

Trees and Landscaping on Development Sites

Supplementary Planning Document

Consultation Statement

This statement has been prepared in order to comply with the requirements of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, for the adoption of Supplementary Planning Documents by Local Planning Authorities.

Published by

Tameside Metropolitan Borough Council
Planning and Building Control

March 2007

Introduction

Under the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 it is a requirement to prepare and publish a Consultation Statement for a range of planning policy documents, including Supplementary Planning Documents (SPD's). This is a reflection of Government's desire to "strengthen community and stakeholder involvement in the development of local communities"¹. The Council formally adopted a Statement of Community Involvement (SCI) on 11th July 2006, which sets out how the public will be consulted on new planning policy and significant planning applications. As the Statement of Community Involvement is now adopted, all such planning documents will be required to conform to its provisions.

This Consultation Statement has been prepared following the adoption of the Statement of Community Involvement, and aims to reflect the intentions of Government planning guidance for reporting on community involvement in the plan making process. It describes the involvement of stakeholders, the community, voluntary organisations and statutory consultees in the preparation of the Trees and Landscaping on Development Sites Supplementary Planning Document Scoping Report, which was the forerunner to a draft Supplementary Planning Document. The Scoping report was made available during a period of formal public consultation in August 2006 for five weeks, and will also be made available to view alongside the draft Supplementary Planning Document and the Sustainability Appraisal Report, in accordance with the appropriate regulations² at formal public consultation stage.

Process of Community Involvement

Work on the preparation of the Scoping Report began in July 2006 when it became clear from initial consultation workshops that there was a growing need to provide guidance to developers on this topic and to promote and ensure high quality landscaping schemes and tree protection in the future. The Supplementary Planning Document aims to amalgamate and improve existing guidance notes on Trees and Landscaping on development sites and tree protection.

A Scoping Report was circulated round internal departments of the Council for comment during July 2006 and an amended version was produced for targeted public consultation on 7th August 2006, after consultation with the Cabinet Deputy of Technical Services.

Consultation on the Scoping Report began on the 7th August 2006 and lasted for five weeks until 11th September 2006. A list of consultees is included in section 6.

In section 8 is a list of primary consultees who will receive the draft document. They include local politicians, statutory agencies, developers and interested parties. Full documents will be sent to some of the consultees, emails will be sent to all contactable consultees and letters will be sent to other interested parties informing them that copies could be viewed on the Council web site, at all Libraries in the Borough, Ashton Customer Services Centre and the Planning Department at Tameside Council Offices. A press release will also be prepared. Consultees are invited to write, e-mail or fax any comments to the Planning and Building Control Department prior to the end of the consultation period. Formal public consultation of the draft Supplementary Planning Document began on Wednesday 29th November 2006.

On completion of the consultation period, all the responses were gathered, read and assessed and a factual précis of the main points was produced during January-February 2007. Responses to the two consultation workshops and written responses to the Scoping Report are included in sections 3 and 4. Responses to comments received during the external consultation period, which closed in

¹ "Planning Policy Statement 12: Local Development Frameworks", Office of the Deputy Prime Minister, 2004, paragraph 1.3 (iii).

² "Town and Country Planning (Local Development) (England) Regulations 2004", ODPM 2003

January 2007, are included in a table in section 9. The changes to the supplementary planning document as a result of the comments shown in section 9 may supersede any previous changes.

The draft Supplementary Planning Document was produced during September-October 2006 taking full account of the consultation responses from the Scoping report, and the consultation workshops with internal and external stakeholders and Members of the Council.

Précis of Consultation Comments of Workshops

Internal and External Stakeholders and Members of the Council

The main issues raised are as follows:

Aims and Context

It was established from the outset that there was a clear need to raise the profile of landscaping across the borough at both developer and community levels. Tameside should be proud of its green heritage and existing stock of landscape areas and actively preserve, enhance and promote them. New landscaping schemes should fit into the context of this wider network of landscape spaces.

In terms of ensuring the appropriate provision of landscaping in new developments it was agreed to be essential that concise and clearly worded guidance for developers should be provided. This should set out realistic guidance in terms of:

Good Practice:

- The provision of access for all in terms of location and ability;
- A balance of landscape planting, nature conservation, wildlife habitat and ecological requirements;
- The application of existing statutory instruments;
- The procurement of adequate and equitable resources from the development process to achieve appropriate landscape proposals either on the development site or elsewhere in the borough.

Good Design:

- The provision of new planting and green space of appropriate type and quality in an optimum location;
- The adequate and appropriate protection and retention of existing vegetation and green space;
- The identification of optimum location and size of landscape provision in terms of access, use, location and security.

Good Housekeeping:

- An adequate provision for future, on-going maintenance;
- The sustaining of local public awareness and 'custodianship' of landscaped spaces;
- An on-going management plan that supports viable green spaces in terms of continued ease of use and safety.

Design and Function

As a first principle the rationale for new landscaped spaces could be established as the need for:

- Local visual amenity;
- Health- 'green' environments have been proven to promote physical and mental well-being;
- Ecology- the sustenance of habitat, air quality and biodiversity.

The feedback received can be categorised under the following headings:

Context

A fundamental starting point for the design of any new landscaped space had to be recognition of its overall physical context. The new environment should respond to its surrounding area and not appear stand-alone, i.e. as if has just been 'parachuted in'.

Adequate local analysis and relevant reference to the development site's context should therefore be evident in any proposed landscape design.

Scale, type and location of new landscaped areas is very important. The proposal should respond to local need taking into account the range of nearby provision and the type of development being proposed. It should be recognised that appropriate landscape provision may not always be associated directly with the proposed development, and may have more effective amenity value in another location.

Linkages

Linkages between landscaped spaces should be identified and designed for. There should be an aim to provide a network of landscaped spaces rather than a varied group of autonomous areas. These linkages could be physical, which shape the success of some road corridors in providing viable environments for wildlife and plants and biotic, linking landscape planting design with ecological initiatives.

Use and Amenity

Their needs to be a balance struck when providing landscaped spaces between 'use and dis-use'. For example rejuvenated canal corridors may have benefited from landscape investment away from specific development sites, but do they provide a viable use for the majority of the local population? They clearly have a limited recreational value and high ecological value but in the case of the latter so do roundabouts and busy road corridors which can also be ecological/habitat havens.

