

From: Michelle Good

Sent: 25 April 2017 20:41

To: Daphney Haywood

Subject: Planning Application APP/16/00774 - Land north of Havant Road, Emsworth - Additional Landscape Consultation

Hello Daphney

Planning Application APP/16/00774 - Land north of Havant Road, Emsworth - Additional Landscape Consultation

General Layout

- The reduction of three storey provision, changes to the previously urbanised layout and the parking court amendments are acknowledged improvements to the application.
- The site access from Havant Rd affords a key vista into the site, partly mitigated by partial retention of the existing hedgerow (G6) and proposed tree planting. Plots 110 adjoining 111-115 require particular attention as the focal point for the end of this vista. Some bespoke brick detailing through this façade could offer significant benefit and improve the transition to plot 110.
- House type WD is not attractive. The expanse of plain brick from the eaves to the top of the first floor windows only accentuates their small size and gives the impression of a receding roof-scape. The continuous run of four units (plots 18-21) are a particular issue. If one of these dwellings was omitted, could parking for plots 17 and 22 relocate and a larger extent of the G6 hedgerow be retained?
- If the southern A259 access to Havant Road is to be signalised, does the design incorporate the recently installed cycleway route enhancement?

Landscape Masterplan

- Landscape components could be more clearly defined, then subsequently detailed in the planting plans and identified within the corresponding landscape specifications and management plans.
- Site frontage mixed native hedgerow managed and enhanced for biodiversity benefit? If so, make sure it connects back to the A27 tree belt (Plot 152 with a cramped, over-shaded rear garden is a blocker to this – can it be omitted?). Improve connectivity with the retained, but isolated Hawthorn (G6 in survey) and the proposed swale by extending hedgerow planting around the open space closer to plot 142. Please can the hedge also include some emerging trees?
- Are there specific open space areas for informal recreation? If so, where is the extent of the short mown amenity grass area for play and where are the less frequently mown grass meadows or the taller native field margin species alongside the hedgerows?
- Rich wildflower grassland areas are often promised in these types of applications, but rarely delivered. I suggest these are more honestly labelled informal grass meadow, which include regularly mown margins alongside paths to maintain access (and confirmed within related specification and management documents).
- The LAP is close to private rear gardens of Selangor Avenue residents and unlikely to be used in this manner. The larger open space overlooked by plots 63-69 requires a more specific proposal to be developed for recreational use?
- I am unconvinced the trim trail proposal is beneficial to the application – the route is quite pinched in places and some equipment placed close to dwellings. Play provision has proved a contentious matter for several recent application sites – it is important that lessons are learned. Similarly, schemes with isolated and dispersed equipment have proved vulnerable to vandalism and dog fouling. I recommend these

proposals are withdrawn to allow further engagement with the HBC Communities and Landscape teams so that the appropriate types of equipped play can be achieved in the most appropriate location.

- The linear open space adjacent to the eastern site boundary offers some benefit in affording a wider landscape buffer for existing properties along Selangor Avenue. Although much of this area comprises easement, it should not just be 'wildflower' seeded but should incorporate some native shrub hedgerow planting to improve appearance / screening benefit alongside the eastern site boundary and improve provision for linking habitats. Carefully specified variations of mowing regimes could also encourage taller field margin species to contribute linking habitat and enhance a sense of boundary definition.
- The label identifying the A27 embankment as retained vegetation to be protected, maintained and infilled with indigenous planting – given this is beyond the application site, it seems misleading?
- Landscape area at the rear of the site – what is it for? Is it to be managed for a specific purpose? Should this not be stated in this masterplan? Does this fit with the introduction of an access circulation route as shown?
- Street trees have previously been identified as a particular element of local landscape character – some improvement is noted, but there does appear some further scope. Where space is available and particularly within open space areas, a reasonable proportion of these should be specified as larger, legacy native specimens. Greater emphasis on native species variation is required – primarily for biodiversity benefit and increased resilience to disease or similar threats.

Swales

I can find no cross-sections (to confirm depth or bank gradients) or any information about the appearance of associated headwall or inlet / outfall construction or material details. Please could we have an appropriate condition to resolve this?

Hard surfacing materials

I can find no detail regarding proposed hard surfacing materials – has this been submitted? If not, please could an appropriate condition seek this information?

Generic planting plan and external enclosures

Should the application be approved, I recommend the detailed planting plans, associated specification, management documents and external enclosures are excluded for further discussion with HBC Landscape team before submission pursuant to appropriate condition.

- Previous comments regarding 'Native Parkland Trees' within POS areas are not sufficiently addressed. Placement, spacing and specification requires further discussion. The planting size for specimen trees within open space intended for recreational use requires increase to improve resilience / robustness (e.g. 16-18cm girth).
- Previous comments regarding the existing southern hedgerow (alongside Havant Road), the eastern boundary and A27 buffer have only been notionally addressed i.e. a single line comment about replacement planting on the drawing for the Havant Rd frontage hedgerow. Please state number for replacement for each growing season, please add cross-references to the landscape management plan that sufficiently detail / confirm when and how all of these work phases are to occur.
- Proposed native hedgerow planting will be vulnerable to trampling / mowing damage unless appropriate timber post/rail fencing is installed. Although there is mention within the management plan, the detail requires addition to the enclosures details and placement clearly highlighted on the detailed planting plans.

