

Subject:

FW: Boorley Park Nursery application ref. F/23/96256

Hi Rebecca

Landscape comments on Boorley Park Nursery ref. F/23/96256

The landscape design is still very weak and not sufficiently good for us to recommend approval for this element. Whilst the appointment of a landscape consultant is a positive step, the drawing implies that they have not been given the freedom and or budget to realise a suitable design. **I would be willing for these to be addressed through a suitably worded condition.**

Here are some of the issues;

Boundary treatments

1. Chain-link fence is not an appropriate quality material for the boundary or the edges of the internal play areas. Please identify and describe any existing boundary fences to neighbouring properties. If any of these are suitable, agreement with neighbours should be sought for these to be the only hard fencing structure. Where this is not the case we'd require a weldmesh fence of suitably high quality, preferably to match the existing one around the tennis courts.
2. The landscape plan should adequately specify the hard landscape materials.
3. The development should 'wash it's own face' in terms of boundary treatment. Accordingly, we need a hedge along the western boundary to soften the development as viewed from the adjacent housing.
4. The inadequacy of the pedestrian access in terms of safety hasn't changed.
5. What is the intended use of the land to the southwest of the site?
6. The trees need to be individually labelled and the exact stock size specified in numerals. The species choice needs to be rationalised. At present it is too varied and gardenesque. Also, the fastigate oaks are too formal a statement for the locations chosen.
7. Whilst the statement on outdoor play is good as far as it goes, its not enough to describe in words such as: '**Planting and growing areas** will be developed to include digging areas, plants and shrubs for attracting insects, small plastic tube green house, gardening tools and bags, bug hotel/house and bird tables.' These need to be designed into the planning drawings by your landscape consultant, in consultation with the end users.
8. The layout fails to optimise the landscape area in terms of providing a stimulating and attractive environment. This needs further design development.
9. Specification: point 2 is superfluous and should be removed. This also applies to the large panel entitled '*Protection of trees*' and the Tree RPA diagram. Please review point 26, which needs to relate to the actual size of the proposed trees. Point 33, please tweak the wording to clarify that the 1m2 weed free area around trees should be maintained for the first five years after planting.
10. Wildflower Meadow specification: this is generally fine, however we can't see how the contractor is expected to '*endeavour to select ground that is not highly fertile*', when the areas have already been specified by the landscape consultant. The general specification should be amended to

ensure that wildflower areas are laid with subsoil (with topsoil removed). Please note, though our point 8 above. Any areas of normal shrubs or grass within the wildflower areas should still have topsoil.

Best regards
Mark

Mark Ellison
Principal Urban/Landscape Design Officer
Planning & Environment - Urban/Landscape Design
Ext.: 3853