

## **Tilletts Lane – response to Landscape Officer comments**

### **Issues to be rebutted:-**

2 - The Landscape Officer has referred to T59 as a veteran tree with a relationship to plots 58 and 59. However, T59 is not a veteran tree and is not near plots 58 and 59. We believe the Landscape Officer meant to refer to T58. The tree officer has not raised concerns regarding the relationship between T58 and plots 58 and 59. The residents of those properties would have no power to fell or prune this tree as its trunk would be situated outside of their ownership, in a strip of land retained under the control of the management company. The Planning submission has stated that the applicant would not object to a TPO being placed on the belts of trees along the northern and southern boundaries as a further safeguard, ensuring that permission would need to be sought from the LPA before any pruning could be undertaken. Taking all of this into account, we disagree with the Landscape Officer's suggestion that there is a 'high likelihood' that there would be "post development pressure to fell or heavily prune the tree which would be hard to resist". Also refer to our response to the Landscape Officer's point 8.

4 - In the pre-application response the planning officer advised 'In regard to layout, our Landscape Architect has raised concerns with the reduced open space to the site's high point compared to that shown on Figure 5.3 within Policy W6 in that the proposed layout encroaches into this area. However, alternative open space is provided to the south of this area, providing a more open amenity area and better separation from the existing western treed boundary. Furthermore, the units located within the open space section have been sensitively designed such that I consider this proposed layout is still acceptable.' If the open space in the north-western corner were extended to more closely match the Neighbourhood Plan's aspirations it would mean plots 1-5 being relocated to the western area of open space which is an important part of the scheme. It would also require the western access to be moved southwards, closer to and possibly within the veteran tree buffer zone for T30.

5 – We disagree that the effect of the development on visual receptors at viewpoint 3 would be 'major/moderate adverse'.

The existing boundary vegetation is not 'only grassland' (as the landscape officer has suggested). It is also a dense hedgerow with hedgerow trees, which will remain in-situ. The proposed built-form will be partially visible, although much of this will only be roofs. Existing built-form is already visible within the view composition (albeit a little further back than the proposed). The built-form will be recessive in appearance, and muted in colour tone / texture. Taking all this into account, we are comfortable with our original assessment of a 'moderate adverse' effect.

7 – The submitted AIA report confirms all RPAs are avoided. The exception is in relation to T59 where due to a third party having laid surfacing over much of its RPA the tree officer considers it to be more reliant of land within the application site. As a result, a no-dig solution is being proposed for a length of the access road which passes over the anticipated RPA.

8 – The Tree Officer has not raised any concerns about T58. The Arboricultural Consultant considers there to be limited risk of pressure to prune the tree as debris from it (acorns, leaves, twigs etc) would not ordinarily be sufficient justification to prune a tree as part of a TPO application. Debris is part and parcel of living in a rural location and is outweighed by the benefits of living near such large trees.'

10 - There are strong transport-related reasons for the clusters of trees which have been deliberately placed to avoid vehicles passing east-west through the site. This is necessary to avoid the site being used as a short-cut through the village and will ensure each access point is dealing with an appropriate level of traffic.

13 – We disagree that the latest design iteration has removed buffer planting which is relied upon for mitigating visual effects.

The hedgerow referred to within the LVA has not been moved. Furthermore, we believe the changes would improve the mitigation afforded by the proposed trees. In the original proposals the orchard trees were tucked further around the corner, out of view, whereas they now are aligned with the site boundary, so more within the field of vision for visual receptors at viewpoint 5.

19 – We disagree with the suggestion that wildflower meadow would not be appropriate in the narrow strip abutting Plot 10.

Wildflower here would serve better as a setting for Plot 10. Tree, hedgerow and buffer planting (as per the Landscape Officer's suggestion) would make access to the rear garden gate difficult. Wildflower here would in-fact connect with retained grassland, enhanced as wildflower, along the site boundary. (We do acknowledge that a graphic error in our originally submitted landscape plans was showing woody vegetation here rather than retained grassland).

40 – Cycle parking provision is required

Plans of all garages/ports have been submitted showing cycle storage areas, along with plans of cycle stores for the apartment blocks.

52 – Within the LEMP, use of the phrase 'as required' in respect to watering regimes for successful establishment provides insufficient detail.

This terminology has been accepted by Landscape Officers in consideration of countless Landscape Management Plans produced by terra firma for many years. It is a standard wording, understood by any competent Landscape contractor. It is not in the Landscape contractors interests not to adequately water new planting, as they would need to cover the cost of any re-planting. Landscape contractors are best placed to understand the affect of climatic changes on plant establishment. It is not necessary for us to dictate what levels of rainfall should dictate a response, and what that response should be.

#### **Issues to be clarified:-**

2 – We disagree that *'the current layout poses a risk to some of the existing vegetation and its loss or undermining would have a significant effect on [the 'vegetation and biodiversity' landscape receptor] and landscape character of the area overall'*, and that *'the effects of the proposed development on the vegetation receptor [is] Major adverse'*

Our design proposals safeguard existing boundary vegetation. We have rectified the error that meant proposed trees were previously shown within the RPA's of mature trees to be retained.

24 – *"Please clarify if the Herb Mix table is additional to the Herbaceous table within the planting schedule as this seems duplicated"*

The herb mix is planted as a strip alongside the road, between the kerb and property boundaries, along with the bulb mix. This a separate specification to the herbaceous planting, which have species-specific positioning amongst shrub planting within ornamental borders.

#### **Issues to be deferred to Planning Conditions:-**

36 – Litter and dog bins at key access points, as well as signage to encourage control of dogs and discourage dog fouling

37, 38, 39, 41 – Detailed design of play area (inclusive of play equipment, provision of wider gate to fencing around LEAP to allow for maintenance vehicle access, and welcome sign).

45 - Blue green roofs to ancillary structures

46 - Position of tree root barriers to be shown on plan

50 – Detailed specification on the creation of wildflower meadows. Specification of maintenance operations for wildflower meadows within the LEMP.

53 – Production of a Habitat Management and Monitoring Plan.