

Building for Life Assessment

Site Address:

Land North of Calvin Court, Kingsley, Staffordshire. ST10 2DY

Applicant:

Hammonds Construction Ltd

Proposal:

Erection of 9no. bungalows: 4no. for the over 55s and 5no. standard market.
Scheme 7

Planning Statement:

Date Issued: 21st June 2025

Job Reference: 6060

1. Introduction:

- 1.1 This application is classed as a minor residential development, the construction of 9 No. Bungalows being less than the major development criteria of 10 dwellings, however, Scheme 7 has been assessed against the 20 Building for Life Criteria set out by CABE.
- 1.2 There are no formal requirements for a building for life assessment on this scheme based on the number of units, however, the assessment has been prepared to demonstrate the benefits of this development.
- 1.3 The following tables have been made answering each of the 20 questions about the proposed developments, with an answer for each of the 20 questions about the proposed development and a score rating that follows the BFL scoring system of 0, 0.5 or 1. The total score should ideally reach over 14 to be classed as 'good' design and over 16 to be classed as 'very good'.

2. Environment and Community

- 2.1 **Question:** Does the development provide (or is close to) community facilities, such as a school, parks, play areas, shops, pubs or cafes?
 - **Answer:** As set out in the planning statement, the development is within proximity to both villages of Kingsley and Kingsley Holt and is a short drive of Cheadle Town Centre. A variety of services are on offer in Kingsley, Kingsley Holt and Cheadle.
 - The residents will have opportunities to walk, take the bus or drive to all community facilities and amenities. Local schools, shops, post office, pubs, village halls, community buildings, churches are all within walking distance, and large convenience stores, doctors, leisure centers are all within driving distance or a bus journey.
 - It is not considered that the development will result in undue additional demands placed on those existing services.

Score: 1

- 2.2 **Question:** Is there an accommodation mix that reflects the needs and aspirations of the local community?
 - **Answer:** The demand to propose housing for older people is critical, both nationally and locally. As outlined in the planning statement, there is a clear lack of over 55 housing within Staffordshire Moorlands.

Score: 1

2.3 **Question:** Is there a tenure mix that reflects the needs of the local community.

- **Answer:** It is well considered locally and nationally that there is a shortage of bungalow dwellings. Bungalow dwellings are practical for both older generations or those with disabilities which benefit from not having to use the stairs. Typically, however, bungalows are very desirable for older generations (Over 55's), both Kingsley and Kingsley Holt has an increased demand for bungalows with a common motivation for downsizing but being able to stay within the local area.
- Based on the guidance from the planning department, The proposed units in scheme 7 have been limited to only 2 bedrooms, the ambition is to reduce the impact on the openness and thus the building footprints have been reduced.

Score: 1

2.4 **Question:** Does the development have easy access to public transport.

Answer: The site is extremely well served by public transport with a bus stop immediately outside of the site. Public transport links extend to Cheadle, Ipstones, Leek and Hanley and interconnecting links to most of Staffordshire.

Score: 1

2.5 **Question:** Does the development have any features that reduce its environmental impact?

Answer: Yes the development does have features to reduce its environmental impact. Please refer to the energy/ sustainability document.

Score: 0.5

3. Character

3.1 **Question:** Is the design specific to the scheme?

Answer: The new properties have been specifically designed to be of a similar scale and proportion to that of the recently approved bungalows at Calvin Court. The material palette matches the surrounding properties, and the density follows the same pattern of development.

The layout is partially dictated by the existing road infrastructure, but also the layout will serve to encourage social integration with active frontages, yet provide a high level of privacy with independent rear gardens

Score: 0.5

- 3.2 **Question:** Does the scheme exploit existing building, landscape or topography?

Answer: There are no buildings on site which are suitable for re use, however the scheme will follow the topography of the site. The site being relatively level once approached from the gradual gradient roadway from Calvin Court.

Score: 1

- 3.3 **Question:** Does the scheme feel like a plan with a distinctive character?

Answer: The most recent development of the 4 bungalows at Calvin Court sets strong precedent for the style and character of development,

We have worked with the planning officer since the latest refusal in order to bring forward a positive development scheme. Refer to the planning statement for details of the variations implemented to the scheme.

Score: 1

- 3.4 **Question:** Do the buildings and layout make it easy to find your way around?

