

NFPC 20/03555 Objection – Landscape and Visual Impact

North Ferriby Parish Council (NFPC) objects in the strongest terms to the desecration of residents' and the public's amenity space for the sake of an applicant trying to over develop a plot of land with minimal landscaping contribution and minimal effective noise mitigation.

NFPC are the democratic representatives for 4000 East Riding residents with a mandate to ensure their views are listened to and respected. Unfortunately, NFPC do not have the financial resource of a company like Wykeland and certainly not of Amazon, but their views and those of their professional advisors are just as valid as FPCR's.

NFPC commissioned an analytical report from The Landscape Partnership (TLP) and gained the views of 2B Landscape Consultancy Ltd on the proposal.

It does not require site visits (although 2B Landscapes have made several) to see through the landscaping proposal of FPCR and the comments in the FPCR submission of 5th March 2021, dated 3rd March 2021

FPCR have produced a scheme for a strip of Open Space land nominated by Wykeland after Wykeland have squeezed a massive building onto their Plot E without any landscaping mitigation to the eastern side. It is not an acceptable and professional approach to landscaping a major industrial development.

To be clear the FPCR report advocates using a strip of ERYC land legally defined as Open Space. This will be legally challenged separately by NFPC and residents.

The Wykeland/ FPCR proposal is not to the same standard as previously approved applications e.g.08/30799/CONDET, which encompassed a continuous 8 to 9 metre high bund on the applicants land, higher than the proposed buildings to the west of it. On this application, FPCR try to convince that a series of bunds **up to** 5 metres high with 2 gaping valleys between, is satisfactory for landscaping a building between 22 and 25 metres high. It is then portrayed by Wykeland in 'marketing speak' as a bio-diversity corridor. This is a misrepresentation.

It is not about biodiversity it is about noise mitigation, which will still travel down the aforementioned valleys. The noise mitigation purpose is confirmed in an email from Dominic Gibbons of Wykeland on 1st June 2020 to ERYC advising that topsoil would be transferred to the Long Plantation Area "to form bunds to **aid visual and noise transfer**" The noise mitigation role of the bunds is further evidenced by the fact that FPCR propose to remove a mature, healthy, centuries old English oak tree (T4) on legally defined open space, a home for bats and replace it with earth bunds - we submit that this is **not** biodiversity.

NFPC makes substantial points on the FPCR report that require additional challenge, response or acknowledged

- Bunds up to 5 metre high are on average not 5 metres high and there is little overlap and numerous gaps for noise break through
- Any planting on the bunds, if it "takes root" will take 15 years to establish
- Bunds with a gradient of 1:3 are not safely accessible to the elderly and walkers with dogs off-lead and is not open space accessible to the public.
- 6.16 (of the Landscape and Visual response by FPCR) It is not the responsibility of TLP (The Landscape Partnership) to produce an LVA it is for the applicant.

- 7.4 The views submitted are from an industrial Brickyard Lane or from behind the lights at the dumbbell roundabout, these are not views regularly visited by residents other than in a car when concentration is on the road
- 8.1 NFPC supports the TLP assessment that “there is no element of the proposed measures that could be considered to provide open green space for recreation.”
- 8.3 agrees the bunds are for noise mitigation, but that **they only assist** in filtering and screening views of the built development
- 8.4 The strip of land next to the Long Plantation, described by FPCR for bunds is also defined as Open Space in a Section 106 Agreement
- 8.5 FPCR cannot propose landscaping for mitigation and then advise it does not subsequently matter and can be replaced by treeless vantage points. If approved it cannot fall into disrepute and must be maintained by Wykeland or their successors as the original planted landscaping
- 8.8 FPCR has not mentioned the removal of trees to permit the proposed maintenance access to Long Plantation
- The additional planting to the North of the site will increase “tunnelling” of the footpath and increases shadowing to make existing risk from Winter ice more dangerous
- 9.7 LVA Site assessment is a **Moderate Averse** landscape effect for up to 15 years before Moderate – Minor assessment – only if planting survives to maturity!
- 10.15 LVA impact on the Wolds Way (a high proportion of which is in the Long Plantation) is **Major-Moderate Adverse** and Moderate Averse **after 15 years**, but severely impacting the home owners 20 metres further to the East of Long Plantation with **immediate effect**.
- 11.15 the land is already publicly accessible. This proposal adds nothing in this context and in fact reduces accessibility
- 11.18 As described earlier the proposal in no way safeguards residents visual amenity as per 08/30799/CONDET etc.
- 12.3- 12.7 ERYC and FPCR have failed to consider specifically visualisations from the Wolds Way in Long Plantation and the Trans Pennine Trail in favour non-descript overviews favouring development.

As a result, NFPC have commissioned a professional Landscape Consultant to provide the pertinent views and ask that ERYC Planning Officer’s allow appropriate time for these to be delivered. (FPCR took 3 months to provide these).

The most amazing statement is made in response to 12.12 from 2B Landscape Consultants “*I cannot find any meaningful description of the lighting (e.g. column height) and night time effects of the development. The words “lighting” and “night” do not appear in the applicants LVA*”. This is contrary to GLVIA3. We find the response to be incredulous for a professional landscaping company and by ERYC officers

- 12.13 *During the pre-application stage there was no request from the council for lighting and night time effects to be addressed or to be considered within the LVA.*

This is for an application with 284 column or factory wall mounted floodlights, 150 metres from residents homes, that is bigger than Wembley Stadium and probably visible from space at night.

NFPC insists on a professional night time LVA assessment being carried out, including the ecology impact

NFPC will in parallel submit the visualisations that have been commissioned and **paid for by local tax payers**. In the meantime, NFPC continues to object in the strongest terms to the desecration of residents and the public’s amenity space as detailed above.