

There is a surplus of *Malus Tschonoskii* and *Prunus avium*. In terms of biosecurity and sustainability of these trees do not fare well; they are susceptible to disease according to The RHS website. There must be range trees that are of a low risk of pest and diseases (including leaf scorch). I recommend the following trees:

*Acer campestre* -32 proposed

*Amelanchier lamarkii* – 29 no. *Amelanchier* proposed

*Ginkgo biloba* - too large for use with a residential development

*Liquidambar styraciflua* 'Worplesdon' – too large for use with a residential development

We disagree there is a surplus of *Malus Tschonoskii* and *Prunus avium*. However *Malus Tschonoskii* has been swapped with *Malus Trilobata*. *Prunus avium* has been retained because of it being native with good ecological benefits.

Due to the deleterious affect of climate change on trees and the increased possibility of disease and pests affecting trees a variety of trees would be preferred

*Rubus tricolor* is extremely vigorous and will out compete other species for light nutrients and water. It can only be planted in large areas on its own where it will not disrupt a designed scheme.

*Rubus tricolor* is vigorous but we disagree that it will out compete the other plants it is planted with. It will form a robust base plant to the planted areas it is within.

I disagree - I have specified this species; once it is established it will romp through the other plants and radically change the design intention

An interesting choice of *Fargesia robusta* (bamboo) in small space between kerb and the road. A very tall dense bamboo when established. It may well be a problem in restricting visibility for pedestrians and drivers. They should be deleted from the proposals.

*Fargesia robusta* is to be contained within planters as shown on drg 14790/5020

TS - The bamboo will not survive in such difficult environmental conditions. Bamboos prefer moisture-retention soil and the containers will require regular watering

Any failures of planting - especially the 'soft', herbaceous perennials - may require temporary post and wire fencing may have to be erected to protect the Hornbeam hedge on the play areas/public open space from desire line damage until establishment.

Planting will be managed and if necessary replaced by a private management company.

#### LANDSCAPE PROPOSALS SHEET 1 OF 12 14790/5001

*Hedera helix* will climb garden and house walls and if the mortar joints are not recommended replacing this ivy with the evergreen *Vinca major*

*Hedera helix* is a native species and reinforces the Eco village approach. Its use was agreed in Caroline Ford's comments dated 13/03/18.

This may be an issue if the mortar joints start to fail

#### Trees

*Malus tschonoskii* is too close to the garden wall of plot with a distance of only 0.98 m wall. It is prudent to delete this tree to reduce future soil shrinkage and associated structural damage.

We disagree, root barrier will be installed to protect the wall from root damage

#### LANDSCAPE PROPOSALS SHEET 2 OF 12 14790/5002 P4

#### Trees

*Malus tschonoskii* are used continuously. In light of these trees' susceptibility to fireblight (if one gets infected it will spread to the others) I recommend that they are replaced with the aforementioned trees in paragraph 2.

Malus Tschonoskii has been swapped with Malus Trilobata. The majority of trees recommended by Tim above are too large for these locations and Amelanchier lamarkii would not be durable enough.

The Betula pendula is going to be planted too close to the paved edge of parking bay 146. Centralise the tree in the centre of the bed to alleviate this problem of root encroachment and soil shrinkage. The specified root deflector is appropriate.

The tree has been moved. Accepted

The double leaf maintenance gate on the play area should be kept locked to ensure pedestrian do not use it given that it opens onto the grass area in the play area.

The Mediterranean plants such as Thymus and Rosemarinus require a free-draining soils (wet soils in winter tend to kill off these Taxa). It is prudent therefore to ensure that the sub soil is de-compacted and topsoil free-draining to ensure successful establishment.

The spiny Pyracantha 'Sappho Orange' is a little bit too close to the parking bay of 169 and my make access to and from vehicles a bit difficult with its spines – replace with Lonicera pileata.

