**Heyford Park – Parcels B4A & B4B**

**Ref : 17/00983/REM**

*Reserved matters application to 10/01642/OUT – In respect of Bovis Parcel B4A & B4B to provide 29 open market and 71 affordable dwellings.*

**Urban Design Comments**

I previously commented that the proposals were generally satisfactory from an urban design perspective but highlighted afew less satisfactory aspects.Previous comments (2nd June 17) are shown below in italics and current comments in standard text:

1. *Rear parking courts are generally not desirable****.*** See point 2 below.
2. *Where rear parking courts are necessary they should be gated (automated gates), secure*

*and/or well overlooked (natural surveillance) from ‘active/habitable’ rooms at the rear of the dwellings/flats.* No gates added. Natural surveillance from rear of block type A is improved.

1. *The inclusion of a good corner turning house, type P1385 (corner turn), is good for natural surveillance of the adjacent streets and adds architectural interest, however, plot 27 also occupies a corner plot and has a blank flank wall. This house should also turn the corner perhaps with the inclusion of a bay window to the living room.* Achieved.
2. *Type A apartment block – Whilst the street facing front elevation has ‘active/habitable’ (kitchen/living) rooms facing the street the rear elevation overlooking secondary street/car parking areas achieves poor natural surveillance with bedrooms, bathrooms and cycle stores on these elevations.* ‘Active/habitable’ rooms have been added to achieve better natural surveillance of the rear of the buildings.

*Some of these blocks have access paths running adjacent to ground floor bedroom windows with no physical separation or defensible space.* No apparent change.

1. *Type B flat block – natural surveillance of the entrance to rear parking courts could be improved with windows to active/habitable rooms in the blank end elevations.* No apparent change.
2. *The bin stores don’t look robust and no information is given about materials. Bin stores are vulnerable and should have steel frames, steel bumper rails and steel framed doors/gates.* Have these measures been incorporated?
3. *Details of mitigation of the visual impact of the prominently sited sub-station should be submitted.* The substation has been set back to the adjacent building line thereby lessening its prominence.
4. *On 4B the corners of two parking bays V20 & 82 appear to be very close to the back edge of footway. It will be important to ensure that there is sufficient room for a consistent hedge to be established.* Achieved
5. *I suggest that estate type steel railings are used to reinforce important hedges and ensure that gaps don’t develop where desire lines occur.* No railings shown.

The exposed rear garden boundary enclosure of plots 51 & 52 was previously shown as a brick wall. This has been changed and now shows a close-boarded fence topped with trellis on the site layout plan and a brick wall on the materials plan. It is not clear what rear boundary enclosure is proposed for plots 53-58. Brick walls topped with trellis are more robust and secure. A clearly drawn and keyed means of enclosure plan should be submitted.

Paul Acton

Urban Designer
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