

Explanation of Amendments to Plans – Update 19.07.18

1. Explanation regarding the evolution of lake design;

The shape of the lake remains as the initial planning application, along with the planned uses, aesthetics, and the overall vision of restoring this feature with its historic footprint.

The following things have been altered through the detailed design with engineering input:

- The depth has increased by 1m. The revised lake is 3m deep.
- The lake profile, with the inclusion of a shallower 'beach' area, with strengthened turf
- Inclusion and detailed specification of aeration and drainage, included to futureproof the lake.

2. Explanation regarding changes to the open space proposed adjacent to the homestead building;

The shapes of the open spaces adjacent to the Homestead, along with the path layout remains the same in the revised plans. The terraced lawns (current tennis courts) adjacent to the Homestead have been adjusted by the inclusion of planting configurations and further seating to provide a variety of spaces to spend time, along with seasonal interest and improved biodiversity through the planting.

The area adjacent to the Café terrace becomes a more useable and flexible lawn, to allow users to sit out on sunny days.

3. Explanation regarding the additional screening mounds, raising of the level of the car park, and amended earthworks design/spreading on the north-western side of the car park, particularly detailing the changes in finished ground levels/overall height increase;

To tie into the existing levels of the road adjacent to the car park, to ensure the drainage of water within the car park, and also to lessen the impact on existing tree roots, the finished ground levels had to be raised (and occasionally lowered) in certain areas. Subsequently, to mitigate the increase in levels, additional screening mounds have been included to the same extent. Care has been taken to ensure that mounding does not encroach onto the base of the existing tree trunks surrounding the car park, thereby damaging the tree. The shape and profile of the mounding is to be naturalistic as shown in the sections.

4. Confirmation that there is no change in the number of parking bays including disability parking bays;

The previous application had 103 parking bays and 5 disabled bays. The revised plans have 104 parking bays and 5 disabled bays.

5. The fence line as shown on BP(90)LP 101 is moving only 2 metres to allow a door to open to the paving area adjacent to the Southend lodge;

Confirmed

6. *Variety in plant species only is the change in relation to garden areas annotated on the plans;*

Confirmed. The rationale behind the changes to the garden areas is also referred to in point (2) above.

7. *Annotations to playground areas merely define the type of play equipment to be installed;*

The area of play, feel and style of play equipment and path layout remains the same. The play equipment labelled and annotated on the amended plans has been adjusted for its range of play value, and to include more accessible equipment for those less able.

8. *Comments regarding the degree of change to footpath design where applicable;*

Very minor amendments to paths have been proposed. Where alignment of paths have been tweaked, it is minimal and to avoid clashes with trees e.g. in the car park area where a path was removed as it would have significantly impacted existing tree roots. Some paths were indicated in red in the initial application as receiving new surface dressing, however these are now to remain as existing with only localised repairs wherever deemed necessary on site.

9. *Confirmation and comment regarding the additional footpath to be installed to the northern side of the Mansion.*

The current ramp adjacent to the toilet block is steep and with the toilet block being removed it was felt a gentler 1:21 slope for improved accessibility was necessary in this location.

Update re NMA revised landscaping plans submitted following pre-app meeting - Planning ref. 106811 responses:

10. *The bollards (as per LP 102) are too far down the main drive. They should only be as far down from the entrance to the parking area as is needed for a coach and maintenance vehicle to wait in front of the bollards when letting coaches through. To have them so far down may encourage people to park alongside the road outside of the parking area/used as overspill parking;*

This has been amended to allow for 2 coaches to wait beyond the entrance of the car park whilst waiting for the bollards to be put down. Please see attached plan (BP(90)LP102 Mark up of General Arrangement for Planning).

11. *The coach bay is too close to the mansion and would not be supported. This should be re-located to be between the parking area/stables and the vehicle access/opening*

to the front of the mansion – see area in google streetview shot below. Either side of the road can be used for a bay, and it can encroach into the carriageway partially – this has been confirmed by Highways – as past the bollards there will be very little vehicular traffic (maintenance vehicles only). This area is screened from the mansion by the trees along the right side of the road in the photo;

The ambition is to achieve 2 coach parking spaces and after tracking a suitable location has been found on the attached plan that allows 3.5m roadway to be clear, with a 1.2m pathway for a good pedestrian comfort level either side of the coach parking. There will be limited movement of vehicles beyond the bollards and therefore it is expected that pedestrians will also walk up the driveway within the 'road'. It would not be possible to achieve even 1 coach parking space along of the northern edge of the main drive between the mature trees and therefore this option has been discounted due to the root zones and tree canopies. The tracking studies have been done to take into account the inward movement and the tracking left in blue on the drawing (BP(90)SK180712_Coach Parking) for reference.

12. *Car park still has a very urban sense to it and a more informal arrangement would suit the parkland setting eg;*

- a. *Kerb edging to carpark surface is indicated to be raised concrete kerb. As the sides to the drive from the park gates to the mansion are low key edges - in fact mostly non-existent edging so the grass is the edge – it would be good to clarify a similarly low key edge restraint within the carpark eg timber or much smaller dimension concrete edge flush with the carpark surface rather than a highway concrete kerb;*

Given that the car park is sunken with 1:2.5/3 slopes, the raised concrete edging around the perimeter is necessary to assist with levels and provide a stable grounding. Where possible this edging can be flush as shown in purple (particularly within the centre of the car park and where this ties into the main driveway). We would not recommend the use of timber edging within the car park as this will need to be replaced much quicker due to the frequency of vehicles and therefore is not sustainable. The wear and tear of a car park setting is particularly high and timber edging would need to be replaced at least every 10 years (and if overrun, which is likely, even sooner than this). This level of replacement is not possible within parks budgets and is therefore not a sustainable option.

- b. *A more organic shape to the car park would suit the site;*

As discussed the layout of the car park has not changed from the previously accepted proposal.

- c. *More informally arranged planting to carry the flow of tree planting from the park, across the parking area and continue with tree planting on the other side;*

As discussed a row of low hedging has been introduced along the pedestrian access to the car park to tie this into the hedging on the stable yard side (See drawing BP(90)LP102 Mark up of General Arrangement for Planning). This will increase the legibility of the access and also help to screen the cars where there is no mounding at this location.

13. *Is it known the type of reinforced grass that will be used within the carpark? i.e. plastic or concrete permeable pavers – can it be confirmed please? As this will influence how successfully grass covered v muddied the carpark will end up being, important given raised elevation of surface level.*

Please see the following link for the detail of the reinforced grass. The product is Golpla Standard System by Geosyn (grass not gravel)
<http://www.geosyn.co.uk/product/golpla-grass-gravel-reinforcement>.

14. *Can the pedestrian link path have a slight curve to it for a more informal, less urban character?*

As above, hedging will be used to soften this path and tie it in visually to the straight paths on the opposite side of the driveway.

15. *If the drop kerb at the car park entrance is for pedestrian pavement with reinforced grass, can the pedestrian link path also be reinforced grass? Or at least have a difference surface finish such as a gravel top finish (like an anti-slip finish) rather than the tarmac finish?*

This has a resin bonded finish.