

67597 - 9/11/21
GMEU Comments

Thank you for consulting the GMEU

I responded on the following conditions only.

Condition 15 - Bat Activity Surveys (Tower Farm)

I have no objection to the proposed amendments to the wording of the condition.

Condition 16- Otter Surveys

I have no objection to the proposed amendments to the wording of the condition, though given otter can wander significant distances from the river, I am not sure this would actually exclude any phases.

Condition 17 – Nesting birds

I have no objection to the proposed amendments to the wording of the condition.

Condition 18 – Breeding Bird surveys

I do not see that there is a need to remove the word sports pitches from the wording. Whilst there currently may only be proposals for the cricket pitch, given how long this application has been sitting at outline proposals may change again. Maybe they could do the same wording as for bat activity surveys as this condition was basically to cover Tower Farm works.

Condition 23 - Landscape

No objection to the general direction, ie for each phase. There is however a risk of an incoherent approach to landscaping and certain developers trying to claim their phase has minimal impact, whilst other phases become overly costly as they bear the burden of say the riverside strip. ***I would argue for the main landscaping along the river been pulled in to its own condition which is required prior to any development (see condition 32).***

I would add in below the list of bullet points if the general variation is agreed ***“and in keeping with adjacent phases that have already been agreed”***

Condition 30 – Crow Tree Brook Culvert

A bit chicken and egg this one if you don't know where it is. Maybe the proposed wording of “affecting this area” needs to be a bit more defined. I guess we are however fairly certain it is west of Cock Clod St and south of Rectory Lane. So maybe “affecting this area” should state affecting land west of Cock Clod St and south of Rectory Lane.

Condition 32 – Riparian Buffer Zone

I would object to the variation of this condition. I think the landscape buffer along the river is the key GI for the entire site and should be funded by the entire development not just the phase adjacent to the river. If left to the phases along the river there will be a disproportionate cost to these phases and whilst no doubt the houses along the river will have a higher value, less likely to be progressed.

Condition 33 – Landscape Management Plan

I have no objection to the proposed amendments to the wording of the condition though again would ideally recommend that phases look to what has gone before and conform to one overall management strategy eventually.

Condition 34 – Riparian Management Plan

I would object to the variation of this condition for the same reasons as condition 32.

David Dutton

Ecologist

Planning

Planning and Transportation

Place