


Urban Design Response			Officer	Stephen Kilmartin
Description:	Land East of Chipping Lane Longridge			 Ribble Valley Borough Council www.ribblevalley.gov.uk
Application Ref:	2014/0438	Case Officer:	D.R	
Response Ref:	2014/0438/UDR/01	Consult Date:	N/A	
Meeting Date:	N/A	Issue Date:	N/A	
OFFICER REFERENCE ONLY				

General Comments/Observations

- I have fundamental concerns regarding appearance of the high-level fencing bounding the cricket pitch area, its overall scale and treatment. The site is afforded a high-level of visibility upon approach and occupies prominent long-views and I would therefore consider that the proposed treatment would be of detriment to the appearance of the immediate and wider landscape context.
- I am unconvinced that the proposed layout adequately reflects the transition from the more urban fabric of Longridge to that of the open countryside. Plots 89-94 appear to result in an increase in density when compared to the inherent density/plot sizes found within the area. Given these plots occupy a peripheral location I would have expected a reduction in density or at best a density reflective of the existing properties fronting Inglewhite Road to allow them to visually reflect the physical transition into a more semi-rural setting.
- I am unconvinced by the extent of the landscape buffer zone fronting Chipping Lane. There appears to be an inadequate margin that would allow for substantial landscaping to establish long-term with private drives coming in close proximity to proposed planting. Given that the proposed development represents a significant expansion of the existing settlement pattern westward it is considered that the visual impact of the development should be mitigated through the use of a robust 'green edge' and decrease in density to the westward edge of the development.
- The excessive use of 'rear-alley' arrangements for the purposes of waste transport is ill-conceived. In the long-term it is likely these areas will become largely unmaintained and experience dictates that residents will resort to the storage of refuse receptacles to plot frontages due to excessive travel distances (Examples: Plots 4, 5, 24, 23, 62, 63, 66, 67, 92, 93, 100, 101, 104, 105 not-exclusively). Ginnel arrangements are felt to me appropriate as they allow for ease of access to rear yards by residents and residents tend to take 'ownership' of these areas more readily than rear alleys.
- The Design & Access Statement is basic at best. It fails to provide any narrative in relation to the development of the housetypes/elevational language and their response to the immediate/wider context or provide any level of narrative in relation to the creation of character areas, hierarchy of spaces or the overall Urban Design approach taken.
- I consider the introduction of the 2.5 & 3-storey house-types at complete odds with the landscape context and the proposed developments visual relationship with the existing settlement and its location in relation to the existing built form. As I have previously stated the development represents a significant expansion into the open-countryside and therefore consider that the scale of the proposed buildings within the development should be limited to a maximum height of two-storeys. Any dwellings that exceed this height are likely to be afforded a high level of visibility and will read as incongruous elements within the landscape setting particularly in relation to long-views into the site.

- I would suggest that an additional pedestrian link be provided to the 'Village Meadow' located at the turning head to the north of plots 52 & 58, this would appear to be a far more rational location to allow pedestrian access and would compliment the current peripheral locations providing access to the Meadow.

General Observations (Plot Specific)

- **Plot 15:** Parking provision appears to be overly detached from the dwelling in terms of location.
- **Plot 30:** Reversing distances seem to be excessive and vehicular access/egress may conflict with vehicles parked to the frontage of plot 29.
- **Plot 59:** It appears that this plot has an off-set distance of approximately 7m in relation to the rear yard of Plot 55, this is considered insufficient when taking into account potential overlooking from first floor.
- **Plot 85:** It appears that this plot has an off-set distance of approximately 6m in relation to the rear yard of Plot 72, this is considered insufficient when taking into account potential overlooking from first floor.
- **Plot 89:** Parking is located in a highly prominent location forward of the building line. This is poorly conceived given the junction of Chipping Land and Inglewhite Road is considered as a major gateway into the settlement.
- **Plots 92-93:** Potentially inadequate parking provision/bay size and inadequate reversing distances.
- **Plots 99-106:** Parking appears to dominate this frontage with excessive hard surfacing (red-chipped area) that is likely to be used for informal parking further compounding the visual dominance of parked vehicles on the street scene.

Final Comments

- I have numerous concerns regarding the elevational language and materiality of a number of the house-types and their failure to respond to the site context and its relationship to the wider setting. Given the level of concerns in relation to the overall proposal I have limited my comments to the overall design approach and layout/principle of the development.

Should you find it would be of assistance I would welcome the opportunity to engage with the applicant in sketch dialogue to address the concerns in relation to elements of the proposed layout and the proposed house-types.

Officer:

Stephen Kilmartin