

BARTON ROAD, BARLESTONE

Building for a Healthy Life

Project: RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT, BARLESTONE

Site: LAND NORTH OF BARTON ROAD

Issue: 01

BUILDING FOR A HEALTHY LIFE

Appraisal Checklist

Project Name / Location: Barton Road, Barlestone

Planning Authority: Hinckley and Bosworth District Council

| | |
|------|--|
| Key: | |
| | Green score: indicates that the scheme meets the criteria of the question under consideration. |
| | Amber score: indicates that an element does not fully satisfy all the criteria set out or may need further work or cannot reasonably be resolved by the design team. |
| | Red score: indicates that an element of the scheme is unsatisfactory and needs to be reconsidered where possible. |

INTEGRATED NEIGHBOURHOODS

1. NATURAL CONNECTIONS

| Create places that are well integrated into the site and their wider natural and built surroundings. Avoid creating isolated and disconnected places that are not easy places to move through and around | Score | Commentary / Response |
|--|-------|--|
| What Green Looks Like (from building for a healthy life) | | |
| Edge to edge connectivity | | Connectivity across the development site, to the existing context in response to desire lines and existing breaks in hedgrows boundaries, and also to future potential development phases are all provided |
| Respond to pedestrian and cyclist desire lines | | As above |
| Connected street patterns. These work best when they include straight or nearly straight streets to makes pedestrian routes as direct as possible. | | The layout of the development is generally based on orthogonal perimeter block structure, reducing the road network as far as practicable |
| Filtered permeability. A useful technique that designs out 'rat running' and creates a pleasant low traffic environment around people's homes whilst still allowing pedestrian and cycle movement | | Pedestrian links are the priority on the site over vehicle movements |
| Continuous streets (with public access) along the edges of a development. Private drives can frustrate pedestrian and cycle movement along the edges of a development. | | All shared surface private drives provide pedestrian and cycle connectivity - they do not form dead ends for these users. |
| Connecting existing and new habitats; safeguarding existing or creating new movement corridors for nature. | | Existing hedgrows are protected by a defined hedgrows buffer, not contained within individual dwelling rear gardens. Proposed hedgrows improve connectivity between existing hedgrows |
| Where retained, keeping hedgerows within the public realm, safeguarding their future retention and management. | | As above |
| Streets and routes that can be extended in the future | | Future development phase has been masterplanned. Turning heads and road ends are designed to allow future extension if required. |
| Adoption to site boundaries. | | No ransom strips proposed to remain |
| What Red Looks Like (from building for a healthy life) | | |
| Single or limited points of access for pedestrians and cyclists | | A number of pedestrian and cyclists access points are proposed to respond to desire lines and connect to the context |
| Extensive use of private drives | | Private drives (shared surfaces) within the development are interconnected for pedestrians so do not present a barrier to movement across the development |
| Pedestrian or cycle routes that are not well overlooked and lit after dark | | N/A all pedestrian routes are overlooked |
| Failing to respond to existing (or anticipate future) pedestrian and cycle desire lines | | A future phase masterplan has been considered to respond to the sites context and future development potential |
| No opportunities to connect or extend streets and paths if required by later development | | As above this has been considered |
| Internal streets and paths that are not well connected or are indirect | | All streets and paths are interconnected with no dead ends for pedestrians. |
| Retaining existing hedgerows between the back gardens of individual homes. | | Existing hedgrows boundaries are either to plot frontages, adjacent public open space or located within defined hedgrows buffer zones to ensure these are protected |
| Ransom strips | | N/A |