There is no Lonicera pileata in the scheme. Replaced with rubus tricolor. A spiny shrub next to a parking area will be a hazard for people and vehicles will get scratched. R. tricolor is too vigorous.

Where is the purpose of the double-leaf gate near the crescent shaped fence at the south side of the play area. This and the pedestrian gate - which is also surplus to requirements - must be deleted from the scheme.

This was an error on the drawing, it has been deleted. Accepted

#### LANDSCAPE PROPOSALS SHEET 3 OF 12 14790/5003 P5

I note that Ligustrum vulgare (privet) hedging is still proposed further to my advice. Because it is native plant I assume it is being used to improve the BREEAM rating, and planted on plots 209, 210 and 228 near and therefore associated with the native boundary hedge/buffer, however it is quite an ugly hedge, especially when severe pruning exposes the bare wood which never regenerates sprouts leaf cover.

The use of Privet has already been reduced following Caroline Ford's comments dated 13/03/18. Accepted

Consider replacing M. tschonoskii for the aforementioned reasons

See above comments

The planting areas to the north of plots 195 and 196 would benefit from the removal of Rubus tricolor. R.tricolor is an extremely vigorous plant once it gets established. It will smother the Luzula. Therefore replace in favour of Euonymis fortunei Darts Blanket

Rubus tricolor is vigorous but we disagree that it will out compete the other plants it is planted with. It will form a robust base plant to the planted areas it is within. Furthermore Rubus provides edible fruit in keeping with the Eco Town approach. Refer to above mentioned response

#### LANDSCAPE PROPOSALS SHEET 4 OF 12 14790/5004 P3

Consider the comments re Ligustrum above.

The use of Privet has already been reduced following Caroline Ford's comments dated 13/03/18. **Accepted**

#### LANDSCAPE PROPOSALS SHEET 5 OF 12 14790/5006 P3

The spiny *Pyracantha Sappho Orange* is a little bit too close to the foot path in respect of plots 167 and 184. This plants spiny outgrowths will impede access on the path. I recommend replacing this species is replaced with hedge that does not have any spines, such as *Osmanthus x burkwoodii* .

We disagree, the species will be managed to prevent it spreading onto the footpath.

Obviously there is a risk to operatives catching themselves on the spines as they cut back these shrubs - it is prudent to replace them

Delete most of the *Malus tschonoskii* trees in favour of a range of tree species that include *Acer campestre*, *Amelanchier lamarkii*, *Ginkgo biloba* and *Liquidambar styraciflua* 'Worplesdon'

*Malus Tschonoskii* has been swapped with *Malus Trilobata* **Accepted**

In respect of the area south of plot 189 the *M. tschonoskii* on the right of the bin store is located too near to the edge of the paving. Delete this tree from the scheme (there is no space a tree here, therefore replace with a multi-stemmed *Amelanchier* specimen shrub in the middle of the bed).

The tree has been replaced with *Amelanchier lamarckii*. **Accepted**

The 3 *Carpinus betulus* 'Fastigiata' west of plots 191 and 192 are not appropriate for the rural edge hedgerow corridor. Replace with 3 native *Betula pendula* arranged naturalistically as opposed to the rather straight, equi-distanced trees.

Amended to *Tilia cordata* to complement trees proposed further north along primary road.

#### LANDSCAPE PROPOSALS SHEET 6 OF 12 14790/5006 P3

The *Betula pendula* tree on the eastern boundary of plot 226 boundary is far too close to the path edge, even with a root deflector the root flare/bole of the tree will grow and expand and push the root deflector into the kerb and cause structural damage to the path. Delete the tree

The path has been amended **Accepted**

What is the reason for the triangular-shaped space at the rear of plot 226? Does it have a function? Is it possible that this land could be claimed by the future resident of the plot? There could be anti-social behaviour issues for the resident. I recommend planting it up the entire area with *Viburnum opulus* and *Hedera helix* groundcover.