- Areas of existing native hedgerow / scrub proposed for removal are not deemed to have been sufficiently mitigated for within the submitted proposals. A significant additional amount of mixed native hedgerow and scrub habitat planting is required..
- The hatch showing 'Existing grassland to be retained and undisturbed' abutting proposed footways and parking areas to be constructed is unrealistic – please coordinate the extent of the protection area, adding an additional reinstatement hatch (with associated sections added to the specification and management plans).
- Whilst the submitted landscape maintenance and management plan describes how the landscape should be managed, it provides very limited detail about who or by what mechanism this will occur. Further details are required about provision for:
 - adequate performance reporting and monitoring
 - how inadequate or non-performance is to be resolved
 - how replacement / repair responsibilities are assigned
 - funding arrangements and safeguards to achieve a satisfactory performance level

Planting Plan: Sheet 01

- Existing vegetation habitat to the west of 113 Havant Rd requires retention and enhancement for both screening and linking habitat benefit. Proposals to subdivide this into rear garden provision of plots 152 and 161 are not acceptable. Additionally, the indication of an 1.8m brick screening wall within an existing tree root protection area is unacceptable.
- Placement, specification and spacing of trees within the open space in front of plots 142 -161 requires further resolution by discussion.

Planting Plan: Sheet 02

- Does the grass hatch beneath the retained extent of hedgerow (G6) need correcting to retained grass? Are there proposals for supplementary / enhancement work – if so please add details or cross-reference to appropriate documents?
- 2no Acer by parking bays for plot 4 are closely spaced, please can 1no be relocated close to the end of the retain hedge / proposed path close to parking bays for plot 5?
- Isolated length of Laurel hedge adjacent to plot 10 driveway? A more substantial volume of native shrub planting is required for the linear open space alongside the eastern site boundary.

Planting Plan: Sheet 03

- Scope for mixed native hedgerow reinstatement (with emerging trees) adjacent to swale 5 should be considered to mitigate for loss of the existing hedgerow (G6).
- Can the specimen shrubs in front of plots 131, 133 and 121 be upgraded to small trees?
- Missing Hornbeam tree symbols noted by plots 133, 135 , 137, 120 etc.

Planting Plan: sheet 04

- 2no Hornbeam to frontages of Plots 23 and 21 are missing symbols (only labels shown).

Planting Plan: Sheet 05

- Weeping Birch by swales 6 and 7 may block visibility for vehicles using the parking bays and the indicated pedestrian crossing. There is plenty of scope in these locations for more significant, clear stem specimen trees.

Planting Plan: Sheet 06

- Open space specimen trees – please improve species diversity to include a small number of larger legacy trees. The size specification needs to increase for improved robustness in recreational space.

- Hornbeam hedging against façade of plots 71-76 is likely to obstruct windows?
- Could climbers be added to the margin alongside parking bays for plots 70-76?

Planting Plan: Sheet 07

- Ornamental planting and the single species hedge by parking bays for plots 28/29 – please omit and incorporate proposals for a native mixed hedgerow with timber post/rail support fence and some native specimen trees capable of becoming legacy trees. This will also protect the open space from unauthorised access by vehicles.
- Plot 32 – proposed Hornbeam tree labelled but symbol missing.
- Plot 27 – proposed Hornbeam tree between dwelling and the A27 tree belt is inappropriate (excessive overshading / proximity damage to building), please relocate to a more suitable location.
- Plot 27 – proposed rear garden fencing / hornbeam hedge seems awkward / difficult to maintain (why not return fence-line to corner of garage? Suggest climbers / evergreen shrubs instead of hornbeam hedge to help screen bland garage rear façades and close board fencing. Similarly, setting the rear fence-line away from parking bays for plots 47,43,42 would reduce impact damage to the close board fence and allow space for some enhancement planting.
- Rear plot 34 – proposed Hornbeam (labelled but symbol missing) does not have sufficient space to establish – running the fence-line from the corner of plot 37 across to the rear corner of garage (plot 32) would address this.
- Plot 37 / 51 frontages Hornbeam tree labelled but symbol missing.
- Hornbeam proposed to narrow gap between plot 60 garage and three storey flats (plots 53-61) will be difficult to establish and maintain.
- Continuous hornbeam hedge to 49/50/51 rear plot boundary seems excessively bland – is there scope for some interest / variation? Generally the proportion of hornbeam hedging and tree planting seems rather high?
- Sorbus tree adjacent to frontage of plot 50 appears within the gas pipeline easement?

Any queries, 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