2 WALKING, CYCLING AND PUBLIC TRANSPORT

| Short trips of up to three miles can be easily made on foot or bicycle if the right infrastructure is in place, helping to improve public health and air quality whilst also reducing local congestion and carbon emissions. | Score | Commentary |
|--|-------|---|
| What Green Looks Like (from building for a healthy life) | | |
| Share street space fairly between pedestrians, cyclists and motor vehicles | | The scheme is designed to have a simple street hierarchy with primary access routes having dedicated pedestrian footways, and shared surface routes, where vehicles and pedestrians share the space. These allow all users to safely navigate the development and response to desire lines, existing footpath links and routes and also connections to the surrounding context. |

| | | |
|---|-------|--|
| Cycle friendly streets with pedestrian and cycle priority (and protection) with across junctions and side streets. | | The street hierarchy is outlined above. Shared surfaces which have junctions with the main access route are formed by dropped kerb pavement cross overs which provide priority to pavement users. Junctions have raised tables |
| Nudge people away from the car. Offer cycle (and cargo bike) parking closer to the entrance of commercial, leisure and community facilities than car parking spaces. | | N/A |
| Provide scooter and cycle parking at schools. Scooters can encourage younger children to get active on the way to school. | | N/A |
| Design out school runs dependent on cars. | | Pedestrian links are proposed across new areas of public open space to provide reduced travel distances within the development. These pedestrian links connect to the existing street network and provide pedestrian access to the primary school within approximately 750m of the centre of the development |
| Start or contribute to the delivery of a Local Cycle and Walking Strategy Infrastructure Plan. | | Highways officer to comment, potentially as site wide masterplan |
| Zebra, parallel and signalised crossing. | | N/A due to size of development |
| Tight corner radii (<3m) at street junctions and side streets. | | Scheme design has 6m junction radii on main access route as an adopted highway compliant design, with shared surfaces being formed by pavement crossover. Highways officer to comment on whether reduced junction radii generally would be acceptable to allow the applicant to review design |
| Concentrate new development around existing or new transport hubs. | | N/A |
| Demand Responsive Transport, car clubs and car shares. | | No on site provision made |
| Short and direct walking and cycling connections that make public transport an easy choice to make | | Pedestrian links are proposed across new areas of public open space to provide reduced travel distances within the development. These pedestrian links connect to the existing street network on Barton Road where bus stops are located |
| New or improved Park and Ride schemes. | | N/A |
| 20mph design speeds, designations and traffic calming. | | |
| Protected cycle ways along busy streets. | | All roads within the development are 20mph maximum speed and would not be classed as busy streets |
| What Red Looks Like (from building for a healthy life) and how the scheme responds positively | | |
| Travel Packs that fail to influence people's travel choices. | | Travel pack will be provided in handover packs by the contractor |
| White line or undivided shared pavement/cycle ways. | | N/A due to size of development |
| Pedestrians and cyclists losing priority at side junctions. | | Side junctions are onto private drives / shared surfaces which are formed by pavement crossovers. Raised tables at junctions |
| Oversized radii corners on streets that are principally residential that allow motor vehicles to travel around corners at high speeds. | | Scheme design has 6m junction radii on main access route as an adopted highway compliant design, with shared surfaces being formed by pavement crossover. Highways officer to comment on whether reduced junction radii generally would be acceptable to allow the applicant to review design |
| Streets that twist and turn unnaturally in an effort to control vehicle speed but make walking and cycling routes longer than they need to be. | | Streets are generally straight where possible |
| Streets principally designed around waste collection vehicles. | | Bin collection points are proposed to limit need for waste collection vehicles to access all parts of the development |
| Overwide carriageways that reduce space for pedestrians and cyclists, making it more difficult for people to get around easily especially when social distancing restrictions are in place. | | All roads are either shared surfaces or have 2 separate footways, to adoptable standards but not oversized, still providing opportunity for people to distance if required. |
| Serviced parcel developments where pedestrian and cycle connections between different phases of development are frustrated. | | Future phases have been considered by way of a site wide masterplan to ensure connectivity |
| 3. FACILITIES AND SERVICES | | |
| Places that offer social, leisure and recreational opportunities a short walk or cycle from their homes | Score | Commentary |
| What Green Looks Like (from building for a healthy life) | | |
| Intensifying development in locations that benefit from good public transport accessibility, in particular around public transport hubs such as train stations and bus interchanges. | | Barlstone has existing bus connections which the development provides easy pedestrian access to. |
| Reserving land in the right locations for non-residential uses. | | N/A |
| Active frontages. | | All dwellings provide active frontages and are designed as 'corner turn' dwellings where required. |
| Clear windows along the ground floor of non-residential buildings (avoid obscure windows). | | N/A |
| Mixing compatible uses vertically, such as placing supported accommodation at the heart of new developments above active ground floor uses. | | N/A |
| Giving places where routes meet a human scale and create public squares. | | N/A |
| Frequent benches can help those with mobility difficulties to walk more easily between places. | | Possible within POS subject to landscape design |
| What Red Looks Like (from building for a healthy life) and how the scheme responds positively | | |
| Local centres that are not easily accessible and attractive to pedestrians and cyclists. | | The development site is located within walking distance of the village centre |

