

SMDC Planning Reference –	SMD/2021/0550		
Site Name –	Fole Dairy, Uttoxeter Road, Fole		
Summary of proposals -	Landscape Reserved Matters Application		
Consultation Note Subject –	Landscape and Visual Matters (Second comments)		
Planning Case Officer –	Jane Curley		
Landscape Comments Prepared By –	Stuart Ryder of Ryder Landscape Consultants		
Date of site visit —	No visit	Date of first response	24/6/22
		Date of this response	12/10/22
Summary of comments –	Acceptable landscape Reserved Matter application subject to Minor amendments.		

Dear Mrs Curley

Fole Dairy, Landscape Reserved Matters Application – Landscape and Visual Re-consultation

Thank you for re-appointing us to review the landscape and visual aspects of the updated Landscape Design information for this scheme for 48 residential units at Fole Dairy, my response is set under the following three headings;

1. Documents Reviewed
2. Suggested Amendments
3. Next steps

1. Documents Reviewed

The following documents have been reviewed as part of this re-consultation exercise.

-  461-KL-ZZ-00-DR-L-002 P1 Detailed Landscape Proposal Sheet 1 of 3 Fole Dairy 25.09.22
-  461-KL-ZZ-00-DR-L-003 P1 Detailed Landscape Proposal Sheet 2 of 3 Fole Dairy 25.09.22
-  461-KL-ZZ-00-DR-L-004 P1 Detailed Landscape Proposal Sheet 3 of 3 Fole Dairy 25.09.22
-  7796_157B_Green Infrastructure
-  7796_158B_Proposed Private Amenity Areas
-  7796_159A_Hard Landscaping Plan
-  RT-461-001 Landscape Management Plan Fole Dairy 25.09.22

2. Suggested amendments

I set down below a series of comments against various of the proposal drawings. If I have not included the drawing then I have no remarks to make upon it.

461-KL-ZZ-00-DR-L-002 P1 – Detailed Landscape Proposal Sheet 1 of 3

Comment 1 – Uttoxeter Road frontage hedges

The provision of a ‘instant-hedge’ to screen the close boarded fence to the middle northern units (Plots 37 & 48) would be effective in an estimated 3 years after planting. However, there is an odd arrangement in planting a native hedge with trees in it to the edge of the highway footpath

approximately just 3m to the north. The suggestion is that the advanced hornbeam hedge is replaced by an advanced native hedge to continue to provide the rapid screening of the close board fencing and the original native hedge to the back of the footpath is removed to provide a wider verge.

The trees in the original native hedge could be placed in the new retreated native hedgerow to keep the verge clearer of mowing obstructions. By not having two hedges close to each other the verge is more likely to flourish and be seen. By investing in the native hedge the BNG value is retained and the overall rural character of the village better respected.

The advanced hornbeam hedge within the estate at Plots 6, 27, 32 36 and 45 is considered acceptable in a more ornamental, garden like setting.

Comment 2 – Extending native hedge to side of Unit 1

There is a curved line of new native hedgerow set to the east of the main site entrance but to the west side of the road this is just a short straight section of hedge. It would appear better for road users to see the native hedge run to the back of the sight line to the north of Unit 1 to provide visual continuity with the landscape layout to the east side of the road.

The gap in the hedgerow could still be retained to provide side access to Unit 1 and will make the side garden more semi-private as a space.

461-KL-ZZ-00-DR-L-002 P1 – Detailed Landscape Proposal Sheet 2 of 3

Comment 3 – Plot 21 Tree Impacts

The large mature tree canopy appears to be directly affected by the proposed house type. There are also concerns about the amenity quality of the garden space and future 'tree-spite' from the residents. Would a smaller house type work better and provide a garden whose amenity is not compromised by deep shade?

Comment 4 – Plot 32 Bed width

The narrowness of the thin bed between the footpath and the suggested planting of Euonymus are not likely to be successful to soften the close boarded side fence to the garden. It is suggested that the garden is narrowed and the space gained given over to widening this side bed. Minimum bed width should be 1000m to be able to create enough soil volume to sustain planted stock.

Comment 5 – Plots 35 & 36

Again, bed width to rear of the plots adjacent to car parking areas where overwalking and lack of soil volume are real possibilities. Marginal reduction in garden size could be put to an increased bed size.

Comment 6 – LEAP and boundary hedge

The LEAP equipment layout has not been defined which is critical for what appears to be an under-sized facility. The planting of the hedge around the LEAP also needs some sort of walkable maintenance strip between the surrounding fence and the hedge line for cutting / litter pick purposes. If it is not provided it would mean the hedge would effectively be 'boxed-in' from both sides.

Comment 7 – Ornamental hedges

Equally applicable to Sheet 1 of 3 as well can it be confirmed that the ornamental hedge plants are set in double staggered rows rather than single lines of planting.

7796-157B – Green Infrastructure Plan

Comment 8 – Green Infrastructure Areas

The small separated beds of planting should not be classed as Green Infrastructure (GI), they are incidental planting areas and do not realistically serve any GI purpose. The two prime areas of GI are the central channel and the north bank of the River Tean corridor. The removal of the small areas will likely only have a marginal reduction on the quantum of GI (currently 23%) proposed on the Site.

7796-159A – Proposed Site Plan (*Hard Landscaping*)

Comment 9 – Basic surfacing materials

Two of the four surfacing materials shown – Concrete Flag Paving and Concrete Block Paving (Marshalls Driveline 50 – Red) are basic in appearance and do not convey the character of settlement in a rural village on the edge of the countryside but are more akin to urban areas. In the first submission resin bound aggregate was proposed but this is now not included. There is concern that concrete flagging and red block paving would make the external realm appear ubiquitous and reduce the amenity of the development.

These products are not known for their SuDS efficiency as they are not ‘porous’ by nature, nor are any SuDS systems or references shown. What is the primary external drainage system and where does it discharge to? I note the pumping station but presume this is for foul drainage rather than surface water.

Comment 10 – Omitted Items

Hard Landscape proposals typically convey details of other parts of the external realm such as road signs, lighting equipment, street furniture and the like. This information is not indicated on this drawing nor is reference made to other drawings.

Next steps

The submitted information is now of sufficient detail to allow a better understanding of the external soft and hard landscape matters to be formed. Comments 1 to 10 above are matters of finer detail that should be readily resolvable by the Applicant and their design team.

I trust you find these notes useful as you manage the determination of this Landscape Reserved Matter application. Should you have any queries please do not hesitate to contact me.

Stuart Ryder

12/10/22