This has been amended **Accepted**

#### LANDSCAPE PROPOSALS SHEET 7 OF 12 14790/5007 P4

It is prudent to ensure that the micro plots, opposite plots 12 and 14 are not over-shaded by 3 proposed *Prunus avium* trees with dense canopies near the site. An open sunny site is more conducive for growing produce. 3 *Amelanchier lamarkii* multi-stemmed shrub specimens should be planted to replace these trees.

We disagree, these trees would only partially shade light during the morning. *Amelanchier lamarkii* is not a native species and therefore not fully conducive to an eco-town approach.

On the periphery of the site the numbers of *Prunus avium* are to be reduced to combat bacterial canker. Replace these tree with native *Acer campestre*, *Crataegus monogyna* and *Quercus robur* (where space allows)

*Prunus avium* is a native tree which is valued for its ecological benefits. We do not think it should be removed on the off chance it develops bacterial canker. Both *Quercus robur* and *Crataegus monogyna* could not be planted around the periphery due to their size and water demand. The tree will be managed and replaced if necessary by the management company.

Trees that will eventually grow to over hang to play features equipment are still a concern.

This issue has not been adequately addressed by the developer

#### LANDSCAPE PROPOSALS SHEET 8 OF 12 14790/5008 P4

Again the *M. tschonoskii* are to be replaced with the replacement trees identified above.

*Malus Tschonoskii* has been swapped with *Malus Trilobata*. The majority of trees recommended by Tim above are too large for these locations and *Amelanchier lamarkii* would not be durable enough for these locations. Then more space should be allocated for larger trees

The spiny *Pyracantha* 'Sappho Orange' hedge to the car parking plot nos. 69 – 70 should be replaced to with a non-spiny formal hedge i.e. *Osmanthus x burkwoodii*.

This has been amended Accepted

A surplus of *Prunus avium* trees: if they get bacterial canker they will have to be felled.

*Prunus avium* is a native tree which is valued for its ecological benefits. We do not think it should be removed on the off chance it develops bacterial canker. Both *Quercus robur* and *Crataegus monogyna* could not be planted around the periphery due to their size and water demand. The tree will be managed and replaced if necessary by the management company.

#### LANDSCAPE PROPOSALS SHEET 10 OF 12 14790/5010 P4

Refer to paragraph 5 above. *Fargesia robusta* (bamboo) a locations along the side of the road is unusual. I am concerned that these specimen will suffer from rock slat deposits during winter; will become damaged by vehicles and drought ridden (very small volumes of growing medium). These bamboo specimens do not provide the same amenity and environmental impact that street trees would provide .

*Fargesia robusta* is to be contained within planters as shown on drg 14790/5020

The planter is a hazard for road users and the Bamboo will be difficult the establish, relying on regular watering.

#### LANDSCAPE PROPOSALS SHEET 11 OF 12 14790/5011 P3

The car park layout is unworkable. The parking for plots 91 to 119 should be situated located along the edge of the rear garden plots. The current layout does not allow vehicles the reverse or drive into the parking bays.

The layout has been tracked and works. Accepted

#### LANDSCAPE PROPOSALS SHEET 12 OF 12 14790/5011 P3

A *B.pendula* south of plot 49 is situated too near to the edge of the path and damage will ensue with the roots and stem grow and spread. Therefore delete this tree.

The tree has been moved away from the path edge. Accepted

The tree P. avium south of the bin stores and the parking bays for plot 131 is positioned too close the edge of the paving.

The tree has been moved away from the path edge.

The planting around the aforementioned bin store should ideally be increased in depth to provide the necessary screening.

This has been amended **Accepted**

The parking areas where plots 131 exist the narrow strip along the northern side is too narrow to sustain the proposed planting of ornamental dogwoods. Concrete haunching will reduce the optimum soil volume and cause a drainage problem (the soil will dry out too quickly in drought). Delete the border planting adjoining the house to plot 132, but retain a widened border with the dogwoods (1 m) along parking bays 131-133

We disagree, the 700mm wide planting area north of the parking bays should be large enough for the planting proposed. **Disagree**

#### EASTERN OPEN SPACES 14790/5013 P5

The narrow planting borders with sharp mitred corners will be trashed by people walking across, and cutting corners, over the ends of these borders.

