

# FORMER B&Q SITE, GREAT STONE ROAD

Stretford, M32 0YP

Appeal by Accrue (Forum) 1 LLP

LPA Ref: 100400/OUT/20

Appeal Ref: APP/Q4245/W/20/3258552

Summary Proof of Evidence

Document Reference: AC/3/A

Summary of Proof of Evidence in relation to massing, articulation and architectural design prepared by OEA on behalf of Accrue (Forum) 1 LLP

A development of 332 dwellings, car parking, public open space, retail and amenity spaces, and associated access.

1.1 The following sub-headings relate to the section headings in the Main Proof (AC/3/B).

#### Section 5 – Site Context

1.2 This section contains a description and aerial view of the existing site context.

#### Section 6 – Policy Context

1.3 This section sets out applicable policy documents related to the proposals.

#### Section 7 – Design Evolution

1.4 This section provides an overview of the issues raised by the site and its surrounding context and the key decisions informing the design process leading to the proposed scheme. It details the changes in layout, scale, height and massing made to the original scheme after constructive input from the Places Matter design panel. Most of the suggestions made by the panel were incorporated into the current scheme.

1.5 One exception to this was that, although the SE block was separated from the rest of the development as recommended, the other two elements retained a degree of connection at the rear of the site. This section provides an explanation for this decision.

#### Section 8 – RFR 3 – Scale, Height & Massing

1.6 This section examines the LPA claim that the proposal does not respond sensitively to the context of the site in terms of height scale and massing. This claim is refuted by a series of diagrams and illustrations which show that the scheme acknowledges the context of both the low-rise housing and the much larger massing of the slab-block offices and stands surrounding the cricket ground.

1.7 A number of accurate photo-montages of the building were submitted with the application but subsequent concerns about the appearance of the proposals from other views led to the commissioning of a series of verified views, the locations of which were agreed with the LPA. The views are shown with accompanying text explaining why the building would cause no visual detriment to its context and would instead be a high quality building and a positive contribution to the street scene

#### Section 9 – RFR 3 - Layout

1.8 It is claimed by the LPA that site coverage and boundary distances are inappropriate. This analyses site coverage for this site and compares it with nearby proposals with a very similar context approved by the LPA. It challenges the assertion that trees will be removed and that there is insufficient room around the site for new planting.

#### Section 10 – RFR 3 – Appearance, Density & Permeability

1.9 This section describes how the layout was amended after the design panel meeting, how the SE block was completely separated and how the design developed to improve permeability, creating a ground level connection between Great Stone Road and a possible future connection to the tram stop – an early request by the planners. As well as describing how the buildings are split into separate main elements it shows how they were further subdivided into visually separate volumes and explains their articulation and detail.

1.10A series of images show a virtual walk-by of the Great Stone Road frontage to illustrate the resulting design. This section also addresses questions raised regarding courtyard elevations and entrance to vertical circulation cores.

#### Section 11 – RFR 3 – Access & Pedestrian Permeability

1.11 Vehicular and pedestrian access is discussed in this section and questions the claim that new entrances along Great Stone Road are contrived by showing a series of views of these entrances showing that they would be simple and straightforward to use, encouraging pedestrian activity along the frontage and improving pedestrian permeability through the scheme.

#### Section 12 – RFR 5

1.12 Doubts cast regarding space standards are refuted in this section which states that all apartments comply with or exceed Nationally Described Space Standards.

1.13 It also refutes the claims that outlook to the housing to the SW and SE would be adversely affected along with suggestions that outlook from the apartments themselves would be inadequate.

#### Section 13 – RFR 6

1.14 This section sets out reasons why the proposed development would not have an inappropriate effect on neighbouring properties given the overall context of two storey housing and their existing neighbours, the six storey office blocks and the tall massings of the cricket ground.

1.15 It compares the proposal with another scheme approved by the LPA and currently under construction.