**From:** Tim Screen   
**Sent:** 05 June 2015 17:16  
**To:** Matthew Parry  
**Cc:** Jon Brewin  
**Subject:** FW: 15/00837/OUT - Part Land on North East Side of Gavray Drive Bicester

Matt

Further to consideration of the above planning application I respond as follows.

The LVIA is a comprehensive report and I mostly agree with its conclusions. However, in respect of photo-view EDP7 where the development will be clearly seen by visual receptors on the PRoW and cycle way to Gavray Drive (there is no hedgerow in the way) , and I disagree with EDP’s assumption that the receptor sensitivity is medium (Landscape and Visual – Constructional and Operational Effects)  because of the existing urban influence. This should be judged as **high** visual sensitivity for receptors with a magnitude of change of **high** resulting in a significance of effect of **Major/Moderate (adverse)**, as considered from DLA/PDD’s visualisation Fig 7 pp. 23 of the Design and Access Statement, April 23, against photo-view EDP 7. In order to effectively mitigate this potentially detrimental effect the  landscape proposals must not only screen the built form but enhance the POS corridor/ flood Zone, as suggested in the illustrative masterplan,  subject to EA approvals.

With the onset of winter and associated leaf drop of deciduous hedgerow to Gavray Drive the effect on visual receptors will more apparent because of the increased permeability.  In order to mitigate the effect additional native hedgerow trees should be planted along this boundary, however the build line of the south facing units must be at a distance to reduce the effects of shade and light reduction caused by this hedgerow and trees. In this respect I would prefer to see a wider landscape buffer, than that proposed on the  illustrated masterplan, between the road and the hedgerow. A particular concern is the proximity of the block adjacent to the retained hedgerow in the western corner. The building appears to not only conflict with the surveyed root protection area but will also be subject to the problems mentioned above (to be address at the reserved matters stage).

The public footpath is to be integrated into the scheme as proposed by the illustrative masterplan.

There are no recorded view for the new railway over-bridge. I judge the visual effect would a **major** magnitude of chance from this however it is not a PROW and therefore deemed less sensitive to visual receptor which would not be encourage to linger on the over bridge.

The northern site boundary would benefit from the woodland buffer planting as indicated on the illustrative masterplan, this will be have many environmental benefits especially in landscape mitigation terms: the screening of the railway corridor and visual receptors of the railway, and the screening of the northern edge of the development from the aspect of the over bridge/PRoW

I am encourage to see visualisations if street trees in the DAS I would hope that he detailed design layout provides enough space for such trees to ground to full maturity, with appropriate amounts of soil volume in structured cell tree pits . Drainage /utility layouts are to work effectively with the street tree planting scheme, as evidenced by combining utility (sewerage and potable water systems, gas street light and electricity) information with tree planting proposals. The east west orientation of street will mean that trees on the northern side of the street will cast shade and reduce light levels to windows in south facing units. Therefore species, their mature sizes and location must be carefully considered. I suggest that the tree canopy sizes  are drawn at the 25 year interval for the species proposed in order to ensure enough surrounding space is allocated.

There is no provision for LAPs within the housing areas. The should be at least 4 un-equipped LAPs within 100 lm metres of the farthest extremity of the housing to allow for children, parents and carer to walk to the play area on ‘safe’ footways without the need get in a car, and so more sustainable. A combined equipped LEAP and LAP is required in the an area of POS that does not flood. The illustrative masterplan shows the play area overlays flood compensation which is unacceptable given future flooding problems and deprivation of play opportunities.  A LAP should be located close to the PRoW.

A play strategy and masterplan proposals would be very useful. The quality standards for the provision are:

Unequipped/free play zone LAP

* 50 m2 min. of play activity area
* 350 m2  min. of landscaped buffer between activity areas and active unit frontages
* Protective dog proof play area  fencing and gates (two entrance/exits for ease of escape if child is threatened), to standard BS EN 1176
* A single robust steel seat with back and armrests for users of varying disabilities
* Robust litter bin with lockable lid
* Paved (slab) ‘no dog’ signs at each entrance
* Robust non- toxic planting scheme of scent, texture, flower and movement
* Mown grass areas
* Shade trees (no seating to by sighted beneath them because of bird staining, etc.)
* Clear surveillance from adjacent footways and housing.
* No utilities under or above the play provision.

LEAP/LAP Combined

* At least 3 pieces of interesting and challenging play equipment for age ranges 2 -6 with facility for disabled children (with wet pour safer surfacing to BS EN 1176
* 500 m2 min. of play activity area
* 3500 m2  min. of landscaped buffer between activity areas and active unit frontages
* Protective dog proof play area  fencing and gates (minimum two entrance/exits for ease of escape if child feels threatened), to standard BS EN 1176
* 2 or 3 robust steel seats with back and armrests for users of varying disabilities
* 2 Robust litter bins with lockable lid
* Paved (slab) ‘no dog’ signs at each entrance
* Robust non- toxic planting scheme of scent, texture, flower and movement (protected by fencing)
* Mown grass areas
* Shade trees (with no play equipment or seating under them under them due to staining from birds, etc.)
* Amenity trees
* No utilities under or above the play provision.

The commuted sums and rates/m/lm  of all the typologies will be provided in due course.

Recommended Planning Conditions are:

A standard landscape conditions for a detailed landscape scheme indicating plant schedule, sizes, planting distances, plant names and aftercare/maintenance;

Standard POS/play area condition;

hedgerow retention with minimum maintenance height of 3 m above adjacent ground levels;

and a condition for tree pit details in hard and soft landscaped areas.

Please do not hesitate to make contact if you have any questions on the above matters.

Regards.

Tim
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