Detail

In terms of landscape design detail there needs to be a degree of prescription with regard to appropriate plant species and numbers but this should inform rather than dictate the overall design. Types of trees should be suggested, perhaps as part of a design palette that are appropriate for a particular location and use within the borough. A fewer number of established standard trees can be more effective than a lot of whips. A group of new trees may be in the medium to long term of more amenity value than preserving in place ageing existing trees. This can also be true of transplanting existing trees to alternate locations; 'root-balling' is a specialist and often risky process for the subject tree and more often than not good quality new planting may be preferable to transplanting which can often be little more than a public relations exercise.

Spaces and Form

On a wider scale it needs to be remembered that spaces around trees and across landscaped areas are as important as the vegetation and also the value of tree-less areas such as grassland

[both cultivated and uncultivated] and wider open landscapes in a more rural context should not be overlooked. Areas of hard landscaping- primarily by its nature usually in an urban context- are also an important element in the overall provision of landscaped spaces in new development and should be given equal consideration.

In general it was agreed that the level of prescriptiveness to apply to new landscape designs was a difficult one to pitch; this was compounded by climate change and shifting range of plant species that are viable in our location. There is a danger in placing too much emphasis on 'native plants'. What exactly constitutes a native plant now, and in turn, fifty years from now? All species have some value and can be utilised effectively in our townscape for particular uses [for example hardy street trees] outside the strict parameters of being 'native'.

Mechanisms and Constraints

In order to fully devise a new landscape proposal there are a number of mechanisms that can be applied and constraints that need to be considered.

Surveys and Methodologies

Ecological and landscape surveys are useful tools for assessing a development site and its surrounding area. Where necessary these should be identified as a pre-requisite to the proposed landscaping scheme.

Visual amenity methodology is increasingly being utilised to assess the landscape value [and hence it's enhancement potential] of an area but this should only be treated as an element of the overall assessment process and not over-emphasised.

Development Control

Development control processes are vital mechanisms to secure viable new landscape proposals. They are instrumental in the identification of a particular landscape need in a proposed development, quantifying its appropriate form and quality and capable of devising procurement measures to realise that need. Through conditions the form of future management and maintenance programmes can be set.

The need for an enhanced system of procedures and mechanisms needs to be investigated for use in the planning application process. These may well be wrapped up in the eventual Supplementary Planning Document that emerges from this consultation and may take the form of requests for landscape design statements that detail proposed species and materials and a management plan beyond the initial works. Too much prescriptive detail needs to be avoided but there may be a case for the production of broad landscape design codes that cover particular wards or groups of wards across the borough, particularly as Tameside is such a diverse authority in terms of townscape and landscape. These could be utilised by developers as aids to devising appropriate designs for their proposals.

Tree Preservation Orders

There was a consensus of agreement that a Tree Preservation Order strategy should not be used as a 'blunt instrument' to control landscape proposals. It needed to be kept focussed with the specific aims of the design considered in the whole e.g. local amenity value, provision of new trees to replace ageing stock for the future landscape etc.

It had to be recognised that not all Tree Preservation Order trees could be retained at any cost. There was a question of resources, what if owners couldn't afford to maintain them? There was also a need to enhance public perception as to the true nature of Tree Preservation Orders; the emphasis is primarily on the protection of trees not their total preservation. Permission is needed to carry out work to or around them whilst public perception generally seemed to erroneously think all Tree Preservation Order trees were untouchable.

A Tree Preservation Order strategy therefore needed to be adaptable and possibly widened in scope and it was worth investigating how far this could be integrated into the proposed

Supplementary Planning Document. This widening of scope could consider mechanisms for the monitoring of the 'progress' of a tree's condition as an on-going process, ensuring that trees meet the end of their life this is recognised and they are replaced. A 'hierarchy' of protection/preservation measures according to species, quality etc. could also be devised although it was recognised there is an issue of resources inherent in such processes.

Developer and Community Contributions

The properly targeted funding of a landscape proposal is crucial in the development of a network of successful, well-used landscaped areas across the borough.

Individual developments need to be judged on their own merits with regard to the necessary level of landscape provision inherent in them. For example, in a particularly urban context there may be no need or scope for a communal landscaped area of any significance; some developments may be in areas already well provided for in terms of a good range of existing landscaped areas. As such there is not only the issue of establishing developer commitment to fund site-specific landscape proposals [both in terms of implementation and future management] but securing funds for any agreed off-site works in lieu of those directly associated with a development.

Landscaping 'Common Fund'

Section 106 agreements are useful mechanisms for agreeing developer contributions to landscaping proposals, particularly when the developer is keen to complete a development and 'move on'. The administration of these funds is important however to ensure they are targeted properly and with optimum return.

Maintenance and Monitoring

The on-going care and maintenance of a landscaped area is one of the most important elements of a landscape design proposal although it was stressed that future management and maintenance issues should not necessarily over-influence the design process.

An extension of the landscape common fund's role could be to act as a third party management body for landscape after-care. This could be supplemented by local resident service charges where communal landscape amenity is present. New Charter for example make it an identifiable part of their rent charge which gives residents a sense of 'custodianship' over their surrounding environment. This can raise the expectations of all residents of all tenures of how well their surrounding landscaped areas are designed and maintained.

On-going care and maintenance need not be an entirely corporate exercise. Provision can be made for the involvement of non-profit groups such as trusts and 'eco-schools'. This can lead to wider community involvement in the development and maintenance of the borough's rich and varied landscape assets.

Summary

It was established that concise and clearly worded guidance for developers and the wider community was required that set out guidance in terms of good practise, design and housekeeping.

The starting point for the design of any new landscaped area had to be the consideration of its existing physical context and required environmental amenity in the area. Decisions had to be made on the appropriate type of landscape proposal for the development in terms of need, form and location. More detail on design proposals was needed in both soft and hard landscaping terms and as such there may be scope for producing more detailed guidance/codes for developers to successfully achieve this.

Development control mechanisms were identified as effective tools in achieving an appropriate landscape proposal. Existing guidance request landscape design plans but it was thought that the proposed Supplementary Planning Document could incorporate more firm requirements such as a landscape design statement including necessary landscape and ecological surveys of the site.

There may also be a case of devising simple 'landscape design codes' to aid developers although once again a balance needed to be struck between firm advice and over-proscriptive detail.

There were issues over Tree Preservation Orders and the general perception and application of them; they are primarily an instrument for protection rather than preservation at any cost but firm, clear measures needed to be put in place that ensured Tree Preservation Orders were not a 'one-off' event and allowed for the continuing monitoring/contingency procedures of notable trees and tree groups across the borough.

