**From:** Tim Screen
**Sent:** 18 April 2017 16:09
**To:** Andrew Lewis
**Subject:** 17/00119/disc - Heyford Park Camp Road Upper Heyford

Andy

Further to our discussion earlier today.

The southern contextual landscape, as indicated on superseded drawing:  Village Green  - Detailed Landscape Proposals Bir.4322\_18E, under reserved matters  15/00153/REM, is not indicated on the latest drawing, Bir.4322 18S. With the two additional play areas on the northern end of the cricket field, there are a number of issues:

1. I assume that the original intention to located a play areas within the application red line of the Village Centre south has been dropped in favour of the two play areas?
2. With this submission there appears to be no justification for the omission of informal open space south of the cricket field. We wish to consider the design layout and function of this area.
3. Why has the LEAP+ in the north-eastern area and the formal tree layout in the opposite area been deleted in favour of the two play area proposal?
4. Where is the justification for the Hoggin Surface (see comment below)?
5. Where is the risk assessment for the cricket balls in respect of  proximity of play areas and housing, in adherence to Condition 5 of 15/00153/REM?
6. Where are the proposals for a robust erectable/de-erectable fencing to prevent cricket balls flying into ‘safe’ areas?

Hoggin surfacing is not suitable for well-trafficked areas due to the transfer of surface material on peoples shoes, during periods of precipitation, onto play area surfaces and interiors.  The surface level tends to deform and require regular replenishment, grading and rolling, depending on the intensity of use of the public. Cricket balls, will inevitably run over this surface, making it harder for players to retain firm footing, resulting in injury, when fielding the ball. A mown grass surface is more appropriate with macadam surface path links to a play area. A paved extension/transition from the market’s canopy/link access would be appropriate for the perceived usage.

In my view the two play area increase the risk of accidents to children, parents and carers with the cricket ball, and so increasing Dorchester’s liability. One larger play area maybe appropriate on the north western area additional protection with ball court fencing, however the risk assessment must address this play area proposal, and discount it due to an unacceptable risk, if necessary! The cricket ball risk analysis must identify corridors of reduced ball ‘traffic’. Note that both play areas do not achieve the minimum play activity area of 400 m2; a larger play areas will address this spatial problem.

The play areas are located within a formal, well maintained, mown area comprising of the cricket outfield, and therefore the timber play equipment is inappropriate, because  it is more suitable for semi-natural areas. Therefore steel equipment, with challenging play potential, would be more appropriate.

It is important for the revised layout to recognise the importance of user’s viewing experience of the cricket square from the canopy link/access, the Brasserie. Intervening trees between the Brasserie and the cricket outfield should have clear stems and high  canopies to achieve views framed by tree canopies.

Best regards.

Tim
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**Landscape Architect**
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