

COMMENTS ON MATTHEWS GREEN PHASE 2B – LINDEN HOMES 162140 AND 162141

General Observations

In the opinion of this committee this application represents a considerable improvement in quality and sustainability than that provided by the phases of this development that have already been approved.

The general street scene and layout seems to provide a good mix of architectural styles with varied roof heights giving visually an interesting and attractive appearance.

In particular we welcome the presence of pavements and minimal use of shared surface areas within the development. We also welcome the use of roof spaces in the larger three storey units for accommodation purposes helping to reduce the height impact of these larger buildings.

We are generally happy to provide our support for this application subject to a number of concerns as detailed below.

Internal Road Layout

The internal road widths are once again to an absolute minimum size permitted by current regulations being generally just 4.8 metres. Having examined the swept path diagrams and the 'Reserved Matters: Transport Statement' a number of areas of objection need to be raised.

If you overlay plans ITB11377-GA-001 (Refuse Vehicle Swept Path) and ITB11377-GA-004 (Large Car Swept Path) it is clear that in almost all the carriageways when refuse is being collected no other vehicle would be able to pass either in the same or opposite directions. The roads are not wide enough to allow two large vehicles or a large vehicle and a car to pass each other. We are especially concerned that this represents a health and safety issue in the event of access requirements for emergency services when large collection or delivery vehicles are present on site. We consider that if the road widths are to be maintained at 4.8 metres then passing places should be provided to minimise this risk or additional access to the site from further along Toutley Road. The ideal solution is to make the roads a little wider. The use of such narrow roads in new developments is causing issues elsewhere in the borough and in the opinion of this committee should be discouraged.

The Transport Statement in section 4.3.2 states 'it may be assumed that they (the large refuse vehicle) will be able to use the full width of the carriageway to manoeuvre'. This therefore indicates an assumption that in order to satisfy the requirements for access no one else is using the road and that no vehicle might be stopped or parked anywhere on the carriageway. This is not a practical assumption in the opinions of this committee.

In addition, section 4.3.5 of the same document states 'smaller vehicles that will require regular access (e.g. parcels and supermarket deliveries) will also be accommodated'. This clearly contradicts 4.3.2 in which it says a large vehicle will use the full width of the carriageway, clearly not accommodating smaller vehicles.

Section 4.3.2 also states 'This shows that this refuse vehicle can safely enter, turn within, and leave the site in forward gear'. We believe this statement is questionable and that all these activities cannot be performed in forward gear.

The swept path analysis contains so many points that are dependent on no one parking outside of allocated parking and no one else using the carriageway that we have to question this current proposal as a sustainable layout.

We also consider that plan ITB11377-GA-004 (Large Car Swept Path) is inadequate in that it does not show actual access to the site and only shows a few metres of the relatively straight main access road and not the whole development.

The large vehicle swept path diagram assumes that the refuse vehicles will only enter and leave the site from the south which is likely to not be correct. Having again looked at the provided plans it would seem impossible for a large vehicle to enter the site from the northern end without at a minimum requiring it to cross the opposite carriageway. Being this is located on a bend we feel this could present a hazard to other road users.

Parking Provision

Whilst we welcome the greater than required minimum parking provision with the development a number of small observations need to be made. Some of the parking spaces are not that close to the plots to which they are allocated. For example, plots 37, 38 and 46. From the parking provision analysis a number of plots have '0' allocated parking. In an area where car ownership ratios are near the highest in the country this would seem inappropriate.

Layout

It would seem that plot 46 could be seriously overlooked from Apartment block B (Plots 50-58).

Garden Lengths

In the provided plans no garden dimensions appear to have been provided but we have concerns that the gardens of plots 45, 48, 31, 37 and 17 may be undersized.

Flooding

We note that the northern most tip of the development is in the 100 + 20 flood zone.

Balancing Ponds

Having examined the provided plans, we have a number of concerns about the balancing ponds located in the public open space area to the north east of the development.

How are water levels in these to be maintained?

If water levels are allowed to fall too low these ponds turn into an eyesore full of smelly rotting debris and like elsewhere in the borough become a dumping ground for rubbish. Allow the water to stagnate in warm weather and they become equally smelly with the subsequent emissions of sulphur (bad egg) gas caused by the breakdown of vegetation in the water. They will also attract in particular flying insects

which will detract from the usage of this public open space and provide an unpleasant and unnecessary hazard to users of the public open space and in particular to the residents of plots 67-70.

Unless proper controls are in place to manage this issue we believe that the sustainability of this public open space could be questionable.

Construction Environmental Management Plan

We would like to remind that in order to comply fully with the Outline Planning Permission a CEMP needs to be provided before applications are fully approved.

This page is intentionally left blank