

From: Michelle Good
Sent: 17 May 2016 17:47
To: David Eaves
Cc: Peter Marshall
Subject: FW: Planning Application APP/16/00347 Purbrook School Former Playing Fields Stakes Road Waterloooville

Hello David

Planning Application APP/16/00347 Purbrook School Former Playing Fields Stakes Road Waterloooville

Layout comments:

1. The indicative 'potential pedestrian access' appears far too intrusive to plot 008 and follows a rather awkward route. It appears that insufficient space has been afforded to the creation of an appropriate connection with the adjacent development.

Whilst I can appreciate concerns raised by a small number of residents and Hampshire Police about the prospect of this connection – a more appropriately designed link for both pedestrians and cyclists would improve natural surveillance to discourage anti-social behaviour. I have observed pedestrians walking through the neighbouring estate for the very reason that it does offer a more convenient and more attractive route to walk.

If a successful link is to be achieved, the design layout requires adjustment to better define an approach to the link without being intrusive to dwellings or in conflict with parked vehicles. The width of access needs to accommodate both pedestrians and cyclists (3 metres with appropriate bollards to prevent vehicular access). Opportunity to improve connectivity may well require some works to the adjacent site by agreement or contribution to appropriate parties.

2. Generally, the layout includes some particularly small or remnant triangles that are not deemed of sufficient size to establish soft landscape or indeed grass. Examples of these include:
 - Grass areas to north of plot 007
 - Grass adjacent to access path for plot 004
 - Planting between driveway and access path for plot 024
 - Planting between driveway and access path for plot 017 / 016I recommend some further design refinement to address these by either enlarge areas or conversion to hard surfacing where appropriate.
3. Several parking bays appear too narrow. As a minimum these should be 2.4m width and additional width is required where bays are immediately adjacent to building facades or screen walls e.g. Plot 019.

Soft landscape proposals:

4. Daphne laureola is significantly toxic and the sap causes skin irritation – hence recommend this is substituted for an alternative plant.
5. Pieris japonica 'Little Heath' requires acidic soil (so deemed unlikely to establish successfully).
6. Photinia planted to the frontage of plot 014 is likely to grow / spread far beyond the planting area shown and is likely to obstruct windows etc.
7. There appears opportunity for screen planting to fence lines around plot 018 (rear of plot 026)?
8. Recommend the Ligustrum hedge to the site frontage is substituted for a native mix of feathered plant stock, which should be reinforced with an appropriate support fence (also to be indicated on boundary drawing).
9. Provision for screen planting to enhance the appearance of close board fencing for the adjacent development is required (plots 001 – 007 and plot 008).
10. Management proposals and gapping up planting are required for existing vegetation to be retained. These should be incorporated with the soft landscape proposals or identified as a separate landscape management proposal.

Boundary and surface treatments:

11. Northern boundary to plot 007 has little or no provision for soft landscape / screen planting. Recommend the close board fence should be substituted for a brick screen wall.
12. The 2.1m fence appears to conflict with existing trees to be retained along the northern boundary.
13. Close board fencing indicated at ends of parking bays will be impact vulnerable (plots 013, 018). Suggest a soft landscape set back area, which will also improve the appearance from the access road.
14. I question the merit of close board fencing alongside parking bays to plot 018, which is likely to be impacted by vehicles and isolates the grass area from any view or natural surveillance benefit. Does this area comprise part of plot 018? Can the fence be omitted and the grass protected by some set back chunky timber bollards or a post/rail fence?

Any queries or concerns, please don't hesitate to contact me.

Kind Regards

Michelle Good CMLI

Senior Landscape Architect

Tel: 023 92446 537

<mailto:michelle.good@havant.gov.uk>