

Kensington Court

Response to Consultee Comments

Highways

Issue	Consultee Comment	Response
Highways Response		
Pedestrian Footway	The primary concern is the forward/pedestrian visibility at the entrance. There does not appear to be any information to inform this and therefore concerns remain and an objection is raised pending further information to satisfactorily allay the concerns. Two plans are presented; one a swept path and the other a landscape sketch, and these are not consistent in terms of footway position alignment. The plans do not appear to align footway with existing footway at the entrance to the site and the inside of the bend appears to make pedestrians leaving the site vulnerable	Please see attached 'Site Layout W 300636' which demonstrates the new pedestrian footpath on the Woodland Side of the entrance road, the adjusted Vehicle Tracking path, as well as the EV points to each house. In regard to the response that the Swept Path and the Landscape sketch is inconsistent, these plans have since been superseded, and updated. Please also refer to the latest site plan 'Site Layout W 300636' showing the proposed footway position alignment.
Swept Path	We are unable to find a swept path assessment for anything other than a car entering a garage. We will expect to see vehicles up to 12m are able to enter and leave in forward gear. However, this does not appear possible as there is no recognisable turning head. Access is needed for bin collection and other servicing. <i>Further Highways Response:</i> The issue is that the "head" isn't really a head and is not likely to be big enough to facilitate larger vehicles. We need them to provide a swept path showing that they can accommodate vehicles delivering furniture etc. There are no swept paths provided except for a car (which is pointless). What you are showing below does show a truck (no clue what size) but it does not complete the manoeuvre and appears to reverse into someone's drive anyway. The greatest benefit here is that the development provides a turning head where there isn't one. If they do not get this adopted RCVs (11/12m long) will probably not enter but other deliveries up to 10m are likely to. I could accept something a little smaller (say 8m large panel van/small box van)	Please see attached 'Site Layout W 300636' which demonstrates the adjusted Vehicle Tracking swept path for a vehicle 9.595m in length. We respectfully question the need for swept path analysis for an 8m large panel van/small box van, given that swept path analysis has been provided for vehicles much greater than 8m in length.

	on the basis it is better than the existing situation, but there does not appear to be sufficient room to turn anything more than a large car/small van.																															
Parking	Parking must be compliant with current	In accordance with the Council's SPG, the properties each require 3no spaces each. However, a Sustainability Assessment has been submitted in support of the application, which demonstrates that 2 car parking spaces per dwelling is acceptable in this location (see below sustainability calculation): <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th><th></th><th></th></tr> <tr> <th>Local Facilities</th><th>Distance</th><th>Points</th></tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Maes Ebbw Bach</td><td>350m</td><td>2</td></tr> <tr> <td>Foodstore</td><td>600m</td><td>1</td></tr> <tr> <td>Dentist</td><td>400m</td><td>-</td></tr> <tr> <td>Eveswell Primary School</td><td>500m</td><td>-</td></tr> <tr> <td>Bus Stop</td><td>400m</td><td>2</td></tr> <tr> <td>Cycle Route</td><td>-</td><td>-</td></tr> <tr> <td>PT Frequency</td><td>10 mins</td><td>2</td></tr> <tr> <td>Total</td><td></td><td>7</td></tr> </tbody> </table> <i>Sustainability Assessment</i> The submitted Transport Note sets out <i>"Each of the properties would benefit from a private drive/hard standing providing parking for 2 cars. This is considered to be an appropriate provision given the accessibility of the site and would accord with local and national policy approaches which discourage excessive parking provision."</i> The SPG allows for a reduction in parking provision if accessibility criteria are met, utilizing a scoring matrix which awards points for proximity to services and transport options. The calculations are shown in Appendix B of the Transport Note. The site has been assessed using this criteria and deemed to score 7 points, which therefore permits a reduction of one space per property. As such the proposals are considered to accord with the requirements set out in the SPG. Accordingly, the proposal adheres to the guidance set out in the parking SPG.				Local Facilities	Distance	Points	Maes Ebbw Bach	350m	2	Foodstore	600m	1	Dentist	400m	-	Eveswell Primary School	500m	-	Bus Stop	400m	2	Cycle Route	-	-	PT Frequency	10 mins	2	Total		7
Local Facilities	Distance	Points																														
Maes Ebbw Bach	350m	2																														
Foodstore	600m	1																														
Dentist	400m	-																														
Eveswell Primary School	500m	-																														
Bus Stop	400m	2																														
Cycle Route	-	-																														
PT Frequency	10 mins	2																														
Total		7																														

