**From:** Tim Screen   
**Sent:** 12 July 2017 17:59  
**To:** Linda Griffiths  
**Subject:** RE: 16/02482/REM - Land South West Of Bicester Adjoining Oxford Road And Middleton Stoney

Linda

As discussed, there are numerous issues with the layout, landscaping and play area. I hope they take on board our advice.

LAP

1. The LAP design and specification lacks detail.
2. There must be a transitional area at the entrances for buggies and pushchairs and also to allow for the outward opening gates, away from the play activity area. With the currently inward opening gates there is a possibility for children run into them and  cause injury!  Outward opening gates on to the footpath are also problematic, hence the transitional area.
3. The play activity area, at approximately 72 m2, is too small an area to provide the required circulation and range of play equipment, in accordance with CDC’s current SPD. An area of 100 m2 is required. In order to accommodate a relocation of a larger swing frame a few more metres away from the southern entrance which will influence the relocation of the SB1044 Hamal Multi Play Unit a few metres east, resulting in additional wetpour safer surface increasing the activity area to100 m2. I would prefer the wetpour safer surface under the swings and the Hamal Multi Play Unit rather than the rubber bark – James Blake Associates to confirm with the hard landscape drawing.
4. SB4042 Haden The Horse is acceptable as a piece of equipment but be re-orientated for it head to face the seat for easer interaction between parent and child.
5. SB2032  Jabbah Single Swing is located too close the northern entrance for ease circulation. Furthermore children will not perceive the risk of running across the swing for the entrance to the multi-use slide. Improve the play experience with individual swing seats for two children of age ranges 2 -6  - swing type to be submitted for my consideration.
6. The Bench SB 5057 did not appear in the current product range. If it is devoid of back and arm rests. Back and armrests provide support for people with varying degree of mobility. Grandparents, parents who are infirm will be grateful for a proper seat. I recommend the Miracle B5048 Ergo Bench as a suitable replacement.
7. A 1/100 scale hard works drawing is required. We must ensure the surfaces and edges are durable and the construction methods are appropriate – for example timber edging board and hoggin are unsuitable.
8. The bowtop play areas fencing is the surround the entire play area boundary. The current proposal does not indicate fencing between the frontages 196 to 202 and the edge of the landscape buffer.
9. The play manufacturer and guarantees of the lifespan of the equipment.
10. The native hedge mix is not appropriate adjacent to a play area, with potentially thorny outgrowths. Therefore a single species hedge is required. On the Detailed Landscape Proposal Dwg no. JBA 17/081-06 Rev B under Hedger Mixes is say 100% Carpinus betulus. This is not a mix but a single species, however this species is accepatable.
11. For the planting:

* Phormium ‘Jester’ has lanceolate leaves with a point at the end which could poke into children’s eyes. Therefore replace with a suitable non-toxic plant.
* Replace the Acer campestre ‘ Steetwise’ clones with the native species A. campestre. The genetic variability of the native Field Maple is greater the clone and able to cope with environmental changes.
* The 5 no Betula utilis ‘Jacquemontii’ are do moany in number and planted far too close together fro the purposes of mowing underneath their canopies. Delete 2 trees and position further apart to achieve a more open canopies and symmetrical canopies.
* Euonymous fortunei ‘Emerald and Gold’ toxicity: all parts may cause severe discomfort if ingested. Therefore replace with a more suitable plant species.
* Phlomis russeliana, although a good plant it requires a free draining soil. The soil on site is quite heavy and it would be advisable to add sand  to facilitate good drainage.
* Rosa ‘Flower Carpet’ with its spiny outgrowths, if not kept in check will grow the other side of the hedge and cause scratching to children’s. A suitable replacement is required.
* Salvia × superba is a herbaceous perennial that is neither long lived or robust. It will be trodden on and killed off in its position near the northern access.

Proposed Trees and Their Locations

1. A number of trees are very close to walls and paving, even with the root barrier the expansion of the buttress roots will cause damage. Trees are to be at least a minimum of 2 m away from these structural features. If there is insufficient space in which to do this then the tree must be deleted, or relocated, for example:

* Delete Prunus ‘Amanogawa ‘ near 1800 mm high brick screen wall.
* Relocate Betula ‘Fascination to the centre of the border adjacent to the cycle storage
* Delete Acer campestre ‘Nanum’ from the front of Plot 182
* Delete Prunus ‘Amanogawa ‘ from the grass frontage of plot 58 in favour of Amelanchier lamarkii tree  planted at least 2 m from the kerb.
* Delete 2 no Acer campestre ‘Nanum’ (because they are genetic clones), from the frontage of plot 129. Replace with 2 Amelanchier lamarkii \ 2 m   from the edge of the paving.
* Similar issues with proposed trees on the frontage of plots 182
* Delete Prunus ‘Amanogawa’ from the corner of plot 131 and replace with specimen shrub Amelanchier lamarkii
* Delete Prunus ‘Amanogawa’ from near the parking bay 132 and replace with specimen shrub Amelanchier lamarkii
* Replace Prunus ‘Amanogawa’ with A. lamarkii and relocate 2 m away from the paved edge.
* Delete Betula pendula from the very narrow border, south of plot 70
* Delete Prunus serrula from the south of plot 72 because of limited space.

1. The problem with Pyrus calleryana ‘Chanticleer’ is that when it is exposed to the street and damage to the trunk occurs an with potentially ugly wound response will result. Replace the tree with Amelanchier lamarkii within a ‘arboresin’ surface rather than a tree grill and tree cage. The tree grill allows for the collection of litter and unsightly weed growth. The tree cage once deformed by vehicle strike will be unsecure and visually ugly. Replace the tree cage with 4 bollards (1 on each corner of the tree pit). Tree pit details are required.
2. The parking courts  153 to 161 are devoid of any greenery. Is it at all possible to create a tree pit in a space between parking bay 156 and 157 and plant a Liquidambar styraciflua within a structural cell system – details are required.
3. Proposed hedge against a wall is counter-productive and the hedge may cause structural damage and obscures it. Delete the hedge and plant wall climbers (exclude ivy) every 3 to 4 metres  and low groundcover ‘cushion’ to the base to soften the feature. The wall remains visual and able to be maintained.

Planting Mixes

1. Groundcover mix A adjacent to plot 153. The fence is visually quit onerous and the inclusion of climbers would be useful , such as Lonicera halliana ‘Japonica’ which will grow over and soften the fenceline. Shade will be caste on the border by the dwelling (plot 153) and the 1800 mm fence. The plant species’ cultural requirements should to reflect this. Retain Euonymus fortunie ‘Emerald and Gold’  and Lonicera ‘Maygreen’ because it is shade tolerant, but delete Ceanothus thyrsiflorus var. repens because it prefers full sun.
2. The presence of Hebes sp on the northern elevations is inappropriate because they are, in the main more suitable for sunny, south facing areas.
3. The window positions are not indicated on the drawings, which leaves me to consider that the landscape design does not allow for window cleaning. This matter to be revisited by the landscape architect in order to incorporate a paved area within the border to allow for window cleaning/maintenance on the house frontages.

Ascot Railing

1.    Ascot fencing is required to the edge of the private drives on the northern area of the development in order to prevent vehicular access onto Friar’s Walk.

Regards

Tim

**Tim Screen** CMLI

**Landscape Architect**

Cherwell District & South Northants Councils
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