**From:** Carmichael Ian [<mailto:Ian.Carmichael@thamesvalley.pnn.police.uk>]   
**Sent:** 05 November 2018 15:16  
**To:** Caroline Ford  
**Cc:** Planning  
**Subject:** RE: 18/00484/OUT Land North of and Adjoining Home Farm Banbury Road B4100 Caversfield.

**FAO: Caroline Ford**

Dear Caroline

**Planning ref: 18/00484/OUT Land North of and Adjoining Home Farm Banbury Road B4100 Caversfield.**

Thank you for consulting me on the planning application above. I have analysed crime data, reviewed the submitted documents and visited the site.

I do not wish to object to the proposals. However, I consider some aspects the design and layout to be problematic in crime prevention design terms and therefore feel that the development may not meet the requirements of;

         The National Planning Policy Framework 2018, Section 12 ‘Achieving well-designed places’, point 127 (part f), which states that; ‘Planning policies and decisions should ensure that developments… create places that are safe, inclusive and accessible… and where crime and disorder, and the fear of crime, do not undermine the quality of life or community cohesion and resilience’.

         HMCLG’s Planning Practice Guidance on ‘Design’, which states that; ‘Although design is only part of the planning process it can affect a range of objectives... Planning policies and decisions should seek to ensure the physical environment supports these objectives. The following issues should be considered: safe, connected and efficient streets… crime prevention… security measures… cohesive & vibrant neighbourhoods.’

In addition, despite the inclusion of a section entitled crime prevention, I feel the Design and Access Statement (DAS) does not adequately address crime and disorder as required by CABE’s ‘Design & Access Statements- How to write, read and use them’. This states that DAS’ should; ‘Demonstrate how development can create accessible and safe environments, including addressing crime and disorder and fear of crime’. I am available to advise the applicant on how they can cover the subject more comprehensively in a revised version for their reserved matters application.

With all of the above in mind, I offer the following advice in the hope that it will assist the authority and applicants in creating a safer and more sustainable development, should approval be granted:

* Four out of the five perimeter blocks contain unsecured rear parking courts. These features make vehicles and the rear of properties vulnerable, and they often attract anti-social behaviour (ASB). The intention is to reduce the impact of vehicles on the street, but in reality courts are frequently abandoned by residents in favour of parking in front of dwellings. This can lead to neighbour conflicts, parking on footways and access problems for all, including emergency services. Wherever possible, courts should be removed from the parking strategy. The problematic nature of rear parking courts is recognised in Cherwell’s Residential Design Guide, where it states that these features are the ‘least preferred’ parking option. If some must remain, the number and size should be kept to a minimum and they should be made secure as possible. The police’s Secured by Design (SBD) scheme provides advice on how to achieve this. This is a significant issue and may lead to police objections at reserved matters should the layout remain unchanged.
* Some of the housing blocks are have rather irregular shapes, creating more exposed rear property boundaries than necessary. The majority of burglaries take place from the rear of dwellings and I recommend the layout is revised to reduce the level of exposure to this crime risk.
* In relation to the point above, where boundary treatments of private rear gardens abut public or semi-private space they should be of sufficient height (at least 1.8m) and incorporate features that make them difficult to climb; trellis on fences, angled or rounded copings on walls etc. All access gates to rear gardens (including communal ones) should be; robust, of the same height as boundary treatments, self-closing, have anti-lift hinges and be key operated from both sides.
* The landscaping scheme should ensure that natural surveillance throughout the development and to/from dwellings is not compromised, especially in relation to the play area and allotments. I am also concerned that some trees may impinge upon street lighting in future. Tree positions and final growth height/spread should be considered to avoid this. A holistic approach should be taken in relation to landscape and lighting, and SBD guidance on both should be followed. I am pleased that the DAS states that lighting will be ‘mindful’ of SBD guidance and look forward to seeing how this will be achieved in the reserved matters application, particularly in relation to the pedestrian footways around the perimeter of the site and any remaining parking courts.
* Finally, the allotments area raises some concerns; in the reserved matters application I would expect to see detail of how the parking and plots can be made secure (boundary treatments etc), as access should be limited to allotment holders. Landscaping should not impinge on natural surveillance to or from the area either. In addition, the footway between the allotments and the existing development to the North West should be moved to the South East edge of the car park as its current route is secluded and appears to have very little natural surveillance.

The comments above are made on behalf of Thames Valley Police and relate to crime prevention design only. You may receive additional comments from TVP on other Policing issues regarding infrastructure etc. I hope that you find my comments of assistance in determining the application and if you or the applicants have any queries relating to crime prevention design in the meantime, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Regards

***Ian Carmichael***

Crime Prevention Design Advisor | **Oxfordshire** | Local Policing | Thames Valley Police