

Wiltshire Council Planning Consultation Response

URBAN DESIGN

Officer name:

Brian Johnson Dip Arch RIBA
Urban Design Officer
Landscape & Design
Economic Development and Planning
Wiltshire Council

Date: 13th September 2016

Application number: 16/07288/OUT

Proposal: Outline planning application (all matters reserved except means of access) for residential development, including the construction of up to 71 dwellings, the creation of new vehicular access with footways and cycleways and ancillary road infrastructure, public open spaces, children's play area, landscape planting, surface water attenuation and associated infrastructure.

Site location: Land South of Filands, Malmesbury, Wiltshire

Case Officer: Alex Smith

Recommendations:

<input type="checkbox"/>	No Comment
<input type="checkbox"/>	Support
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Support subject to conditions (please set out below)
<input type="checkbox"/>	Object (for reasons set out below)
<input type="checkbox"/>	No objections

Reference:

Drawing number BMD.15.019.DR.P002 Illustrative Masterplan; BMD 15.019.DR.P003 Parameter Plan; Design & Access Statement and Design Guide July 2016 Version A,

Policy and guidance:

- Wiltshire Core Strategy Core Policy 57 'Ensuring high quality design and place shaping
- 'Malmesbury Neighbourhood Plan': 'Volume I - Main Body' & 'Volume II - Design Guide' (February 2015) (NP): The design should be informed by the character and appearance of the historic core of the town noting the aims and objectives of the 'Malmesbury Conservation Area Appraisal'.
- Building for Life 12 (Third Edition): The government endorsed industry standard for well designed homes and neighbourhoods.(BfL12).

I note that this application site is not an allocated site for development in the Malmesbury Neighbourhood Plan but that current national planning policy may indicate this application site should be considered and my consultation responses should be viewed in this context.

The proposed design intent (masterplan layout and design parameters) in the above submitted information is a positive response to my comments on 15/12603/PREAPP dated 21.01.2016 and subsequent review of the draft masterplan on 30.03.2016 and would essentially form a sound basis in terms of the above policy and guidance for working up a detailed building and landscape design for any subsequent Reserved Matters planning application.

I support this application in terms of the general design intent subject to the following specific design matters apparent from the Design & Access Statement being addressed at the appropriate stage. As shown these would not significantly reflect the characteristic appearance of the historic core of the town for the detailed design to strongly reflect local distinctiveness and represent an appropriate high standard of design in respect of the Neighbourhood Plan Design Volume and Core Policy 57 iii. These matters could be suitably addressed without fundamentally altering the layout or buildings conveyed:

- 1) The extensive use of low hedgerows to enclose front garden strips which could easily be removed or die back and encourage paving over and vehicle overrun of this frontage.

While some mid height railings are indicated there is an absence of mid height 'stone' front boundary walls for example 900mm high characteristic to gardens where these front the street in the historic core of the town.

A considerable extent of mid height stone walling should be indicated on the parameter plan to reinforce key frontages such as street corners and facing the two main areas of public open space along the main street (as the example photos below from a recent development off the High Street in neighbouring Sutton Benger demonstrate).



- 2) It is not apparent what facing would be intended for high sided garden walls fronting the streets and public open spaces.

These should be indicated in 'stone' throughout to reflect this characteristic use of stone in the historic core of the town.

- 3) The extensive number of facades shown with a subdivision of half 'stone' (at ground storey) and render (at first storey).

This subdivision is not characteristic of the historic core. A much greater use of stone should face buildings with subdivided facades and any fully rendered facades appearing only incidental within the street scene.

- 4) The pitched roof carports/stone face above driveway openings spanning between houses shown on the strip elevations would appear visually incongruous being set back and without supporting piers either side.

The opening face should ideally be brought forward flush with the house front facade building line or be supported on integral stone piers at each end abutting the house flanks in each case incorporating an expressed lintel and thereby framing these openings.

- 5) The representative photo of a bay window suggests an applied Upvc component lacking an appropriately robust and visual quality of appearance.

These should be traditionally constructed and faced in masonry and with solid expressed structural corner posts (as for example shown on the photo above).

- 6) A bay window is indicated placed offset on street corner and other prominent two storey end flanks but this on its own would not represent turning the corner well.

Other windows at both ground and first floor should also be provided to appropriately enliven these flanks. (For example as in the gable end of the photos above). This should include the flanks to the proposed houses at the start of the main street seen on the approach from Filands 1.

- 7) In addition to reconstituted slate mentioned red plain tile clay roof tiles are also shown but no clay pantiles (not 'Double Roman' pattern).

These are characteristic of rural areas of North Wiltshire and together with stone tiled roofs predominant in the historic core should also be reflected in the design.
