**From:** Public Access DC Comments   
**Sent:** 30 August 2017 11:55  
**To:** Public Access DC Comments  
**Subject:** Comments for Planning Application 17/01466/F

Planning Application comments have been made. A summary of the comments is provided below.

Comments were submitted at 11:55 AM on 30 Aug 2017 from Mr Paul McCormack.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Application Summary** | |
| **Address:** | Heyford Park Parcel B2A Camp Road Upper Heyford |
| **Proposal:** | Addition of approximately 310m of metal 'field' style railings painted black (Retrospective) |
| **Case Officer:** | Lewis Bankes-Hughes |
| [Click for further information](https://www.publicaccess.cherwell.gov.uk/online-applications/centralDistribution.do?caseType=Application&keyVal=OSQAJKEMKO700) | |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Customer Details** | |
| **Name:** | Mr Paul McCormack |
| **Email:** |  |
| **Address:** | 5 Hart Walk, Upper Heyford, Bicester OX25 5AF |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Comments Details** | |
| **Commenter Type:** | General Public |
| **Stance:** | Customer objects to the Planning Application |
| **Reasons for comment:** |  |
| **Comments:** | 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 is inspired by existing dwellings where there are no fences dividing public areas.  The planning application states that the fence is to address "safety concerns". This statement is overly vague and also misleading.  Whilst the planning documents are inconsistent in their depiction of the fence, I assume that the fence supposedly serves two purposes: Firstly, to separate the two east-west "pedestrian link" footpaths from the swales; and secondly, to separate a footpath from shared driveways (part public, part private).  The first purpose is unnecessary as 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. If some form of separation is deemed to be necessary, the fence should be low wooden fences to match the barrier near to the playpark as this is much more in fitting with the environment, planning guidelines and intent. I am aware that there has been some concern about the concrete areas of the swale, however, the proposed fence is completely ineffective in protecting these small areas.  The second purpose seems not to have any genuine "safety concern" and is only really to separate a public footpath from a shared driveway or surface street. I would argue that the fence creates more of a safety issue as it restricts the usable width of the footpath so a young child on a bike is more likely to fall into the fence rather swerve temporarily onto the driveway. If fences are not required outside the school on Camp Road then why would it be deemed a "safety concern" next to a driveway? Why was this not deemed a concern during the original planning process? Furthermore, in no way does the fence separate the main footpath from the swales so this cannot be the "safety concern". No fencing exists on the Broad Way side of the swale which-although it does not have public footpath-is used extensively by pedestrians and young children.  The proposed fence separates the path from open areas creating isolated pockets of green where there should be large open areas such as at the northern end 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, the proposed 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 boundary reasons only which contravenes the Design Code of the Conservation Area.  Without prejudice, if this fence is \*really\* required to keep children safe, it will not work. Small children can easily pass through the railings but adults caring for them cannot. This itself presents dangerous scenarios.  It is my opinion that the supposed "safety concerns" mentioned on the planning application form are at best overblown and at worst simply an excuse to prevent pedestrians using the private drives adjacent to the footpath.   This retrospective application uses vague and inconsistent "safety concerns" as an excuse to install such an excessive and out-of-character fence and should not be approved. The design code makes it clear there should be open frontages and this area must "provide natural surveillance out over the open space". |