

Summary of Comments from Tour of Sites
(Updated January 2020)

Aspects that had been done well

- There were two schemes where it was felt that the layout and design was good and in respect of one particular scheme it was commented that a good transition had been achieved from existing to new development
- A good variety of materials (brick and tile types) had been used on one site which was liked
- The pumping station on one development had been well located with vehicle flow in and out and there had been an attempt made to visually separate it from the development
- On two sites, meter boxes had been located on side elevations where possible thus minimising their prominence
- On one development in particular it was commented that it does not feel like a 100% affordable scheme and the stone cill details used were liked

Aspects that could be improved

- On one particular scheme the quality of the play area was felt to be poor as only limited pieces of equipment have been provided
- Consideration should be given to the location of pumping stations – locating them in the middle of open space limits the functionality of it
- Could be more variety of front door designs in some developments
- Potential for more variation of ‘building line’ in places
- Loose cables on the front elevation of houses for satellite dishes look poor
- Obtrusiveness of meter boxes on front elevations in a number of instances
- Peculiar position of tree in pavement on one particular development
- On one specific scheme the easement to the IDB drain adjacent had been dedicated as open space but the grass had been damaged by the Board maintaining this drain. On another development, concerns were raised about possible future maintenance issues for the easement adjacent the IDB drain
- External design of affordable units different to market units on one scheme
- The colour of windows and door features were mismatched in one instance and the green windows used at the front of the development could have been continued throughout the scheme
- On one development no railings/fencing had been erected around a refuse collection point to define it
- Prominent parking space numbering was not liked
- Some properties on one scheme had no level access and some were lower than the road meaning a drop down to the rear garden gate
- There was one scheme in particular where it was felt that it was overdeveloped
- Also on the above scheme, it was noted that there was a mismatch of brick type on semi-detached dwellings which was not liked as well as a mismatch of fencing on the eastern boundary. The pavements and road were block paved in parts which it was felt could create visibility issues
- On the same site there were small or missing refuse collection points and it was unclear who had management responsibility for private drives
- Bricked up windows were observed on one development but it was questioned whether this was a worthwhile design feature. Furthermore, the visual dominance of the balcony on certain house types was disliked

Appendix A

- One scheme was considered to be maze like in terms of layout overbearing in places. Comments were also made about the juxtaposition of 3 storey and 2 storey dwellings on parts of the site and that the planting scheme could be improved
- Concerns were raised about poorly lit alleys between the rear ends of gardens and street lighting being located in inappropriate places
- Unconventional doors that were not aesthetically pleasing had been added to the integrated parking spaces of some dwellings on one particular scheme. Furthermore, concern was raised about the potential for parking on frontages due to parking spaces and garages being located to the rear of properties
- Flats Over Garages in car dominated areas offer a poor outlook for occupants of such dwellings
- On one scheme it was noted that there was a peculiar weathering effect on the brickwork of some dwellings. Overall it was felt that that particular development had a confined feel and points were raised about ensuring that care is taken in the positioning of refuse collection points in relation to surrounding development