

- 19/03143/FUL

**Land Off Moorthorpe Way Sheffield S20 6PD**

Erection of 72no. dwellings, formation of access road, associated landscaping works and open space works

DM Officer:

Howard Baxter

UD & C Officer:

Harshada Deshpande

Conservation Area

<b>Comments:</b>	
<i>Please note – Comments are internal only, intended as initial feedback for DM officers and may have been made without a site visit. Queries should be directed to the allocated UD&amp;C case officer who will provide further advice and comment as required.</i>	
Summary and Overall Recommendation:	
The scheme has merit and minor design development can realise a successful scheme.	
The scheme has some key elements that require attention. Further detailed design development is necessary in order to address these elements and achieve a satisfactory scheme.	✓
The scheme has significant flaws. Consider that complete redesign is necessary to address the issues.	
<p>An Informal planning guidance note was produced for the site that outlines key development principles. Comments were also made at the pre-application stage, some of which have been taken into account.</p> <p>There remain a number of unresolved issues, see below, that need to be addressed as part of the application.</p> <p>Comments on the layout starting west to east,</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. No 34 needs to include the wedge of green to its north within the garden with a boundary treatment to the back edge of pavement.</li> <li>2. The visitors parking across from Nos 42- 45 needs to be reviewed as it results in severing of the green link to the newly formed incidental open space in front of 45-50. It would be much better if this parking was designed to be part of a wide pavement instead of a layby. Parking for 31-32 should be re positioned as a drive which will replicate other areas and form a front garden. Currently there is no definition to the area in front/to the side of Nos 30-33.</li> <li>3. Bins and cycle parking should be well integrated within the open space and not prominently visible as shown adjacent to No 31.</li> <li>4. No 30 could be pushed out a little to accommodate parking to side, accessed from the spine road. The wedge of open space to the south should be part of its side garden. For Nos 26-29 forming the frontage to the road, parking should be redesigned to reflect the treatment opposite.</li> <li>5. Nos 22-24 - could a small rear parking court be created to avoid frontage parking along both the street frontages?</li> <li>6. No 21- wedge of open space should be part of its garden.</li> </ol>	

7. 18 to 21 and 6-15 , need a softer boundary treatment , a hedge is strongly preferred.
8. No 15, the paved forecourt needs to be defined- could it have a tree to avoid becoming an additional area of parking?
9. Nos 16-17 could be pulled to the east, losing the piece of open space/ parking bay and creating parking to the side of the pair of semi instead of in the front. This will improve the vista. Tree planting could be provided towards the corner as above.
10. The wedge of green in front of no 1 and 2, separating the drive from the footpath could have a tree to create a corner marker/ continue the boulevard.
11. Nos 69-72- the wedge of green space to the footpath does not make sense as the houses are turning their back on it, resulting in exposed rear fences in a prominent location. This needs to be reviewed.
12. No 68 needs to be pulled forward to the edge of the footpath, and have a boundary treatment to mask the parking court, instead of leaving a large area of open green. This will also allow for more parking to the east, reducing parking to the frontage of what is already a car-dominated courtyard.
13. Nos 57-59- parking to the front is an issue. Could No 59 have parking to its rear- replacing the wedge of green? This will allow for soft landscaping/ tree planting to the front of 59 to hide the parking for Nos 57 and 58.
14. Site sections are needed to understand how levels are dealt with as there are considerable level changes across the site.
15. A boundary treatment plan is required that indicates the proposed boundary treatments as well as proposed tree planting. As previously mentioned, a hard edge is preferred to the street edges in the form of a masonry wall/ railings and a softer edge in the form of a hedge is expected towards green/ woodland frontages.
16. Drainage layout- It will be useful to have the latest layout on this drawing, also showing any proposed retaining walls/ pump room enclosures etc.

#### Scale, massing and elevations

17. The proposed scale, massing and roofscape is generally supported.
18. The proposed contemporary architectural approach towards the house types is generally supported, however simplification is recommended to create a distinct and coherent response across the site.
  - a. In principle the proposed red and grey brick masonry/ slate roofs is acceptable, subject to details. The proposed distribution is somewhat random. It is suggested that Nos 43-44 and Nos 15-17.
  - b. The window above the garage in the Chesham does not need a surround/ is too horizontal and could be split in a pair to create verticality.
  - c. Large scale sections through the housetypes are required to ensure sufficient modelling.
  - d. Unclear as to the dimpled render on most of the housetypes (eg Chesham, Napsbury)- what is this? render would be unacceptable. Textured brick would be okay in principle.
  - e. Grey cladding?- to first floors, limited amount would be acceptable between

windows as infill but an entire floor (as indicated on Ramsbury) would be a concern.

To achieve a successful scheme it is recommended that:

- See above

Access Recommendation:

- 

Public Art Recommendation:

Offsite commuted sum

Onsite by Developer

- 

Referrals:

- Sheffield Sustainable Development and Design Panel
- Sheffield Conservation Advisory Group
- Access Liaison Group
- Historic England
- Design Council Caba