

Response to Comments: RM/24/98388

Consultee	Comment Summary	Applicants Response
Archaeology	Details submitted are acceptable	No action on current application (separate discharge of conditions application to be submitted)
HCC Countryside Services	1) Clarity requested on surface finish of proposed links to PROW. 2) Advice in respect of altering the surface of the existing PROW. 3) Comment advising that the PROW shall not be obstructed at any time & must remain open and safely accessible at all times. 4) Request for further information detailing the PROWs protection and enhancement. 5) Concern regarding the accuracy of the extent of the PROW shown on the submitted plans.	1) Please see updated surface finishes plan clearly distinguishing the proposed finish of the proposed links on to the PROW. 2) This is noted. The proposals do not include any plans to alter the surface of the existing PROW. 3) This is noted. This is requested to be included as an informative on the Decision Notice. 4) Information relating to the PROWs protection during construction will be included within the CEMP. The application <u>does not</u> include proposals to enhance the existing PROW as this was not included in the s106 agreement under the outline planning permission. 5) This is noted. Please see updated plans reflecting the correct extent of the PROW. The proposal <u>will not</u> alter/divert the extent/route of the existing PROW in any shape or form.
Urban Design	1) Concern around the amount of hard surfacing around plots 47-49. 2) Concern around the extend of hardstanding across the site. 3) Concern on the amount of side brick walls facing the central green corridor, which won't contribute much towards an active frontage. Encouraged to explore more permeable solutions such as brick walls with railings on top or proposing some architectural interest on these walls.	1) The comment is acknowledged but this cannot be amended any further. The current arrangement provides suitable access and parking arrangements for the dwellings, is the best orientation for noise constraints and suitably addresses the area of POS. A Golpla gravel drive and hard paved parking spaces are proposed to this area to provide a natural approach to the development edge. Please see updated surface finishes plan better distinguishing the finishes. 2) The amount of hardstanding cannot be reduced further. Roads and footways have been designed in accordance with industry standards meaning this cannot be reduced. Please see pre-application feedback from HCC. 3) This comment has been reviewed. We cannot provide the brick wall and railings due to the privacy of future residents. Projected brick detailing won't work successfully on retaining walls because of the level changes.

	4) Unclear from drawings what type of roof material is proposed (natural or manmade). 5) Timber cladding on some fragments of the walls seems random and not strong enough as a gesture. timber cladding on a larger surface is preferred. 6) Further encouragement towards more dwellings reflecting the woodland edge and local context.	Instead, climbers to the brick walls where achievable are proposed Current proposals already offer detailing to the brick walls, such as tile creasing and rolled tops. Please see material mood-board with photo examples taken from other Bargate Homes schemes. In addition, specific photo examples of the successful use of climbers at another Bargate Homes site will be submitted. 4) Clay tiles are proposed. Please see further submitted proposed materials schedule for further detail. 5) Cladding proposed is 'cedral cladding'. Some elevations do not lend themselves to having whole first floor level cladding due to levels. Bargate are content with the proposals and believe it works well. The proposed materials/elevations provide a balanced variation between brick and cladding – it is not proposed to amend this any further. 6) We consider that the scheme as proposed sufficiently reflects the woodland edge in the appropriate areas of the development. All dwellings within the site are considered to reflect the local context. It is not proposed to amend the scheme any further in this respect.
Ecology	1) Concern around discontinuous green edge around the site, particularly on the eastern boundary. 2) Central G.I corridor must include more varied planting with different levels, structure and cover. 3) E-W corridor needs an area of scrub to the south of the path all the way across. Must include the area north of plot 23 so that it can provide cover for wildlife moving across the site. 4) Appears to be a pipe to tank to pond system. The use of swales and rain gardens is preferable along the road and path edges before the water reaches the attenuation tank, SuDS ponds and wetland area. 5) Request for arrows to be included on plans showing direction of surface water drainage. 6) Request for water butts to be added to dwellings. 7) All gullies must have amphibian escape ramps. 8) Maintenance in grassed areas could have a detrimental effect on GCN and other wildlife.	1) See updated landscaping plan demonstrating that the site includes a continuous green link inclusive of the eastern boundary. The updated plan highlights that the existing native scrub(bramble) is clearly retained. The same is reflected in the updated ECOSA ecology reports. 2) This is noted and is reflected in the updated landscaping plan. Further specific detail could be conditioned. 3) Noted and this is now reflected in the updated landscape plan. 4) Upon review with the technical design team and relevant engineers, a swale cannot be included as tabled at our meeting on the 28th November. This is due to a number of technical factors. The surface water drainage within the access road is 375mm pipe, at a gradient of 1:20 and, average of 1.6m deep. To divert this pipe into a swale in the verge, would necessitate a retaining structure along the road, as there is insufficient room between the edge of the road to the site boundary to provide 1:3 side slopes which this channel would require. To include additional swales the drainage model would need to be re-ran in its entirety in order to see if swales could be accommodated within the network. This would take a significant amount of time and would disrupt the currently proposed drainage network/system we are close to agreeing with the LLFA.