| | | |
|--|--|---|
| Non-residential developments that are delivered as a series of individual parcels with their own surface level car parks set back from the street. | | N/A |
| Where routes converge, avoid creating places that are of an inhuman scale and that frustrate pedestrian and cycle movement. | | Street heirarchy is clearly defined and simple, of human scale and appropriate to the type of development |
| Inactive street edges, dead elevations, service yards next to the street and obscure ground floor windows. | | All elevations where street facing offer active frontages. No blind dead ends are included. All dwellings provide ground floor views out. |
| Play and other recreational facilities hidden away within developments rather than in located in more prominent locations that can help encourage new and existing residents to share a space. | | Parcels of POS are proposed and not confined to backland locations. They are positioned to account for future phases of development also |
| Not anticipating and responding to desire lines, such as between public transport stops and the entrances to buildings and other facilities. | | N/A |

4. HOMES FOR EVERYONE

| A range of homes that meet local community needs | Score | Commentary |
|---|-------|--|
| What Green Looks Like (from building for a healthy life) | | |
| Designing homes and streets where it is difficult to determine the tenure of properties through architectural, landscape or other differences. | | All dwellings will be built equal and tenure blind |
| Apartment buildings might separate tenure by core but each core must look exactly the same. | | N/A no apartments proposed |
| A range of housing typologies supported by local housing needs and policies to help create a broad-based community. | | Dwelling types provide a mix of size, design, plot size and tenure |
| Homes with the flexibility to meet changing needs. | | Dwelling types provide a mix of size, design, plot size and tenure |
| Affordable homes that are distributed across a development. | | All dwellings will be built equal and tenure blind and affordable homes will not be isolated |
| Access to some outdoor space suitable for drying clothes for apartments and maisonettes. | | All plots have access to enclosed outdoor space |
| Consider providing apartments and maisonettes with some private outdoor amenity space such as semi-private garden spaces for ground floor homes; balconies and terraces for homes above ground floor. | | All plots have access to enclosed outdoor space |
| What Red Looks Like (from building for a healthy life) and how the scheme responds positively | | |
| Grouping affordable homes in one place (except on smaller developments). | | All dwellings will be built equal and tenure blind |
| Dividing places and facilities such as play spaces by tenure. | | All dwellings will be built equal and tenure blind |
| Revealing the different tenure of homes through architecture, landscape, access, car parking, waste storage or other design features. | | All dwellings will be built equal and tenure blind |
| Not using the space around apartment buildings to best effect and where these could easily be used to create small, semi-private amenity spaces allocated to individual ground floor apartments. | | N/A no apartments proposed |