Answer: Yes, the vehicle and pedestrian access point to the site is directly in line with the existing road and footpaths formed by the development of Clavin Court. The proposed dwellings are separated by the road, with individual drives and pedestrian footpath to the front doors of each dwelling. The fronts are open, with the principal access to the dwellings all facing the road.

Score: 1

- 3.5 **Question:** Are streets defined by a well-structured building layout?

Answer: Yes, We have worked with the planning officer since the latest refusal in order to bring forward a positive development scheme. Refer to the planning statement for details of the variations implemented to the scheme.

Score: 1

4. Streets, Parking and Pedestrianisation

- 4.1 **Question:** Does the building layout take priority over the streets and car parking, so that highways do not dominate?

Answer: Yes, We have worked with the planning officer since the latest refusal in order to bring forward a positive development scheme. Refer to the planning statement for details of the variations implemented to the scheme.

Score: 1

- 4.2 **Question:** Is the car parking well integrated and situated so it supports the street scene?

Answer: Yes, We have worked with the planning officer since the latest refusal in order to bring forward a positive development scheme. Refer to the planning statement for details of the variations implemented to the scheme.

Score: 1

- 4.3 **Question:** Are the street pedestrian, cycle and vehicle friendly?

Answer: The scheme comprises of a singular road with a pedestrian footpath to one sides, the new road connected to the existing highway road and footpath which are well served as pedestrian, cycle and vehicle routes.

Score: 1

- 4.4 **Question:** Does the scheme integrate with the existing streets, paths and surrounding development?

Answer: The development will use a new road, which is connected to the existing road infrastructure on Calvin Court. The proposal therefore integrates well with the existing arrangements.

Score: 1

- 4.5 **Question:** Are public spaces and pedestrian routes overlooked and do they feel safe?

Answer: Yes, the public spaces and routes would be well viewed from the newly constructed properties without losing privacy. The space is open with no screen or blocked area.

Score: 1

5. Design and Construction

- 5.1 **Question:** Is public space well designed and does it have suitable management arrangements in place?

Answer: The proposed dwellings will have their own garden and amenity space. There are some areas north of the site which are to be retained as public space, these will be managed and maintained by the applicant and the relevant management company.

Score: 1

- 5.2 **Question:** Do the buildings exhibit architectural quality?

Answer: The architectural influence are taken from the surrounding properties. We are proposing some minor improvements in the form of alternative brick colors, a brick band detail, stone cills and arched brick lintels and feature porches to the front elevations. All in line with the discussions and interactions with the planning team.

Score: 1

- 5.3 **Question:** Do the internal spaces and layouts allow for adaptation, conversion and extension?

Answer: Internally the bungalows can be reconfigured, with bedrooms suitable for use as other spaces such as additional living, dining, office space etc. The bathrooms are located next to bedrooms which will allow for the installation of interconnecting doors between the bathrooms and the bedrooms allowing direct access, future installation of hoists and other aids for transferring to and from the bathroom could prove beneficial.

All of the properties are suitable for alterations and extension subject to the necessary planning consent. The garden areas are sufficient to allow such extensions, without impacting on amenity and there is space between the dwellings and the existing building to meet the space about dwellings requirements.

Score: 1

- 5.4 **Question:** Has the scheme made use of advances in construction or technology that enhance its performance, quality and attractiveness?

Answer: Yes please refer to the energy/sustainability assessment.

Score: 0.5

- 5.5 **Question:** Do the buildings or spaces outperform the statutory minimum, such as building regulations?

Answer: Each dwelling is not only designed to meet the current housing

standard, they have been designed to extend the standards. The buildings will be constructed using the latest building techniques, and will fully comply to the building regulations Part L. The buildings will be highly efficient and sustainable. Where possible the use of renewable energy sources will be encouraged.

Score: 1

6. Conclusion

- 6.1 To conclude, Local Authorities have been encouraged to adopt the Building for Life Assessments. The total score should ideally reach over 14 to be classed as 'good' design and over 16 to be classed as 'very good'. There would be a very limited number of projects achieving a perfect score of 20, as every development and site has different constraints and therefore you could argue that there would always be at least one limitation. The score for this development achieves 18 which places the project in the very good category. The 0.5 scores in this project are well justified due to the nature of the site.