

Bartons Road RM – V 29/10/18 <i>I have reviewed my notes of our meeting and the information submitted and set out below the issues identified and would ask you to confirm the information addressing each issue unless my comments cover it and progress in relation to any outstanding matters (DE):</i> Matter Raised	Response	Superseded	Revised	Date
APP/18/00453 Reserved Matters				29/10/18
Firstly I list the additional information provided seeking to address the outstanding issues discussed at our meeting of the 3rd September 2018: Emails of 2nd October: Site Layout Ground Level Drg No. P101 D Site Layout Roof Level Drg No. P102 D Phase 2 Surface Water Drainage Strategy Drg No. C85850-SK112 Phase 2 Swale Details Drg No. C85850-D140 Boundary Materials Layout Drg No. 17300-P104 B Emails of 6th October: Phase 2 Mains Private Drainage Layout Drg No. C85850-D131 A Foul Sewer Diversion Layout Sheet 1 of 2 Drg No. C85850-D120 Foul Sewer diversion Layout Sheet 2 of 2 Drg No. C85850-D121 Email of 10th October:	A schedule of updated documents is at the end of this document Superseded Superseded Superseded Current Superseded Superseded Current Current			

Hard Landscape Proposals Drg. No. BELL21747 12A Sheet 1 Hard Landscape Proposals Drg No. BELL21747 12A Sheet 2 Hard Landscape Proposals Drg No. BELL21747 12A Sheet 3 Hard Landscape Proposals Drg No. BELL21747 12A Sheet 4 Hard Landscape Proposals Drg No. BELL21747 12A Sheet 5 Hard Landscape Proposals Drg No. BELL21747 12A Sheet 6 Landscape Proposals Drg No. BELL21747 11B Sheet 1 Landscape Proposals Drg No. BELL21747 11B Sheet 2 Landscape Proposals Drg No. BELL21747 11B Sheet 3 Landscape Proposals Drg No. BELL21747 11B Sheet 4 Landscape Proposals Drg No. BELL21747 11B Sheet 5 Landscape Proposals Drg No. BELL21747 11B Sheet 6 Landscape Proposals Drg No. BELL21747 11B Sheet 7 Landscape Proposals Drg No. BELL21747 11B Sheet 8	All Superseded 			
Landscape Team Comments: <i>Concerns re swales:</i> <i>Integration of Swales with open space</i> <i>Steep sided fenced off areas need to be avoided – allow access egress for some informal play provision and ease of maintenance and to improve bio-diversity:</i> Drawing No. C85850-D140 shows a 'typical cross section' through swales and slopes of 1:3 - The landscape team will be re-consulted in relation to these details	Noted			
<i>Boundary materials layout drawing P104 – 1.2 post & wire fencing enclosing suds – creating sterile un-natural environment – details needed:</i> Drawing No. P104 Rev B shows 'dragon tooth posts' to the Swales and 1.2 post and wire fencing with planting to the existing pond area – The landscape team will be re-consulted on this but on a point of clarity please provide details of the spacing and height of the posts.	Revised plan confirming height and spacing of dragon tooth posts.	P104C	P104D	29/10/18

helpful if further comments re the route selection and natural surveillance were provided.	which connects open points of pedestrian access to the land from Bartons Road and Japonica Way respectively, appears to have a degree of public use. At present, the only natural surveillance of users of the footpath would be in aspects across the landscape. On most occasions, existing users of the path are likely to be subject to no surveillance. The quality of the footpath was the subject of discussion at pre-application stage. In the pre-app response letter (27/11/17) the Planning Officer stated: <i>"I note that the route between Japonica Way and northern link is shown on the latest drawing as following the outside of the site. At our meeting you raised concerns about changing the existing route around the field. The route is not defined as a Public Footpath however it is clearly used at present as a public route and any change in its line may be challenged.</i> <i>It is considered however that from a usability point of view as well as from a security of properties and users point of view, the route should be integrated into the development and made an attractive feature of the site. I would not support the positioning against the site boundary and would ask that this aspect is re-considered. The internal roads should include a 3m wide footpath between the cycle/pedestrian links to Bartons Road and Japonica Way."</i> Whilst the planning officer acknowledged the risk of challenge if the footpath was to be re-routed, the concerns expressed at that time related to: (1) usability; and (2) security. In response to the concern, the scheme design was amended as follows: (1) <u>Usability</u>: The route is one of several routes through the site and will continue to provide exactly the same travel distance between the public access points to the site (at Bartons Road and Japonica Way) that			
---	---	--	--	--

