


Urban Design Response			Officer:	Stephen Kilmartin
Description:	59 Downham Road Chatburn			 Ribble Valley Borough Council www.ribblevalley.gov.uk
Application Ref:	2014/0353	Case Officer:	S.W	
Response Ref:	2014/0353/UDR/01	Consult Date:	01/08/14	
Meeting Date:	N/A	Issue Date:	10/09/14	
OFFICER REFERENCE ONLY				

General Comments/Observations
Observations are provided in relation to amended drawings received.
<p>1.1 The proposed 'side elevation' (west) fails to accurately reflect the variation in eaves height that would occur as a result of the footprint and roof-form proposed. The elevations should be annotated to reflect their orientation (east, west etc.)</p> <p>1.2 The side elevation (east) fails to show what appears to be a dormer/pediment addition at second floor. If any alterations within the roof space are provided section indicative sections should be requested at this stage showing finished floor levels and ceiling heights to ensure adequate head height/clearance has been considered and can be achieved.</p> <p>1.3 The rear elevation (south) appears to show the terraced area and steps passing in front of the bi-fold doors whereas the floor plan appears to show these steps terminating before the opening I am therefore unsure in relation to the actual proposed design solution.</p> <p>1.4 There does not appear to be adequate vehicular manoeuvring to allow vehicles to turn within the site and leave in forward gear.</p> <p>1.5 I am concerned about the extents of residential curtilage to which the application relates and clarification should be provided as to whether the intention is to extend the current curtilage or if this extension has benefitted from previous consent.</p> <p>1.6 I consider that the overall scale and form of the proposal fails to respond sensitively or positively to the parent property and consider the level of development proposed as excessive in that it appears to more than double the footprint of the dwelling.</p> <p>1.7 I am unsure as to the overall intention in terms of an adopted design language and consider the proposal, as submitted, somewhat ambiguous and ill-conceived.</p> <p>1.8 The proposal clearly impedes upon the root protection area and canopy of a category 'A' tree and it appears the applicant has failed to consider this.</p> <p>1.9 If the intention is to propose an extension of a contemporary language, which is hinted at through its overall form, but not necessarily its elevation execution, then I would recommend the overall footprint and form be rationalised, reduced and a clear design rationale put forward.</p>

Conclusions/Suggested Conditions	
2.1	Given the level of inaccuracies/omissions in the submitted details and the overall scale, mass and language of the proposal it is my opinion that the proposal cannot be supported.
2.2	Should you feel it would be of assistance I would be willing to enter into sketch/design dialogue with the applicant to explore possible acceptable options or design solutions. Please note that given the level of concerns in relation to the proposal it would be my opinion that this could not be undertaken under the remit of the current application without significant fundamental changes and therefore leave it to your discretion as to whether you consider this exercise should be undertaken through the pre-application process.
2.3	Should you require further comments or suggested reasons for refusal please do not hesitate to consult me on this matter.
	Officer: Stephen Kilmartin