

## Great Wilsey Park - Infrastructure RMA- Applicants Response- Landscape and Ecology

### Redrow Homes

19/12/2019

	Headline Comments	Redrow Response
1	The trees to the south of Great Wood plantation have not been surveyed and most of these trees have veteran features. The SUDs banks could have direct and indirect impact on these trees which have not been adequately assessed	These trees have been reviewed please refer to FPCR Tree survey plan
2	A number of unsuitable tree species have been proposed including white willow, white poplar, crack willow. The predominant oak around Haverhill is Quercus robur rather than Quercus petraea.	All tree species reviewed and Quercus petraea replaced with Quercus robur
3	Great wood plantation has not been properly considered as part of the proposals	Please refer to LEMP for management
4	It was never envisaged that the southern woodland would essentially remain private – a management plan for the woodland is required as required by the land-use parameter plan.	Please refer to LEMP for management
5	Some of the proposed new Public Rights of Way have not been provided	These have been reviewed and provided
6	A safe road crossing for the play area in the south east is not included	This has now been included
7	The main route to school footpath on the western boundary has not been properly resolved.	This is outside the landownership boundary
8	The SUDs infrastructure will impact on landscape amenity and on trees and will not provide the level of ecological interest (embayments, scrapes, ponds etc.) that was intended and detailed in the ES	The SUDs infrastructure design has been reviewed with features of ecological interest added
Phase 1 Landscape Strategy Document Rev K		Redrow Response
March 2019 Comments		October 2019 Comments
	The Phase 1 Landscape Strategy sets out the progression from the approved masterplan and proposes a broad approach to landscape including constraints, vision, character areas, and strategies for access, GI, play space, soft landscaping, blue infrastructure and ecological intervention. The document deals with the whole phase 1 area at a large scale and is very generic. The approach is not rooted in the existing site constraints and opportunities. The red line constrains the site and there is no contextual references.	The intention of this document is to set over arching guiding principles for phase 1. Each RMA application within Phase 1 responds to this and provides more detail relating to the elements covered in the application. This document references the work submitted at outline and aims to add additional phase 1 information.
	The character areas do not embrace the green corridors adjacent to the residential parcels neither does the descriptions reflect that they are heavily influenced and constrained by the built development that is proposed.	For example the section on Woodland Edge which is essentially residential parcels A3 and A5 however the illustrations and typologies do not deal with how a distinct character for that part of the site can be created using landscape features and species that can be delivered alongside the housing. The revised document is essentially the same.
Planting Plans P202 - P226 Rev C		Redrow Response
March 2019 Comments		October 2019 Comments
Annotated Plans from WSC - P201 - P228		
	A section of hedge to the north (240m) is removed to allow for the main access. A small section of this is replaced however it is not clear where the remainder of the compensatory hedge planting is located.	The phase 1 hedgerow removal and replacement plan is welcomed, however it is noted that many of these hedges are outside of this application – species within the replacement hedges should be adjusted as follows: Remove common elder (short lived) Remove blackthorn (suckers)
		The species have been removed as requested.
		Note that the planting here now has more structure however the design is confused. The design should focus on making a bold structural entrance statement rather than providing ornamental/herbaceous planting beds. It is not clear from the plans how this would be achieved and more detail of the planting design is required to demonstrate this. However the planting pallet for this area should be reconsidered.
		Further detail on shrub planting has been provided which creates additional clarity to the design.