	9) Query on the Brown dotted line along the top edge of the northernmost pond on the drainage plan. 10) Request for quantity of bird and bat boxes to be increased. 11) A more specific BEMP requested.	5) Directional flows are now included on surface water drainage plan. 6) Water butts are now proposed on semi and detached units. 7) Noted. This will be done as part of the GCN license. 8) Please see updated maintenance note which covers the appropriate wildlife precautions. Detailed maintenance will be included in the LEMP (condition 14). 9) This is gabion style retaining wall, the detail of which has been kept loose at this stage. This has been added to the key on the relevant plans. 10) Please see updated Ecology report outlining that Bargate's policy is for every dwelling to have a biodiversity enhancement, whether that's a bat brick, bird box or bee brick. A plan will be included with the conditioned LEMP showing a bird, bat or bee enhancement on each plot. 11) It has now been agreed with the Case Officer that this will be included within the LEMP as per condition 14.
Environmental Health	Detail submitted acceptable.	No further action on this application.
Hampshire Swifts	1) Request for every dwelling to have a swift brick.	1) Bargate's policy is for every dwelling to have a biodiversity enhancement, whether that's a bat brick, bird box or bee brick. Please see further plan provided by ECOSA which identifies the biodiversity enhancement features on each individual plot.
HCC Highways	1) Query raised in relation to whether roads and footways are designed to industry standards and whether a private management company will maintain these. 2) Requested that refuse vehicle tracking diagrams are produced for the build out section of the access drive, given the narrow width of the highway at this point, in order to fully demonstrate that the manoeuvre can be easily undertaken. 3) Given the widths of available highway throughout the development, it would be requested that combined car and refuse vehicle tracking is completed for the whole of the internal site in order to identify any pinch points where the two vehicles are unable to pass each other.	1) Roads and footways are private and will be maintained by a private management company. The roads and footways have indeed been designed to industry standards. 2) Please note that this has already been provided as part of the outline planning application and approved. Please refer to figures 3 & 4 in the approved transport assessment within the outline planning permission. 3) Please see separate response addressing this provided by our consultant. In short, the roads are 5.5m wide and within low traffic areas so there is not conflict between refuse and car movement interactions. 4) Noted. Please see updated site layout plan which has positioned this parking space slightly further south. 5) The pergolas have been designed so as to ensure car doors will be able to open fully. Further detail can be provided as part of condition if required. The quantum of parking is in accordance with EBC's emerging parking standards which is considered acceptable.

	4) The visitor parking bay opposite plot 47 is also partially driven through, and so a vehicle parked in this could prevent refuse vehicle movement if not parked centrally. 5) Concern raised about parking spaces under pergolas and the amount of parking provided throughout the site being slightly under the adopted standards.	
Housing Enabling Specialist	Various comments	Please see separate formal letter in response to these comments prepared by Gillings Planning.
Landscape	Various comments	Please see separate response and updated plans provided by Terra Firma addressing the Landscape Officers Comments.
HCC LLFA	Various comments	A full detailed response to these comments was provided by our consultant on the 29.11.2024. Please refer to these in full. Please also refer to amended drainage layout plans.
Nature Space	GCN License recommended.	Noted and traditional route is being sought.
Eastleigh Ramblers	1) Error in the plotting of the PROW route on the submitted plans. 2) Upgrades to the existing PROW surfacing requested. 3) Request for an additional link from the site on to the PROW in the northern most section of the site.	1) Noted. Please see updated plans detailing the correct PROW route. The proposed development <u>does not seek</u> any alteration to the existing PROW route. Please see sperate note prepared by Gillings Planning outlining this clearly. 2) This is not secured in the s106 agreed under the Outline Planning Permission and as such is not part of the current proposals. 3) This has been explored however is not feasible due to the significant understorey growth and scrubland that would need to be removed in order to facilitate a link here.
Southampton Airport	Concern in relation to bird attractiveness of the site.	These comments were addressed with further information provided on the matter on 07.11.2024. Southampton Airport have since submitted a 'no objection comment'.
Southern Water	Precise location of foul water connection requested.	
Tree Officer	No objection	No further action required on this application.
Natural England	Not received as of 13.12.2024	
Parish Council	Not received as of 13.12.2024	