whilst I am not adverse to contemporary additions in such situations, I am of the opinion that the level of development proposed and the solid mass of the orangery fundamentally undermine the character of the existing mill and remained unconvinced by the approach taken. I also do not consider that the recessed lead panel alone provides sufficient visual delineation between the original/rebuilt fabric of the building and that of the proposed orangery. Concerns also exist regarding the extents of the orangery and that it will result in the loss of openness to the building frontage/forecourt area which clearly currently contributes to the overall setting of the building.
03. The circulation core (SSG Curtain walling) when read in conjunction with the orangery element clearly dominates and undermines not only the lower levels of the primary elevation but also that of the upper floor. The 'glazed-bay' element is clearly proportionally wider than the south-east wing to which it is attached, will be higher in terms of eaves level (which has not been reflected on the proposed east elevation) and will match the aforementioned wing in its forward projection. In my opinion, despite the level of transparency afforded to this element, it clearly dominates the Mill and would appear as an overtly unsympathetic commercial addition that fails to relate or respond to proportions inherent to the south facing elevation.
04. I have noted that the applicants Design & Access Statement makes mention of minimising illumination of the overall area to minimise nocturnal light pollution and the erosion of the rural setting. Given the glazed-bay serves a primary circulation core it is assumed that this would require either permanent or low-level illumination with sensory activated lighting. In either case I have concerns regarding the light-pollution that would be resultant from this element and the level of visual dominance it would be afforded during nocturnal hours, it is also noted that due to potential levels of luminescence this could be visible upon approach from the south and Church Raikie/Malt Kiln Brow being of detriment to the setting and character of the area.
05. No details have been provided in relation to the west facing elevation of the glazed lean-to.
06. Detailed clarification will be required with regards to the public realm/surfacing treatment to the frontage of the Mill, should consent be granted I would envisage this could potentially be dealt with through condition but given the status of the building/area a preliminary detailed proposal should be

produced to allow for accurate assessment at this stage. Clarification will also be required as to whether issues such as danger of falling have been considered and if any measures of protection will be required in relation to the brook.

07. The arrangements for the storage and collection of commercial waste should be clarified.

02 - Hotel/Spa General Comments/Observations

01. It is noted that the Hotel/Spa proposal appears to provide no facilities to allow potential guests/users of the spa to procure refreshments/food. Clarification is sought as to whether the intention is for the 'Mill Hotel' to provide facilities that will cater for this and site-wide as I also have concerns that the commercial kitchen/prep room for the 'Wedding Venue' is relatively small in comparison to the capacity of the venue.
02. The public-realm element fronting both 'The Barn' and the Hotel complex appears to be largely undefined. Whilst I welcome transitions in the surfacing I have a concern that the area, by virtue of its size and open nature is likely to be utilised for informal parking by users/guests.
03. Clarification is sought as to whether the public realm to the north and south elevations of the Hotel/Spa have been designed or are intended to act as informal parking-bays as the area of hard surface to the southern extents of the Hotel appears to be excessive. Where it is intended that areas within the complex are to accommodate vehicular parking this should be clearly shown on a revised site-plan.
04. The Steam Room, Sauna and Spa element of the Hotel appear to be located in the single storey glazed-link portion of the building. Clarification is sought that extract has been considered and will be dealt with via the Plant Room ventilation above the pool element.
05. The main pool/plant building appears to introduce what could be considered as an incongruous and alien mansard roof-form that appears to hint at a 'scandinavian' approach. Whilst I can understand the design intention may be for this to appear as a 'utilitarian' structure I consider that given the level of visual prominence it will be afforded the elevational language and roof-form be reconsidered.
06. At present the pool element it is likely to dominate the overall context/setting of the Mill and that of the residential/domestic scale of the existing and proposed cottages, no composite streetscenes have been provided to allow for direct scale comparisons to be made or to demonstrate that the inherent scales within the vicinity have informed the overall design & scale
07. I am unconvinced that the practicalities of the outdoor pool have been considered. There appears to be no provision for hard surface routes around the pool area that would allow guests/users to access the pool.
08. No provision for waste storage/collection appears to have been provided for this part of the hotel complex, given the immediate setting I would encourage that any such storage be integral to the built form.

03 - Barn/Cottages General Comments/Observations

01. I have concerns regarding the treatment of the existing 'Barn', in particular the domestification of its primary (south-west) elevation. I consider the timber panelled infill to the main sliding door area to be wholly inappropriate which is further reinforced by the introduction of what appears to be a standard window/door arrangement. A bespoke solution should be considered that maintains the character and inherent value of this element.
02. The timber clad element of the 'cottages' should also be reviewed in light of the above comments.
03. Whilst I understand the footprint of the 'Barn Cottages' has been dictated by the size of existing structures to be demolished the first floor level floorplan appears to be excessive in terms of internal space for a singular bedroom and suggest the overall scale of the cottages could be reduced as a result.

04 - Malt Kiln Brow Housing General Comments/Observations

01. I have concerns regarding the location of the Malt Kiln Brow Housing element. The plots appear to be both physically and visually detached in relation to built form and it could be argued that the Brow acts as a clear physical break and delineation between Chipping and the natural 'basin' that the remainder of the proposal is located within. It is considered that development on the brow could visually consolidate the settlement with the Mill complex undermining its setting and value.
02. I also have concerns regarding the practicalities of the access point to the Brow. The area appears to benefit from a significant change in topography and it is likely additional planting may be required to be removed to achieve visibility splays. It is important to consider that the area of planting in this area clearly contributes to the overall setting of the 'Basin'.
03. Whilst I appreciate this element is at outline stage (access only) I would have long terms concerns regarding how residential curtilages would be defined and that the development would lead to vehicular parking to forecourts undermining the rural setting of the area.

05 - General Comments/Observations

01. The extents of hard-surfacing in relation to the car park should be reduced and permeable surfacing also considered. I would suggest that parking bays be further broken up/reduced through the introduction of additional intermittent tree planting and/or screening.

Officer:**Stephen Kilmartin**