DISTINCTIVE PLACES

5. MAKING THE MOST OF WHAT'S THERE

| A range of homes that meet local community needs | Score | Commentary |
|---|-------|--|
| What Green Looks Like (from building for a healthy life) | | |
| Taking a walk to really understand the place where a new development is proposed and understand how any distinctive characteristics can be incorporated as features. | | The proposed development responds well to the surrounding context. Existing site features are limited but retained and incorporated where possible |
| Using existing assets as anchor features, such as mature trees and other existing features. | | Existing mature tree to the Barton Road frontage has been incorporated into the development to provide a focal point adjacent the proposed POS |
| Positive characteristics such as street types, landscape character, urban grain, plot shapes and sizes, building forms and materials being used to reflect local character. | | |
| Sensitive transitions between existing and new development so that building heights, typologies and tenures sit comfortably next to each other. | | |
| Remember the 'four pillars' 12 of sustainable drainage systems. | | A SUDS basin is proposed to provide an above ground SUDS feature for the development |
| Protecting and enhancing existing habitats; creating new habitats. | | The existing hedgerows are protected by a buffer which will be maintained by the registered provider not divided between individual dwellings. New hedgrow boundaries are an opportunity to connect existing hedgrows and create new habitats. |
| Interlocking back gardens between existing and new development (where existing back gardens adjoin a site boundary). | | Development either backs onto existing gardens (with a hedgrow buffer maintained between not split between private gardens) or is outward looking to avoid dominant back gardens fencing. |
| What Red Looks Like (from building for a healthy life) and how the scheme responds positively | | |
| Designing without walking the site first. | | |
| Funnelling rainwater away in underground pipes as the default water management strategy. | | A SUDS basin is proposed to provide an above ground SUDS feature for the development |
| Unmanaged gaps between development used as privacy buffers to existing residents. | | N/A |

| | | |
|--|--|---|
| Placing retained hedges between rear garden boundaries or into private ownership. | | Existing hedges are subject to a protection buffer which has been designed to be within one ownership, not divided between plots |
| Building orientations and designs that fail to capitalise on features such as open views. | | Development where possible is outward looking to avoid dominant back gardens fencing and to capitalise on open countryside views beyond the site. |
| Not being sensitive to existing neighbouring properties by responding to layout arrangements, housing typologies and building heights. | | The proposals are sensitive to the neighbouring developments, being of an appropriate scale, mass and layout to respect and enhance the context. |

6. A MEMORABLE CHARACTER

| Great places that are memorable | Score | Commentary |
|---|-------|--|
| What Green Looks Like (from building for a healthy life) | | |
| A strong, hand drawn design concept. To find the right solution a number of different ideas and options might need to be explored. | | a number of design iterations and arrangements were explored involving local planning officers in the process during the pre-application enquiry process |
| Drawing inspiration from local architectural and/or landscape character. | | predominant red and red multi bricks and mix of roof tiles of the historic village are used in the development with a contemporary clad element to add a sense of place and unique character |
| Reflecting character in either a traditional or contemporary style. | | predominant red and red multi bricks and mix of roof tiles of the historic village are used in the development with a contemporary clad element to add a sense of place and unique character |
| Structural landscaping as a way to create places with a memorable character. | | All plots have landscaped frontages with tree planting where possible and used around areas of POS to define and add interest. Roah heirarchy helps create a sense of place |
| Memorable spaces and building groupings. | | Dwellings are designed to have different architectural designs and material combinations arranged in groups helping to create character areas and a sense of place |
| Place names that have a connection to the locality can help stimulate ideas and design thought. A place name like 'Valley View' will always be more helpful on larger, multi-developer developments than generic terms such as 'Parcel R5.1'. | | Development name yet to be determined |
| What Red Looks Like (from building for a healthy life) and how the scheme responds positively | | |
| Using a predetermined sequence of house types to dictate a layout. | | The dwellings have been individually designed to respond to the site, it's context and constraints |
| Attempting to create character through poor replication of architectural features or details. | | None of the features proposed create a pastiche |
| Arranging buildings next to each other in a way that does not create a cohesive street scene. | | The dwellings are arranged to form strong street frontages and perimeter developments, creating a cohesive street scene |
| Referencing generic or forgettable development nearby to justify more of the same. | | N/A |

