

Application No. APP/15/00896

Site Address: Land at, 38-44 London Road, Purbrook, Waterlooville

Proposed Development: Demolition of existing buildings and redevelopment to form 42No. retirement apartments for older persons including communal facilities, parking provision and associated landscaping; and 2No. commercial/retail units.

No landscape objection to the principle of development, but I would make the following comments:

Design quality

Although loss of the existing character building is regrettable, the proposed scale and design offer good potential for a positive contribution to the local streetscape character.

The use of high quality materials within the new building and associated landscape setting will be particularly important in this local context – I recommend this is sought by appropriate conditions.

Boundaries and enclosure

London Road and Stakes Road frontage proposals for flint walling with hedge and tree planting are deemed positive. It will be important that the flint wall detail corresponds with the existing vernacular.

The eastern linear garden proposals with tree and hedge planting is also positive. I am concerned the site plan indicates 1.8m close board fencing adjacent to the public footway, which will look unattractive and negate any natural surveillance benefit to be gained. I recommend a more appropriate and visually permeable boundary treatment is required in this location.

The proposed building will screen the rear parking court from the road frontage and the proposed development southern elevations indicate generous landscape screening from the parking area.

Conversely, there is minimal car park screening provision for the adjacent public footpath and residential rear gardens. Accepting an obvious natural surveillance benefit, it would seem reasonable to request some further landscape enhancement to the southern and south-eastern car park edge.

I recommend a condition requiring submission of fully annotated plans showing the locations of existing, retained and proposed new boundary treatments, with scaled elevation drawings to show height, design, materials, type and colour of proposed new walling, fencing or other type of enclosure.

Hard landscape

Hard landscape routes need to be of sufficient width for people to walk side-by-side, and to accommodate manoeuvring wheelchairs or mobility scooters. I am concerned the boundary wall returns to the Stakes Road access appears to 'cut-off' the mobility

buggy route to access the store. Gaps between lengths of maintenance access surrounding the building also appear disjointed.

4no parking bays accessed direct from Stakes Road will displace current on-street parking and require agreement from the highway authority. Noting public consultation comments regarding local parking pressures, the parking bay surfacing should differ from the adjacent public highway and may require lockable drop-bollards. The adjacent landscape and boundary treatment should carefully consider visibility site lines for pedestrian safety.

The design and access statement mention of a *'flexible layout to allow the location of any disabled bays that might be needed'* requires further explanation. Surfacing details will need to demonstrate how this can be achieved without deterioration of surface quality.

I am concerned parking bays 20 and 21 in the site sketches appear undersized. Car park tracking within the transport statement also appears very constrained – particularly given this location against the boundary retaining wall. I suggest it would be more appropriate to omit these bays and to incorporate a soft landscape area to both enhance and protect the retaining wall boundary.

I question the orientation of parking bay 7, particularly since the landscape sketch excludes the planted island that is shown on the site plan.

I recommend a condition requiring submission of fully annotated plans and details to identify hard surfacing material type, build-up, edging, laying bond and colour. Proposed levels, any retaining structures and slope gradients should also be identified in coordination with existing levels.

Soft landscape

I recommend fully annotated planting plan to identify individually planted trees, shrubs, hedges, bulbs and any areas of grass. Ornamental planting areas should show the locations of different single species groups in relation to one another, and the locations of any individual specimen shrubs. Other information shall include planting schedules, noting species, plant sizes and proposed numbers / densities and details of the proposed planting implementation programme

Japanese Knotweed

I recommend conditions regarding eradication and spread prevention precautions would be appropriate.

I trust the above is considered reasonable. Any queries, please don't hesitate to contact me.

Kind Regards

Michelle Good CMLI
Senior Landscape Architect