

From: Paul Bryan [<mailto:paul.bryan@Teignbridge.gov.uk>]
Sent: 28 March 2018 19:50
To: Williams, Angharad <Angharad.Williams@torbay.gov.uk>
Subject: Inglewood, Further Landscape Comments, March 2018

Word document enclosed, text below.

P/2017/1133 - INGLEWOOD 2018- LANDSCAPE COMMENTS IN RESPONSE TO THE ADDITIONAL INFORMATION MARCH 2018

These further landscape comments are made in response to the issues raised by the additional information submitted in March 2018. The documents seen as relevant to landscape being: Revised Masterplan, Landscape Addendum, GI Plan, Revised LEMP and Additional Lighting report.

1. Revisions to the layout

The changes to the layout remove development from field 3 and change units along the southern boundary to single storey. These changes will eliminate the short term adverse effects on the Waddington Conservation Area and the South Devon AONB that were likely to have arisen from the initial application. These changes are therefore welcomed and make the proposals even more acceptable in landscape terms.

Disappointingly, suggestions that the character of residential area along the southern boundary should be of a lower density as the development tapers out into the countryside has not been adopted as far as I would have hoped. However the benefits in withdrawing development from field 3 compensate for this.

There is now a plan that shows character areas which is welcomed and should help to inform future development. I cannot see any document that set out the characteristics that make up the character areas. More information on key characteristics would be of benefit.

2. Woodland blocks field 3 and Management of fields 2 and 3

The changes also include the repositioning and reforming of the woodland block(s) shown in fields 2 and 3 between the proposed housing and Nords. The block now straddles a hedge between field 2 and 3, whereas previously it was detached from the boundary. I am not clear why this has been done and am a little concerned that the hedge engulfed by the planting will be unmanageable and over time will be lost as a distinctive feature. The lines of the hedges are many hundreds of years old and form the historic fabric that is, in historic landscape terms, of value in its own right. Its potential loss for no obvious reason is perplexing.

Also, what was previously shown as a one large block of woodland is now two blocks. The original aim was that the mitigating planting should reflect the existing characteristics of the area, this being the presence of large conspicuous plantations. The changes compared to what was originally proposed is bitty and has lost the sight of original purpose. I think this should be looked at again to see if there are ways that fragmentation and engulfing of the hedge can be reduced.

I think that the removal of the housing from field 3 opens up the opportunity to have a larger block that not only mitigates the development and reinforces character but also result in the field pattern that remains making better sense and more easily managed using livestock. The fragmented woodland that is currently proposed will be difficult to manage in an agricultural manner and will need additional amenity landscape maintenance and the resultant change in character from agricultural land to amenity land that should be avoided.

There seems to be a lack of appreciation of the following:

- that livestock fencing works best as a series of straight runs – curves should therefore be avoided.
- Livestock tend to avoid shady narrow passageways between woodland and corners where they feel they may get trapped
- Machines used to top grass can't get into odd tight corners easily and so get weedy and scrubby

Suggest that the shapes and positions of the woodland are revised to keep fencing in straight lines and to a minimum, avoid odd left over corners

3. GI plan and LEMP

3.1. General – The GI plan is very useful however the LEMP is vague, confusing and overall suggest approaches that I don't think reinforce landscape aims. (2.1 Landscape Aims and objectives). Needs to include that the aim is also to *conserve a traditional farming character to the land, through: retaining the field pattern, managing the land in a traditional agricultural manner avoiding over use of amenity landscape management pattern techniques.*

3.2. If this is to become a framework document, then I think it needs set out more firmly the character that is expected and be more exact about the minimum requirements to be achieved. At the moment the document sets out vague, mostly wildlife aims.

3.3. I welcome the commitment to plant the structure planting (outside of the housing development areas) in advance of the development. I think it would be helpful if the planting strategy could be refined to show more accurately shaped planting area, show fencing (I suggest metal bar estate fencing) , open space within the planting areas, and extent of the understory where present. The character of woodland blocks should copy what is found at Nords. I'm not sure that this is so far the case, need to check that the pines are the correct species.

3.4. (5.3.25 item 4) Woodpasture clumps –I think that these trees should be all the same rather than the mix of species as suggested and that they should be oak. Form of protection needs to be resolved. I suggest metal bar estate fencing. To ensure that the woodpasture is carried out appropriately, I think it would be of benefit to show tree locations, fencing location and specification, tree staking and protection, tree sizes and container grown stock.

3.5. (5.2.5) Orchard, I think this would be better managed by a management company otherwise there will be a risk that it will develop an unkempt appearance, start to appear unowned and unloved and turn in to a place where rubbish is dumped.

3.6. Management information on highways area needed.

4. Lighting

4.1. The revisions to lighting strategy would appear to include smaller columns in some areas and for the areas closet to the AONB low level lighting. This approach is welcomed and should help to reinforce and give distinction to the separate character areas. The likely spread of light is shown in the very helpful isoline drawings which would suggest that lighting is relatively well contained.

Kind regards,

Paul

Paul Bryan
Landscape Officer,
Design and Heritage
Teignbridge District Council
01626 215730

paul.bryan@teignbridge.gov.uk
www.teignbridge.gov.uk/planning



Save time and do it online www.teignbridge.gov.uk

[Email disclaimer](#)

[**Teignbridge: Highly Commended 'Outstanding Strategic Local Authority of the Year' - UK Housing Awards 2017**](#)