Resources for new landscaped areas needed to be channelled in the most effective ways to the most appropriate locations; some areas may have an abundance of existing landscaped spaces, some a shortage. As such contributions to landscape schemes that are development site specific need not always be the most effective use of investment and so an easily identifiable central landscape fund may be useful to increase community and developer confidence in the borough's commitment to landscape improvement and in effectively directing resources particularly in terms of maintenance and management.

It was agreed that the new Supplementary Planning Document needed to be a synthesis of the existing guidance notes, updated to take account of the issues discussed above with the aim to produce a flexible but firm guidance document.

The way forward after circulation of this document for further discussion will be to hold another workshop specifically for members of the council in order to produce a final round-up of issues paper to inform a consultation draft Supplementary Planning Document.

Scoping Report Consultation responses

Agencies/Organisations

Two responses were received during the consultation period of the scoping report.

The Environment Agency

The Environment Agency- supports the proposed Supplementary Planning Document and says that the adoption of the document will help in the approach to sustainable development. The Environment Agency seek good practice in relation to new landscaping schemes, particularly where these are identified adjacent to wildlife sites, wildlife corridors, and river corridors. The promotion of good practice in the sourcing and use of native species for large developments has the benefit of protecting local genetic diversity. Introducing plant stock more adapted to the location, improved wildlife value and prevention of cross breeding between native and non-native stock.

This point has been responded to positively in the draft Supplementary Planning Document and is addressed in section 4 of the draft Supplementary Planning Document.

The Environment Agency recommended that Flora Locale and Woodland Trust be added to the consultation list.

The Council accepts the recommendation made by the Environment Agency Woodland Trust and Flora Locale have now been added to the consultation database and will be consulted on the draft Supplementary Planning Document.

The Countryside Agency response highlights the following issues.

- Reaffirm comments made in Core Strategy on 'Sustainability Objectives'.
- The inclusion of an issue 'The need to raise awareness of landscape elements, nature conservation, wildlife habitat and ecological requirements'.
- Plus the additional issue of 'the need to conserve and enhance the character and quality of the landscape', which includes 'Townscape'.

The Council has addressed these issues by the inclusion of section 4 (Ecology and Street Scene) in the draft Supplementary Planning Document, which outlines issues to be considered and included when submitting a detailed landscaping scheme.

The Countryside Agency also asked that a specific objective 'to conserve and enhance the character and quality of landscapes in the Borough' be added.

This request has been considered and the Council is in agreement with this request and as such the objective has been included in the draft Supplementary Planning Document.

The Government Office for the North West-made no comments at this stage.

The draft Supplementary Planning Document was the subject of a 6-week formal public consultation from Wednesday 29th November until 10th January 2007.

Comments on the report were received, and all documents were available to view on the Council's website throughout this consultation period.

Reference copies were made available at Mossley Library, Mossley Customer Services Centre (in Mossley Library), Ashton Customer Services Centre Tameside Council Offices, Wellington Road, Ashton-u-Lyne, and in the Planning and Building Control Department at the Council Offices in Ashton.

The closing date for these comments was Wednesday 10th January 2007.

Comments were made in writing and addressed to:

Helen Charlesworth, Tameside Council Offices, Planning and Building Control, Council Offices, Wellington Road, Ashton-u-Lyne, Tameside, OL6 6DL.

Fax: 0161 342 2837

Telephone 0161 342 2214

or by email to: helen.charlesworth@tameside.gov.uk

For a summary of this report in Gujarati, Bengali or Urdu please contact 0161 342 8355. It can also be provided in large print or audio formats.

A summary of the responses to this consultation is included in this document. The responses have been fully considered and where appropriate, changes have been made to the draft Supplementary Planning Document prior to its adoption.

List of Consultees

Attendees of the workshops

Internal and External Stakeholders-30th June 2005

Bill Johnson-Longdendale Heritage Trust

Trevor Bridge-Trevor Bridge Associates-Landscape Architects

Barry Englesow-New Charter Housing Trust

Roger Whalley-Tameside Council Tree Officer

Adrian Walker-Tameside Council Landscape Architect

Derek Richardson-Greater Manchester Ecology Unit

Stephen Young-Tameside third sector coalition Green and Open Spaces Forum

Pippa Brown-Tameside Council Design and Regeneration Officer-Planning.

Martin Watkins-Environmental Improvements Co-ordinator Strategic Planning Tameside Council

Councillors and Elected Members-14th September 2005

Cllr D Dickinson

Cllr John Bell

Cllr A Doubleday

Cllr R Etchells

Scoping Report Distribution List-Statutory Consultees

To fulfil the requirements of Stage A5 in the Sustainability Appraisal process the Scoping Report was sent to the following consultation bodies:

| List of Consultees | Email, Letter, Document |
|--|--------------------------------|
| English Nature | E,D |
| Countryside Agency | E,D (Response) |
| Environment Agency | E,D (Response) |
| English Heritage | E,D |
| Government Office for the North West | E,D (Response) |
| North West Regional Assembly | E,D |
| North West Regional Development Agency | E,D |
| Manchester City Council | E,D |
| Stockport Council | E,D |
| High Peak Borough Council | E,D |
| Oldham Council | E,D |

Internal Consultation Responses on the draft Supplementary Planning Document

The draft Supplementary Planning Document was circulated internally for comments on 13th October 2006 for a period of seven working days to the following departments within the Council: -

- Engineers Department
- District Assemblies
- Borough Landscape Architect
- Countryside Unit
- Assistant Executive Director-Planning and Economic Services
- Assistant Executive Director-Sustainable Communities
- Greater Manchester Ecology Unit
- Engineers Department

General Comments include agreement that the guidance does not aim to provide detailed instructions for developers and is not meant as a substitute for professional advice.

Suitable 'hard surfacing' materials. Any such materials should be of a good high quality, fit for purpose and sustainable including longevity and maintainability. If it is intended that the Council will maintain the area then the maintainability of the materials is a prime consideration.

In response to this, it is necessary to find a balanced solution by utilising materials which are not only durable but also aesthetically pleasing and which are seen to enhance the appearance of a new development site. This has been acknowledged and incorporated into the document in section 4 of the draft Supplementary Planning Document.

Street scene design- the engineers department recommended the inclusion of a web link to an existing Council document 'A Street Scene Good Practice Guide'. This is a useful document and includes examples of good and bad practice. It also makes reference to colours used on street furniture in the various towns in the Borough.

It is agreed that the document is a useful guide and as such it has been referenced in Section 4 (Street Scene) of the draft Supplementary Planning Document

Countryside Unit

The main comments included the need to cross reference ecological requirements set out in the objectives and ensure that it is addressed in the text of the document.