7. WELL DEFINED STREETS AND SPACES

| Create a networks of streets and spaces that are well enclosed by buildings and or structural landscaping, taking care to ensure that front doors and principal facades of buildings face streets and public spaces. | Score | Commentary |
|--|-------|---|
| What Green Looks Like (from building for a healthy life) | | |
| Streets with active frontages. | | Street scenes are carefully considered to ensure active frontages to all aspects and no blank elevations |
| Well defined streets and spaces, using buildings, landscaping and/or water to enclose and define spaces. | | Buildings are generally positioned close to the road to help define the spaces, with side parking set back at the building line. |
| Cohesive building compositions and building lines. | | Consistent building lines are proposed to all streets with consistent set backs to each street. |
| Front doors that face streets and public spaces. | | All front doors face public spaces |
| Apartments that offer frequent front doors to the street. | | N/A |
| Dual aspect homes on street corners with windows serving habitable rooms. | | All corners have corner turn housetypes |
| Perimeter blocks. | | the development is designed around a series of perimeter blocks |
| Well resolved internal vistas. | | vistas are either stopped by strategically placed buildings or provide open vistas to the countryside beyond. |
| Building typologies that are designed to straddle narrow depth blocks. | | N/A - blocks are generally formed of narrow frontage housetypes with side parking as the most efficient layout whilst providing considered street scenes and building arrangement |
| What Red Looks Like (from building for a healthy life) and how the scheme responds positively | | |
| Distributor roads and restricted frontage access. | | N/A |
| Broken or fragmented perimeter block structure. | | N/A - designed out |
| Presenting blank or largely blank elevations to streets and public spaces | | Dual aspect dwellings proposed or dwellings front open spaces |
| Lack of front boundaries, street planting and trees. | | Plot frontages are landscaped to define private space |
| Apartment buildings with single or limited points of access. | | N/A |

| | | |
|---|--|---|
| Apartment buildings accessed away from the street. | | N/A |
| Staggered and haphazard building lines that are often created by placing homes with a mix of front and side parking arrangements next to each other. | | Streets are arranged with either side, or frontage parking to define the building line, not both on the same street |
| Street corners with blank or largely blank sided buildings and/or driveways. Street edges with garages, back garden spaces enclosed by long stretches of fencing or wall. | | N/A dual aspect dwellings proposed |
| Buffers between new and existing development that create channels of movement between back gardens whether access is permitted or not. | | Hedgrows buffer required which creates a maintenance route between new and existing plots |
| Single aspect homes on street corners. | | N/A - dual aspect dwellings proposed |
| Bits of left over land between the blank flank walls of buildings. | | The site layout has carefully considered land ownership and future maintenance to avoid such features |

8. EASY TO FIND YOUR WAY AROUND

| Use legible features to help people find their way around a place | Score | Commentary |
|--|-------|--|
| What Green Looks Like (from building for a healthy life) | | |
| Designing for legibility when creating a concept plan for a place. | | not specifically referenced |
| Using streets as the main way to help people find their way around a place. For instance, principal streets can be made different to more minor streets through the use of different spatial characteristics, building typologies, building to street relationships, landscape strategies and boundary treatments. | | Simple street heirarchy of primary access and private drive / shared surfaces proposed |
| Navigable features for those with visual, mobility or other limitations. | | not specifically referenced |
| Frame views of features on or beyond a site. | | not specifically referenced |
| Create new legible elements or features on larger developments – further reinforce legible features where necessary through the landscape strategy, building and layout design, hard landscaping and boundaries. | | not specifically referenced |
| Simple street patterns based on formal or more relaxed grid patterns. | | Street patterns generally simple and well connected . Private drives clearly demarked in different surface material to avoid confusion as vehicle through route. |
| What Red Looks Like (from building for a healthy life) and how the scheme responds positively | | |
| No meaningful variation between street types. | | Simple street heirarchy of primary access and private drive / shared surfaces proposed |
| Disorientating curvilinear street patterns. | | Streets are primarily linear avoiding unnessecary direction changes |
| Disconnected streets, paths and routes. | | N/A |
| Building typologies, uses, densities, landscaping or other physical features are not used to create places that are different to one another. | | N/A |
| Cul de sac based street patterns. | | All routes provide pedestrian links to other routes to ensure permeability of the development. |

