



Mr Graham Lamb
Pegasus Group
Queens House
Queen Street
Manchester
M2 5HT

**Development Management
Room 119 - 121
The Business Centre
Futures Park
Bacup
OL13 0BB**

Our reference: Edenfield Masterplan

Date: 22/11/2023

Dear Sir

Re: Site H66 Masterplan and Design Codes Land West of Market Street, Edenfield.

I refer to the above site and the development proposed.

The revised Masterplan and Design Code have been assessed by Officers and I write to set out the measures needed to address concerns raised at this stage specifically with regard to issues of the design and also the landscaping of the H66 site allocation.

Despite my previous comments, the following matters have not been addressed to the satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority:

Key features – The response in the last paragraph of page 72 should be changed from, *‘Dwellings at important junctions and/or nodal points should, where appropriate consider incorporation of contrasting facing materials or elevated features to create visual interest and enhanced character to development,’* to read, *‘Dwellings at important junctions and/or nodal points should incorporate contrasting facing materials or elevated design features to create visual interest and enhanced character to development.’*

High quality design of house types – The second paragraph on page 77 does not include reference to innovative designs and feature glazing, as was suggested. The whole paragraph should be amended to read, *‘House types need to be high quality designs throughout the development(s), and should incorporate innovative designs and feature glazing. There should be a range in the design of dwellings across the development and it should not just feature standardised house types which could be found in any location.’*

Materials – It was explained that the building materials in all areas should comprise a mix of natural stone, reconstituted stone, brick (of different shades), timber, render, slate and roof tiles. The use of natural and reconstituted stone has been omitted from AT/VS/06 (Village Streets) on page 84 and also AT/CS/06 (Chatterton South) on page

86. Therefore, it should be amended to include both types of materials in each character area. Also, in Edenfield North at AT/EN/06, there is reference to buff brick. This should not be limited to buff brick and this requires amending to include a range of bricks, in addition to the already stated natural stone and timber detailing.

Boundary treatments – There was a request for the use of dry stone walls and hedges to be used in the character areas along Market Street and Blackburn Road in keeping with the village cores and traditional terrace character areas of the Edenfield Neighbourhood Area Design Code. This still needs to be included in the revised Design Code.

There should be a commitment to retain or re-build all dry stone walls within or on the boundary of the allocation, including the remainder of the wall on the west side of Market Street at the proposed site entrance to the TW development, once the necessary length of wall has been removed to facilitate site access.

Currently there is only reference to front boundary treatments in the Design Code and this needs to be altered to include side and rear treatments as well. It was also requested that retaining walls which are visible from the street/footpath network should all be natural stone faced, at the moment the Code only refers to stone faced and it should be clear that this is natural stone.

Permeability - This needs to refer to permeability within streets within the development and not just green modes of travel, as previously highlighted as an area of concern by the Places Matter Design Review.

Multi user link – We have been in discussions regarding the proposed multi user, green modes route (incorporating bridleway) immediately to the west of the residential development parcels and this needs to be shown on the Masterplan and a commitment to it needs to be stated in the revised document, subject to land ownership constraints.

Also, the indicative pedestrian/cycle route shown on Peel's land in the Masterplan does not tally with the route shown in their planning application (ref: 2023/0396). The Masterplan should be amended to account for this.

Driveways & private drives – The first bullet point under surface materials on page 73 states permeable block paving should be used in visually prominent locations. However, this needs to be revised to include its use within the whole allocation and not just visually prominent locations.

Also, despite the Council's previous request for tarmac not to be used, there is still reference to it and this needs removing from the revised document.

Useable Public Open Space within developed areas – Places Matter in their Design review stated *'The landscape principles are strong but these don't penetrate the development, being confined to the edges only. The approach presents "one lump and wall of development", so the landscape needs to break this up by integrating green spaces with built form positively.'* They also stated, *'The quantum of development seems to be being defined by the constraints and seeks to fill all the available space. This gives it a sense of sprawl and sense of 'nowhere development', when you should*

be seeking to create distinctive places resonating what is quirky/unique about Edenfield e.g., create smaller pockets of development, broken up by landscape. This is expected to increase connectivity and make a better transition from the old place to the new.' In addition, they requested, *'you undertake a study to explore the transition to the village edges and show clearly how the existing settlement pattern connects to the new development. The corners, thresholds and edges also need to be considered in the Design Code and an Urban Design Framework – with vistas, viewpoints etc – will help you with that, so is also needed.'* This still needs addressing in the revised Masterplan.

The phraseology in bullet point 5 on page 60 that, *'development proposals should consider the ability to provide small incidental pockets of greenspace/landscaping within the developed areas of the site....'*, is unacceptable as there needs to be a firm commitment shown here. This is in addition to the work requested by Places Matter (outlined above) to make the Masterplan/Design Code acceptable.

Long views to Peel Tower and Emmanuel Church – Places Matter in their Design Review state, *'There needs to be a much clearer narrative as to how key views translate to the masterplan layout. You must keep 'glimpsed views' to the countryside to help with the sense of place.'* This narrative needs to be clear from the Masterplan/Design Codes and there must be a commitment to the aforementioned glimpsed views. Also, in the Edenfield Core Area Type Code at AT/EC 08, the key views to be maintained (not considered as you state) need to include Edenfield Parish Church. Similarly in the Village Streets Area Type Code at AT/VS 08, the key views to be maintained need to include Edenfield Parish Church as well as Peel Tower and Emmanuel Church, Holcombe. You should alter, *'key views to be considered,'* to, *'key views to be maintained,'* for all area types.

The Masterplan diagram on pages 7 & 51 should show heritage assets, in particular the Grade 2* Parish Church – as this is a key feature in the locality and its setting should be preserved, with views to the Church retained as stated in the Site Specific Policy.

Boundary treatments on interface with the Green Belt. - Under the 14th bullet point of the 'Landscape Design Principles' section in the Site Wide Codes (page 60), it states, *'development proposals that interface with retained Green Belt land will need to consider and justify an appropriate boundary treatment of dry stone walls, native hedgerows or open boundaries depending on the character of the development and views towards the boundary interface.'* However, this is not what was requested and is therefore, unacceptable. Please provide the clarity that was originally called for. The words consider and justify need removing from that paragraph & there needs to be a commitment to dry stone walls and hedgerows, to ensure an acceptable form of development. The acoustic barrier treatment on the boundary with the A56 also needs clarifying. Masonry walls can amount to effective sound barriers, therefore, the dry stone wall should be specified for this purpose. Similarly, it is likely to be effective in preventing unwarranted encroachment onto the A56, as required by National Highways.

The comments above are purely in relation to design and landscape matters. As you are aware, work is ongoing to attempt to resolve matters around other issues and I will

be writing to you separately about these points.

Officers reserve the right to request further amendments in the future, once any amended plans and documentation have been reviewed.

Yours faithfully

Mike Atherton

Mike Atherton

Head of Planning & Building Control