This has now been achieved by the inclusion of separate paragraphs on ecology, hedgerows and water areas in section 4 of the draft Supplementary Planning Document.

The Countryside unit also recommended the inclusion of Planning Policy Statement 9- Biodiversity and Geological Conservation and its associated Good Practice Guide.

In agreement with this recommendation reference has been made to Planning Policy Statement 9 in section 3.4- National Policy of the Supplementary Planning Document.

District Assemblies

General comments included the need for wider circulation to community safety section.

In response to this comment, it was always intended that the draft document would be circulated to Tameside Metropolitan Borough Council Community Safety Department along with Greater Manchester Police particularly as the Supplementary Planning Document includes, in section 4, a paragraph on designing out crime.

District Assemblies raised the issue that schemes which are cost-effective and easy to maintain are not an excuse to provide unattractive, bland and poor quality designed schemes.

This issue is fully supported and has been addressed in the document as it is considered to be a very important part of ensuring a suitable landscaping scheme in terms of quality, appearance and durability

List of Consultees for Draft Supplementary Planning Document

Councillor Consultee List - (E- Email, L-Letter, D-Document)

| | |
|-------------------------------|------|
| Councillor R Ambler | L, E |
| Councillor D Baines | L, E |
| Councillor B Beeley | L, E |
| Councillor JS Bell | L, E |
| Councillor P Bibby | L, E |
| Councillor W Bray | L, E |
| Councillor V Carter | L, E |
| Councillor GP Cooney | L, E |
| Councillor J Davis | L, E |
| Councillor D Dickinson | L, E |
| Councillor A Doubleday | L, E |
| Councillor M E Downs | L, E |
| Councillor W Downs | L, E |
| Councillor A Etchells | L, E |
| Councillor R Etchells | L, E |
| Councillor JM Fitzpatrick | L, E |
| Councillor Joseph Fitzpatrick | L, E |
| Councillor C Grantham | L, E |
| Councillor A Gwynne | L, E |
| Councillor AJ Gwynne | L, E |
| Councillor W Harrison | L, E |
| Councillor A Highton | L, E |
| Councillor AJ Holland | L, E |
| Councillor B Holland | L, E |
| Councillor J Kelly | L, E |
| Councillor J.A.P Kitchen | L, E |
| Councillor J Lane | L, E |
| Councillor C A Meredith | L, E |
| Councillor J Middleton | L, E |
| Councillor M H Oldham | L, E |
| Councillor S Roy Oldham | L, E |
| Councillor S Parker-Perry | L, E |
| Councillor C Piddington | L, E |
| Councillor K Quinn | L, E |
| Councillor S Quinn | L, E |
| Councillor V Ricci | L, E |
| Councillor G Roberts | L, E |
| Councillor PJ Robinson | L, E |
| Councillor E Shorrock | L, E |
| Councillor M Sidebottom | L, E |
| Councillor M Smith | L, E |
| Councillor S Smith | L, E |
| Councillor J Sullivan | L, E |
| Councillor D Sweeton | L, E |
| Councillor JC Taylor | L, E |
| Councillor L Travis | L, E |
| Councillor B Walsh | L, E |
| Councillor M Wareing | L, E |
| Councillor B Warrington | L, E |
| Councillor K Welsh | L, E |
| Councillor R Welsh | L, E |

| | |
|-----------------------------|------|
| Councillor C White | L, E |
| Councillor J Alan Whitehead | L, E |
| Councillor M Whitley | L, E |
| Councillor B Wild | L, E |
| Councillor K Wright | L, E |
| Councillor P Wright | L, E |

Partner Consultee List - (E- Email, L-Letter, D-Document)

| | |
|--|------|
| Roland Bardsley Builders Limited | E |
| Roland Bardsley Construction Limited | E |
| Barratt (Manchester) | E |
| Countryside Properties | E |
| Bellway Homes Limited | E |
| Contour Homes Limited | E |
| New Charter Housing Trust | E |
| North Country Homes Group Limited | E |
| The House Builders Federation | E |
| Loxley Homes | E |
| Philip Millson Architecture | E |
| Trevor Bridge Associates | E |
| Tameside Green and Open Spaces Network | E |
| Tameside Third Sector Coalition | E |
| Groundwork Tameside | E |
| Pennine Edge Forest | E |
| Woodland Trust | E, L |
| Flora Locale | E, L |
| The Environment Partnership | E |
| Bartlett Trees | L |
| Peter Duckworth Tree and Garden Services | L |
| Till Hill Forestry | L |
| Lowther Forestry Group | L |
| Longdendale Heritage Trust | L |
| Greater Manchester Ecology Unit | E |
| Government Office North West | D |
| English Nature | D |
| North West Development Agency | D |
| North West Regional Assembly | D |
| Forestry Commission | D |
| Countryside Agency | D |
| Environment Agency | D |
| British Waterways | E |

| | |
|--|---|
| United Utilities | E |
| Manchester City Council | E |
| Stockport Council | E |
| High Peak Borough Council | E |
| Oldham Council | E |
| Local Strategic Partnership | E |
| Greater Manchester Police Architectural Liaison Officer | E |

Internal Consultee List –Tameside Metropolitan Borough Council (E- Email, L-Letter, D-Document)

| | |
|--|---|
| District Assemblies | E |
| Countryside Unit | E |
| Parks and Land | E |
| Landscape Architect | E |
| Tree Officers | E |
| Environmental Improvements Officer | E |
| Development Control | E |
| Education Department | E |
| Community Safety Unit | E |
| Housing Department | E |
| Engineers Department | E |
| Highway Engineers | E |
| Economic Development Unit | E |
| Pat Rattigan-Assistant Executive Director Planning and Economic Services | E |
| Nigel Allen-Head of Planning | E |
| Building Control | E |

- Press Release

To local papers.

- Website

Link to Council's website.

Précis of External Consultation Comments on Draft Supplementary Planning Document

The following section summarises the main comments received on the Draft Trees and Landscaping On Development Sites Supplementary Planning Document.