STREETS FOR ALL

9. HEALTHY STREETS

| Streets are different to roads. Streets are places where the need to accommodate the movement of motor vehicles is balanced alongside the need for people to move along and cross streets with ease. Activity in the street is an essential part of a successful public realm. | Score | Commentary |
|--|-------|---|
| What Green Looks Like (from building for a healthy life) | | |
| Streets for people. | | Streets include raised tables, continuous paths, shared surfaces, hidden parking |
| 20mph (or lower) design speeds; 20mph designations. | | Streets should be designated as such |
| Tree lined streets. Make sure that trees have sufficient space to grow above and below ground, with long term management arrangements in place. | | No street trees currently shown |
| Tight corner radii (3m or less). | | Currently drawn at 6m radius but could consider tighter radius subject to highways officer input. |
| Places to sit, space to chat or play within the street. | | Limited opportunities beyond POS |
| Pavements and cycleways that continue across side streets. | | Side streets are either pavement cross overs or include raised tables |
| Anticipating and responding to pedestrian and cycle 'desire lines' (the most direct routes between the places people will want to travel between). | | This has been considered where possible subject to existing site features (gaps in hedgrows dictacting footpath locations) and proposed block structure |
| Landscape layers that add sensory richness to a place – visual, scent and sound. | | All front gardens landscaped enriching the street scene |
| What Red Looks Like (from building for a healthy life) and how the scheme responds positively | | |
| Roads for cars. | | Simple street heirarchy of primary access and private drive / shared surfaces proposed to limit car dominance |

| | | |
|---|--|--|
| Failure to adhere to the user hierarchy set out in Manual for Streets. | | |
| Wide and sweeping corner radii (6m or more). | | Radii 6m maximum, could be reduced subject to highway officers comment and tracking |
| 6m+ wide carriageways. | | Main access 5.5m wide, private drives 6m wide where required for vehicle manoeuvring. No roads in excess of 6m carriageway width |
| Highways engineering details that make pedestrian and cycle movements more complex and difficult. | | Side streets are either pavement cross overs or include raised tables |
| Street trees conveyed to individual occupiers. | | Trees are within private curtilage |
| Distributor roads with limited frontage access, served by private drives. | | N/A |
| Painted white line cycle routes on pavements or on carriageways. | | N/A |
| Speed control measures that rely on significant shifts in street alignment that contribute towards wasting land whilst also creating disorientating places. | | N/A |

10. CYCLE AND CAR PARKING

| Well-designed development will make it more attractive for people to choose to walk or cycle for short trips helping to improve levels of physical activity, air quality, local congestion and the quality of the street scene. Well-designed streets will also provide sufficient and well-integrated car parking. | Score | Commentary |
|---|-------|---|
| What Green Looks Like (from building for a healthy life) | | |
| At least storage for one cycle where it is as easy to access as the car. | | Sheds will be provided where specified by employers requirements. Gardens have adequate space for sheds. |
| Secure and overlooked cycle parking that is as close to (if not closer) than car parking spaces (or car drop off bays) to the entrances of schools, shops and other services and facilities. | | N/A |
| Shared and unallocated on street car parking. | | On street unallocated parking possible but not specifically indicated |
| Landscaping to help settle parked cars into the street. | | Where parking is not entirely concealed to the side of dwellings pockets of landscaping are proposed to frontages to break up expanses of parking. |
| Frontage parking where the space equivalent to a parking space is given over to green relief every four bays or so. | | Parking limited to 4 bays wide where frontage parking |
| Anticipating and designing out (or controlling) anti-social car parking. | | All parking allocated and clearly demarked. Areas of POS closed off by timber knee rail to prevent unwanted vehicle access. Areas of uncontrolled landscaping designed out. |
| A range of parking solutions. | | All parking either within curtilage or clearly defined (no shared parking areas). Potential for on street incidental / visitor parking |
| Small and overlooked parking courtyards, with properties within courtyard spaces with ground floor habitable rooms. | | N/A |
| Staying up to date with rapidly advancing electric car technology. | | All plots to be provided with provision for electric vehicle charging but subject to detailed design and specification |
| More creative cycle and car parking solutions. | | Standard approaches shown |

