

Harrison, Liz

From: Oliveira, Marta
Sent: 07 September 2023 14:21
To: Harrison, Liz
Subject: Ages Bowl

Hi Liz

I have now had the opportunity to look into the amendments drawings and my comments are as follows:

Most of my previous comments remain applicable to the current proposal. I'll be focusing the following comments on other concerns which respond to the submitted amendments.

In general, it is considered that the overall proposal is a setback comparing with the previous scheme in terms of vehicular and active travel network, e.g.: removal of the ramp and southern gateway/ pedestrian and cycling links to the residential neighbours near CA5 still to be sorted/ CA5 seems to fail to provide an appropriate design which would allow a future vehicular route to the settlement of West End/ potential conflicts between movements from future residents, hotel and retail users, drop in/ drop off from coach/bus/ taxis and anyone arriving on foot.

CA 1&2

- From an Urban Design perspective, it is a shame that the pedestrian ramp has been removed. As it stands, it is unclear how the proposal is improving the pedestrian access to the stadium. A great number of users is expected on event days and the current solution is not ideal. It was mentioned that Marshall Drive will be used on event days exclusively for pedestrians. That doesn't seem very feasible as there will always be the need to give access to the existing retail users as well as to the new residential occupants. It was also explained that an alternative vehicular route could be provided for future residents through the golf course towards Moorhill Road. The existing road doesn't have any passing places and is currently one way only. This scheme should be an opportunity to design a high-quality public space with great emphasis on the pedestrian circulation rather than use marshals.
- There is a dead-end road proposed along the water stream between the existing car park and the residential properties. More information should be provided to understand this proposal.
- I defer to comments by the Landscape Officer regarding the amendments to the overflow car park given the fact that they are more landscape related.
- Whilst I defer to separate comments by the Highways Officer, I have concerns with a few aspects of the proposed vehicular and pedestrian access arrangements, both into and around the site.

CA 4

- It is a shame that the pedestrian southern gateway has been removed. As it stands, it is unclear how the proposal is improving the pedestrian access to the stadium for those arriving from the southern park and ride. The previous scheme was proposing a welcoming and high-quality open space whilst reducing parking spaces and giving that space to the pedestrian.
- However, the proposed Care/Retirement Home is within the urban edge, it is contrary to Policy WE4 clause dii that states 'any residential development is located solely in the northwest corner of the site'.
- It is mentioned on the DAS that the architectural treatment was simplified and more in keeping with Hotel and Well Being Centre design. More information should be submitted in terms of elevations to acknowledge this fact.

- It is difficult to understand the improvements proposed to the landscape around the Care Home building. Sections through the site/ building would be required.

CA 5

- It is a shame that there aren't a lot of improvements in terms of pedestrians and cycling links to the residential neighbourhood.
- Regarding the potential vehicular access towards the Pitters site, it is felt that the proposed layout shows a too narrow access, looking straight to two trees and close to someone's garden. The layout should make sure that if in the future is viable to open a vehicular route, it's achievable to do that.
- In terms of layout, the site plan indicates an approach based on a series of perimeter blocks with housing facing outwards, enclosing private garden spaces within each block. This design principle works perfectly well and creates a greater sense of place with a clear distinction between private and public space where the buildings frontage creates a clear, direct, and positive relationship with the public realm, such as the public open space or the ecology area. However, the proposed perimeter blocks are quite large which doesn't allow for a lot of permeability from a pedestrian point of view.
- The overall proposal of CA5 still looks dense and cramped, that can be seen through the size of some of the proposed rear gardens, etc.
- In terms of the amount of private amenity space provided – size of rear gardens - while a comprehensive effort was made to increase them, there are still a few cases where they seem too small for the dwelling's size (i.e. terraced houses facing the Telegraph Woods). On another occasions, some of the dwellings still have rear gardens proposed at different levels overshadowed most of the times.
- More information is required to understand the amount of engineering works and retaining structures that will need to be undertaken to deliver this scheme.
- The site plan shows a significant level change along the Block of Apartments. Does this mean that open space between these buildings and the stadium is flat enough to provide an informal kick about area?
- The proposed built form of block of apartments seems to be acceptable; however, in terms of height, more clarification is needed to understand if the relation between the proposed buildings and the stadium/ and other distant views improved. Sections through the site will be required.
- There are still on some occasions green areas which are not clearly defined who will be managing them in the future (towards the Telegraph Woods).
- It's a shame that the proposed house types for the corner plots are not bespoke typologies that help to hold the corner and make a positive contribution for these prominent locations.
- Producing streetscenes is important to properly assess the proposal and should be submitted as well as providing visualisation of some of the roads to understand how the different housing typologies relate to each other. As it stands, there is a lot of variation from one side of the road to the other and it is difficult to assess the proposal.

I hope these comments are of help but please find me available if you need to discuss it further.

Kind regards
Marta

Marta Oliveira
Senior Urban Designer

Service Delivery - Specialist Services - Housing and Development

Ext.: 8032