We disagree they would get trashed. In any event the Management Company would be responsible for re-instatement. **Disagree**

What is the reason for the double leaf gates and pedestrian gates and pedestrian gates and fence at the southern end of the play area when there is already a double maintenance gate proposed in the eastern boundary.

This has been corrected. **Accepted**

The protruding gatepost is a hazard for children in the circulation area near play feature 5. I recommend a redesign of the fencing position to resolve this problem.

This has been corrected. **Accepted**

The planting mix has been repeated throughout. The herbaceous perennials are not robust enough to cope with the rigors of active children running around. Strong, robust landscape plants are required: a mix of non-toxic shrubs and ornamental grasses already specified.

The plant mix has not been repeated. There are three different plant mixes chosen for interest and ecological value. **Accepted**

Narrow plant borders near hedges are going to be trampled and compacted due to landscape contractor's access to cut the hedges.

We disagree, this depends on how careful the contractor is. In the event of damage the Management Company would be responsible for re-instatement. **Disagree**

#### CENTRAL OPEN SPACES 14790/5014 P4

The triangular planting areas near the picnic tables are in located where plants and soil will be damaged by trampling and cycling. The border to the grass should have a metre verge between the path and the edge of the border. Both areas should be protected with knee rail fencing (the extent to be indicated on the drawing). A similar problem will occur of the small

beds at the pedestrian junction west of the bus stop. These bed are so small that will be unsustainable.

We disagree, the planting is located outside of pedestrian desire lines. In any event the Management Company would be responsible for re-instatement. I give them the benefit of the doubt

The crab apples of the Malus trees will attract birds over the picnic tables. The ensuing bird mess will is a hazard and substantial amount of cleansing will be required.

These have been swapped to Betula spp. There is still going to be a problem with bird detritous

The Amsonia tabernaemontana salicifolia is unsuitable because they will be trampled which is a concern because the milky sap may irritate skin

Amended to Persicaria Still liable to be trampled, but acceptable

Please note that if this planting is given consent and fails the developer will have to formally write to this authority to change the species to a more suitable species or cultivar.

#### WESTERN OPEN SPACES 14790/5015 P4

Carpinus betulus 'Fastigiata' to the front of plot 113 is actually shown to be planted in the foot path. This tree must be shown to be 2 m minimum from the edge of the paving. The canopy of this tree are very dense and the afternoon sun will cast shade over the front gardens and dwelling of plot 113 .

The Carpinus has been moved. We disagree the Carpinus would cause excessive shadow cast. The feature of this tree is the very dense upright branching canopy, which castes dense shade when in full leaf.

#### OPEN SPACE SURFACE FINISHES & DETAILS SHEET 3 OF 3 - PLAY AREA SURFACING ENVIRONS: ILLUSTRATIVE CROSS SECTIONS

I am concerned about the proposed gravel surface to the play areas and the edge of mown turf. Children tend to fall and graze themselves more badly on gravel. Also the gravel tends to be kicked onto safer surfaces which can indent the surface and deform and split it. Falling on a safer surface with aggregate embedded within it also creates injury to children.

The Eastern and Western Open Spaces are coloured tarmac. The footpaths with the Central Open Spaces play area are also coloured tarmac for the reasons you mention above. Acceptable

#### NORTHERN GATEWAY 14790/5016 P4

The rather soft herbaceous perennial planting at the base of the mounding is prone to damage from inconsiderate mowing operatives. Being such a high profile site is impotent to ensure this planting thrives. In order to make these small areas of planting more sustainable they should be increased and joining together.

We disagree, the areas of planting in their current size are maintainable. In the event of damage the Management Company would be responsible for re-instatement.

I am able to give the developer the benefit of the doubt