

		CALA		CRUDEN		AMA
Use	10	100% residential	10	100% residential	10	100% residential
Housing mix	10	Mix of 2 & 3 bed units; 25% affordable	10	Mix of 1,2,3 bed units; 25% affordable	10	Mix of 2,3, a4 bed units; 25% affordable (for older people).
Layout	5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - North boundary: Houses too close to existing gardens. Likely to breach 45° rule governing building height relative to distance from boundary (EDG p 78). - South boundary: opportunity missed to vary/increase density overlooking allotments. - Reasonable level of usable private open space. 	5	<p>Strong street frontage supported.</p> <p>But:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - excessively high proportion of site area allocated to parking, resulting in poor outlook for some homes; - overall, inadequate levels of useable open space; - Some houses too close to north, east and west boundaries, breaching 45° rule. 	5	<p>Footprint has potential to deliver good quality, usable communal and private open space.</p> <p>But</p> <p>Overdevelopment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - too close to boundaries (especially north); - Communal open space dominated by parking; - Problematic height – see below.
Parking	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Visual character of public realm dominated by car parking, either on street or in-curtilage. - Satisfactory level of cycle parking and EV charging - Too much parking (100%) 	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Spatial character dominated by car parking. - No info on cycle parking or EV charging - Too much parking (100%) 	5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Layout maximises potential for future controlled parking. - Satisfactory level of cycle parking <p>But</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Too much parking (100%)
Density	3	47 dph – probably too low	5	66 dph – probably okay?	4	- 73.8 dph –too high? (matches highest neighbouring density but doesn't take account of extent to which densities vary at site edges).
Building height and massing	5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Unimaginative use of height/massing in response to context. - Could increase density by going higher. 	3	Heights probably acceptable (2.5 - 4 storeys) but massing shows little sensitivity to context.	4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Over-scaled/too high for backland development; - No reference to surrounding grain.
Trees	7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Intention to retain most mature trees. <p>But</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Opportunity for new planting constrained by high proportion of site area covered by buildings or hardstanding (roadway/parking). 	5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - No retention of existing trees. - Opportunity for new planting constrained by high proportion of site area covered by buildings or hardstanding (parking). 	5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Good level of new planting <p>But</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - No retention of existing trees.

Amenity/privacy	6	Layout minimises overlooking residential properties abutting the site, which complies with EDG. But: - homes are too close to north boundary, which could impact negatively on sunlight to existing gardens. - Failure to use existing pattern of development to define appropriate privacy distances is at odds with EDG guidance.	4	- Failure to use existing pattern of development to define appropriate privacy distances is at odds with EDG guidance. - Some homes are excessively close to boundaries.	2	Failure to use existing pattern of development to define appropriate privacy distances is at odds with EDG guidance.
Overall design quality	5	Standard volume house product; unimaginative layout and appearance	4	- Inadequate levels of private open space; - Visual and spatial character of all open space very poor and dominated by car parking.	6	Layout has potential to respond well to context and deliver good residential quality. But heights need to reduce and distances increase between buildings and boundaries.
TOTAL	54		48		51	