

GA1 - Urban Design

It is expected that my comments can be incorporated into conditions by the case officer for determination at a later date but prior to construction.

1.0 General Comment on layout and collaborative process

The proposal is extremely well-thought out and is an example of how development can create accessible, legible development through a commitment to open collaborative design, together with the local planning authority and other stakeholders. Croudace and their design team have worked closely alongside NHDC Urban Designers and Planning Officers on GA1 to create place that meets the needs of future residents. Collaborators willingness to engage and be open minded throughout this process has been invaluable and should set a precedent for future collaborative placemaking in the district.

2.0 Parking & Garages

2.1 Parking provision on the site is delivered through various means, and these have been worked through rigorously within the PPA workshops. However, there are still instances where garages are shown that are not being utilised as parking spaces. In my view these should be removed from the plan or, if the intention here is to provide external garden storage space/garden office space, these should be designed for this purpose, labelled as such and perhaps better located elsewhere in their respective gardens? At the very least, if they are to remain in their positions at the end of long driveways, they should contain the necessary cycle and waste storage for that home without the need for additional storage externally.

2.2 Where garages have space for a modern car internally, they should be used as a parking space on-plot and the space saved on drives should be given over to front garden/greenspace. Our aim is to discourage over-reliance on vehicles and providing excessive on-plot space for more cars is contrary to our aim, and the aim of HCC Highways. See plots: 1, 2, 4, 6, 9, 14, 15, 19, 20, 33, 51, 58, 205, 206, 277.

2.3 Visitor parking spaces are shown on private drives to the north of the site. Visitors to the site would be unlikely to park on a drive in front of a garage and regardless I think this creates an issue regarding clarity of ownership and maintenance. Visitor spaces are for public use and should be cited in clear locations that can easily be accessed and maintained.

3.0 Street Lighting

3.1 The lighting plan as submitted does not show sufficient lighting for a residential area of this density/scale. There should be street lighting (columns - not bollards) on all streets, lanes and mews where there isn't a sensitivity to ecological habitats. There should be street lighting columns within the parking courts along the eastern edge of the site to ensure these are safe and surveilled spaces. These can have shielding if light-spill to properties/windows is a concern.

3.2 Bollard lighting should be used along the countryside edges to the west and north of the site, and along the Eastern Greenway together with providing additional lighting along park pathways and pedestrian only routes.

4.0 Pumping Station Screening to Plot 13

Plot 13's view, from the front upstairs rooms, is directly down into a pumping station. This was flagged at multiple sessions and I think it could be very easily remedied by planting a tree opposite the house (to the northern side of the pumping station) to block the view. This would increase the quality of 13's aspect significantly.

5.0 Roof Material Rationale

Roofing materials are not rationally laid out across the site. The southern end of the site seems fairly rational but the northern end is more pepper-potted with a random mix of clay and slate roofs. Materiality should be rationally laid out and attributed to key buildings (i.e. corner turners, buildings at the end of a vista etc).

Joe Morizzo

*BA(Hons), MArch, PGDip
[ARB Registered Architect]*

*Senior Planner / Urban Designer
North Hertfordshire District Council*