

As an overarching principle, on a greenfield/brownfield site with limited constraints, I would expect a strong GI strategy to be considered from the outset. This should create a strong landscape structure developed alongside the urban layout and form from the outset. GI is by its nature multifunctional, and thereby should be embedded within the form and function of the new development to provide a high quality development with landscape assets that integrate the proposals into the existing urban area and create a place that will mature and evolve in a positive way, contributing to local distinctiveness and townscape character.

Parameter plans.

It is vital that landscape structure/GI is designed in from the outset rather than as an add-on to the architectural layout, in order to create a robust and well-functioning public realm and maximising the potential for new biodiversity links, sustainable transport choices, such as walking and cycling over car use: and facilitating wellbeing and community building by providing a public realm that is attractive and well used.

In order for GI to be considered a fundamental aspect of site master-planning, it is important that the landscape framework is expressed appropriately in parameter plans. This ensures that positive landscape and GI attributes indicated at outline stage are embedded within the structure of the masterplan and are carried through the planning process in order to achieve its potential at detailed stage.

I would therefore wish to see parameter plan FD 16-1431-60 adjusted to reflect the key features of the GI/landscape strategy.

I note that an Land Use Parameter Plan is provided. Ideally I would like to see a separate Landscape/GI Parameter plan however as long as clear information is included somewhere in the outline application it will suffice. This should include all the existing constraints (i.e. trees to be retained and root protection areas) as well as key structural GI connections and features that inform the landscape masterplan.

#### Indicative Masterplan

It is my understanding that the indicative Masterplan supplied with this outline application is, as labelled, not for approval at this stage.

Therefore under these circumstances I will refrain from picking up on the entirety of landscape comments.

I will however draw out some overarching comments that I would wish to see addressed in the masterplan for approval. From my perspective, the indicative Masterplan as submitted contains a number of concerns that will need to be addressed prior to a site plan/GA being approved.

I am happy to discuss these in more detail in person as required.

- 1) Landscape Structure:

As explained in the section above, on a greenfield/brownfield site I expect to see a strong and well-functioning landscape structure to be embedded within the masterplan and compliment the street hierarchy and planned townscape character. It is important that space for substantial structure planting is designed in upfront as a fundamental part of the site layout.

My marked up sketch gives a possible solution imposed upon the current layout. Other solutions are possible, but the underlying principle remains the same, and I will expect to see the site designed accordingly at detailed stage.

The landscape principles set out in the Design and Access Statement have not been well translated into the indicative masterplan. I would especially want to see the north south axis defined more clearly, in particular the central axis. This should be considered from a multifunctional GI perspective, and therefore overlay with a cycle route (no problem with this being on-road) that links in a clear and direct way to the cycle route along the north of the site. This link needs to be direct and unambiguous . Following a clear structural tree line will help with this, whilst the avenue will lift the quality of the development.

The use of formal avenues, even within the setting of a contemporary development, will help create character links with the listed building. Linking strong structural planting through visual alignment across the site north and south will help relate the listed building to the development and help to avoid a piecemeal or disjointed character.

## 2) Character Areas.

Character Areas as expressed in the Design and Access Statement focus almost exclusively on building typologies rather than as a holistic vision for the urban form, which includes its landscape framework. I would like to see these revised and suggest leading this with landscape structure would be a useful point at which to make these revisions.

I would also like to see some precedent images and typologies for streetscape design and the function of the square. At present it is indicated that it would contain a LEAP. However, this is at a key gateway point to the development, the street design , albeit indicative to me has more the character of a formal square and setting to building. This, to my mind, has an uneasy relationship with a formal equipped play space. I would like to see images of how this could be achieved to create a positive, great looking space, and some precedent studies carried out. For example, it could be that a bespoke type of provision could be acceptable, or that a decision is made to locate play facilities either in association with the football pitch or instead provide contributions for an offsite provision , if this is considered acceptable in terms of accessibility studies.

In relation to that, I cannot see evidence anywhere in the D&A that an open space requirement study has been carried out in relation to this site, and whether a LEAP is needed or wanted here?

3) Setting to the listed building and relationship to the residential development.

As a general principle, all remnant trees that are associated with the original setting to the building should remain unless the arboricultural survey over-rides this. Note Category C trees may have landscape character value, therefore unless need to be removed for safety reasons, should be considered in design terms also.

The character of the listed building can be expressed and enhanced through spatial design that draws on historic landscape precedents and translates them to help integrate the building, as well as expressing it and helping its qualities define some of the character of the setting to the development, therefore maximising the potential for locally distinct placemaking.

My marked up plan gives a brief indication of how this could be explored and expressed, however other solutions are possible and I would want to see this aspect engaged with fully to ensure the excellent opportunities that having on-site heritage can provide for local distinctiveness. These opportunities are a relative rarity within the borough, and it is important to express and make visible this time-depth as part of the borough's vision for quality placemaking.

4) Access and boundaries: across the site, there are many very narrow, very restrictive alleyways between plots and even in some case providing the main access to dwellings. Consider both that we expect all boundaries to plots to generally be secure, and where they face the public realm to be brick walls (close board fence only acceptable to rear boundaries). This gives a number of narrow alleyways between 1.8 high boundaries across the site. The must be designed out prior to a fixed layout being given planning permission. Such access should be considered only as a very last resort, and never as the primary access to any plot.

Summary

In accordance with the comments above, I would like to see Parameter Plans revised to properly consider and include GI /Structural landscape.

In addition, I do not consider that landscape matters have been adequately addressed in the indicative masterplan and would want to see a significant re-design of the proposed layout to address and resolve the points raised above, prior to planning permission being given to the site layout.

Marked up plan provided to accompany these comments.