

## Edwards T

Tara,

Sorry time has run away in making a more detailed response on the Rainbow brief. There has obviously been a lot of work carried out in developing a framework for the brief.

My principle comments are:

### Section 4. Brief

My observation relates to the site planning and the use of built development to provide enhanced site conditions within the site. As the site has railway noise and disruption on every boundary the most effective way of masking this adverse marginal condition would be to place buildings close to the railway boundary, utilising the less sensitive uses (such as bathrooms and kitchens in residential uses) on this boundary. The open amenity spaces should be collected in the core and not dissipated between building facades and the railway. With the prospect of longer trains and therefore longer duration of noise the site planning should seek to provide more of a public realm oasis in the core where amenity and site conditions can be managed within a defensive perimeter. The current indicative site planning does not seem to fully respond to the perimeter constraints. Landscape spaces at the foot of a building next to railway lines will have little to commend them to residents in terms of amenity.

### Section 4 Aims and 5.3.2 Residential accommodation.

In view of the sites proximity to good public transport, library, local shops, and with a benefit of reducing demand on school places I would have suggested that the housing mix should not be angled too much to family affordable housing but as being for sheltered and older age groups. The UK population as a whole is ageing and if older people can downsize to well designed smaller housing with local conveniences this may free up their use of larger housing in the borough

The kiss and ride recognition is welcomed.

I am responding to the brief individually and not representing the RPA.

Regards