	already exist. Thus, in terms of the route, there is no diminution of usability. Unlike the existing route, which is indicated on the ground by a narrow strip of loose surfacing material, the proposed route will be laid to hardstanding and 3 metres wide, lined by soft landscaping. It will, accordingly, be functionally more accessible to a range of users than the existing path. (2) <u>Security</u>: The concern regarding security in the path at pre-application stage was attributable to it being narrow and enclosed by the rear boundary fences of homes which would obstruct natural surveillance. The proposal has now been amended to provide a much wider, spacious and open route that will pass the frontages of homes, meaning that there will be extensive natural surveillance and direct access to the space from homes. It will be an equally secure space as any of the other streets within the development or the surrounding residential areas. Thus, the proposal fully addresses the concerns raised about the usability and security of the footpath at the northern western boundary.			
<i>East Boundary Pinch Points</i> The pinch points to the eastern boundary were discussed. It is noted that the 5m buffer is breached close to plots 93 and 131. The hedgerow provision is considered to help with the impact on the wider landscape – details to be considered by Landscape Team.	Noted.			
<i>Car parking + 20% visitor parking</i> The following units require adjustments to parking: Plots 5, 6, 7, 30, 36, 43, 46, 49, 50, 62, 65, 79, 80, 84, 97, 111, 122, 127, 128, 135, 160, 163, 168– require 3 spaces annotated	This query has highlighted an error in the accommodation schedule which identified a number of the proposed homes as 4 bedrooms when they are actually proposed to be 3 bedroom units (and thus the parking representation was correct). The accommodation schedule and plans have been amended accordingly.	Schedule of accom Rev H	Schedule of accom Rev J	29/10/18

Plot 137 -requires 2 spaces annotated Many of the units appear to have space to provide these spaces.	The following units were previously identified as 4 bed units in error on the accommodation schedule when there are in fact 3 beds: Plots 5, 6, 30, 43, 46, 50, 62, 65, 86, 111, 122, 135, 160, 163, 168 and 170. The parking provision for these units is therefore correct. The remaining identified units have been addressed with amendments to the layout as follows: Plot 7 – Parking provision correct Plot 36 – 1 space added; Plot 49 – 1 space added Plot 79 – 1 space added Plot 80 – 1 space added Plot 84 – 1 space added Plot 97 – 1 space added Plot 127 – Parking provision correct Plot 128 – Parking provision correct Plot 137 – parking provision correct	17300 P101E	17300 P101F	29/10/18
Plots 17-20 - these two bed units show a total of 4 parking spaces – The Parking standards (PS) require 8 spaces if allocated or 6 spaces unallocated Plots 21-29 – these provide 6 x 2 bed units and 3 x 1 bed units and a total of 9 spaces are shown – PS require 15 spaces if allocated or 11 unallocated Plots 100-105 – these provide 4 x 2 bed units and 2 x 1 bed units and a total of 6 spaces are shown – PS require 10 spaces if allocated or 7 unallocated Plots 147-150 – these provide 4 x 2 bed units and a total of 4 spaces are shown – PS require 8 spaces if allocated or 6 spaces if unallocated Please provide amended plans to indicate how parking to standard is to be provided.	Site layout plan amended The parking spaces for these affordable units are now marked as unallocated 'U' and have been increase in number to meet the identified standards for unallocated provision.	17300 P101E	17300 P101F	29/10/18
The overall proposal is for: 5 x 1 bed flats	There were previously 36 visitor spaces shown on the layout plan.	17300 P101E	17300 P101F	29/10/18

18 x 2 bed flats 28 x 2 bed houses 84 x 3 bed houses 40 x 4 bed houses If unallocated parking is assumed for the flats this would equate to 372 spaces – Visitor parking is required at 20% of this would require 75 visitor parking spaces. 29 spaces are shown on the plans. Please provide an assessment of the level of opportunity for informal on street car parking.	The quantum of visitor parking has been devised to represent 20% of units, rather than 20% of car parking spaces; this approach appears to be consistent with what has been permitted elsewhere. The layout has been modified and now shows 35 visitor parking bays, representing 20% of the 175 dwellings proposed. This is considered to be sufficient and policy compliant.			
With regard to the parking layout there are a number of areas of parking that present un-relented areas of hard surfacing that should be broken up by landscape planting to improve the character and amenities of the estate and future living environments. It is considered that with some relatively minor amendments the following areas of parking can be greatly improved to provide a better layout in line with the NPPF and design guidance: Plots 11-14 Plots 75-78 Plots 87-92 Plots 142-146 Plots 171-175 Please provide amended plans to break up the hard surfacing with planting in these areas.	Parking areas reviewed and modified to include additional landscaping in/adjacent to parking areas where feasible.			29/10/18
<i>Cycle Parking</i> Cycle parking will be conditioned to meet the PS (Long Stay 1 space per 1 bed unit, 2 spaces per 2, 3 and 4 bed units). In relation to the flats/maisonettes, this would require for units 17-20 - 8 spaces, units 21-29 – 15 spaces and 100-105 – 8 spaces.	Noted			
<i>Garden depths – separation distances</i> Considered acceptable	Noted			
<i>Amenity Space – flats</i>				

