

From: Amanda Scholes on behalf of Planning.Responses
Sent: 22 October 2018 09:05
To: Planning Scanning
Subject: FW: LU/240/18/PL - Response to landscaping scheme (to be read-alongside WSCC Highways report dated 10th October 2018)

From: Tim Townsend
Sent: 19 October 2018 13:55
To: Michael Eastham
Cc: Planning.Responses; David Lambert
Subject: LU/240/18/PL - Response to landscaping scheme (to be read-alongside WSCC Highways report dated 10th October 2018)

Dear Michael,

Further to my highways report of 10th October 2018, please find below comments in response to the landscaping scheme as submitted:

The tree planting details are fine – the use of soil cells: <https://www.greenblue.com/gb/type/soil-cells/> gives the required rooting volume whilst providing load bearing for hard surfaces, so it's almost a continuous rooting zone below ground. Storm-water management does not appear to be incorporated into the whole design (that would have been WSCC's preferred approach): <https://www.greenblue.com/gb/type/stormwater-management/> **Please respond saying why the design is as it is.**

Please confirm that the utilities' ducting will be located within the footway / cycleway or highway, as appropriate. Any future excavation for maintenance could be very damaging otherwise. **Response required.**

It's still only an outline specification [LA101] unless the detail is elsewhere; not immediately apparent scrolling through the documents online. The clear stem *can* be specified – currently just shown as 'semi-mature' – depending on where they are sourced from, which should be indicated in the detailed specification. 2.4m is easily achievable. Most will be at least 2m minimum at the point of planting, so when mature the lowest crown branches will be well above that. There should also be details on post-planting management and maintenance. **Reply required.** No reference to BS8545:2014 is made. **Response required.**

Re the general tree pit detail shown on LA108 – I know this is just a drawing but it is critical that the trees are not planted too deep. This drawing shows the root flare well below the surface. **Response required.**

A contractor experienced in installing these systems is needed.

In terms of species choice, there does need to be some continuity with the Lyminster bypass [south] proposals. Just to the west of this section of main avenue, 5 *Carpinus betulus* Frans Fontaine have been specified, so it is not clear as to why *Tilia cordata* Green Spire have been

specified for the rest of the avenue. They either need to be all *Carpinus betulus* FF or all *Tilia cordata* GS. **Response required.**

Please also note that At the Section 38 stage and following review of a Stage 2 Road Safety Audit, the positions and number of trees shown on the adopted road system may need to be reviewed again.

WSCC look forward to receiving answers to the points raised.

Thank you,

Tim

Tim Townsend, MCiHT

Principal Planner, Highways – Planning Services

West Sussex County Council, Ground Floor Northleigh, County Hall, Chichester PO19 1RH

This email and any attachments are confidential and intended solely for the persons addressed. If it has come to you in error please reply to advise us but you should not read it, copy it, show it to anyone else nor make any other use of its content. West Sussex County Council takes steps to ensure emails and attachments are virus-free but you should carry out your own checks before opening any attachment.