The Précis has been carried out in tabular form for ease of understanding. Any amendments to the document are highlighted and underlined in red. Any text to be permanently removed from the Supplementary Planning Document is shown with strikethrough and highlighted in red.

| Comment | Response | Changes |
|---|---|--|
| <p><u>1. Government Office for the North West</u></p> <p>1. The draft document falls short of the requirement set out in paragraph 2.43 of Planning Policy Statement 12 for the Supplementary Planning Document to be clearly cross-referenced to the relevant saved plan policies, in matters covered in sections 4-7.</p> <p>2. Government Office North West also commented that the Supplementary Planning Document refers to policies in the submitted draft Regional Spatial Strategy. It would be preferable to refer to existing Regional Spatial Strategy policies and update the Supplementary Planning Document if these change.</p> | <p><u>TMBC</u> <i>This comment is acknowledged and full cross-referencing now appears throughout sections 4-7 where relevant and an example of how it appears is shown below: -</i></p> <p><i>The text has been changed in accordance with the comments made.</i></p> | <p><i>I.e. Section 4.0 Part I- Landscaping in Development' now includes</i> <u><i>[Supplements Unitary Development Plan policies H10, E6, S9, and OL10]</i></u></p> <p><i>Regional and Sub/regional</i> <u><i>3.7 The following policies are set out in the submitted Draft North West Regional Spatial Strategy (January 2006) existing Regional Planning Guidance for the North West- Regional Planning Guidance 13 (March 2003) and Submitted Draft Regional Spatial Strategy for the North West (Jan 06)</i></u></p> |
| <p><u>2. Environment Agency</u></p> <p>1. 4.27 When submitting a planning application Environment. Agency suggests that the developer checks whether the proposed site is at risk of flood and a flood risk assessment would be required.</p> | <p><u>TMBC</u> <i>The following change has been made to the document.</i></p> | <p>4.27 When Submitting a Planning Application: The developer should always check with the Local Planning Authority whether there are any of the following designations, which may affect the nature of development on site.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Relevant Unitary Development Plan Proposals i.e. Conservation Areas ▪ Tree Preservation Order (s) ▪ Listed Buildings ▪ Sites of Biological Importance ▪ Woodland Strategy Zoning-For more details or to see a hard copy of the Woodland Strategy please contact your local tree officer or refer to paragraph 3.17. ▪ <u><i>Site is at risk of Flood. A Flood Risk Assessment is required if so</i></u> |

| | | |
|--|---|--|
| <p>2. 4.38 Landscape Maintenance and Management Plans-Planting near watercourses should consist of native species. Appropriate species should be chosen to provide an acceptable landscaping scheme whilst ensuring minimum maintenance.</p> <p>3. 7.9 Invasive weeds- The Environment. Agency is pleased to see that a section is included on invasive species but suggested some re wording.</p> <p>4. Biodiversity Action Plan trees species should be mentioned such as. Black Poplar is a Greater Manchester Biodiversity Action Plan species</p> | <p>Agree. The comments have been included in paragraph 4.40.</p> <p>Agree. The following revisions have been made to the Supplementary Planning Document.</p> <p>Disagree. Following advice from the Councils Tree Officer we do not wish to specifically mention such species as the Black Poplar as it is known that these species are currently suffering from a disease, which may ultimately kill them off. To encourage further planting of such trees at this time is considered to be inappropriate.</p> | <p>4.40 Management plans are written to guide the efficient and effective long-term management and maintenance of a green space or landscaped areas and on any non-adopted hard surface areas. <u>Planting near watercourses or sites of ecological interest should contain native species. These species should be appropriate species to provide an acceptable landscaping scheme whilst ensuring minimum maintenance. The use of chemicals for maintenance purposes should be kept to a minimum.</u></p> <p>7.9 <u>Developers should ensure that all invasive species for example</u> All treatment of invasive species such as Japanese Knotweed, Giant Hogweed and Himalayan Balsam <u>should be eradicated prior to development commencing and</u> should be professionally carried out by experienced and authorised operatives and to any specification laid down in conditions on approval. <u>Where such species are identified on sites, the Council will require a method statement to ensure its safe removal and disposal.</u></p> <p>NO CHANGE</p> |
|--|---|--|

| | | |
|--|---|--|
| | | |
| <p>3. North West Regional Assembly</p> <p>1. North West Regional Assembly welcome the specific mention that is made of a number of Regional Spatial Strategy policies within the draft document, and reaffirm the support offered by these policies, in particular policy UR10. However, these policies are referenced as being from the submitted Draft Regional Spatial Strategy of January 2006, when in fact they are policies from the adopted Regional Spatial Strategy of March 2003(Regional Planning Guidance 13).</p> <p>2. There are a number of Submitted Draft Regional Spatial Strategy policies which would offer further support to the document in particular policy DP1, EM1 and EM3.</p> | <p><i>Please refer to the comments made to response 1-GONW, in particular comment 2.</i></p> <p><i>Please see added text paragraph 3.13. which acknowledges these comments.</i></p> | <p>See comments on Response 1 Q2</p> <p><u>3.13 Policies EM1-Integrated Land Management, EM3-Green Infrastructure and DP1-Regional Development Principles from the Submitted Draft Regional Spatial Strategy offer further support to the Supplementary Planning Document.</u></p> |
| <p>4. Royal Town Planning Institute (North West Region)</p> <p>1. It is important to stress both the real value of this document and its clear relationship both with all other Council Documents and professional advice (para1.0/2.1). Perhaps a diagram would help clarify this in the mind of the developers.</p> | <p><i>Disagree-The Supplementary Planning Document is only one of a suite of documents within the Council's Local Development Framework. The Local Development Scheme sets out the relationship between the documents in the Local Development Framework. The Sustainability Appraisal of the Supplementary Planning Document sets out the relationship between the Supplementary Planning Document and wider strategies. This diagrammatic approach has not been</i></p> | <p>No Change</p> |

| | | |
|--|---|---|
| <p>2. The objectives are fully supported, but perhaps the first and the last objective could be integrated? (Para.2.0)</p> <p>3. There is value for the developer of having national, regional and local policy context, although PPS3 will now require an update and you may be able to incorporate some feedback from the Examination In Public of the Regional Spatial Strategy (paras3.2/3.7-10). At the local level might it be helpful to indicate (including in map form) the various landscape character areas. produced by the former Countryside Commission. (3.14)</p> <p>4. The principles of landscape design are strongly supported (Para 4.1). Good practice illustrations could be used to accompany them and show what it is that you are looking for. (Para 4.6).</p> <p>5. Where contacts are mentioned it may be</p> | <p><i>taken in other Supplementary Planning Document's, which the Council has produced. This Supplementary Planning Document follows the approach set out in other Supplementary Planning Document's and this consistent approach is considered necessary.</i></p> <p>Agree</p> <p><i>Disagree-At Local level, Tameside Metropolitan Borough Council have not carried out a Landscape Character Assessment for the Borough and as such does not have the data required to map the various character areas.</i></p> <p>Agree. The adopted Supplementary Planning Document will include more illustrations throughout the document to demonstrate these points.</p> | <p>2.0 Objectives Enabling the speed up of the planning process by providing detailed advice and guidance at pre-application stage and to encourage the developer to provide appropriate, well-considered and clear information at the detailed submission stage <u>and to avoid delays and additional costs to the developer during the application process.</u></p> <p>No Change</p> <p>Illustrations included in document</p> |
|--|---|---|

