

DESIGN EXPECTATIONS: VALIDATION REQUIREMENTS: **DEV F1 form**

Application DC/21/04118:

Erection of 1no. detached dwelling and cart lodge (following demolition of existing cart lodge), Land East of Wenham Lane, Wenham Magna, Suffolk CO7 6PJ

To Babergh Mid Suffolk District Council; Please find below in italics our responses and information concerning the design decisions and proposals within the above application. These design proposals are also expounded in the Design and Access Statement submitted with the application.

If you consider a question not relevant, please explain why the question is not relevant as this can be just as informative to the design process. This document does not seek to find a version of what is good design, only that your version of good and sustainable design can be understood better. Take this opportunity to provide the reasoning as to why positive design choices have been made and explain why others have not. If you use this document as the form, please expand the boxes as needed.

1. (ALL) How has the site and its context been appraised, identifying all the factors that contribute to its character and locality, as well as other planned development?

The site for the new house was appraised within the approved submission (ref. DC/20/01408). The new application does not propose any significant alteration to the location, scale or form of the new dwelling. Consequently no significant re-appraisal was required.

The demolition and re-erection of the cart lodge required an assessment of the proposed new location for the cart lodge. The new location remains within the wooded area of the site, at a lower level (approximately 4m lower) and out of sight of the sensitive heritage asset – Wenham Hill (see the Heritage Consultant’s report to which we refer in the DAS). The new location for the cart lodge is screened from external view by the existing trees, although its form, scale and materials make it appropriate for the location.

2. (ALL) Has the local community been consulted and participated in the design and layout process? Can evidence be provided of this involvement and what changed as a result?

Not applicable

3. (ALL) Has a constraints and opportunities plan been produced and how has this been considered in relation to the proposal?

Please see the answer to 1 above and as expounded within the DAS: the basis for the minor changes to the design of the house are opportunities to provide a dwelling using more suitable materials, more environmentally considered and functionally improved – overall greater sustainability in a form relating to the area.

The cart lodge retention and relocation also ensures a more practical and sustainable overall site, removing certain future pressure for approval of a new building for the same functions, essential to the maintenance of the land and all on it.

4. (RES & FUL) Has there been a topographical survey to ensure any design is a true representation of the existing and proposed site levels to ensure design opportunities and constraints of different levels are explored, including understanding of relationships with neighbouring dwellings?

Yes; see the site layout plans submitted

5. (ALL) Have appropriate investigations been undertaken to establish historic and archaeological value and what enhancement is proposed?

Yes, see the Heritage Consultant's report (from previous submission) and our reference to this in the new application, all focussed on enhancing the setting of Wenham Hill (the heritage asset) in a more practical way than previously proposed.

6. (ALL) Have steps been taken to ensure the conservation and enhancement of wildlife and habitats found on site and how?

Yes, see the Ecological Consultant's report and proposals (from previous submission) and our reference to this in the new application, all focussed on enhancing the ecological value and contribution of the site.

7. (RES & FUL) Please state if there will be Hedgehog friendly fencing installed, Owl, Swift, Bat or other Bird Boxes and/or Bee Bricks included and how?

See the Ecological Consultant's report and proposals which state the ecological enhancements proposed and previously approved.

8. (ALL) Will the proposals lead to an increase in biodiversity value and how will this be achieved?

Yes; please see the Ecological Consultant's report and proposals which state the ecological enhancements proposed (previously approved).

9. (ALL) Are the proposals a compatible and quality response to landscape/townscape character, including the scale of the buildings, streets, landscape and roofscape, as identified in the Landscape Character Assessment, Conservation Area Character Appraisal, Village Design Statement, Neighbourhood Plan.

The proposals for the minor changes to the new dwelling's design and for the demolition and re-erection of the cart lodge in a new location provide the same considered and appropriate response to setting as previously approved.

