

Homes by Woodford.

Building For Life Assessment

Former Perfecta Bedding Site.
Barnsley Road.

Phil Knapton

Knapton & Knapton

4/8/2010

Prepared by:
 Knapton & Knapton
 Dean Hey Country Business Park
 Unit 1c
 Cragg Road
 Mytholmroyd
 Hebden Bridge
 HX7 5RU
 Tel 01422 884444

Building for Life outline assessment: Woodford Land Ltd. Perfecta Bedding Wombwell.

Environment and community 4.0/5	Comment		Potential area of development
1. Does the scheme provide community facilities?	- No specific new community facilities provided. - Accessible for buses, shops in local centre - Section 106 contribution for education £220,000	1.0	
2. Is there an accommodation mix that reflects the needs and aspirations of the local community?	Yes, accommodation mix reflects requirements of the local community.	1.0	
3. Is there a tenure mix that reflects the needs and aspirations of the local community?	Yes, tenure mix reflects requirements of the local community.	1.0	
4. Does the development have easy access to public transport?	No new bus facilities are provided, though there is existing easy access to bus facilities and train station in local centre	1.0	
5. Does the development have any features that reduce environmental impact?		0	

Character 5/5			
6. Is the design specific to the scheme?	The layout is developed specifically according to site opportunities and constraints. Further information required bespoke House types and including a range that allows for corner turners, linked homes, etc	1.0	
7. Does the scheme exploit existing buildings, landscape or topography?	- Buildings are positioned to reflect the existing road geometry. - Views have been maximised. - POS is integrated	1.0	
8. Does the scheme feel like a place with distinctive character?	Character areas are being carried through strongly from varied building heights etc. The character areas and the mix and layout and types of units appear quite similar throughout.	1.0	
9. Do the buildings and layout make it easy to find your way around?	- May be overly regimented and too small. - Building heights strategy- does give distinctiveness to different streets and different character areas	1.0	
10. Are the streets defined by a well-structured building layout?	Yes, though perhaps overly repeated.	1.0	

Streets, parking, pedestrianisation 4/5			
11. Does the building layout take priority over the streets and parking so that the highways do not dominate?	• Yes • Very formal and regimented.	1.0	
12. Is the car parking well integrated and situated so that it supports the street scene?	• Yes, good range of parking types • Parking courts are generally overlooked, though natural surveillance and enclosure could be improved in some instances.	1.0	
13. Are the streets pedestrian, cycle and vehicle friendly?	• Yes, natural traffic calming and raised table are incorporated in the design.	1.0	
14. Does the scheme integrate with existing streets, paths and surrounding development?	• Yes connections provided to the existing streets. • Footpath connection to existing network.	0.5	
15. Are public spaces and pedestrian routes overlooked and do they feel safe?	• Yes on the whole, though there may be potential improvements to some parking courts and cul de sacs	0.5	

Design and construction 1/5			
16. Is public space well designed and does it have suitable management arrangements in place?	Public Open Space to the north is well designed and will have management.	1.0	
17. Do the buildings exhibit architectural quality?	No house types so not demonstrated.	0.0	
18. Do internal spaces allow for adaptation, conversion or extension?	No house types so not demonstrated.	0.0	
19. Has the scheme made use of advances in construction or technology that enhances its performance and attractiveness?	Not yet demonstrated	0.0	
20. Do buildings or spaces outperform statutory minima such as Building Regs?	Not yet demonstrated	0.0	

Total: 14/20