

Hi David,

I have seen the Council's Landscape & County Archaeology Consultation Responses on the Interbridges Planning Application and would like to provide the following comments in response.

Landscape

We would like to re-emphasise that despite the policy allocation and the previous planning permissions granted on the site, unfortunately no scheme has yet been implemented for employment use on the site. This is predominantly due to the site constraints which include a gas main, public sewer, and railway easements crossing through the site plus the 2 restricted height bridges either side of the access. These easement constraints have led to limitations on where the buildings can be placed and the amount of soft landscaping planting that can be achieved on the site, with planting in the easement areas being restricted.

In response to the comments of the Landscape Officer and also noting those of the South East Hants Ramblers Association, our Landscape Consultant, IJLA, has managed to introduce some additional areas of planting where it has been possible on the site as shown on the attached amended landscaping plan. The additional planting incorporates a native hedge along the eastern boundary adjacent to Yard B, this extends from the native shrub mix further north, creating a more robust landscape buffer adjacent to the yard area. Additional tree planting has also been added along the southern boundary. We consider that the revised layout provides a sensitively designed landscaping scheme which respects the character of the area, whilst still being functional with the operation of the proposed Business Park.

We would be grateful if you could take this amended plan into account when considering the planning application, and re-consult the Landscape Officer for their comments on the revised landscape plan.

Archaeology

We note that the County Archaeologist has requested a pre-commencement condition which requires a written scheme of investigation, trial trenching and a post excavation assessment to be undertaken.

We would like to query whether this is necessary given that the site is in an area where there are very few heritage assets and not in an archaeological notification area. We would also like the County

Archaeologist to be informed that the presence of the High Pressure Gas main and the two main foul drains that cross the site as per the attached plan have already disturbed the ground, (please see attached services plan). The depths of the pipelines are shown, which is the difference between the CL and IL levels.

We also note that these archaeology conditions were not included on the previous planning permission for redevelopment of the site to a veterinary practice and four business units, (APP/16/00295 relates).

If you have any queries regarding this, then please let me know.

Kind regards,

Becky Tier