

Michelle Houghton

From: David Eaves
Sent: 21 August 2014 17:02
To: bst shared
Subject: FW: Purbrook Park School - Alterations to Playing fields APP/14/00464

Hi please add to Meridio and Web as Further Consultation Response Lanscape Architect HBC

Thanks

David

From: Louise Gilbertson
Sent: 21 August 2014 11:30
To: David Eaves
Subject: Purbrook Park School - Alterations to Playing fields APP/14/00464

David: my Reponses to Mr MacGregor's responses.

The Landscape Architect has suggested a reduction in the playing field. I do not know quite what is intended by this observation. Clearly the improvement in playing fields is a key element in the wellbeing of the pupils and community users and is a major contributor to healthy lifestyles. It is a much publicised Government policy that every possible encouragement is to be given to improve the participation in sport and physical activity to combat obesity, improve quality of life and reduce the spiralling health costs of the Nation. I shall need some guidance on this if the field is to be reduced in size. - If the increase in distance and therefore boundary tree retention has been achieved by moving the whole plateau north and east as noted *without* decreasing the size of the pitch and without negative impact elsewhere on the site then of course this is fine. Is there a plan showing the pitches also marked - revision to PPS/03?

The comments from the Landscape Architect regarding trees are, I believe, covered above.

The issue of fencing and ball stop netting were considered at an early stage in the planning of the works. While they could be effective in reducing ball loss into adjacent gardens, and would be very helpful to the sports' participants, I felt it would be most unpopular with the residents. Effective fencing would be visually intrusive and the trees should minimise ball loss. If you feel fencing or catch netting appropriate, please let me know and I can discuss it with the Client.

Just wanted confirmation that it had been considered - I also believe that the trees should act as sufficient screening and reduce potential ball loss. If residents have not raised concerns then I am happy to not add extra visual intrusions. I hope the school will review the site once established and if issues are raised at a later date once implemented that they will address them for their own, and residents benefit.

It is not clear how close to the synthetic surfaced area the Architect is suggesting planting should be done. Obviously no planting should be considered that will overhang the fence. Leaf drop onto the synthetic surface must be avoided and shade should be minimised. Failure to observe these design principals results in slippery, dangerous surfaces due to moss and algae growth, which is very difficult to prevent without the use of toxic chemicals. There is ample room away from the fence line for further planting if required.

Yes I agree that planting as close as is practicably possible to the existing fence line (1.5 meters?) with several slender species that will create a strong visual barrier would be considered suitable. a slender

The pond fencing is required for the safety of the pupils and other site users. The new water depth will be a maximum of approximately one metre. Access to the remaining area adjacent to the pond is to be maintained as a nature area. You may be aware that the intention is to develop a walk from the south western, wooded, area of the School site, along the southern boundary and around the woodland surrounding the pond. This needs to be unrestricted will excessive fencing.

The Client when onsite showed an interest in the proposal to fence the wider area rather than so close to the pond itself which will not create the pond character envisaged - a fence around the perimeter could easily incorporate a small gate. I would be happy to discuss a plan with the client to look at both options for their consideration.

Additional fencing on the field is not proposed. Most of the new embankments are at a gradient of 3:1 to allow machine mowing. The existing embankment at the west of the MUGA will not be steeper than the existing one. Only in very limited short runs will any new embankments be steeper than 3:1 and, as noted above, they will have some planting on them.

Thank you for clarification

Planting- three new oaks along the western boundary together with some reasonably dense shrub level planting, including thorns to discourage anyone going through. Similarly the other two areas include shrubs that will develop a dense bed of crowns to 4m-6m height over time. **Approved**

trees on the corner of the pitch I thought new trees that fitted in with the memorial origins of the site and had the potential over time to be large feature trees was appropriate. Holm oak provides year round screening and they tend to develop open spreading crowns quite rapidly. The tulip tree I thought could be a real feature tree in time and slightly different to standard species."

I feel it will be difficult to achieve this planting bearing mind the existing planting which is to be retained.

The plan reflects the only the approximate canopy line of the existing trees but I feel that achieving planting within the root zones will present problems. I would not suggest use of the deciduous *Liriodendron tulipifera* where leaf fall on the corner of the pitch but would suggest amending this to a Holm oak-*Quercus ilex*, and omitting the Holm oak shown closest to the boundary.

Kind Regards

Louise Gilbertson CMLI
Senior Landscape Architect
Transport and Implementation Team
Environment & Neighbourhood Quality
Havant Borough Council: Southmoor Offices

2 Penner Road, Havant Hampshire PO9 1QH [Map](#)

Tel: 023 92446 537 Fax: 023 9249 8031

mailto:louise.gilbertson@havant.gov.uk

www.havant.gov.uk

[The Havant Borough Townscape, Landscape and Seascape Character Assessment \(HBTLSA\) is available online here.](#)

[The Hampshire Checklist Developers guide is available here](#)

[Plan a Cycle Journey to get here](#)

 save paper - do you need to print this e-mail?