<p>10. (ALL) Is the use and amount of development appropriate to the site's accessibility to jobs, shops, local services, community facilities and the frequency of public transport service? <i>Not applicable</i></p>
<p>11. (ALL, Majors, Dwellings) Where residential development is proposed does the development offer a mix of residential types and tenures that reflect the needs of the locality, including affordable housing, (which is indistinguishable from the general housing)? <i>Not applicable</i></p>
<p>12. (ALL and Majors) Has an appropriate analysis been undertaken of the environmental constraints and opportunities on the site and have the findings informed the development of green infrastructure proposals for the site? Does the development provide private open space and/or communal open space of sufficient size to meet the needs of the future community?</p> <p><i>Please see the Ecological Consultant's report and proposals which state the ecological enhancements proposed and previously approved.</i></p>
<p>13. (ALL) Where opportunities exist, does the development provide safe routes for pedestrians and cyclists that connect into the wider green infrastructure, and are these appropriately combined with routes to other services and amenities? <i>Not applicable</i></p>
<p>14. (ALL and Majors) Where SuDs are to be integrated as part of the public open space, explain how does the design allow for safe dual use? <i>Not applicable</i></p>
<p>15. (ALL) Is there an implementable energy strategy that forms part of the design and minimises energy demand for the site through layout, building orientation, landscaping, includes natural ventilation and passive solar design? <i>Not applicable because the fundamental design decisions were already made within application DC/20/01408</i> <i>However the minor changes proposed to the new dwelling's design in the current application improve the energy strategy by incorporating air source heat pump technology where none was proposed before.</i></p>
<p>16. (ALL, Majors) How has provision been made for managing flood risk and water resources (e.g. sustainable drainage systems, harvesting rainwater and grey water recycling schemes) and is there opportunity for betterment in doing more than mitigating net increase of flooding? <i>Not applicable because the new application does not propose variation to the strategy previously approved (ref. DC/20/01408)</i></p>

17. (RES & FUL) How does the development allow for at least three bins per dwelling (each capable of 350litres) and these can be removed easily from street frontage and public view when not bin collection day. Does development or surrounding roads allow for Bin collection areas and access of refuse vehicles to take place while ensuring good design is maintained?

The minor changes proposed to the design of the new dwelling include significantly increasing the storage area for refuse and recycling within the house layout, addressing the shortfall in the previous design.

18. (RES & FUL, Dwellings) Does the development ensure the provision of at least one composting area per dwelling?

The estate includes on-site management of the thinnings, felled timber, lake/ pond clearance, etc that will be undertaken throughout the seasons. This is evidenced by the proposal to retain the cart lodge for the equipment essential for the estate management.

19. (RES & FUL, Dwellings) What are your U values, Air pressure test and your thermal bridging targets for the development (part of TFE (Target fabric energy efficiency))?

These targets have not yet been set

20. (RES & FUL) Does the development include on-site energy production from renewable sources, that will reduce CO2 emissions from energy use by users of the buildings?

Yes, contrary to the previously approved design for the new dwelling, the minor changes proposed in the new application include the provision of air source heat pumps. These will make a significant contribution to primary energy needs

21. (OUT when access and/or layout included, RES & FUL) How will the proposed layout contribute to a network of connected streets and open spaces that also, where opportunities exist, connect to existing patterns of streets and open spaces or is there any reason not to do this?

Not applicable

22. (RES & FUL, Major Dwellings) Is there a clear hierarchy of streets and open spaces, each with a clear 'desired character' (the desired character should inform the road design and not the other way around), which are designed to have appropriate traffic speeds?

Not applicable

23. (RES & FUL and OUT if landscaping and/or layout is included) How do the proposals clearly define public space from private, work or play spaces and these can recognised by clear boundary treatments and be well defined by active frontage such as front doors, windows, shopfronts etc. that are interesting and varied, that provide supervision as well as respecting each other?

Not applicable

24. (RES & FUL, Major) Do the areas of open space (squares, parks, formal/informal spaces and play areas etc.), together with the streets, form a public realm that is integral to the development and respects and enhances its surroundings?

Not applicable

25. (RES & FUL, Major, Dwellings) Have the ground surfaces, kerbs, changes of levels, lighting, public art, landscape, public seating and street furniture, together with utility boxes, cables, signage and poles, been designed into the street and/or public space to avoid clutter? And do they respect, integrate into and/or enhance the character of the area?