	Landscape planting at the entrance to the site is weak.	The ornamental/herbaceous planting mix has a number of anomalies, for example <i>Typha latifolia</i> , reedmace is a tall vigorous marsh/water edge plant, not a suitable addition to shrub planting. Meadow foxtail is a native meadow grass rather than an ornamental. This planting mix is used throughout the scheme which is not consistent with the landscape strategy which tries to create different character types.	Parkland mixes have been created to define the entrance and provide additional definition to the character areas. Species review has been undertaken.
	And the area of compensatory woodland to be created in the north of the site is not included.	Note that the woodland is now included – suggest that standard sized trees are included in this area to give the area some initial height and presence.	Noted.
	Screening/softening of drainage ditch headwalls with planting should be considered as rails are likely to be required for safety. This is relevant throughout the site particularly where headwalls are in close proximity to access points. Planting should be capable of coppicing to ensure that the structure can be maintained adequately.	Not all outfalls have been planted. It would only take a few shrubs to soften the visual prominence of this infrastructure.	Landscape plans show all proposed headwalls with planting to soften their visual appearance.
	<i>Prunus spinosa</i> is normally considered to be a shrub and whilst native, with many attractions, it can sucker and spread so may not be appropriate next to the path. This species should be confined to woodland areas away from other infrastructure.	There are still two shown as parkland trees in an area that could take a bigger tree (south of bat hop)	Tree planting has been revised.
	<i>Carpinus betulus</i> , whilst an attractive tree typical of Suffolk, this tree can branch from a low height, has dense foliage and is wide spreading – its location should reflect the need for it to have space. The fastigiata cultivar <i>Carpinus Betulus</i> 'Frans Fontaine' is more appropriate as a street tree or in a confined location.	It also has a dense canopy so would contribute to deterioration of play equipment, and surfaces where it overshadows the play area – lighter canopy species to be used where they overhang the play area.	Tree planting within play area has been revised
	Trees such as Oak and Swamp Cypress must be located so that they have sufficient room away from the residential parcels.	Please show the parcel areas on the plans where foundation depths to properties will be affected according to NHBC guidelines and based on the shrinkage of the soils. Quercus robur is the dominant oak in this area – there are no records of Quercus petraea on the tree survey so far as I can see. Suggest that Q. Petraea is removed to a minimum. Other more ornamental oaks could be used in the parkland areas where there is sufficient room.	Housing Proximity plan has been provided. Please refer to Exa_1868_P_118. Tree planting strategy has also been revised Noted and changes made.
	In addition <i>Salix alba</i> , and <i>Salix fragilis</i> should be carefully located so that they do not interfere with house foundations or other infrastructure including drainage.	Please review the use of these species – white willow is a very large tree with a high water demand as is crack willow. These species should preferably be avoided and where they are used please show the parcel areas on the plans where foundation depths to properties will be affected according to NHBC guidelines and based on the shrinkage of the soils. By contrast goat willow and osier would be good additions to this site (particularly in the SUD /meadow area) and they are not included.	Noted and changes made.
	<i>Populus x candensis</i> (hybrid black poplar) is probably not a suitable species. It may be appropriate to include a very few native black poplar (local provenance) in the SUD corridor however these need to be carefully located.	Did this species get included? White poplar is also a very large tree of high water demand which needs plenty of space. The use of this tree should be reviewed carefully and preferably avoided. Where it is used please show the parcel areas on the plans where foundation depths to properties will be affected according to NHBC guidelines and based on the shrinkage of the soils.	Yes species included in south of Great Field Plantation Noted and changes made.
	<i>Malus</i> spp. and other species likely to drop fruit should not be located close to paths or roads.	Fruit and nut trees should also not be planted to overhang the school grounds. We have experienced the removal of these types of trees around schools in the past.	Noted.
	The planting scheme relies very heavily on <i>Prunus</i> species and on <i>Betula pendula</i> , birch which is a short lived tree. There is not enough species diversity to ensure that the planting scheme has resilience.	This is still the case in relation to <i>Prunus</i> .	Noted.
	There is not enough shrub planting included.	The introduction of a few additional shrubs is welcomed however the diversity of species used is poor and the planting needs to be designed to a greater detail (consistent with the scale of the plans).	Additional detail provided.