What Red Looks Like (from building for a healthy life) and how the scheme responds positively

| | | |
|---|--|--|
| Providing all cycle storage in garages and sheds. | | Sheds will be provided where specified by employers requirements. Gardens have adequate storage for sheds. |
| Over reliance on integral garages with frontage driveways. | | N/A no garage provision proposed |
| Frontage car parking with little or no softening landscaping. | | Where side parking is provided entire car space is concealed behind building line. Where frontage parking is proposed groups of spaces are limited to 4 spaces wide and broken up with soft landscaping where possible |
| Parking courtyards enclosed by fencing; poorly overlooked, poorly lit and poorly detailed. | | N/A no parking courts proposed |
| Over-reliance on tandem parking arrangements. | | A number of plots do have tandem parking provision |
| Failing to anticipate and respond to displaced and other anti-social parking. | | All parking allocated and clearly demarked. Areas of POS closed off by timber knee rail to prevent unwanted vehicle access. Areas of uncontrolled landscaping designed out. |
| Views along streets that are dominated by parked cars, driveways or garages. | | Where side parking is provided entire car space is concealed behind building line. Where frontage parking is proposed groups of spaces are limited to 4 spaces wide and broken up with soft landscaping where possible |
| Car parking spaces that are too narrow making it difficult for people to use them. | | Spaces have 500mm to each side where against a wall or structure. |
| Cycle parking that is located further away to the entrances to shops, schools and other facilities than car parking spaces and car drop off bays. | | N/A |
| Relying on garages being used for everyday car parking. | | N/A no garage provision proposed |

11. GREEN AND BLUE INFRASTRUCTURE

| Creative surface water management such as rills, brook and ponds enrich the public realm and help improve a sense of wellbeing and offer an interaction with nature. As the richest habitat for a range of flora and fauna, they are also a key play in achieving the net gain in biodiversity sought by the 2020 Environment Bill. | Score | Commentary |
|---|-------|------------|
| What Green Looks Like (from building for a healthy life) | | |

