

Consultee Comments for Planning Application APP/16/00875

Application Summary

Application Number: APP/16/00875

Address: Land at Larchwood Avenue, Havant

Proposal: The erection of a drive-thru restaurant (Use Class A3/A5), car parking, access, servicing, landscaping, engineering works and ancillary works.

Case Officer: David Eaves

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

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

Whilst there is no landscape objection to the principle of the proposed development, the submitted site layout and associated detail does not sufficiently meet the requirements of Policy CS16.

Landscape comments regarding the submitted application documents:

- i) Proposed levels around the western site corner do not sufficiently correspond with the existing context. Existing surface levels at the base of the retaining wall range 29.82-29.60 for this part of the site, yet proposed levels are reduced to 28.82 and 28.67. The resultant increase of bank steepness alongside the NE site boundary and a metre depth reduction at the base of the existing retaining wall could pose a stability / structural risk to adjacent land. It is recommended that the proposed levels and layout arrangement are reviewed further.
- ii) A pedestrian route width of 1.2m is not deemed sufficient for comfortable passing / circulation. An increase to 1.8m is regarded far more appropriate and will allow two wheelchairs to pass. As a minimum, route require widening to 1.5m with regular provision of passing places of 1.8m width. Routes alongside perpendicular parking bay rows are a particular concern because vehicles are likely to overhand the kerb further obstructing these already narrow routes. Similarly, stepped or ramped access routes require sufficient width to ensure the distance between handrail centres is not less than 1.2m and that intermediate ramp landings allow sufficient width for wheelchairs to pass (1.8m).
- iii) It is accepted that the proposed pedestrian connection to the existing Asda access road crossing will provide an important link to a primary route from adjacent residential / business areas

further south and east. The submitted Landscape Plan and Tree Protection Plan do not coordinate with this proposal. If the application is approved, a planning condition is recommended requiring submission of detailed proposals to address:

- Updated Tree Protection Plan and associated Arboricultural Reports
- Extension of the proposed footway to full width (back of kerb) for avoidance of a trampled bark mulch margin alongside the footway.
- Provision of a dimensioned plan and cross-section detail with levels demonstrating compliance with BS 8300 / Part M, detailing appropriate step and footway materials and specifications (i.e. hazard warning paving, handrails etc.).
- Details of proposed tree felling and vegetation clearance to facilitate access construction, as well as, replacement landscape proposals sufficient to mitigate for the loss of TPO trees.

iv) The majority of submitted plans appear to indicate removal of the existing tarmac footway alongside Larchwood Avenue. Extending beyond the application boundary, this footway leads to an informal (but well used) route along the top of a banked ridge and gravelled access to ASDA supermarket. This informal route is deemed a quicker, more direct approach to / from ASDA car park areas and particularly the supermarket bus stops. Removal of the existing tarmac footway will not prevent use of this route and the proposed shrub bed will become prone to trampling / compaction damage. Retention of the existing footway and improvement / formalisation work to the informal path would be far more beneficial to pedestrian circulation, site security, levels coordination and appearance of the proposals. The proposed layout should also clearly demonstrate coordination with drop kerb and tactile paving located on the adjacent side of the McDonalds / KFC access.

v) Proposed access ramps to the customer entrance indicate a combined level change approaching 2m. It appears each of the 5m length ramps will have a gradient approaching 1:12 gradient (which is not BS8300 / Part M compliant). Accommodation of retaining walls / guardrail or handrails is likely to reduce the width below 1.2m (again not BS8300 / Part M compliant). If the ramps are intended also to accommodate cycles, the width will need to be substantially increased. Intermediate landings will require sufficient width to allow for passing wheelchairs (min. 1.8m). On a related matter, the adjacent stepped access will require hazard warning paving, handrails etc. Although the recommended condition for item ii) above could be utilised in this instance, it is anticipated the site layout requires significant revision to resolve.

vi) Means of access for cyclists from the existing route network to the proposed cycle parking area requires some clearer demonstration.

vii) Proximity of walls to parking bays 7 and 11, 12-17 present a vehicle collision risk either the parking bays need to be enlarged, a buffer margin introduced or the walls repositioned. The menu board sign and light column will unacceptably obstruct access to a disabled parking bay. The 2nd ground signs for the disabled bays will also require positioning to ensure a minimum 1.2m width clearance is maintained.

viii) The soft landscape proposals are deemed wholly unacceptable. Proposed grass to the walled bed along parking bays 7-11 will be unsightly and difficult to establish and maintain. Proposed grass to the base of the existing wall will do very little to enhance the existing concrete retaining wall - noting the rodent issue, perhaps the grass margin could incorporate some climbing plants or small sized trees? Given the steepness of the NW bank, how will grass be implemented and managed in order to minimise risk of injury? Areas identified as existing landscape will require landscape enhancement and management proposals. Existing trees indicated for removal within the Tree Protection Plan (G3) have not been removed from proposed Landscape and Site Plans. Loss of trees and habitat will require some form of mitigation to address the Ecology Report recommendations.

ix) The indication of a future extension zone appears to further limit and restrict adequate provision for adequate pedestrian circulation. Removal of this zone from the proposal is recommended.

Kind Regards

Michelle Good CMLI
Senior Landscape Architect
Civil Engineering & Landscape Team

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