These areas are limited and potentially further reduced in relation to parking requirements. I would ask that these areas are looked at again in order to seek to provide more usable amenity areas. The flat blocks should be provide with an amenity space that is more private with suitable boundary treatments.	The amenity space for the flats has been reviewed and modified as shown on the layout plan. Where logical, flats have been given individual garden areas. The retained communal gardens for Blocks A and B are now shown to be securely enclosed. Natural surveillance of the garden for Block B has been enhanced by revised window positions	P196 P197 P200	P196A P197A P200A	
<i>Communal parking areas – off plot – lighting etc</i> It is understood that lighting is still being discussed in relation to the scheme and will need to take account of amenity, security and ecological issues. A planning condition in relation to these matters will be required to be met.	Noted			
Police Comments: <i>Plots accessed directly off POS</i> Please comment on how this issue has been addressed as the layout in relation to accessing properties from POS does not appear to have altered. <i>Robust boundary treatments to POS required</i> Please explain any changes to the boundary treatments between dwellings and POS on the latest boundary treatments plan.	On the site plan, plots 5, 6, 65 and 66 are shown to enjoy some defensible planting on the frontages onto the open spaces which means that the interaction with the public realm (the POS) is the same as the interaction of the other properties in the development onto the street – also public space. The interaction with those dwellings and the POS is actually intended to benefit the natural surveillance and security of the public spaces. Nonetheless, the boundary treatment layout plan has been amended to show defensible railings to the frontages of Plots 5 and 6, while the other plots identified will be adequately protected by soft landscaping. The Crime Officer noted that plots: 1, 6, 16, 86, 89 and 125 have boundaries to POS which increases the vulnerability of these dwellings to crime and anti-social behaviour. The boundary treatments in all of these cases (other than plot 19 which has a feature wall), is 1.8m high close boarded fence. This robust fencing should provide no greater opportunity to access to these			

	suburban homes than walls of comparable height. The spaces from which access may be obtained (more likely by climbing over the boundary treatment than breaking through it) are either heavily overlooked public open spaces, or dense tree/planting belts where access should be largely obstructed by planting. Accordingly, no revisions have been made to the proposals in response to this observation.			
<i>Footpath to Bartons Road and relationship to Plot 16</i>	Noted			
Wall and repositioning of units noted.				
<i>Plots 86 / 124 – accessibility from green ribbon eastern boundary</i>	The Local planning Authority has requested that a planting buffer is set out along the eastern boundary. This can either occur within or outside of the respective plots. The approach shown segregates the planting strip from the plots. No direct access from the individual plots to the green ribbon is proposed, and public access to this space will be discouraged by virtue of it being a functioning/densely planted landscape buffer. The plots will be contained by robust 1.8m high close board fencing. No supplementary security measures are proposed.			
Please comment on how this is addressed.				
<i>Vulnerability of access to rear gardens from footpaths or parking areas</i>				
Please comment on security measures to be employed.	1.8m fencing as above.			
<i>Parking Areas need to be overlooked</i>				
Please provide comments on how this is achieved.	The extent of overlooking of the parking areas and the means of access to them has been reviewed., It was noted that the parking serving Block B was not well-overlooked and, accordingly, revisions have been made to the fenestration of the block to improve the aspects onto the car park (and also to address a potential overlooking issue with the rear garden of Plot 30). All other parking areas benefit from appropriate degrees of natural surveillance.	P196 P197 P200	P196A P197A P200A	
<i>Lighting requirements</i>	Noted			

Conditions regarding lighting anticipated (need to take account of security and ecological issues).				
Development Engineer <i>Permeability concerns relating to future cycle/footway to future developments</i> Drawing annotated 'potential future access link'. Please show on the layout a 3m wide link to the site boundary.	Layout drawing modified to show 3m wide link to the site boundary	P101E	P101F	
Drainage / Flooding It is noted that revised drainage proposals have now been provided.	Noted			
Environment Agency <i>No objection subject to capacity and restrictions on deep borehole soakaways</i> Given the changes to the drainage proposals the EA will be re-consulted in relation to this proposal.	Noted			
Southern Water <i>Previous objection</i> We will forward all formally submitted drainage plans to SW to confirm their final position but note that matters appear to have been progressing positively.	Noted			
Local Lead Flood Authority The LLFA will be re-consulted in relation to the latest plans. The LLFA have requested the following information:	Additional information supplied			29/10/18

