

25/00486

| Comment<br>Numbering |
|----------------------|
| Ancient woodla       |
| 1                    |
| 2                    |
| 3                    |
| 4                    |
| Tree and Hedge       |
| 5                    |

6

Fronting onto

7

Protecting and

8

Wildlife corri

9

Active Travel

10

Street Trees

11

Tree planting

12

SuDS Designs

13

Environmental

|                          |
|--------------------------|
| 14                       |
| 15                       |
| 16                       |
| 17                       |
| 18                       |
| 19                       |
| Landscape infrastructure |
| 20                       |
| 21                       |
| LEMP                     |
| 22                       |

## /OUT – Hallam Land, Knowsley Village – Design Team

**KMBC Comments** *"(Comments on the design from the perspective of the key priorities*

and

The Ancient Woodland appears to have been surrounded by a 15m buffer around the boundary which is welcomed and it has been noted that the 15m buffer zone is in the outline design.

It has been noted that the ancient woodlands themselves can't be classed as POS as an important habitat. The relationship of the development with the ancient woodland, and how it needs to be outlined within a management plan document which will be approved by the council.

To prevent degradation of the ancient woodland as a result of recreational harm from the current desire lines, this will ensure the public can positively use the woodland for access, rather than having free informal access which can ultimately do more harm.

Ongoing management of the pond at the centre of the woodland and the surrounding area has previously been used for angling by the community therefore confirmation of the relationship between the woodland and the pond needs to be confirmed. The ancient woodland's integrity should be maintained. Knowsley's Pits (Spooky Wood), however any use by the public should not be ignored and it would be good to know how this matter is going to be addressed or accommodated.

erows

It is noted that the development document is seeking to minimise impact on the trees. However, to fit the development into the site the proposals need to remove a significant amount of trees to create the main vehicular access points and associated sightlines and highway infrastructure. The hedgerow internally to fit in the proposals as is. The proposals have attempted to bring the junctions closer together, but this will involve the loss of most of the hedgerow and the Arboricultural Impact Assessment Report.

The Arboricultural Impact Assessment shows that all the Sycamore and Goat Willow on the site will be removed to provide long-term benefits, as such, it is considered better to manage the tree stock, remove them and replant new trees which will provide long-term benefits.

## greenspace

There are too many rear and side facing properties against the POS, especially in the southern sides, the layout as it is will only cause problems on the estate moving forward.

## and enhancing habitats

Agricultural Land Classification and Soil Resources report highlights that the loss of this type of grassland and agricultural land is nothing to be concerned about throughout Knowsley and it's chiefly because the land has been modified by drainage and farming. This being the case, it's this native wetland and deciduous woodland habitat that is lost through agricultural activity. So, it is considered the loss of this type of land does need compensation to help mitigate its loss whether on site or mitigated off site, particularly habitat provision for species such as the Brown hare.

## corridors

In the Strategic Design Code document, Section 6.5 focuses on Ecological corridors. Areas need to be connected. To enable the wildlife to safely pass through the site from west to east. Presently, the development allows for a connection from the east to the northwestern corner of the site where an attenuation basin is proposed and the corridor needs to be as wide as possible, ideally 20m but 10-15m is better than what is currently proposed.

## travel routes

In the Strategic Design Code document, Section 3.5 focuses on the active travel links and connections within surrounding POS areas, for example public right of way and The 100m rule. However, the lack of having an ecological corridor to the north-western corner has been identified as a Travel route, this needs to be rectified. It is also recommended that the active travel route be established in the south-eastern corner.

Street trees need to be incorporated into all the different streetscapes, with enough space to successfully establish. To ensure provision of these trees there is a need to make design develops. Consequently, these trees need to remain in the highway verges not

Proposed Tree species are still awaited, so comments to guide species selection:

- a. Tree species to be dominated by climax species wherever possible. The planting first, giving them space to grow to maturity and then interplanting them with smaller species.
- b. Unless planting tree avenues requires the same species, don't group the same large species together. Fagus is a longer lived tree, so should be spaced out to eventually let them grow up.
- c. Use a mix of longer and shorter lived varieties in between, this provides a better mix and diversity and avoids Salix and Poplar species (unless black poplar).
- d. Limit the amount of Betula and Sorbus species planted, as they tend to be overplanted. Betula sp. typically also have poor structural form although they provide a benefit by being early flowering.
- e. Trees within the Arbor cells need to be climax species, if required due to spread of invasive species. Avoid fastigiate forms.
- f. In native scrub mix it's important to include some climax species within it, like Hawthorn, which can take over.
- g. With the native hedgerow should have hawthorn dominating (60%) on a double stage, with some holly and hawthorn. Also have a good percentage of holly to provide winter cover for the birds.

