

Summary of Comments from Tour **(October 2022)**

Aspects that had been done well

- It was commented that schemes that appeared dense on paper did not actually feel this way on the ground
- Meter boxes look better on those sites where they were on the side elevations
- Variation of the building line was identified as a positive on two sites
- Variation in brick type welcomed
- Projecting courses of brickwork on one scheme was a good design feature
- Three storey properties with no habitable rooms at ground level worked well with the garages and entrance space at ground floor in the context of the surrounding development
- Positive comments were made in relation to the use of permeable block paving to assist with drainage
- The most positive comments were in relation to a site of commercial units
- Unallocated parking on site of those units considered to be of benefit as gives customers more flexibility on where to park
- Bin storage on site located in unobtrusive place

Aspects that could be improved

- Concerns were raised on a number of sites regarding the maintenance and management of public areas, such as strips of grass, drainage features incl. attenuation basins, knee rail fencing etc. as there were instances of neglect or inaccessibility
- Some sustainable drainage features didn't appear to be functioning as intended and concern was raised over the steepness and safety of some attenuation ponds
- On one scheme it was commented that it was not clear which properties parking spaces were allocated to and that could lead to residents parking on the road
- On another site there appeared to be only one parking space and a garage
- Where dwellings were raised 1m above ground level as flood mitigation, comments were made about wheelchair access for occupants where there are stepped entrances at the front
- On one site the turning head didn't appear to be functioning as intended with a car parked in that space
- Obtrusiveness of meter boxes on front elevations in a number of instances
- Lack of variety of front door colours in some developments
- Cables on the front elevation of houses look untidy
- Any play areas installed should be of a suitable standard
- Unfinished tactile paving for crossing point on one site and play area indicated on one site plan not provided
- Limited variation in house types and design on one scheme
- Planting does not always appear to have been thought through in terms of what it would look like in the future (e.g. vigorous growth and potential to grow large if not managed well)
- Refuse collection points not always clear and no segregation
- Permeable block paving could be used on more sites across the district
- On one site the open space was lacking grass and unusable due to mud

Appendix A

- Cladding that had been used on the front elevation of dwellings on one site terminated only a few centimetres round the corner of the side elevation and looked unfinished
- Render was preferred to cladding
- Metal railings beginning to rust on one site – quality should be improved in future
- The window design on one commercial site includes a ledge that could attract pigeons – droppings already evident on the front elevation of a black steel building
- Roads and footways were also unfinished on this site when buildings were already occupied. It was felt that this does not look appealing to developers who might be interested in other parcels of land on site as it currently stands. Thought could be giving to requiring their completion at an earlier stage in development. Some potential health hazards also identified such as exposed wires to utility box and fencing around trench poorly secured
- The difference in design between the buildings on that site were noted and it was commented that different design trends might become evident as other parcels come forward in the future
- 3D visuals of proposed developments would be beneficial at planning application stage