

Following review of the application and cross-reference to the originally approved documents, I confirm the following landscape comments apply:

Soft landscape (Condition 8) - the submitted 'Hard & Soft Landscaping Plan' and associated plant schedule are not acceptable and the condition may not be discharged:

- The proposed extent of turf and planting bed areas are not sufficiently defined on the plan.
- It appears the numbered circles represent individual plants, which is insufficient for some areas and inappropriately spaced in others. Additionally some plan numbers do not seem apparent on the plant schedule (10?).
- Bulb planting included on the plant schedule is not apparent on the plan.
- The Arboricultural Officer's comments regarding the original application have not been addressed. There is a requirement for a replacement Beech tree at a sufficient proximity from the house. It is recommended this is introduced to the north-eastern side of the proposed cycle store.
- The approved Site Plan (original application) identifies 'Indicative locations of new trees, shrubs or hedge within the site – all to be native varieties.' The submitted proposals are notably contrary to this – few of the specified plants are native or deemed location appropriate. The proposed 'screening' plants alongside the eastern and western boundaries, for example, comprise non-native ornamental species that are frost-tender and unlikely to grow much above 700mm height. It is recommended that the applicant seeks the advice of a Landscape Architect or Garden Designer to resolve.

Hard landscape (Condition 9) - the submitted 'Hard & Soft Landscaping Plan' is not sufficiently acceptable and the condition may not be discharged:

- There is no existing drop kerb or vehicular crossing for the proposed driveway access onto the public highway. Please note a separate application requires submission to Hampshire County Council Highways. The proposals / specification should be also be incorporated within the submitted plan or by cross-section detail to demonstrate how this corresponds with the driveway material.
- Noting potential issues associated with noise nuisance and neighbouring resident concerns, it may be more appropriate to substitute the X-Grid retained gravel for permeable block paving. Any areas intended to remain as gravel require confirmation additional specification information e.g. colour of retention system, proposed depth / spec for the compacted sub-base beneath the X-Grid etc.
- The extent of the RPA protection should be identified within this plan, particularly in accordance with para. 3.2 of the approved Tree Survey, Arboricultural Impact Assessment and Tree Method Statement, which details a requirement for a cellular confinement system for the sub-base stone (prior to any site commencement).
- Bradstone Infilta – which colour is proposed - Brindle or Red? Laying bond? Edging? What is the proposed build-up specification?

Boundary treatments (Condition 10) - the submitted proposals are deemed acceptable and this condition may be discharged.

Any queries regarding the above, please don't hesitate to call.

Kind Regards

Michelle Good CMLI
Senior Landscape Architect
Civil Engineering & Landscape Team