| | | |
|--|---|---|
| <p>useful to give names and direct contact details to assist developers (page 29/30).</p> <p>6. While it is positive to see clear reference to hedgerows (paras 4.13/14) it is perhaps somewhat negative to have an opening line that gives emphasis to their value as barriers to screen existing and new development. must be biodiversity/ecological/landscape benefits of hedgerows that come first? Some may see screening as an opportunity for poor design.</p> <p>7. In the case of submitting a planning application, the inclusion of material on the relevant landscape character area would be helpful as would completed quality examples for site location (para 4.28); existing situation (para 4.29), Development proposals (para 4.30) and Landscape Proposals (para 4.31)</p> <p>8. Para 4.46 does raise interesting questions and it would be helpful to illustrate how cost effective schemes need not be bland and uninteresting.</p> <p>9. The two illustrations on Page 15 are very helpful when it comes to good practice. Can further examples be used?</p> | <p><i>Disagree-This is not Council policy</i></p> <p><i>Agree-the wording has been altered to include wildlife and ecological value.</i></p> <p><i>As response to 4 (3)- Disagree-Tameside Metropolitan Borough Council has not carried out a Landscape Character Assessment for the Borough and as such does not have the data required to map the various character areas. Examples of site Location Plan, existing situation plan, development proposals plan and landscape proposals plans are all now included in appendix 1 of the document.</i></p> <p><i>Disagree-Demonstrating this point is considered beyond the scope of this guidance documentation. This document is not intended to either replace professional expertise or other published information on landscape design and costs.</i></p> <p><i>Agree-more illustrations will be included in the final document</i></p> | <p>No Change</p> <p>4.14 Hedgerows <u>provide excellent wildlife habitats and have significant ecological value</u>. They also form attractive and useful barriers to screen existing and new development.</p> <p>See Appendix</p> <p>No Change</p> <p>More illustrations included in the document</p> |
|--|---|---|

| | | |
|--|---|---|
| <p>10. On the question of tree replacement, should a more varied replacement policy exist across the varied landscape/townscape character areas of the district? Are there areas where a 2 for 1 policy might be more appropriate? Para 6.5</p> | <p><i>Disagree-TMBC has not carried out a Landscape Character Assessment. Tameside Metropolitan Borough Council Tree and Environment Officers always recommend appropriate species dependant on siting, location etc. The Council wishes to retain the tree replacement policy of 1:1 but this will be more clearly worded.</i></p> | <p>No Change</p> <p>The Council expects a policy of replacement on of a minimum of 1: 1 basis. The Council expects a Tree replacement policy of a minimum of 1:1.</p> |
| <p>11. The Root Protection Area material is helpful and some worked examples could benefit developers (page 17/18).</p> | <p><i>The Root Protection Area material is based on the British Standard 5837. However, for clarity it will be explained in the document that the Supplementary Planning Document focuses on the Council's own Interpretation of the British Standard within our own guidance. We have decided to include a worked example of how to calculate the Root Protection Area and this will be accompanied in the appendix by a diagram.</i></p> | <p>See Appendix</p> |
| <p>12. The Tree protection material is also helpful but experience suggests that regular checking and enforcement will be essential throughout the period of development, with some financial penalties in place where breaches take place. (Chapter 7). Removal of Tree .reservation Order trees should require at least a 2 for 1 replacement with the trees selected by the Council (para 7.15)</p> | <p><i>Disagree-We can only have the power to prosecute on trees covered by a Tree. Preservation. Order</i></p> | <p>This is already mentioned in point 10. Also, refer to Chapter 6 of the Supplementary Planning Document.</p> |
| <p>13. Where suggested species are listed, illustrations should accompany them (appendix 3)</p> | <p><i>Disagree-The Council do not think that this is necessary for the scale of this document.</i></p> | <p>No Change</p> |
| <p>14. Given the earlier policy context, is it</p> | <p><i>Disagree-The Council considers this to be</i></p> | <p>No Change</p> |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| <p>necessary to include related Unitary Development Policies here (appendix 5).</p> | <p><i>necessary to explain fully the policy background of this Supplementary Planning Document.</i></p> | |
| <p><u>5.0 Woodland Trust</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. WT welcome the use of British Standard 5837 categorisation, which should include all ancient woodland and ancient/veteran trees under category A3. They stress the importance of including ancient woodland less than 2 hectares. Therefore they have suggested that the wording of paragraph 6.5 be made more explicit in requiring absolute protection of ancient woodland and ancient trees. 2. Woodland Trust wish to object to paragraphs 4.1 and 4.23 for the following reasons. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ And would like to see protection and enhancement of biodiversity incorporated into the ‘principles of landscape design’ which are listed in paragraph 4.1. ▪ And would also like to see some reference to biodiversity in para 4.23, which is headed ‘adapting to climate change’. | <p><i>Disagree-Detailed reference to ancient woodland and protection of ancient woodland will be an integral part of the forthcoming Tameside Countryside and Nature Conservation Strategy which is currently in production by the Countryside Unit.</i></p> <p><i>Disagree-Biodiversity is referred to in its own distinct section paras 4.11-4.13.</i></p> <p><i>Disagree-this is a viable point to make but it is not considered to be appropriate for inclusion in this policy document considering its predominantly urban context. The Council always look to protect existing wildlife designations and as opportunities arise will always seek to enhance biodiversity and wildlife habitats in accordance with the Greater Manchester Biodiversity Action Plan.</i></p> | <p>No Change</p> <p>No Change</p> <p>No Change</p> |

