

Osmond, Gary

From: Griffin, Tim (Contractor)
Sent: 10 October 2025 21:27
To: Osmond, Gary
Cc: Oliveira, Marta (Contractor); Dyer, Tim; Ellison, Mark
Subject: F/25/100154 91B The Crescent, Eastleigh - landscape comments

Hi Gary,

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

I have not had the opportunity to visit the site but have checked online images which usefully set the scheme in context.

I would like to record a landscape objection to this proposal. Looking at the block plan, I regard the proposal as over-development of this tight site, with the result that any soft landscape areas are extremely limited. There is insufficient space for planting to soften any of the boundaries and the site would be dominated by built-form and hard surfacing. In hot summers it will be a most unpleasant environment in which to live. Bearing in mind Eastleigh's declared climate emergency, this proposal fails to provide adequate landscape mitigation.

The photomontages submitted clearly illustrate how the new terraced houses will be very exposed in views negatively impacting surrounding dwellings.

The proposal offers no significant landscape benefit. The 2 images below clearly demonstrate the negative landscape impact. What appeared to be a green 'island' that softened surrounding urban development, has been replaced by a scheme that results in around 90% of the area being built-form and hard surfacing.

Existing

Proposed

I note from reading through the Pre-App notes, that the existing vegetation has been removed prior to an application being lodged. This is regretted, but since any existing trees were not protected, inevitable.

Bearing in mind the loss of all existing vegetation, I do not think it is unreasonable to expect any site layout to provide meaningful locations for a number of trees to soften the development. At present only 2 trees are indicated on the landscape plan, and these are planted in very narrow planting beds which means they are unlikely to survive.

I suggest the situation can only be improved if the number of units on the site is reduced. This will increase planting opportunities and enable the hard surfaced parking area to be reduced.

Putting my reservations above to one side, if the scheme proceeds as presented further work is required to improve the landscape proposals. Since there is such extensive hard surfacing there

needs to be careful thought to the quality of materials selected to provide a more attractive scheme. At present there is an overuse of tarmac. The block/site plan should be updated to clearly show the range of surfacing proposed.

The planting plan needs to be updated to omit the small areas of grass presently shown in the front gardens as these will be difficult to maintain. A hedge should run along the back edge of the path/drive and kept trimmed at maximum 1m high (Beech or Hornbeam would be preferred). The small strips behind the hedges should be planted up.

Landscape area 10 includes species that are a bit tender for such an exposed situation. Perhaps this planting can be relocated to the small front gardens and replaced by a mix of more robust species such as Hebe 'White Gem', Euonymus spp, Ceanothus 'Repens', Lonicera 'Maigrun' etc. with lower level groundcover species along the front edge where vehicles may overrun.

Some climbers on guidewires should be added to soften flank walls and fences.

I recommend the Field Maple is changed to Acer campestre 'Elsrijk'.

In conclusion, it is disappointing that such a cramped scheme with a barren landscape setting has been submitted.

Please do get in touch if you have any queries relating to my comments above.

KR Tim

Tim Griffin
Landscape Consultant
Working on behalf of Eastleigh Borough Council
Mobile: 07974 900280