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Linda

Lap north of Plot 104

It is inappropriate to have a LAP in this location for the following reasons :

1. Insufficient allocated space, the LAP does not comply with the minimum play activity space (and there is minimal landscape buffer).
2. Driver’s sightlines are to remain clear on the curve of the road and the ‘LAP’ obscures these sightlines.
3. There is insufficient landscape buffer between the road and the play activity for play area fencing and self-closing gates.
4. The LAP has limited accessibility, from the access road. There will be no other point of access because we do not wish to encourage access from or through the adjacent woodland.

Therefore delete the LAP proposal from the scheme.

LAP south of Plot 157

1. The is an urban LAP and therefore steel man made materials are to be used, in keeping with the urban character.
2. The distance between the active frontage of the dwelling and the play activity is very narrow. It is the intention to minimise noise and disturbance to householders by increasing the depth of the landscape buffer to 5 m, in accordance with CDC standards.
3. The play equipment has limited play value for children between 2 – 8. These are static play experiences . The experience of movement is important in child development.
4. Provide a steel  slide on the mound in a north-facing direction to reduce solar gain and prevent burning of children’s skin .
5. The mound should be clothed in wetpour safer surfacing to protect children when they fall.
6. A swing or a turning  device for users of differing levels of physical activity are required on a surface of fall height compliant wetpour.
7. A seat with back and armrests is necessary for parents, grandparents and child carers of differing levels of mobility.
8. The proposed dog bin is inappropriate so close to the play area. We do not wish to encourage dog owners to use dog bins close to a play area: a risk of disease!
9. Trees proposed for within the play area are inappropriate due to the detritus from canopies and bird droppings landing on play equipment and seats, although shade trees are necessary to shade children from sunburn.

Tree Pits

1. The tree pits require more soil volume for the successful establishment of the tree – refer to BS8545:2014
2. The tree grills are inappropriate. They never work effectively. It is difficult to remove untidy weeds, and as the tree roots expand they  raise the segments of the grill, which becomes a trip hazard. The tree stem grows too big for the aperture. Replace the grill with arboresin surface.

The tree issues original highlighted by John Brewin (previous arboricultural officer) I think are relevant since the PRPS landscape proposals remain unchanged.

*The scheme must show the individual locations and specifications for all root barriers. Root barriers are to be incorporated into the planting pit for any tree planted within 1.0m of any structure (boundary walls, footpaths etc). To prevent any errors or confusion, the same details must be shown on all engineering drawings to highlight any potential conflict with below ground services.*

*Generally, the tree species selected for the planting areas within the site are acceptable however there are a couple of areas where species amendments are required.*

*•             The 3 No trees proposed for verge planting adjacent to the Copse and to the side of Plot 43 should be removed from the scheme and replaced with No 2 Acer campestre, a species of trees more in-keeping with the established species within the copse.*

*•             The 2 No Carpinus betulus and 1 No Scots Pine should be removed from the scheme.*

*•             This verge area adjacent to the copse is shown on the drawings as ‘amenity grass’. It would be more in-keeping with the copse to amend this to a ‘meadow area’.*

*•             To assist with the establishment of the ‘meadow area’, the three trees opposite plot 54 (1 birch, 1 walnut, 1 hornbeam) should be removed from the scheme.*

*•             The 2 No birch and 1 No walnut adjacent to the copse edge and opposite Plots 92 & 104 should be replaced with 2 No Acer campestre and 1 No Quercus robur which are more in-keeping with the adjacent established woodland species.*

*•             The tree planting proposed along the northern boundary opposite Plots 105 – 140 should be increased by a further 20 No trees of the species already proposed. This will define the boundary and will provide greater wildlife habitat.*

*•             The pedestrian link / Greenway already provides appropriate (yet compromised) tree coverage along the southern boundary of the site. Therefore the additional planting proposed o/s of plots 235, 251, 85, 88 should be removed from the scheme to prevent ‘over-crowding’.*

*•             The Malus trilobata o/s of Plot 67-69 should be removed from the scheme and replaced with a single Liquidamber styraciflua. This will prevent any future nuisance/safety issues regarding excessive fruit fall on a public footpath.*

*•             The loss of the above trees removed from the scheme should be mitigated by additional planting within the open space area to the east of the site, overlooked by plots 132 – 136. An additional 10 No Quercus robur should be planted within this area with no tree planted within 2.0m of the verge area.*
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