

Michelle Houghton

From: Michelle Good
Sent: 06 October 2015 11:17
To: bst shared
Cc: Daphney Haywood
Subject: FW: Acolaid Case APP/15/00919
Attachments: DocConsult04.pdf

Daphney,

Having taken a further opportunity to review the scheme with colleagues, I include some additional comments identified below in green.

Any queries, please don't hesitate to call.

Kind Regards

Michelle Good CMLI
Senior Landscape Architect
Tel: 023 92446 537
<mailto:michelle.good@havant.gov.uk>

From: Michelle Good
Sent: 18 September 2015 17:04
To: bst shared
Cc: Daphney Haywood
Subject: FW: Acolaid Case APP/15/00919

Application No. APP/15/00919

Site Address: Land north of, Station Road, Hayling Island

Proposed Development: Mixed-use development comprising 76No dwellings (including 30% affordable housing); 4No 1bed, 22No 2 bed, 31No 3bed; and 19No 4 bed dwellings; and 1000sqm of light-industrial accommodation (use Class B1) with associated parking, access, landscaping and surface water drainage.

No landscape objection to the principle of the proposed development, but I make the following landscape comments regarding the details of the submitted proposals:

Drainage Strategy

- DS1 Concerned there is inadequate access provision for future landscape management of the existing watercourse to the eastern boundary (see item EE3 below).
- DS2 Means of access to the SUDS pond is not clear because the gate accesses land outside the application boundary. Unless right of access across neighbouring land can be legally ascertained, it would be more appropriate to adjust the layout to achieve direct access.
- DS3 From a design quality perspective, I am disappointed at the 'engineered' appearance of the SUDS pond. I am also concerned the uniform 1:2 bank gradient will pose difficulties for future landscape management and will limit scope for wildlife benefit. Although I appreciate the requirement to accommodate specific run-off volume, this should not be at the expense

of the local landscape character, local biodiversity or maintenance operative safety. A shallower gradient section of bank is required for safe machine access for future cutting and dredging management operations referred to within the submitted Landscape Management Plan. The SUDS pond design does not correspond with the submitted Ecology Report's mitigation, enhancement and compensation proposals for reptiles. The SUDS strategy requires further review to achieve a more integrated and ecologically sensitive approach. Might it perhaps be feasible to offset some detention capacity beneath the rear parking courts, in order to reduce the volume constraint to the SUDS pond?

External Enclosures

- EE1 Use of red to identify 1800 height screen fence is confusing against the site boundary – please can this be adjusted? Retention of any existing enclosure also requires highlighting more clearly on the drawing (as does any intention for enhancement or repair works).
- EE2 Specification / appearance of the proposed enclosures requires further clarification e.g. 1800mm height screen fence comprises – timber type / sizes? panel style? posts? 1800mm height screen wall comprises what brick(s)? bond? coping? Palisade can also vary significantly in style and appearance – I suggest inclusion of example images would be beneficial.
- EE3 Concerned the existing watercourse appears 'boxed off' by 1800mm screen fencing, which will impede future maintenance access. In contrast to the submitted ditch cross-section, the plans demonstrate there are significantly narrower sections. I doubt that such a narrow grassland strip can be established or managed for reptile benefit along the base of such extensive fencing. In order to facilitate grassland establishment, it would seem reasonable for:
- minimum 1.5m width of level access to be provided adjacent to the existing watercourse,
 - reduction of fencing height to rear parking courts of plots 50-52,
 - reduction of fencing height to rear parking court of plots 38-40 (inc. rear of plot 38),
 - introduce lockable maintenance access gates to each rear parking court.
- EE4 Concerned narrow 'corridor' runs of 1800mm screen fencing will impede natural surveillance and are inappropriate to the local landscape character. I suggest a more sensitive approach is required e.g. rear boundaries to Plots 5 – 18 could be adjusted to 1100mm height timber post & rail fencing, which would afford natural surveillance across the new landscape buffer planting. Reasonable levels of dwelling privacy would still be achieved with the 1800mm height side fencing and proposed fencing along the rear of the proposed Furniss Way Units.

Landscape Masterplan & associated Landscape Proposals

- LM1 LCA31 Central Hayling plain and LCA35 West Town within the Havant Borough Townscape, Landscape and Seascape Character Assessment make specific reference to avoidance of 'additional visual intrusion of the built form on the adjacent open landscape'. The submitted Design and Access Statement states 'Extensive planting is proposed as part of the proposal to create an appropriate boundary to the adjoining countryside...', yet the planting plan comprises only native hedgerow plants between 0.6 and 1.25 metre height in species that do not correspond with existing hedgerow species identified within the Ecology Report. I recommend the species mix is revised to comprise Field Maple (5%), Hazel (5%), Hawthorn (50%), Holly (5%), Blackthorn (25%), Buckthorn (5%), Guelder Rose (5%). Additionally, native tree planting (size 14-16cm girth EHS) Field Maple, Oak and Wild Cherry should also be introduced at 8m centres.
- LM2 The western landscape buffer requires adjustment to match the above species mix.

- LM3 Given the visual sensitivity of the site location, it would be preferable for all trees to be increased to 14-16cm EHS as a minimum.
- LM4 Remaining tree planting throughout the housing layout requires general review:
- Several pairs of trees in close proximity require improved spacing or reduction to a single specimen. Trees should not be omitted from the scheme proposals in these situations, but relocated to contribute more effectively to the proposed street-scene – accepting that some minor layout adjustment may be required in order to achieve this.
 - There are several unidentified circular symbols where additional trees could be incorporated. Anticipating these may be utility or manhole covers, they can reasonably be relocated to adjacent driveways or footways, since tree planting will enhance the street-scene quality. Where below-ground service layouts cannot be adjusted, the design layout requires adjustment and variation to ensure sufficient landscape and tree planting can be incorporated in order to achieve a high quality street scene.
 - Increased species variation would be preferred – perhaps with some Cherry, Field Maple, and Callery Pear?
- LM5 Whilst I have no objection to the ornamental planting species selection, I suggest some further review and consideration is given to the potentially larger varieties proposed in space limited locations, or where taller varieties are planted in front of (or beneath) smaller plants. e.g. Plot 2 use of Escallonia 'Apple Blossom' to under-plant a Hydrangea is somewhat surprising!

Hard Landscape Proposals

- HL1 The hard landscape plan identifies on-plot parking with a different colour compared with the roadway – in reality, these will be consistently large bland areas of tarmac. Further design quality consideration should be given to the proposed hard landscape. Enhanced surfacing colour variation and interest needs to be achieved with additional use of concrete blocks and setts to differentiate driveways and parking courts from broader vehicular circulation areas.

Kind Regards

Michelle Good CMLI
Senior Landscape Architect
Tel: 023 92446 537
<mailto:michelle.good@havant.gov.uk>

From: planning.development@havant.gov.uk [<mailto:planning.development@havant.gov.uk>]
Sent: 03 September 2015 15:20
To: Michelle Good
Subject: Acolaid Case APP/15/00919