Refuse Collection	Where there are likely to be multiple bins for collection, there should be a suitable space to avoid obstruction of highway or visibility splays	It is understood that some considerable time ago the applicant was given dispensation to utilize the existing entrance roadway for this development and that what is indicated on the plan. Plan 'Site Layout W 300636' shows a full sized Refuse lorry being able to enter turn and leave in forward gear and having more than 25M visibility.
Rear Access and EV Charging	The available plans do not demonstrate rear access, or electric vehicle charging.	It is considered that EV charging can be conditioned as part of the planning permission. Nevertheless, the attached 'Site Layout W 300636' demonstrates the EV charging points to each house. With regard to the request for a plan demonstrating rear access, we respectfully question the necessity of this requirement, given that the proposed development is arranged as a cul-de-sac. As such, the layout does not rely upon rear access routes to serve the development, and we are therefore unclear as to the justification for requiring additional information on this matter.

Landscaping

Issue	Consultee Comment	Response
Landscape Response		
Method Statement	Significant areas of scrub and new wildflower seeding are still shown within the root protection areas of TPO'd trees – T35 and T37 at plots 5 and 6; please refer to the Tree Team for advice as a method statement for planting/seeding is likely to be required or proposals revised.	The scrub mix planting is being removed from the scheme and instead the seeding is being extended – see updated Landscape Plan.
Emorsgate Grass Mix	The Emorsgate grass mix for general amenity areas appears unbalanced at 1.5g/sqm EL1F flowers and 25g EG21 grasses. Can this be checked by the landscape consultant as Emorsgate agree the wildflower element is likely to be outcompeted. Generally a 20% v 80% flower to grass mix is used with a slightly higher grass rate if early cover is needed or use their EL1 Flowering Lawn Mixture at 4g/sqm.	Accordingly, the grass mix has been changed to straight EL1 Flowering Lawn Mix at 4gms/sq.m.
Wall Finish	Proposed buildings or planting will screen the wall from public views, however the wall finish is unclear – is this backfill with stone? Is crib to be timber or concrete or plastic?	As demonstrated on the proposed Landscaping Plan, the crib wall is of concrete units backfilled with stone and hardcore and finished with planting medium to allow a variety of planting.
Rain Garden	The larger rain garden is set behind a fence – could this be visually more open? or the fence set back and planted in front to soften hard surfaces meeting boundary treatment. Access is also unclear for maintenance.	The fence is being removed. Please find attached the updated Landscape Plan.

SuDS Proposals	I appreciate the SuDS proposals are outline, but there is no relationship between proposals by WL Squared below and the proposed landscape scheme.	This will be attended to as part of a separate SAB application.
Five Year Planting Plan	A plan for five years to cover new planting until established and existing trees is required and could be conditioned.	The Applicant is content for a Management Plan to be conditioned.
Plot Frontage Landscaping	The Landscape officer advises that no objection is offered subject to changes or conditions. In the main body of her comments, she sets out the concerns/queries that she has. She has always maintained that there is no space for meaningful structural landscape areas to plot frontages. I interpret this as an observation in her most recent response, but it should be addressed. However, if you feel you are unable to incorporate more space for landscaping to plot frontages then this should be confirmed as part of your wider response to her latest comments.	The Landscaping Consultant assisting with the application has responded as follows: <i>"I note the Landscape Consultant's comments on this scheme and we have revised it wherever possible in order to address the various points raised.</i> <i>However, the idea of including 'meaningful' landscape treatment to the frontage of plots 4-6 is, in my opinion, unresolvable due to the many conflicting constraints – existing in terms of levels, but also in terms of the need for vehicular and pedestrian access to each unit, parking and turning requirements. I have looked at this many times since I started work on this scheme and consider that the current iteration (Drg 1143/P 01 Rev C as recently submitted) is the most appropriate and achievable solution.</i> <i>It is also worth noting that the plan should not be viewed in isolation. By this I mean there is already significant amounts of existing vegetation in the form of 'woodland' to the left side of the site and retained existing trees to the right. We have added a further group of three trees in the centre of the gap between units 4/5/6 and units 1/2/3 and consider that, once established, these will work well."</i>