

Dear Lee,

RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT COMPROMISING ERECTION OF UP TO 204 HOUSES WITH PARKING TOGETHER WITH CONSTRUCTION OF VEHICULAR/PEDESTRIAN ACCESSES OFF STONEY LANE, PEDESTRIAN ACCESS OFF CUMBER LANE, SUB-STATIONS, FOUL WATER PUMP STATION, SUDS BALANCNG POND AND ASSOCIATED PUBLIC OPEN SPACE, LANDSCAPING AND ASSOCIATED WORKS.

PLANNING REFERENCE 25/00672/FUL

In response to the comments received from yourself relating to Design, dated 17th July 2026, in relation to our submission, please find our responses with any relevant information detailed below.

Note, that as discussed, these comments form our formal response and, to reduce the number of revisions and overlapping submissions, the updated drawings which accompany these amends will follow upon receipt of any further Highways or Design comments.

Comments and/or Queries

Brick

In conjunction with the comments received in orange, please see our responses below in *italics*:

Thank you for confirming that the grey brick has now been omitted. We note that the revised brick options, namely Forterra Farmstead Antique, Ibstock Leicester Weathered, and Crest Selbourne Red Multi, are all acceptable.

Could you please provide updated elevation drawings of the house types showing these proposed bricks applied, similar to the previously issued drawings that illustrated the original brick selections? This will help us review the appearance of the revised materials across the development.

Noted. The House Type Pack, Street Scenes and CGIs have been updated to suit.

Cladding

In conjunction with the comments received in orange, please see our responses below in *italics*:

With regard to the proposed cladding, reference has been made to examples on Stoney Lane and Cumber Lane in support of its use. However, where cladding is present on these dwellings, it is generally used on a much smaller and more restrained scale than is currently being proposed.

Typically, the cladding is limited to areas between the ground floor lounge window and the first floor principal bedroom window, together with sections beneath the lounge window. Horizontally, it generally does not extend beyond the width of the lounge/bedroom window arrangement.

We do not consider the school to be a directly comparable example, as it is a large institutional building with different design considerations and visual characteristics. Similarly, while the former factory site has been referenced, it is largely screened from public view by its substantial boundary wall. In contrast, the proposed residential development will be much more open and prominent within the street scene, making the appearance of the dwellings far more visible from outside the site. In addition the use of the proposed cladding as a nod to the previous industrial building and railway sidings is not considered appropriate.

Having carefully considered the cladding proposals and the justification put forward by Taylor Wimpey, we remain of the view that the extent of cladding proposed is not supported. Should cladding still be pursued, it may be acceptable if significantly reduced and limited to a scale more in keeping with the existing residential properties in the locality, as outlined above and such would then be considered once updated drawings were received. If a nod to the past is wanted an alternative should be proposed rather than the proposed cladding.

The use of a suitable render finish where appropriate would be acceptable.

As per your request, we have removed the cladding and replaced this with a rough-cast render finish in white. The updated House Type Pack, Street Scenes, Materials Layout and CGIs are provided.

Interface Distances

In conjunction with the comments received in orange, please see our responses below in *italics*:

Having reviewed the revised portion of the layout included within your response (at 1:500 scale), it is noted that the separation distances now appear to accord with the LPA's standards as set out in the New Residential Development SPD.

We note that the dwellings are now positioned closer to the road, which would create a more urban character in this part of the development than was previously proposed. It would therefore be helpful for the Design and Access Statement, or supporting information, to explain how the revised dwelling positions contribute positively to the overall layout, character and design approach of the scheme.

The revised rear garden arrangement for Plot 13 is welcomed and appears to provide a more usable outdoor space. It is noted that the shared boundary between Plots 12 and 13 now runs slightly obliquely, resulting in a modest widening of the rear portion of Plot 13's garden and a corresponding slight reduction in the rear part of Plot 12's garden. As shown on the Coloured Planning Layout drawing, the boundary terminates slightly closer to the detached building within the curtilage of the existing dwelling to the rear.

