

**FROME CIVIC SOCIETY COMMENTS ON HOUSING AT SLIPPS NURSERY, FROME
APPLICATION NUMBER: 030138/019**

We object to this application for the following reasons:

1. **SITE LAYOUT:** The site layout for this scheme is fundamentally different from the site layout of the outline scheme (030138/018) submitted in July 2004 and given outline approval in July 2007. No reasons have been given in the Design and Access Statement, as required by the District Council, on why such fundamental changes have been made to the site layout.
2. **HOUSING DESIGN QUALITY:** The scheme is very poorly designed, very dull and very disappointing. This is a lost opportunity for the town. The scheme does not meet 13 of the 20 criteria set out in the government endorsed Building for Life standard (see www.buildingforlife.org), which aims to help councils meet the aspirations for housing quality set out in PPS 3 (Specifically, criteria 1, 2, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 13, 14, 15, 17, 18, and 20). Contrary to the claim in the Design and Access Statement, the design does not reflect the character of Frome and its poor quality will harm the character and quality of the adjoining Conservation Area. The D & A Statement says on pages 5.0 and 5.1 that this is a "Flagship development", that the "success of the scheme depends on detailed design" and that the 4 storey Apartment Block A has "detailing enhanced to reflect its landmark status". None of this is reflected in the drawings. (see also comment 11 below)
- 3: **SITE ACCESS:** The main access into the site is 6.5m wide between kerbs, which is excessively wide, and will be used for on street parking.
4. **THE MAIN SQUARE:** The main square at the heart of the site has been downgraded to become a junction between four roads. A useless front garden to Block A protrudes into the square.
5. **PEDESTRIAN LINKS:** Pedestrian access at the north west corner of the site, which was shown in the outline planning permission, has been omitted. This link is essential, and should be reinstated, as it will provide a much shorter access to Park Road, the Frome Medical Centre and access to the town centre via Catherine Hill.
6. **STREET ELEVATIONS:** Only 5 street elevations are shown. A further 7 street elevations are still required to properly assess the appearance of the scheme. The street elevation facing onto Butts Hill is extremely poor.
7. **LANDSCAPING:** The Planting Plan 0259.11.01 has no names attached to the planting locations on the scheme layout, making it impossible to assess the quality and suitability of the landscaping. There are very few street trees in the scheme.
8. **GARAGE DOORS FRONTING STREETS:** Garage doors front onto the main access road into the site. Garage doors on Plots 3, 4, 5, 70, 71 and 74 front onto the main access road into the site which will give a very unpleasant entrance into the scheme. On the left hand part of the loop road, Plots 55-65 provide a continuous frontage of garage doors, which will not create surveillance of the street.
9. **BLANK GABLE WALLS:** The almost blank gable end walls of Plots 53 and 54 will not provide surveillance of the footpath to the Mary Bailey Playing Field. Plots 1, 2, 21, 22, 26, 69 and 74 all provide blank gable end walls to the public realm. The blank gable end of Plot 1 will be very visible to Butts Hill.
10. **SINGLE ASPECT APARTMENTS:** Apartments in Plots 58 and 59 only have windows facing north east.

Please reply to:

Whitemill, Marston Lane, Frome, Somerset BA11 4DG. Tel: 01373-462644
E-Mail: johnpeverley@yahoo.co.uk

11. POOR QUALITY ELEVATIONS: Dwg. No. 0333/204 and 205 show very poor quality elevations of the "Landmark" Block A.
12. MATERIALS: Page 7.0 of the D & A Statement refers to "stonework" but page 7.2 shows only reconstructed stone.
13. AFFORDABLE HOUSING: No mention is made of providing a range of tenures, social housing or affordable homes, or where these would be located.
14. SUSTAINABILITY: Reference is made to current building regulations, but this does not address Local Plan policy ER1, nor meet current government guidance or the emerging policies in the LDF which require higher levels.
15. SOUTH WEST DESIGN REVIEW PANEL: This large scheme should be referred to the South West Design Review Panel for comment.