Within the proposed surface Water drainage design there is a total reliance on attenuation basins to create positive habitat spaces which can be utilised by both wildlife and enhance the landscape. This needs to be part of a drainage strategy which starts where the rain falls and spreads across the surrounding network. Over reliance on an engineered 1 in 3 sloped drainage basins is currently showing. These basins designed as shown are not considered positive features and should not be classed as part of the public open space. As such there needs to be a lot of permeable hard surfaced areas;

- a. Permeable hard surfaced areas;
- b. Capturing the water at point of contact with the surface and take into features network (such as rainwater butts, attenuation systems which are integrated into tree pits).
- c. SuDS pond features will only be considered once all other mitigation strategies have been implemented. Natural in their form, with gradual slopes at 1 in 6, with different shelving to encourage water flow. Swales than craters!

Statement comments

The Environmental Impact Screening also needs to include the Landscape Visual Impact minimum and so when visual impact is at its greatest. This will enable the visual impact to be assessed to the fullest extent.

noted that the visual envelope has been quantified through the Zone of Theoretical Visibility assessments based on this.

Noted that the types of buffer planting have been proposed in the way of landscape planting along the Hall Boundary and the existing woodland, the details of which are expected to be included in the LEMP.

Would still like to explore ownership / management of the POS / play elements and the LEMP. It is assumed that a LEMP will be included within reserved matters.

Noted that one centralised larger play facility set within a greenspace is proposed.

Noted and welcomed that attenuation basins have not been included within in the central area.

#### Infrastructure / hard surfacing

Confirmation is required over what surface is proposed for what area, as suggested wherever possible to reduce the amount of water getting into the Surface water system. Need to have a more durable surface than crushed / self-binding gravel surfaces.

Clarification is also sought over what street furniture (location and specification) information boards, external lighting (if any) etc.

A detailed regime for the ongoing and longer-term maintenance of all landscape features in the form of a Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (LEMP). This Plan should detail the landscape features within the site, including the management and care of existing amenity grassed areas, the vegetation along the brook, the maintenance of the hard infrastructure. To enable the contractor carrying out the work to understand and which would clearly set out:

- What areas are in private ownership and what is under a maintenance contract?
- The responsibilities of the private owner to ensure that the BNG of the site is maintained.
- Who is to be the responsible body for managing the maintenance?
- Who is the contractor to carry out the works directed in the LEMP?
- A maintenance schedule of what is to be carried out and when (I have attached a details on how the site is going to be managed and which areas of the site are covered and frequency of operations are going to be used.

It is expected this will be a live document as such will be used by the managing authority also by the contractor when regularly maintaining the site.

## Comments 20/01/202

Design Team Member

Howard Stannard (Landscape)

Howard Stannard (Landscape)  
Emma Telfer (Ecology)

Emma Telfer (Ecology)

Emma Telfer (Ecology)

Edward Cole (Arboriculture)

Edward Cole (Arboriculture)  
Howard Stannard (Landscape)

James Bush (Stantec)

Emma Telfer (Ecology)

Emma Telfer (Ecology)

Graham Lamb (Planning)  
James Bush (Stantec)



Howard Stannard (Landscape)



Howard Stannard (Landscape)



Dan Hodson (Drainage)



|                                                          |
|----------------------------------------------------------|
| Howard Stannard (Landscape)                              |
| Howard Stannard (Landscape)                              |
| Howard Stannard (Landscape)<br>Joseph Empsall (Heritage) |
| Anna Chew (Hallam)                                       |
| Graham Lamb (Planning)<br>Howard Stannard (Landscape)    |
| Graham Lamb (Planning)<br>Howard Stannard (Landscape)    |
|                                                          |
| Howard Stannard (Landscape)<br>James Bush (Stantec)      |
| Howard Stannard (Landscape)<br>James Bush (Stantec)      |
|                                                          |
| Howard Stannard (Landscape)                              |

## Design Team Response

Noted. No response required.

The ancient woodlands have not been classed as POS, with their management to form part of a future reserved matters application. Additionally, a detailed HMMP will be required for the reserved matters.

