

From: Jim Beavan <JBeavan@savills.com>
Sent: 18 May 2022 18:03
To: Oliver, Lewis <Lewis.Oliver@havant.gov.uk>
Subject: Dunsbury Park - APP/21/01267 Phase 5

CAUTION: This email came from outside of the council - only open links and attachments that you're expecting.

Hi Lewis,

We have been reviewing the updated consultee comments as they arrive on the Dunsbury Phase 5 planning file.

I have collated responses to the Landscape Architect and LLFA below.

HBC Landscape Architect

I'm not sure it's entirely fair to say that none of the LA's earlier comments have been actioned. I itemised out our responses/amendments in the email dated 20/04:

- The smaller fastigate species currently proposed (prunus, pyrus, sorbus) have been selected to allow HGVs to pass unhindered along the access road and into the service yards. There is no appropriate location for large stature legacy trees within the site.
- The scheme already includes a Hornbeam selection.
- Additional Beech Tree planting has been included on the embankment to the north of the application (within PCC's ownerships)
- The Dunsbury S106 requires the delivery of an east/west footpath link to the Park Lane bridleway – we are in discussions with HCC Highways to deliver this which obviates the need to deliver it via Plots 500-502.

Materials – please see attached two materials sheets (providing the additional detail requested by the LPA).

LLFA

LLFA Comment: The drainage layout within the Drainage report reviewed previously identified flow control devices restricting flows to 2.84l/s at FC-04 and 7.31 l/s at FC-03. The revised drawings have removed FC-04 and the closest hydrobrake is downstream of attenuation tank AT-02 with a restriction of 11.4l/s. Clarification is required on why the original flow rates are not achievable and how flows are being controlled to previously agreed rates.

Applicant Response: This more recent report shows a more developed design which is more representative of how the drainage would actually function. Due to level and space constraints, attenuation for the road is placed much higher than the outfall. Having the final flow control at it's previous location would not have allowed the full extent of the attenuation to be utilised. Where possible flow controls should be placed as close to attenuation as possible, this latest design allows for that. Regarding the change of flow rate, FC-04 is now limited to the combined total of FC-01, FC-02 and FC-04 as required by the site wide scheme. As flows from FC-01 and FC-02 will need to pass through attenuation designed for run-off from the road, this flow control rate needs to represent this to prevent these flows being attenuated twice within site. A total discharge of 18.71l/s from site

equates to what is permissible by the off-site attenuation and flows will not exceed this with the position and rates imposed by designed flow controls.
I would be most grateful if you could consider the above in responding to your statutory consultees.

Kind Regards,

Jim

Jim Beavan MRTPI
Associate
Central South Planning

Savills, Mountbatten House, 1 Grosvenor Square, Southampton, SO15 2BZ



Tel : +44 (0) 23 8071 3931

Mobile : +44 (0) 78 0799 9464

Email : JBeavan@savills.com

Website : www.savills.co.uk

