

Osmond, Gary

From: Griffin, Tim
Sent: 28 July 2022 11:09
To: Osmond, Gary
Cc: Ellison, Mark
Subject: F/22/93195 BROADWAY FARM, BROAD OAK, BOTLEY - landscape comments (CORRECTED VERSION)

Hi Gary,

I have been asked to provide landscape comments on this application.

Just for the record, this is my first look at this site, and I have not had the opportunity to visit site. I have reviewed online imaging to check the setting of the proposal and tried to assess potential views from surrounding roads.

I have downloaded and reviewed the following documents:

Design & Access Statement (Boyle & Summers)
Landscape Design & Access Statement (LDAS- Fabric)
Floor plan & elevations (Boyle & Summers)
Surface water drainage strategy (Pitman Assoc.)

The Landscape Design & Access statement refers to a Landscape and Visual Appraisal with Impact Statement (LVAIS), however, I could not find this document uploaded to Salesforce.

I note that the previous application F/21/91859 was withdrawn. I cannot see any significant changes to the current proposals from the previous scheme, so I assume this new application is merely to submit additional information.

Given the lack of substantive change to the proposals from the withdrawn application, I have to conclude that the previous landscape objections to the proposals remain valid.

The principal landscape objection is that the site is within designated Countryside and a settlement Gap as identified in the adopted Local Plan. Any development within these areas should be resisted as it is erosive and counter to Policy. Any expansion to the east of the existing boundary hedge will diminish the Gap and have an urbanising impact.

Whilst I agree with Fabric's statement that *'.... this part of the gap along the road corridor of Broad Oak is not pristine rural countryside either side, which contains low density ribbon development comprising dwellings and commercial premises.'* this does not provide sufficient justification for a proposal which will further diminish the Gap. Indeed, the historic erosion of the Gap by piecemeal development makes it even more important to resist further diminution of the Gap.

Other landscape related concerns relate to:

a/ Increased pressure for future expansion of development to the south and east of the proposed warehouse which would further diminish the Gap

- b/ Possible impacts on the adjacent Ancient Woodland SINC
- c/ Potential adverse impact on existing watercourses (Woodhouse Gully)
- d/ Visual impact as the proposed warehouse is on raised ground (see sections within Fabric LDAS)
- e/ Deliverability of proposed screen and hedge planting. The photograph of the existing hedge (in the Boyle & Summers DAS) does not demonstrate a serious commitment to effective planting in the past. This planting is in very poor condition.



I could not find any detailed planting proposals for the site. These are required at this stage, and should not be Conditioned, since bolstering screening of the development is a fundamental part of the proposal.

I concur with the Ecology Officer's observation regarding the extension of hardstanding in the NE corner of the site (apparently undertaken without planning approval) and its adverse impact on the adjacent Ancient woodland. This also diminishes the Gap, and I would support reinstatement of this area to its previous state.

I hope these landscape comments are helpful but should you require clarification, or any changes, do get in touch.

KR Tim 

Tim Griffin

Development Management Consultant

Service Delivery - Specialist Services - Housing and Development