

Building Typologies These have been enhanced and updated as requested

This is going in the right direction but needs more variety such as double height bays, tiles on ridge, pitches on roofs, string/soldier courses, other simple additions not just porch styles, door/window designs (these are examples of how to add more – I'm not saying that these need to be added). It is good to see quoins in places though.

Then in each character area, you have a prevalence of particular items. So for example, one area has ABC, one area has DEF, one area has HIJ etc

It is also unclear how the design features have come from a context assessment. I also note that some of the house photos in the Code are replicated in different character areas.

It might then be helpful to have a single comparison table showing typologies across character areas.

I also note Cllr Jones comments forwarded to you today which echo our own discussion:

"Looks like good character development. Materials and architectural styling seem a little hap-hazard, with many styles per area. Styles would look more integrated if they were kept to one or two per area. Having every house look different along a row is not something found in traditional Yapton construction – rows are usually just one style, so having too many styles next to each other in the new site would look a little odd, make sure rows of houses look cohesive. The 5 different areas make this a great way to use different styles, but each style needs to be grouped so they don't look too higgledy-piggledy."

As an aside, I attended a TCPA webinar last week where there was a presentation about Ebbsfleet Garden village and one of the slides showed how they took a standard house design and progressed through five stages into a characterful home. I attach this image in case it is useful.

Parking

I previously said that we do not want to see frontage parking on the main street. Similarly, we do not want to see any parking courts on the main street (as this will inevitably lead to people parking on street outside their homes).

There will be no front parking along the main street.

Key Buildings

Can the Code be clearer as to the treatment of these – i.e. how these will be made more prominent. This info could also be included in a typologies comparison table

We have sought to provide some enhanced fenestration on the focal buildings however, as recommended by Council Jones, it is not our intention for these buildings to be excessively articulated, just some extra detail on corner turning/accented units.

Central Green Area

We consider that the POS whilst in a good position should be more of a feature so a larger space. Could other areas of fringe open space be relocated into this space for example the narrow

strip of green between the NE built edge and the hedge. There may be other instances where you could take POS from (I do accept that some of the fringe areas are needed for SUDS).

On this subject, there is a possibility here that you could develop the central POS as part of a linear park running through the site. At the same TCPA webinar, they looked at a large urban extension at Beaulieu in Chelmsford where such had been done. If so, then roads crossing the park would have to be minimised or made shared areas/crossing points. Just an idea.

We also don't like the dog leg arrangement along the NE edge of the village green and consider that houses should front onto this central space on all sides.

As you say, the POS is in a good position and was welcomed by Councillors. As part of our forthcoming reserved matters submissions we will provide additional detail on how this space will work, informed by the outline planning permission, parameters and DAS as well as site context. We do not consider it appropriate to enlarge this space and reduce the pockets of open space around the edge of the site. Those areas are required for drainage but also serve to enhance the aesthetic quality of the scheme and have been carefully considered by both the architects and landscape architects. Whilst Beaulieu Park is nice, the Essex urban extension comprises 234 hectares, 3,600 units and has two primary schools, a secondary school and a new rail station so it is a different beast to our proposals at Yapton.

Other Matters

It is not clear where changes have been made to reflect the other items previously requested:

(2) Pedestrian link across the open space and through the existing tree belt between Loveys Field and Drove Field **Included**

(4) & (5) Cycleway still not clear **the annotation in the Design Code has been amended and is clear about the cycle route**