The DAS has been updated and provided to demonstrate how we have listened to and implemented your comments.

Boundary Treatments

In conjunction with the comments received in orange, please see our responses below in *italics*:

It is noted that properties occupying corner plots, or those with rear garden boundaries facing roads, accessways, or other publicly visible areas, will be enclosed by brick walls and that this will be reflected on an updated Boundary Treatment Plan.

When the revised Boundary Treatment Plan is submitted, please ensure that the various boundary treatments are clearly distinguished using distinct colours and/or an easily identifiable key. The use of mono-coloured dots, dashes, or similar line styles can be difficult to interpret and should be avoided where possible.

The comments regarding the proposed southern boundary wall are noted. However, our final view on this element will be reserved until the site visit has been undertaken following completion of the demolition works.

We also note that the proposed bollards are specified as BX01 5503 Heavy Duty Tall Bollards. Please provide elevation details of the bollards, together with clarification of their operation. In particular, details should be provided on how they are intended to be lowered or removed when access is required. For example, if they are to be hinge-mounted and operated by key, this should be confirmed. If an alternative mechanism is proposed, details of its operation and management should be provided where applicable.

Noted, we have provided a detail drawing for the BX01 5503 Heavy Duty Tall Bollard, which is designed as a lift-out design with integrated lifting handles and a black and white highly visible powered-coated finish.

Layout Issues and Maintenance of Common Land

In conjunction with the comments received in orange, please see our responses below in *italics*:

It is noted that the two terrace blocks have been repositioned so that they sit side-by-side in a more central location within this part of the development.

However, further consideration should be given to the positioning of the Cookham house types at either end of the terrace so that there would be a build-up in height from the ends to the centre. Furthermore, could the dwelling on Plot 203 be amended and the house type

relocated elsewhere within the scheme? As currently proposed, Plot 203 is the only dwelling along this stretch of the layout with its ridge orientated in a different direction to the surrounding properties. This creates an incongruous feature that appears somewhat at odds with the otherwise consistent arrangement of dwellings in this part of the development and detracts from the overall cohesion of the street scene.

It is noted that no railings or other boundary treatment are proposed adjacent to the woodland area along Stony Lane, and that the line shown denotes an adopted grass verge. This is noted and accepted.

The comments regarding the areas of 'open land' are also noted. We understand that these areas will be maintained by a management company and that all such areas will be clearly identified on the forthcoming revised Adoptable Areas Layout (Rev A) drawing. If details of the proposed management company are available at this stage, these should also be submitted.

Noted, we have repositioned the 2.5 storey dwellings and bookended them with gable fronted house types. This allows for natural increase in ridge heights along the street scene as well as ensuring that Plot 203 feels more coherent and in-keeping.



Plot 51

In conjunction with the comments received in orange, please see our responses below in *italics*:

Apologies, the comments should relate to Plot 51 rather than Plot 50, however the comments remain unchanged.

The parking for Plot 51 is cited alongside the gable of the dwelling due to ensuring that there is sufficient landscaping to the street scene where runs of upfront parking are present. Also, due to the pump station tracking, we are unable to fit upfront parking in this area for Plot 51.

To provide natural surveillance to the driveway for this plot, we have fitted a gable window to the lounge which overlooks the driveway and pump station. We have also enlarged Plot 51's garden to abut the proposed line of the paladin fencing, removing the area of open landscaping between the plot's garden and pump station curtilage, meaning that there's a small area of landscaping buffer in the curvature between Plot 51's driveway and the paladin fencing.

I trust that this alleviates concerns regarding this plot. The updated house type pack, showing this additional window, has been provided.



I trust the information we have submitted in response to the comments received from yourself regarding Design provide the requested clarifications and information.

Yours Sincerely,

Brandon Bardsley

Senior Design & Planning Executive