Commentary on Proposed Developments for the PCC

The scheme

Its difficult to comment because there is really insufficient information to see what it is you are commenting on. There is a variety of housing blocks shown with roads, footpaths and parking areas. These are in various colours and I assume the grey areas are main roads with footpaths to both sides although there are dotted lines next to some roads. Are these fences?

Basically there are 4 blocks of houses with shared green space with trees

I assume blocks of 7 , 16, 7 and 9 buildings giving a yield of 39 buildings. There are 10 double garages and 6 single.

In these blocks- the one by the entrance has 5 single houses and 2 duplex houses  (by this I mean they have a shared party wall). The middle and largest block has 14 single houses and 2 duplex houses side by side.  The block to the front of the site near the recreation area has 7 buildings, 3 duplex, 3 single and one a combination of 3 joined flats. The final block has 9 buildings. 2 sets of 3 connected flats, 3 duplex houses and 4 single houses.

If you use the building footprints for buildings at Bell Close, Farm Close or Stoneleigh it is difficult to see how all of this can fit on the land area shown. There must be a feasibility study on building types. Can we see this?

It's unusual to see garages at the back of houses in the garden. Are these going to become annexes or habitable dwellings long term?

The other confusing item is the different colours used for parking. There are light blue orange and red. Are these different types of materials? Is it proposed to have gravel for natural soakage to the ground? It seems odd that 16 out of the 39 buildings have to drive through a designated parking area.

A schedule of building types and heights would help. It looks like half the site is hard surface which may account for the size and volume of the attenuation pond for rainwater run off. It seems a shame that this feature could not be incorporated into the scheme and of a size that encouraged newts.

Roads

A diverted entrance and access to the site is proposed close to the agricultural buildings. This could be considered as an improvement on what exists but there's going to be an awful lot of new traffic generated with this scheme. Currently cars and trucks have to "lie in wait" in the area where the proposed access is so they can take turns in getting up the narrow Stoke Rd hill. Has any discussion taken place about making Roughmoor lane one way and putting a new road the other side of the existing hedge? Providing traffic lights? What is the long term plan with developing the rest of the site with housing? Will this junction become the main entrance to further housing. Currently the proposed access is the way in for agricultural machinery . Will this have to use the farm entrance?

What provision is being made for disabled access and parking? There are 3 buildings with protrusions on the corner of 3 of the blocks. Are these being identified for specific disabled use? One is close to the local area playground.

What are the road and footpath dimensions

Right of way

There exists a public right of way past the church and connecting to the recreation ground. This is not shown so is the proposal to incorporate this into the scheme?

What is the maintenance link to the pond for? What is an "informal" footpath in planning terms? Can this incorporate cycles?

Bulk and massing studies

Currently the occupants of Stoneleigh enjoy views out over the site and the site is overlooked from Stoke Road. The development slopes down from Roughmoor lane and the scheme has identified one effective long view through the middle of the site. What are the proposed levels of the houses? Will the site be built up or  reduced? We really need bulk and massing studies to comment further. There are no 3 story houses in Westbury sub Mendip and what exactly does a 2.5 floor level mean?

Has any study been done that splits the site into 4 blocks? The main connecting road in the middle and access roads to the other 2 sides. This would give 3 long views through.

I assume the buildings will have pitched roofs and no hips as a planning requirement. The slope facing Stoke Rd to be tiled and the slope facing south to have provision for solar panels. Carrying the wall up to provide a stone capping and the tile flashing into this wall is a feature of the village.

Rubbish collection and recycling

The scheme has red coloured parking areas that the rubbish collection trucks could not access. What is proposed for recycling collection points or rubbish?

Community use land.

How realistic is that size of land for a village hall? Does this incorporate parking or can a condition of planning is the community has use of street parking and road access. Can this be incorporated adjacent to the church? Is there provision for the church grave yard to expand?

Church water supply and sewer

I understand the water supply to the church will be effected with this scheme. Can provision be made for a sewer connection?

Services

It seems a pity that the foul water pumping station is sited at the back of the church property. Can this go to the other side of the site? What provision is being made for an electrical sub station? I assume all services to individual buildings run in the roads. This includes telecoms, water, sewer and any future provisions. There is no street lighting.

That's my initial reaction to the drawing as presented. I can see the need for additional housing in the village and I'm supportive but as I said at the meeting it just looks "overcooked" in terms of density and size. I am happy to be mistaken!

Please feel free to pass these comments on.

Regards

Paul Hamilton BArch (Hons)