| | | |
|--|-------|--|
| Biodiversity net gain. | | As this is a reserved matters application the mandatory net gain does not apply. However the development includes opportunity for bio diversity in the form of frontage landscaping, new hedgrows boundaries and public open space / landscape buffer planting |
| Movement and feeding corridors for wildlife, such as hedgehog highways. Bird boxes, swift nesting bricks and bat bricks may be appropriate. | | Such features subject to detailed design but will be included where recommended by ecology reports |
| Plans that identify the character of new spaces, such as 'parks', 'woodland', 'allotments', 'wildflower meadows' rather than 'P.O.S.'. Be more specific about the function and character of public open spaces. | | areas of POS subject to detailed design by specialists. Plans offer good potential for areas with character to suit their defined function (as required by S106 agreement for provision of open space) |
| Create Park Run ready routes on larger developments and other ways to encourage physical activity and social interaction. | | N/A given scale of development |
| Capturing and managing water creatively and close to where it falls using features such as rain gardens and permeable surfaces. Allow people to connect with water. | | Rainwater directed to single above ground SUDS feature within landscaped POS. |
| Create a habitat network providing residents with opportunities to interact with nature on a day to day basis. Wildlife does not flourish within disconnected back gardens, artificial lawns and tightly mown grass. | | All frontages are landscaped, predominantly with hedge / shrub species to form a new network of nature. New hedgrows planting to site boundaries creates and reinforces connections to wider hedgrows network |
| Provide natural surveillance opportunities. | | The site has been designed to avoid dead ends or blank elevations - all public areas benefit from natural surveillance |
| A connected and accessible network of public open spaces with paths and other routes into and through. | | A site wide masterplan has been produced which creates links between the various pockets of POS and access / egress points into the site from the wider area, allowing others to access the POS, not just new residents |
| Species rich grasslands. | | Refer to landscape design but there appears to be opportunity for this and a variety of seed mix / species is proposed. |
| Well considered management arrangements whether public or privately managed. | | Refer to site management strategy and landscape management plan. Spaces clearly defined as public or private to ensure ongoing maintenance and care |
| What Red Looks Like (from building for a healthy life) and how the scheme responds positively | | |
| Surface water management by way of a large, steep sided and fenced holes in the ground. | | |
| Small pieces of land (typically grassed over) that offer little or no public, private or biodiversity value that over time become neglected and forgotten. | | These have been designed out and either grouped into larger areas, or allocated to private plots |
| Large expanses of impervious surfaces. | | Subject to detailed drainage strategy design |
| Not designing paths and routes through open spaces where it is difficult for people to create distance between themselves and other people when social distancing restrictions are in place. | | All pathways are a minimum of 2m in width, and have either alternative provision (opposite side of carriageway for example) or are only fenced on one side to allow people to socially distance if required. |
| Buildings that turn away from open spaces. | | These have been designed out |
| Poor quality finishing, detailing and maintenance. | | Subject to install. Landscape management has been considered |
| 12. BACK OF PAVEMENT, FRONT OF HOME | | |
| Garden cities, town and suburbs used hedges to define public and private spaces, helping create characterful and biodiverse places. The space between the back of the pavement and the face of buildings has a significant impact on the quality of a place. Clear demarcations between public and private spaces can encourage people to personalise the front of their homes whilst also offering opportunities to integrate level changes, utility boxes and waste storage. | Score | Commentary |
| What Green Looks Like (from building for a healthy life) | | |
| Defensible space and strong boundary treatments. | | All frontages are landscaped, predominantly with hedge / shrub species to form boundary to back edge of pavement |
| Boundary treatments that add ecological value and/or reinforce distinctive local characteristics. | | All frontages are landscaped, predominantly with hedge / shrub species to form boundary to back edge of pavement |
| Well integrated waste storage and utility boxes. If relying on rear garden storage solutions for terraces and townhouses, provide direct access to these from the street. | | Any terraces are short (3 dwellings) with middle unit having dedicated rear access path to provide access to the street. Bin storage space is located close to the rear access path to reduce bin carry distance as far as possible. Meter boxes to be painted to match adjacent material (brick) and positioned away from front elevations where possible |
| Front garden spaces that create opportunities for social interaction. | | A number of shared pathways to front doors are designed in which would provide opportunity for interaction. |
| Ground floor apartments with their own front doors and semi-private amenity spaces help to enliven the street whilst also reducing the amount of people using communal areas. | | N/A |
| Consider providing terraces or balconies to above ground floor apartments – these can also help to enliven the street, increase natural surveillance and provide residents with access to the open air. | | N/A |
| No left over spaces with no clear public or private function. | | All spaces have been designed to have public and private definition. A maintenance plan has been produced to clearly identify the strategy |
| Consider apartment buildings whose access is from a deck rather than a corridor, enabling cross ventilation of apartments while limiting shared common parts which are enclosed. | | N/A |
| What Red Looks Like (from building for a healthy life) and how the scheme responds positively | | |
| Poorly considered spaces between the back of the pavement and the face of buildings that erode the quality of the street environment. | | All frontages are landscaped, predominantly with hedge / shrub species to form boundary to back edge of pavement |
| Narrow and small grass frontage strips for space between the back of the street and the façades of buildings that are impractical to maintain. | | Frontages are a minimum of 1.2m (generally 2m+) to ensure adequate space for hedge planting and soft landscaping. |
| Waste storage solutions for terraced homes that rely on residents storing bins and crates in rear garden spaces and instead often sees bins and crates placed next to front doors. | | Any terraces are short (3 dwellings) with middle unit having dedicated rear access path to provide access to the street. Bin storage space is located close to the rear access path to reduce bin carry distance as far as possible |
| Slab on edge. | | N/A |
| Concrete screed with pebbles. | | N/A |

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| Prominent external pipes, flues and utility boxes. | | All SVPS are internal. Rainwater goods are black to match fascias and soffits. Meter boxes to be painted to match adjacent material (brick) and positioned away from front elevations where possible |
| Pieces of left over land between or to the side of buildings with no clear public or private function. | | These have been designed out |
| Poorly resolved changes in level. | | Subject to detailed design, but the general topography of the site is flat so no issues are envisaged. |