**From:** Sharon Keen
**Sent:** 04 September 2017 14:48
**To:** Planning
**Subject:** Planning application 17/01466/F.

To whom this may concern,

I wish to strongly oppose this application (  17/01466/F. ) . Throughout the development of Heyford Park fences have been avoided wherever possible. The Design Code states properties should have open frontages, not fenced. The character of the area (Core Housing West) is inspired by Carswell Circle where there are no fences dividing public areas. Therefore this is to be a full planning application and not Reserved Matters to the original planning application as per the Bovis Homes phases this fence divides.

Bovis Homes have stated the LPA that the fence is required to provide “a degree of safety guarding to protect their children from the swale areas” and they “would hope that the LPA would prioritise safety for the children over permeability aspirations”. The swale areas have been deemed wild meadows and are safe. They are regularly mowed and eventually they will be planted with flowers. They are frequently used by children for play and recreation as designed. The LPA have however stated the fence must be permeable to allow the clear pathways through the development, hence the gaps. This renders the fence redundant. It simply does not make sense to have a public path running alongside a public (adoptable) road with a fence separating the two. This again presents dangerous scenarios as pedestrians using the (shared surface) roads would have nowhere to escape to if put in danger by a large vehicles or vehicles travelling at speed. This fence also separates the path from open areas such as the green next to the play area. It also creates small pockets of green where there should be large open areas, such as to the east of the fence where it meets Camp Road. This fence not only contravenes the Design Code of the Conservation Area but it is also inconsistent with the development. A small “timber trip fence” installed by Bovis Homes separates the children’s play area from the swale and is deemed safe. Therefore this fence is not needed, otherwise the play area, which should be the safest area of all, is unsafe. It appears to have been installed for aesthetic reasons only which contravenes the Design Code of the Conservation Area. The design code clearly states this area is a linear park and is an informal open space as opposed to the formal village centre. It goes on to state it should be a wild flower meadow with wet grasses and roughly mown grass and street furniture would be of a simple informal style, with the material typically being timber. This fence is divisive which goes against the open space and makes the area very formal. It is in the style of the fencing at Blenheim Palace. Without prejudice, if this fence was required to keep children safe, it doesn’t work. Small children can easily pass through the railings but adults caring for them cannot. This itself presents dangerous scenarios. Finally, if the fence is deemed as required to protect children from the meadow, then it should be between the wild meadow and the path, not between the path and the road.
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Sharon Keen

10 Gibson Drive, Heyford Park​