	Can the avenue planting along the road be strengthened (why are there gaps) by the inclusion of additional trees lines or other trees set in the POS to bridge the gaps. The trees on the eastern side of the main entrance road are outside of the red line and very close to the back edge of the residential roads.	The parcel design will need to take account of this and ensure that the roads and houses are not located too close.	These have been reviewed against the housing proposals. The verge on the eastern side of the road varies from 4m to 5.5m.
	The existing trees are not shown on the plans in all cases. Where existing trees and the associated habitat is to be retained, there would be no requirement to sow grass beneath.	The RPA for the trees to the south of Great wood are not shown. These are significant mature oak trees including lapsed pollards, all with significant girths and many with veteran features. There are potential significant effects on these trees from the proposals and there is not enough information to demonstrate that the trees would not be damaged.	These have now been surveyed and the RPAs are shown on the landscape GA's plans. Please refer to FPCR Tree survey plan.
	Oak is probably not a suitable species to plant beneath the existing trees west of A2; the preference here would be shrub planting that could provide a buffer between this retained habitat and the play area.	Perhaps some specimen native shrubs to the north are required? See marked up plan.	This has been reviewed with shrub planting provided.
	The habitat features are not in the most appropriate places. They should be in places on the edge of spaces or framed by other habitat planting where they will not be disturbed. Attachments should be considered and details given.	Some additional changes proposed see marked up plan. Also it is not clear whether the fencing around existing habitats is temporary or permanent and the design is not specified/indicated on the key.	Noted and changes made.
	Details of the bridges is required.	Bridge detail noted – the deck thickness looks thin	Noted. The detailed design of the bridge will be to the manufactures recommendations.
	A number of hedges to be retained are not shown. These should be marked on the plans with the adjacent ditches and grass verge areas which are to be retained and protected during the construction phase. Where these are on the edge of the red line it is still important that these are shown to give context to the proposals and to ensure that the infrastructure does not compromise the retention of these features.	Noted. Are the fences shown temporary and what is the design?	Please refer to boundary treatment plan and additional details. Tree protection fencing to FPCR locations and specification.
	Reduce the number of benches along the footpath – perhaps use other structures to provide informal seating and focal points. Benches are acceptable in the vicinity of the extra care facility.	I couldn't see that you have added any alternative informal seating. Nothing shown on the key.	Alternative forms of informal seating explored but determined to be commercially undeliverable.
	The planting in the section south of the play area is weak in providing a bat corridor and the number of trees should be increased – some sections of the main north/south green corridor (P208 and P210) rely heavily on Prunus spp where there is room to include more diversity and some larger trees.	This section requires review – see comments above about Salix alba and Populus alba. I like the use of the fruit trees through this area however they should not overhang the school. There is definitely an opportunity to include an avenue on the western side – which could also be extended south along the eastern side of the allotments. Consider Liquidambar?	Tree strategy reviewed and updated. Liquidambar has not been specified due to the chalk soil in which these trees may become chlorotic.
	The hedge at the allotments should be located adjacent to where the allotment fence will eventually be; tree planting in the adjacent greenspace should have regard to the potential future effects on the allotments.	However an avenue of trees would be appropriate on the eastern side of the path.	Avenue of trees proposed.
	Western boundary - It's not clear how the existing PRoW, ditch and existing vegetation will be accommodated on this western edge of the site. In particular there are at least two locations where the road is very close to the top of the ditch leaving what appears to be insufficient room to accommodate the route. It would be helpful if the PRoW could be shown at the appropriate width.	A width of less than half a meter does not represent the space required to adequately maintain a PRoW and the landscape strategy says that all are to be 2.5m wide (as required by SCC). My concern is that there is not enough space to adequately retain this route. The use of the route is likely to increase significantly as a result of the development and the direct and indirect effects of this on the veteran tree have not been considered. Re-routing to avoid the feature is required so that there are no construction issues associated with providing a surfaced path and recreational risks.	Existing PRoW outside landownership.
	There should be no disturbance in the RPA of the veteran tree, this includes tree planting new ditch headwalls and highway infrastructure.	This has not been demonstrated. The effects on the veteran tree should be assessed against the direct and indirect criteria in the Natural England standing advice. In addition, the effects of the culverting and head wall on the group of horse chestnut trees has not been properly assessed. These trees need to be individually marked on the plan and their condition assessed so that any works can be agreed.	Protection of veteran tree detailed within FPCR Tree survey and shown on GA's. Drainage features further adjusted to prevent any disturbance.

