**From:** Hall Sophie
**Sent:** 05 April 2019 14:22
**To:** Andrew Lewis; Planning
**Cc:** Carmichael Ian
**Subject:** CPDA Planning App response 19/00439/REM

Good Afternoon Andrew,

Please find attached the CPDAs comments for planning application **19/00439/REM.**

Kind Regards,

Sophie

**Sophie Hall**

Crime Prevention & Design Advisor

Milton Keynes

Local Policing

Thames Valley Police

**FAO: Andrew Lewis**

Dear Andrew

**Planning ref: 19/00439/REM. Dorchester Phase 7A (11 Affordable Units), Heyford Park Camp Rd, Upper Heyford, OX25 5HD.**

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 of 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’. And;
* 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.’

Therefore, to ensure that the opportunity to design out crime is not missed I request that the following (or a similarly worded) condition be placed upon any approval for this application;

*Prior to commencement of development, an application shall be made for Secured by Design accreditation on the development hereby approved. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details, and shall not be occupied or used until confirmation of SBD accreditation has been received by the authority.*

With 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:

* It appears that some dwellings do not have windows of active rooms overlooking their parking or driveways. I appreciate that the applicant has provided a window on the first floor from a bathroom, however surveillance should be provided from active rooms. These would include living rooms, kitchens and hall ways. Studies, bedrooms, bathrooms/toilets etc. are not considered active.
* I am concerned that the two trees shown on the verges to the front of the gardens of Plots 797-800 are to be planted too close to the front boundary treatments and could be used as climbing aids to gain access to private spaces. I strongly recommend they are relocated to avoid this. It should also be kept in mind that a holistic approach should be taken in relation to landscape and lighting, and SBD guidance on both should be followed in respect of these proposals.
* Where boundary treatments of private rear gardens abut public or semi-private space they should incorporate features that make them difficult to climb; trellis on fences, angled or rounded copings on walls etc. And, all access gates to rear gardens should be; robust, of the same height as boundary treatments, self-closing, have anti-lift hinges and be key operated from both sides.
* Parking for the majority of the dwellings is at the rear of the properties. This arrangement makes people, vehicles and the rear of properties more vulnerable. The intention is to reduce the impact of vehicles on the street, but in reality rear parking is 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. However, it is accepted that the layout has already been approved and is unlikely to be changed. To combat this problem, I recommend that the top 300mm of the rear boundary treatments be visually permeable. Trellis is often used to achieve this. In addition, lighting of these areas should be to SBD recommended standards, but please note that low level lighting such as bollards should not be used as it creates hiding places, and pooling and shadowing of light.
* Finally, I would also like to remind the applicants that Building Regulations Part Q requires them to install doors and windows that ‘Resist unauthorised access to… new dwellings’. Advice on how to achieve this can be found in Building Regulations Approved Document Q and in Secured by Design’s (SBD) New Homes Guide.

The comments above are made on behalf of Thames Valley Police and relate to crime prevention design only. I hope that you find them 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.