

Michelle Houghton

From: David Eaves
Sent: 16 February 2017 11:37
To: bst shared
Subject: FW: Planning Application APP/16/00875 Land at Larchwood Avenue, Havant

Hi

Please add email below to Idox and Web as Original Consultation Response Landscape Team

Thanks

David

David Eaves
Principal Planning Officer
Planning Services
Havant Borough Council
Public Service Plaza
Civic Centre Road
Havant
PO9 2AX
Direct Line: 02392 446549
David.eaves@havant.gov.uk
www.havant.gov.uk
www.facebook.com/havantboroughcouncil
www.twitter.com/havantborough

From: Michelle Good
Sent: 06 December 2016 18:27
To: David Eaves
Subject: FW: Planning Application APP/16/00875 Land at Larchwood Avenue, Havant

Hi David,

Planning Application APP/16/00875 Land at Larchwood Avenue, Havant

Further to our earlier meeting regarding the above application, I summarise my feedback below:

i) *Reduced levels ...*

Although KFC's structural engineers may be satisfied that reduction of proposed levels presents no risk of retaining wall instability, the associated issue of bank steepness remains unresolved. Several detailed cross-sections through the NE site boundary are required to demonstrate how the existing steep bank will be stabilised (or retained by an appropriate structure) as a direct result of the proposed site levels reduction. The gradients of any landscape slopes will need to be clearly stated. I suggest this issue can be resolved by an appropriate planning condition to be discharged prior to any site commencement.

ii) *Circulation access widths ...*

It is emphasised that Approved Document M ('Access to and use of Dwellings'), particularly 'Section 1: Access to buildings other than dwellings' and BS8300 ('Design of buildings and their approaches to meet the needs of disabled people') are deemed wholly applicable to these proposals. It is recommended that both documents are carefully reviewed and the site layout proposals are reappraised accordingly.

The ramp / steps combination around the customer entrance offers little to enhance the site appearance or to afford site convenience for users. Perhaps some further review of the northern portion of the site layout and levels is needed to achieve a more effective and efficient solution? It may be feasible to resolve this area by means of an appropriate condition.

Whilst it is accepted that the site is spatially constrained, there must be suitable means of access and circulation. 1.2m width would be regarded an absolute minimum that requires adequate provision for passing places. Unresolved issues include:

- Bays 1-6 are likely to overhang the kerb reducing proposed footway below 1.2m (as this already happens for the existing 5no bays adjacent to these).
- Access between the building façade and retaining wall (by parking bays 12-16) appears constrained below 1.2m by bollards / pillars adjacent to the stepped access. Omission or relocation of bay 7 would certainly give the layout a better scope for an overall access improvement.
- The proposed increase of ramp width to 1.5m is acceptable, but must not be constrained at any point by handrails or retaining structures.
- The proposed ramp landings are indicated 1.8m length, but require a minimum 1.8m length and width.

iii) Pedestrian connection to the ASDA access road...

The indicated pedestrian connection requiring the removal of trees 2 and 3 is acceptable, subject to recommended conditions for:

- Detailed construction proposals for the access and steps (with integral cycle channel for the steps)
- Detailed landscape management plan (incorporating Arb. Report recommendations and enhancement proposals for the existing landscape perimeter buffer to compensate for proposed loss of trees).

iv) Proposed access ramps ...

Any proposals for ramped access will need to demonstrate compliance with M1, Section 1, Para. 1.26: a – n (Inclusive)

Any proposals for stepped access will need to demonstrate compliance with M1, Section 1, Para. 1.33: a – p (inclusive)

v) Cycle access ...

The proposed cycle storage for staff is acceptable – anticipating they will utilise the vehicular circulation route to access this?

For visitors – there will be a considerable temptation for cyclists to access the parking stands by cycling into the vehicular exit from the drive-thru (which would be certainly more convenient than wheeling a cycle up 6 lengths of ramp!). An integral cycle channel for the steps might be an option (or indeed a more convenient and accessible location?).

vi) Parking bay collision risk...

I am satisfied collision risk for bays 8 – 17 are now resolved (bay 7 remains in conflict with the steps). In relocation of the disabled spaces, access from bay 17 is now obstructed by the proposed retaining wall.

Remaining comments regarding soft landscape and removal of the extension zone are duly noted and accepted.

Any queries or concerns, please don't hesitate to call.

Kind Regards

Michelle Good CMLI

Senior Landscape Architect

Civil Engineering & Landscape Team

Telephone - 023 92446 537
Email - michelle.good@havant.gov.uk