	In general the proposals for the western boundary lacks purpose and focus – showing the existing vegetation might add some clarity. The ES mitigation included for the boundary planting around the development edge to soften the edges and planting to retain the amenity of the public footpath routes.	See comments above and on the plans.	Noted.
<b>Landscape Statement - August 2019</b>			<b>Redrow Response</b>
<b>March 2019 Comments</b>		<b>October 2019 Comments</b>	
	The approach to roadside verges should be re-considered to ensure it makes the best use of space available to provide landscape amenity.	I note the road character strategy (p24 of the Landscape statement), however this does not address the issues on either side of the road – which are often different. For much of the length the verges are not included in this application contrary to section 4.7 of the landscape statement. Figure 22 is not acceptable and is not even consistent with the text relating to urban thresholds, neither is figure 11 acceptable.	There is limited opportunity for tree planting in this area due to the constraints from highways offsets. Where possible tree planting has been provided and planting has responded to comments on the plans.
	For East/west woodland measures including planting will be required adjacent to areas of woodland removal and disturbance.	I am also concerned that access to this woodland is to be deterred (p17 of the Landscape statement). This raises concerns about the level of open space being delivered to serve the development. This issue is compounded because the proposed new PRow on the northern side of this woodland is not included.	Access to the Southern Plantation has been restricted in accordance with the landowners requirements. PRow to the north of the woodland has been provided for.
<b>Additional Comments</b>			<b>Redrow Response</b>
<b>March 2019 Comments</b>		<b>October 2019 Comments</b>	
	Substations should be softened by planting in the vicinity and the access points designed to ensure that they do not allow access generally to the adjacent greenspace or verge.	Further comments on plans where necessary.	Noted and changes made.
	Why is there a long section of hedgerow removal on the north of A6 opposite the access road to A2 – this does not appear to be in the same location as in the parameters plan. There is also an area of hedgerow removal north of A7.	I note that these gaps have been removed. The submitted revised Hedgerow removals plan EXA_1868_P_114 Rev B is in general conformity with the existing plan however the hedgerow gaps for access roads have been increased to greater than 12m at H17C, H15C and H13C. It is not clear why more space is required than was planned for at the outline stage and assessed in the ES.	These are based on the gaps identified in the ES parameter plans 5055-L-112 C
		It is very disappointing that Great Wood Plantation has not been properly considered. There is not a plan setting out the proposals for the woodland area. There is insufficient baseline information in relation to the woodland – broad woodland compartments /areas of different species composition, existing access points, existing paths, features that are likely to prevent access and features to be protected. The ES made firm commitments about how the woodland would be considered and enhanced and nothing has been proposed, not even proposed access points. The ES stated that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Perimeter hedge planting and fencing to focus public access to paths</li> <li>• Interpretation boards installed</li> <li>• PRow parameter plan shows a new PRow around the whole woodland</li> <li>• Fencing and dense shrub planting around badger setts to avoid disturbance including by domestic dogs</li> <li>• Dog and litter bins at entry points</li> <li>• Existing paths to be soft engineered</li> </ul> The Monitoring strategy sets out the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Three glades to be established by removal of conifers</li> <li>• Understorey planting to be undertaken</li> <li>• Loggeries created</li> <li>• Existing hazel coppiced</li> <li>• Protection of areas from the public through use of barriers</li> </ul>	Please refer to the LEMP for information on promoting diversity and accessibility.

	Details of the flow control weirs are required.	Please provide these or specify where the information is. There is particular concern that the spillway conflicts with an existing PRow which is not acceptable.	Following discussions with Steven Halls we have provided details of the flows and depths expected from the overflow. We have shown a pipe overflow on the revised drainage drawings as discussed with Steven.
	The proposed high flood banks will essentially enclose and screen the river corridor from view. This feature, which was to be the focus of the central green corridor, will be isolated and it will not be visible from any footpaths or residential properties and there would be no natural surveillance. The amount of light to the river will also be reduced with consequent effects on value of the river corridor for biodiversity. The height and engineered form of the flood banks will have a significant effect on the amenity of the meadows both visually and in terms of landscape character. The current scheme is not acceptable from a landscape, biodiversity and public amenity point of view and an alternative approach to reduce the height of the flood banks should be explored.	This does not appear to have been addressed. In addition the effect of the proposed bank construction on the existing oak trees (both south of Great Field Plantation and north of parcel A7) has not been assessed. Many of these trees have a significant diameter and veteran features. A number are lapsed pollards. The whole row of trees at Great Field Plantation must be surveyed. Works including raising of canopies would have a significant detrimental effect on the amenity of these trees.	Trees in close proximity to the drainage basins has been surveyed and their RPA's are located on the landscape plans. Please refer to FPCR tree survey for more information.
In addition the ES requires that the detention basins will include embayments, spits, varying water depths and areas of differing water retention, smaller ponds and scrapes. These features were considered to be important ecological features and are secured by condition 9 of the outline. This is not included.		Additional ecological enhancements identified in the ES have been designed into the basins where possible. The creation of water depths of over 1.5m when flooded have been avoided for safety reasons.	
In addition the footpath on the proposed PRow on the northern side of this meadow area is not included.		PRow has been provided for.	
		Access to play space continues to be of concern in relation to the southern play space because there is no crossing to the main play area from the southern part of the site - see extract from the 'Pedestrian Crossing Assessment'	Noted and crossing point provided.