| | | |
|--|---|--|
| <p>6.0 Sport England</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <u>Section 4: Landscaping in Development-</u> Sport England provides guidance on the layout, design and management of such space in terms of arrangement/orientation of sport facilities, the quality standards of for example pitch construction, and maintenance regimes and how hard and soft landscaping are best integrated within open spaces. Reference to this and the quality standards such documents advocate should be referred to. This section e.g. para 4.32a could refer to expected local open space standards. 2. A list of additional Sport England Technical Guidance Notes could be added as web links. | <p><i>Disagree-The Council has cross-referenced in the Tree and Landscaping on Development Sites Supplementary Planning Document, the Council's Green space strategy. The Green space strategy itself will lay out the Councils expected open space standards for quality, quantity and accessibility.</i></p> <p><i>Disagree-links to such documents will be referenced in the Council's Green space strategy and are therefore not considered appropriate for inclusion in this landscape specific Supplementary Planning Document.</i></p> | <p>No Change</p> <p>No Change</p> |
| <p>7.0 United Utilities</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Para. 4.29 United Utilities supports the inclusion of existing services above and below ground (Deep rooted shrubs and trees should not be planted in the vicinity of underground/overhead utility services). 2. When submitting a planning application- Para 4.30 'Development Proposals' words similar to the following should be used: -'Deep rooted trees and shrubs should not be planted in the vicinity of underground/overhead utility services' | <p>Agree-this is already included in the Supplementary Planning Document.</p> <p>Agree- with the principle of the comments made.</p> | <p>No Change</p> <p>4.30 Produce a 'Development Proposals' plan- a well-designed scheme should include the following elements: - Proposed Landscaping superimposed over the layout and access details with a key to show species, planting specification, hard materials, and boundary treatments. These should also be shown on elevation drawings. Any retained</p> |

| | | |
|--|---|--|
| | | <p><u>features such as trees should also be highlighted along with existing and proposed service lines. Proposals should avoid service cables wherever possible</u></p> |
| <p>8.0 Theatres Trust-No Comments The Theatres Trust wish to make no comments on the Draft Supplementary Planning Document</p> | | |
| <p>9.0 Rambler’s Association (Manchester and High Peak Area)</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Clarification of what diversity means in Bullet point 3 para 4.1 is requested. Is it biodiversity, diversity of use or catering for a diversity of people for example ethnic minorities, young and old? 2. The word Vibrant is not appropriate bullet point 5 para 4.1. This word has associations with activity and excitement. Whilst it might be appropriate for say, a public square in a town centre, it would not be appropriate for say, a piece of open space in a quiet residential development. It is suggested that this word be omitted and the bullet point left to include only 'attractive' and 'safe' which are words that would be appropriate for any type of development. 3. 'Iconic features' could be better explained. 4. We very much support the intention to retain existing hedgerows where possible and to plant native hedgerow mixes on new | <p>Agree. This sentence has been clarified in the document</p> <p>Disagree. The word vibrant is meant to encompass interesting and useable open space across a broad spectrum of types of open space. It also means that planting does not have to be bland and can visually enhance development of all types. Therefore, the Council does not wish to change this sentence.</p> <p>Agree. The word has been replaced with innovative to eliminate any confusion.</p> <p>This comment has been addressed in response number 4 point 7. Please see comments.</p> | <p>To create places which cater for diversity, and offer variety and choice for <u>different users</u>.</p> <p>No Change</p> <p>To create new, attractive and <u>iconic innovative</u> features to the area to enhance character and prominence with hard and soft landscaping elements.</p> <p>Change- as per response 4 point 7.</p> |

| | | |
|--|---|---|
| <p>developments where possible. Hedges not only soften boundaries but also provide shelter and habitat for wildlife.</p> | | |
| <p><u>10.0 Independent Network for Green and Open Spaces, Tameside.</u></p> <p>1. This point is regarding the situation when a developer obtains a site and removes all the trees to clear the site before applying for planning approval. We think that there should be something in the document, which would allow determination if this had happened, and a subsequent insistence on providing some appropriate replacements BEFORE planning permission is granted.</p> <p>2. Page 4 of the report: Para .1.1 <u>Propose</u> –Landscape schemes will be required for most developments. <u>To replace-Not all new.</u> (This follows strength of para 4.4</p> <p>3. Page 8 of the report: Para 4.15 <u>Propose</u>- Existing water features: feeder streams and springs to ponds and wetland-the Council recommends that every effort should be made to incorporate these features within the proposed development. (Followed by the remaining content of para 4.15).</p> <p>4. Page 11 of the report para 4.32b bullet point 2 <u>Propose</u>-Proposals should comply with the requirements set out in</p> | <p><i>Disagree-Unfortunately the Council have no powers to do this. We have surveyed the Borough over many years and hope that trees worthy of retention and or protection have a Tree Preservation Order served on them although this can never be comprehensive, (The Council currently has 200+ Tree Preservation Order's). The Council is pro-active in their approach to dealing with trees on potential new development sites when it becomes aware of these sites.</i></p> <p><i>Agreed. The following change has been made to the document.</i></p> <p><i>Disagree-the Council wishes to retain its existing text on existing water features</i></p> <p><i>Agree-Please see revised text.</i></p> | <p>No Change</p> <p>4.4 Landscaping schemes will be required for most new developments. Not all new developments will require a landscaping scheme.</p> <p>4.32b Where feasible, thought should be given to incorporating the key principles set out in the Disability Discrimination Act 1995 proposals</p> |

| | | |
|--|---|--|
| <p>the Disability Discrimination Act 1995 and 2005 etc.</p> <p>5. Page 13 Para 4.47 <u>Propose</u>- (Following, a number of issues such as wildlife and conservation issues,) the safe specification of trees and shrubs and avoidance of ingestion of dangerous berries etc. particularly by children (perhaps cross-reference this to a guide or further advice regarding restrictive varieties) 'the benefits of professional advice'.</p> <p>6. Page 16 Para 6.2 <u>Propose</u>- (at the end of this para) views into development sites should not result in habitat loss particularly of tree or shrubs.</p> <p>7. Page 16 Para 6.2 <u>Propose</u>- (following scale of 1:500 is required) together with a levels survey and any water features.</p> <p>8. Page 16 Para 6.3 <u>Propose</u>-Following those on adjacent land) outside of the site boundary, and following (development) or biodiversity of the area.</p> <p>9. Re Page 30: List of useful websites <u>Propose</u> –the inclusion of Institute of Landscape Architects.</p> <p>10. Re Page 10 of the Report <u>Comment</u>-Section 4.27 When submitting a</p> | <p><i>Disagree-The Supplementary Planning Documents a policy document, which offers guidance to developers and is not meant as a public safety document. The Council arborist would assess such species in context with its proposed location and use and would offer advice accordingly.</i></p> <p><i>Disagree-This paragraph seems to have been misunderstood. Every application is dealt with individually and on its merits.</i></p> <p><i>Disagree. This sentence deals only with the requirements of a tree survey. The next sentence mentions that a tree survey is in addition to all other plans required at Outline stage</i></p> <p><i>Agree-see revised text.</i></p> <p><i>Agree-The Landscape institute has been included in the list of contacts and useful websites</i></p> <p><i>Disagree-Although viewing plans early on in the 8 week period of determination is always</i></p> | <p>should comply with the requirements set out in the Disability Discrimination Act 1995 and 2005.</p> <p>No Change</p> <p>No Change</p> <p>No Change</p> <p>6.3 The tree survey should plot accurate locations of all existing trees, individual tree spread, shrubs and hedges; including those on adjacent land, <u>outside of the site boundary</u> which may be affected by or have an effect on the development.</p> <p>Refer to list of contacts</p> <p>No Change</p> |
|--|---|--|

