


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/02	Consult Date:	N/A	
Meeting Date:	N/A	Issue Date:	N/A	
OFFICER REFERENCE ONLY				

General Comments/Observations

Daniela,

I have re-assessed the revised proposals for Chipping Lane following my initial comments. I am of the opinion that the amendments put forward fundamentally fail to address the concerns raised within my consultation response (Ref: 14_0438_UDR_01) and have the following observations/comments to make:

- I have noted that amendments have been made to the plots to the west of number 76 Inglewhite Road to lessen the perceived over-looking/over-dominance issues, however the parking/pedestrian access arrangement in place for Pot 90 is fundamentally flawed. It appears only one parking space has been provided for this plot, the location of which is excessively detached from the dwelling itself. The arrangement would require occupiers of the property to traverse an excessive distance and potentially within close-proximity to the habitable room windows of Plot 91.
- A significant amount of 'front of plot' parking is still proposed in south west extents of the site, given this part of the development will be afforded a high level of visibility and occupies a gateway approach into Longridge from the west, all parking should be accommodated behind the building line.
- The excessive use of 'rear-alley' arrangements for the purposes of waste transport remains. 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. 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, taking this approach would also limit the amount of garden area that appears to be lost by to provide 'bin routes'. It should be noted that the LPA has secured such arrangements in other consents within the Borough and this will be an on-going agenda and requirement that will gain increased support through the adoption of design guidelines in the future.
- I still consider the introduction of the 2.5 & 3-storey house-types at complete odds with the landscape context (but have noted that a number have been relocated /dispersed) 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.
- The suggestion of an additional pedestrian link to the 'Village Meadow' located at the turning head to the north of plots 52 & 58 has not been addressed/considered. The provision of an additional route would allow for a pedestrian access that would compliment the other proposed routes.

- **Plot 15:** Parking provision still appears to be impractically located and overly detached from the dwelling its serves in terms of location.
- **Plot 30:** Reversing distances are still considered to be excessive and vehicular access/egress may conflict with vehicles parked to the frontage of plot 29.
- **Plot 59:** Concerns regarding over-looking/ off set distances have not been addressed.
- **Plot 85:** Concerns regarding over-looking/ off set distances have not been addressed.
- **Plots 78 & 79:** Given the potential for elevated over-looking in relation to the rear garden of Plot 75 I consider the off-set distance with the aforementioned plot inadequate.
- **Plots 92-93:** Inadequate parking provision/bay size and inadequate reversing distances remain.
- **Plots 99-106:** Parking still appears to dominate this frontage.

	Officer:	Stephen Kilmartin
--	-----------------	--------------------------