<i>The information provided demonstrates a suitable surface water drainage strategy for the site but in order for us to consider it fully as in accordance with best practise we require the following additional information:</i> <i>. Plans showing the locations where there is potential for water to pond and flow. The 1: 1 00 + climate change storm scenario shows some areas of flooding and these should be identified on this plan together with extent and depth.</i> <i>. Additional information in relation to maintenance. The primary drainage features have been identified with the body responsible for maintenance but this also needs to include the pipe work and other connecting features.</i> <i>. In addition, maintenance schedules should be provided to identify what maintenance is required and at what frequency. Please refer to the Ciria SuDS Manual C753 for examples.</i> Please provide these further details if they are not included in the revised details.				
Portsmouth Water Will be re-consulted in relation to revised details.	Noted			
Trees: Noted that swale removed from TPO tree area – no further issues	Noted			
Infrastructure Officer				

Phasing and affordable unit exemption should be discussed with Infrastructure Officer as previously advised (this also relates to the access road phase).	Noted			
Public Health <i>Cycle stores for flats questioned</i> A condition will be imposed, cycle parking required to meet PS as above <i>Affordable unit concerns</i> Provision considered acceptable <i>Green space concerns</i> Proposals considered acceptable	Noted Noted Noted			
Red Line The red line position on the submitted plans along the northern boundary appears to be incorrectly shown. Residential curtilages and boundary treatments etc are shown beyond the red line. Please correct/clarify.	Red line amended	P101E	P101F	29/10/18
Conclusion You will appreciate from the above that there are re-consultations required in relation to the proposals both internal and external to the Council. These will be carried out early next week. There is also a need to update parking provisions and provide other further information which require further plans to be submitted (at this stage I do not anticipate that these would require further re-consultation). I remain of the view that matters are moving towards a positive conclusion and trust that we can work together to get this application over the line.	Noted I concur.			

We will produce a draft list of conditions for your consideration.	Noted. I look forward to receipt.			
A further extension of time agreement will be forwarded separately and I would anticipate that a further 4 weeks will be required for the consultation period with a week for an assessment of the responses and consideration of any outstanding matters.	Extension approved 26/10/18			26/10/18
Please can you confirm the conditions of the outline application APP/15/01435 that you are seeking to discharge alongside the Reserved Matters Application for clarity.	TBC			
SUMMARY OF AMENDMENTS	SCHEDULE OF ACCOMMODATION	REV H	REV J	
General 17300	SITE LAYOUT GROUND LEVEL	P101E	P101F	29/10/18
	SITE LAYOUT ROOF LEVEL	P102E	P102F	
	BUILDING MATERIALS LAYOUT	P103B	P103C	
	BOUNDARY MATERIALS LAYOUT	P104C	P104D	
	SURFACE MATERIALS LAYOUT	P105B	P105C	
	TENURE LAYOUT	P106C	P106D	
	REFUSE STRATEGY LAYOUT	P107B	P107C	
	BLOCK B FIRST FLOOR PLANS	P196	P196A	
	BLOCK B SECOND FLOOR PLANS	P197	P197A	
	BLOCK B ELEVATIONS	P200	P200A	
Landscape BELL21747	Soft Landscape Sheet 1	11	11C-1	29/10/18
	Soft Landscape Sheet 2	11	11C - 2	
	Soft Landscape Sheet 3	11	11C - 3	
	Soft Landscape Sheet 4	11	11C – 4	
	Soft Landscape Sheet 5	11	11C – 5	
	Soft Landscape Sheet 6	11	11C – 6	
	Soft Landscape Sheet 7	11	11C – 7	
	Hard Landscape Sheet 1	12A	12B – 1	
	Hard Landscape Sheet 2	12A	12B – 2	
	Hard Landscape Sheet 3	12A	12C – 3	
	Hard Landscape Sheet 4	12A	12C – 4	

	Hard Landscape Sheet 5	12A	12C – 5	
	Hard Landscape Sheet 6	12A	12C - 6	
Supplementary Drainage Information	C85850 TN01 Drainage strategy technical note			
	C85850 R100 SuDS Maintenance Report			
	C85850 D142 Phase 2 flood route plan			
	C85850 D101 Rev E Adoptable Drainage Layout			
	C85850 D112 Rev A Flood route plan			
	C85850 D131 Rev B Phase 2 Mains private drainage layout			