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| <p>planning application: This section details the various plans which must be submitted-which is excellent. It is important to inform voluntary groups about viewing such plans at an early stage. A statement relating to these comments this should be added to this report.</p> | <p><i>a good idea it is not specifically an issue for this Supplementary Planning Document.</i></p> | |
| <p><u>11.0 McCarthy Stone (Developments) Limited</u></p> <p>1. <u>Object</u> to Para 6.5. The requirement in respect of Category C trees should reflect that set out in British Standard 5837:2005 in that they are expected to be removed in the interests of efficient development. The British Standard does not seek to justify their removal (see appendix 3) and the <i>Supplementary Planning Document</i> should not introduce such a requirement.</p> <p>2. <u>Object</u> to paragraphs. 6.10/6.11. It should be added that 'The shape of the Root Protection Area may be adjusted at the discretion of a qualified arboriculturist'.</p> | <p><i>Disagree-The Supplementary Planning Document outlines the Council's approach to how we assess the categorisation of trees based on the British Standard. Following consultation with the Council's arborists we will require full justification for the removal of any category C trees. Trees will be assessed on an individual basis and based on their merits.</i></p> <p><i>Agree to an extent- The wording in the document will be amended.</i></p> | <p>No Change</p> <p><u>6.11 The Root Protection Area may change shape but not reduce its size for the following reasons: -</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <u>To take account of existing topographical features</u> ▪ <u>To take account of the distribution of roots around existing site features</u> |
| <p><u>12.0 Development Planning Partnership on behalf of Tesco Stores Limited</u></p> <p>1. Paragraph 4.3 states that a high quality landscape scheme will be expected as part of the planning submission for all full and reserved matters applications for development that will have a significant impact on the surrounding environment. Proceeding paragraph 4.4 states that</p> | <p><i>Disagree-The Council states that a landscaping scheme will be required for all Full and Reserved Matters applications where it is considered that the development will have a significant impact on the surrounding environment. Landscaping is considered important on developments of all</i></p> | <p>No Change</p> |

| | | |
|---|--|---|
| <p>landscape schemes' will be required for most developments'. Requirements for landscaping depend on the size, type, nature and location of a proposal. In this respect, the draft document provides no thresholds or guidance as to the size, type, nature and location of development requiring significant landscaping proposals as part of the submission documents.</p> <p>2. Para 4.29 raises the matter of applicants providing an 'Existing Situation' plan. Once more the Supplementary Planning Document does not provide thresholds for the requirement to provide such a plan; i.e. site area, scale or nature of proposal. It is also important to consider only those issues that are relevant to an application site. For example, the need to identify wildlife habitats and features of ecological interest are unlikely to be required for many proposals. Other details may be dealt with through the Design and Access Statement. The Council should consider both applicable thresholds where more detailed information is appropriate and necessary to determine an application; and what information is actually necessary to provide an 'Existing Situation' plan. Pre-application discussions of issues and parameters would appear to be a better use of time and resources than the proposed blanket requirements.</p> <p>3. As part of any landscape scheme, paragraphs 4.30 and 4.31 also require</p> | <p><i>types and sizes and as such the Council does not wish to be prescriptive but will assess applications on their individual merits and liaise closely with the developers and architects on any specific requirements. Therefore on this basis, it is considered that no changes to the Supplementary Planning Document will be made.</i></p> <p><i>Agree to an extent- For clarity a sample 'Existing Situation Plan' is now included in the appendix of the Supplementary Planning Document to confirm the Council's requirements. Again, the Council does not wish to be prescriptive by setting thresholds and as such each site will be assessed independently and on its merits.</i></p> <p><i>Disagree in part-Whilst in certain instances landscaping can be a planning condition the</i></p> | <p>See Appendix</p> <p>No Change</p> |
|---|--|---|

| | | |
|---|--|-------------------------|
| <p>the production of a 'Development Proposals Plan' and 'Landscape Proposals Plan' respectively. Agree in principal to the merits of the former, noting that such a plan would be applicable in supporting many planning applications, however disagree with the need for a landscape proposals plan and state that this could determined by a condition.</p> <p>4. Landscape Management will be dealt with through the submission of plans at application stage. This is considered to be unnecessary and it is recommended that it be dealt with through a condition.</p> | <p><i>Council encourages a pro-active approach to pre-application discussion and consideration regarding proposed landscaping on development sites. As such, the Council consider it to be necessary to submit a landscaping scheme based on such discussions with other submitted documents. This is also to ensure that high quality and suitable landscaping scheme is considered as an integral part of the planning approval process.</i></p> <p><i>Disagree in part-The Council reiterates its pro-active approach to ensuring good landscape management and that it is considered early on in the planning process. This can be achieved through the submission of plans at application stage and finalised following a decision.</i></p> | <p>No Change</p> |
|---|--|-------------------------|

10.0 List of Stakeholders who responded

10.1 The Council received 12 responses in total within the allocated time- frame. No responses were received after the four weeks elapsed. These comments are summarised in section 9 and any amendments, deletions or additions specified have been included in the Supplementary Planning Document.

10.2 **Internal Council Respondees** – those outside of the normal inter-service consultation that preceded publication of the Draft Supplementary Planning Document. -

Environmental Improvements Co-ordinator

Tree Officers

Tameside Council Landscape Architect

10.3 **External Public Agencies** –

Government Office North West

North West Regional Assembly

Sport England North West

Environment Agency

United Utilities

10.4 **External Private Commercial Agencies** –

McCarthy & Stone (Developments) Limited

The Development Planning Partnership on behalf of Tesco Stores Limited

10.5 **“Other” Agencies and Interested Stakeholders** –

Royal Town Planning Institute (North West Region)

Woodland Trust

The Independent Network for Green & Open Spaces Tameside

The Theatres Trust

The Manchester & High Peak branch of the Ramblers Association