Not applicable

26. (All, Major) Has an opportunity to make a contribution to public art on site been taken?

Not applicable

27. (RES & FUL, Major) Is the proposed development easy to get to and move through for cyclists and pedestrians as a priority and how is this achieved?

Not applicable

28. (RES & FUL and if roads included in proposal) How are the roads designed for low traffic speeds as well as being pedestrian and cycle friendly?

Not applicable

29. (RES & FUL) How are the parked vehicles well integrated so that they do not dominate the street scene and/or other spaces?

Not applicable, because the private drive design and garage location were established by the previously approved application. However, the minor changes to the new dwelling include enlarging the garage to meet standards, thus making the garage more functionally adequate

30. (RES & FUL) Does the development include tandem parking (of three spaces or more)?

Not applicable

31. (ALL) Is there electric charging points available for each occupier of the development?

Not applicable

32. (RES & FUL) How do the landscape proposals fit with and enhance the character of the site and its setting, including pattern, layout, materials, and choice of species? How do the landscape proposals mitigate visual impact, and are they in scale with the proposed development?

The previously approved landscape proposals for how the new dwelling fits within its setting have been retained in the proposals in the new application

33. (RES & FUL) Have the proposals for planting, building layout and service runs been checked against each other to ensure they do not conflict?

Not applicable

34. (RES & FUL) Are the landscape proposals designed to be robust and survive long term, easy to maintain and have space to grow while avoid conflict with occupiers?

The previously approved landscape proposals for how the new dwelling fits within its setting have been retained in the proposals in the new application

35. (RES & FUL) Does the overall design and juxtaposition of buildings and spaces ensure that there are no potential entrapment spots, including hiding spaces and secluded areas, where crime and antisocial behaviour could occur?

Not applicable

36. (RES & FUL) How will the specification of the boundary treatments, windows, doors and garage doors, together with their associated locks, secure an area and/or building in a manner that respects and enhances the character of an area?

Not applicable

37. (RES & FUL) How have materials been selected and detailed to respect and enhance the local character and be of good quality in themselves.

The previously approved design of the new dwelling included the use of flint and of render as the main external wall materials. The current proposals include facing brickwork to replace both these materials, with the brick being of a Suffolk White/ gault type to reflect to local historic use of these bricks in larger and detached dwellings. The DAS makes the point that flint is rarely used locally and not in the manner previously indicated. Similarly, the use of brick to replace render is based on the need to consider practical and sustainable long term material performance for the particular design challenges of a dwelling set into the slope of the hill.

38. (RES & FUL) What brick bond/s is/are proposed for the building/s proposed and was there a reason for the choice.

As noted above, brick is proposed as the main elevational material, to replace flint and render. The bond proposed is stretcher bond in natural mortar, but with the variation to the walls of the lower floor to create a degree of 'texturing' in the walls' appearance by projections of alternative bricks as indicated in the visuals within the DAS

39. (RES & FUL) Are windows to be recessed or flush or a mix of both approaches?

Windows are to be recessed

40. (RES & FUL) How has the building(s) been designed so that all people can easily access it (eg is the entrance obvious), and easily move within it? Has the building(s) been designed to allow easy adaptation, conversion or extension and allow access for mobility issues?

The current proposals do not alter the previous design strategy which placed the principal entrance at first floor level, visible from the guest parking area at the north-west end of the new dwelling (the south end of the house being the private parking and 'back door' side of the house). The design of the layout of the new dwelling was largely set in the approved scheme. The current proposals include only minor changes to those layout principles and none which affect the ease of movement within the dwelling. The original design of the new dwelling does not easily enable or allow extension, however internal alteration for mobility issues would be achievable.

41. (RES & FUL, Major) Has the building(s) design (regardless of any name change) been used before in East Anglia the last twenty years. When and where has this taken place and why is it appropriate for reuse in this location in relation to local distinctiveness?

Not applicable as this application is for minor variations to the design of the new dwelling. The currently approved design of the new dwelling is unique to this site.

Chris Exley
Senior Architect

chris.exley@stanleybragg.co.uk

18 August 2021