

Consultee Comments for Planning Application APP/15/01386

Application Summary

Application Number: APP/15/01386

Address: Land North of Bartons Road, Havant

Proposal: Discharge of Condition No/s 3, 4, 7, 8, 11 and 13 of Planning Permission APP/14/00863.

Case Officer: Daphney Haywood

Consultee Details

Name: Miss Michelle Good (Engineering & Landscape Team)

Address: 2 Penner Road, Havant PO9 1QH

Email: michelle.good@havant.gov.uk

On Behalf Of: Landscape Team

Comments

Application No. APP/15/01386

Site Address: Land North of Bartons Road, Havant

Proposed Development: Discharge of Condition No/s 3, 4, 7, 8, 11 and 13 of Planning Permission APP/14/00863

I outline comments below that require resolution before these condition can be discharged:

Condition 3 & 8 hard surfacing comments

- i) Road Construction Layout (LIND48-004 Rev C) doesnt include the extent of Construction Exclusion Zones (CEZ) as defined on the Tree Protection Plan (Ref. 13132-BT3) by the Arboriculturalist (Barrel Tree Consultancy) that was submitted and approved as part of the original planning application. Dashed lines currently shown around some of the trees corresponds with an illustrative plan by Bright Space Architects that is not deemed sufficient / accurate. Any surface construction that encroaches into the CEZ requires specific construction details with appropriate Arboriculturalist input.
- ii) Proposed granite sett rumble strips (and the double row sett demarcation lines) require a design to accommodate cyclists, whether this is by a widening the 700mm kerbline gap currently indicated for drainage or by introduction of a central margin.
- iii) Extent of block paved road construction is reduced compared with the scope of the original application. It would seem appropriate to reintroduce a block paved area towards the rear of the site to reduce the expanse of proposed tarmac.
- iv) Block laying bond, colour, build-up requires confirmation (the Road Details drawing is missing / not uploaded).
- v) There are several instances where the footway construction hatch pattern continue between proposed driveways and the road (e.g. plots 13 16, plots 24 27 and plots 30 37), whereas I

would expect the driveway construction hatch to continue up to the road as an appropriate vehicle crossing.

vi) Hard surfacing for rear garden access for plots 7, 8 & 9, plots 10, 11 & 12, plot 50, plots 37 & 36 all appear to require some further or clearer definition of either route and/or paving material specification.

vii) Very narrow undefined strips alongside plot 7, the eastern façade of plot 12, to rear gardens of plots 24 & 25, between driveways for plots 36 & 37, the narrow taper between driveways to plots 51 & 52, and to the rear gardens of plots 15 & 16 these are too narrow to support planting, they require further hard material definition / specification or sufficient widening to allow for soft landscape establishment.

viii) I suggest the open space footway is adjusted further away from the visitor parking bay (opposite plot 52) to discourage overrun and to accommodate a more substantial block of separation planting.

ix) Condition 3 makes mention of related provision to be made for street lighting (albeit there is a separate condition 12 for external lighting). Since the 5m columns and lighting bollards appear sparsely distributed, I suggest a lux level plot is required for submission to discharge condition 12. I'm further concerned whether bollard type lighting will be sufficiently robust and durable.

Condition 4 & 13 levels and drainage comments

x) The Engineering Layout (LIND48-001 Rev C) doesn't include the extent of Construction Exclusion Zones (CEZ) as defined on the Tree Protection Plan (Ref. 13132-BT3) by the Arboriculturalist (Barrel Tree Consultancy) that was submitted and approved as part of the original planning application. Dashed lines currently shown around some of the trees appear to correspond with an illustrative plan by Bright Space Architects are not deemed sufficient / accurate.

xi) Surface and Foul Water manholes S17, S15, F11 and associated drainage runs are positioned within the CEZ for existing trees that are proposed for retention. Given some significant trees are being removed to accommodate the proposed development, I consider it vital that the approved Tree Protection Plan is given due regard and consideration.

xii) Similar to the above point, it looks as though the cellular storage and turning head by plot 37 will also encroach into the CEZ.

xiii) Rear garden to plot 30 appears to include a bank with a 1.8m drop over less than 2 metres, which will be excessively steep. I suggest a similar retaining structure to plot 31 is required.

I trust the above is considered reasonable. If you should have any queries, please don't hesitate to call.

Kind Regards

Michelle Good CMLI
Senior Landscape Architect
Tel: 023 92446 537

michelle.good@havant.gov.uk