Agreed. However, the current condition of the woodland is 'poor'. Enhancement to the Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) strategy for the development. At the detailed design stage, the Habitat Maintenance and Management Plan (HMMP) will provide details of woodland management as outlined in the BNG strategy. Additionally, these enhancements along with any required to be secured via the BNG condition for a minimum of 30 years.

As with comment 3 above, the ponds and surrounding woodland will be managed in line with the detailed design stage, and this will ensure the condition of the woodland is maintained.

The submitted Arboricultural Assessment had not considered additional loss of hedgerow from the proposed new junctions and additional footpath links not identified on the Parish map. This will be included within a revised Arboricultural Assessment which would include the attached Tree Risk Assessment (TRA) (**this submission**) which includes an overlay of the detailed access proposals with the existing hedgerow. The loss of hedgerow necessary to implement the proposed detailed access arrangements will be identified and recorded within the revised Arboricultural Assessment.

While the loss of a greater length of hedgerow from along Knowsley Lane to facilitate the proposed new junctions was assessed within the submitted Arboricultural Assessment, this additional loss would be included in the revised report, with this loss of hedgerow not considered a significant arboricultural impact. The proposed hedgerow planting along Knowsley Lane and elsewhere on the development, which would offset the loss of hedgerow.

The trees are shown to be retained, however, their management will form part of a plan to be monitored at an appropriate frequency to ensure longevity of all trees and recommended management is appropriate.

It is noted that the supporting plans (other than the Parameters Plan) are all illustrative and have not been approved/ commented on in detail. Notwithstanding this, the testing layout that has been proposed is **to side/ below** – which is again illustrative and does not form part of the application. The properties which would naturally be corner turners (side elevation is the primary elevation, units of 700) with the ecology corridor updated in the south-east corner. Pink on the plan shows corner turner units as their primary elevation is the side, so a front). Blue illustrates the proposed proposals do seek to maximise outward facing development ensuring good levels of natural light and ventilation.

The assessment has followed established current guidance for both Ecological Impact Assessment (EIA) and Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) in the UK. The guidance is clear in that the baseline habitat is the habitat existing at the time the activities have been carried out prior to the date of application (or proposed date of completion) and any value (degradation). Therefore as the current agricultural use is lawful, and there is no evidence of clearance post 30th January 2020) or unauthorised practice that would trigger a requirement for a licence, it is taken as that at the time of the habitat survey.

The assessment has considered change caused by the proposal, not change caused by other factors. It is the duty to assess impacts against abandonment scenarios and ecological harm must be assessed on a hypothetical basis.

There is a proposed 20m corridor providing connectivity west to east adjacent to the site. This has been proposed in order to strengthen and buffer the existing corridor, rather than creating a corridor where no previous connection exists. A corridor also provides value to wildlife as it can be more effectively buffered from lighting and disturbance than residential areas.

There is a proposed active travel route along the primary street that leads directly to the central play space and ancient woodland. This is then interconnected with other routes. Routes around the south-eastern corner are limited for ecological and Bio-diversity reasons.

As set out in the Strategic Design Code supporting this outline application, street Primary Loop Road, with trees in other streets located within front gardens, where confirmed as part of a future reserved matters application.

This is very helpful feedback and can form part of the information provided as part of principles of proposed trees and planting within different areas of the site is set

SuDS measures upstream of attenuation basin for water quality and interception have been reported, however it is not possible to design these features at this stage, as it is to work from. Basin side slopes of 1:5 have been shown on the drawing per discussion

The Landscape and Visual Amenity Chapter (Chapter 6) confirms in paragraph 6.2.28 *in leaf, the Site was visited in the winter months, with these conditions considered*

Table 6.2 of the Landscape and Visual Amenity Chapter (Chapter 6) states *'The SZTV visual receptors visited, where possible.'*

Further information and clarification on the types of buffer planting proposed for heritage reporting produced in support of any reserved matters application.

A LEMP would be provided as part of a future reserved matters application. Future elements can be discussed and dealt with via conditions and s106 agreement.

Noted. No response required.

Noted. No response required.

The proposals shown on Figure 6.7 Illustrative Landscape Masterplan are indicative of surfaces, would be provided as part of a future reserved matters application. Standards of the highway authority.

The details of street furniture, signage and lighting would be provided as part of principles of street furniture within different areas of the site is set out in the

A LEMP would be provided as part of a future reserved matters application. The response of the LEMP.



Plan Illustrating how Proposed Plots will Front onto Greenspace (Co









mmment 7)











Key:

Frontage

Rear

