

- Need material plan for paths
- Confirmation of POS Plan (and highway verges)
- Adam Darwin to confirm sightlines (on tree plan) are correct.
- Parking spaces 205 – 208, rationalise fence / hedgerow instead of flowing around parking spaces.
- Pier and pancel, specify what material
- 'eixisn boundary wall', confirm gaps to be filled,

G+L Responses Added 13-08-2025 – MILLER APPLICATION ONLY

Following a discussion between myself and Emma Mills, we appreciate the efforts made to progress the scheme. However, some matters remain unsatisfactorily addressed, but we are hopeful that a final further round of feedback and alterations should be able to resolve. These comments are:

- Overall, the soft landscaping (outside of the POS and play areas) is considered acceptable. Emma Mills to do final check for no invasive species / other problematic species.

G+L have liased with Emma. Emma confirmed Prunus lusitanica to be reduced/avoided – this has been substituted for Elaegnus x ebbingei.

- Access tracks for the attenuation tanks have now been included on Vistry's landscape plans. No surfacing materials have been proposed. Particularly for the southern one (adjacent to the LAP), we'd question whether permeable tarmac could be used, and then have informal play markings included on it. Hopscotch, jumping, sprint track etc. Grasscrete is not ideal and just hard surfaced would be a lot of dead road for an annual (biannual?) use. Bit of an innovative approach to make use of necessary infrastructure.

N/A

- Specifications for the proposed footpaths remain required.

See hard landscaping plan.

Which plan is this? Cannot find.

- Discussed in conjunction with Adam Darwin, a combined street tree planting plan plus visibility plan is required to show both where trees may cause conflict, but also where opportunities for more street tree planting could be provided and maximised.

Please see GLY0043 GA 02 Tree Root Protection & Visibility Splays.

- A public open space typology plan (per our Open Space SPD) remains required for each developer, and has not been submitted. See an example of a good version at:

https://www.kirklees.gov.uk/beta/planning-applications/search-for-planning-applications/filedownload.aspx?application_number=2023/92966&file_reference=1077794

Response to be provided following conclusion of all site wide changes, as part of Vistry resubmission.

- An informal path (not grass, but not necessarily tarmac) through the north-east Vistry orchard (presumed, from tree layout) was previously requested and remains sought.

N/A – responses to be provided as part of Vistry resubmission.

- There appears ample opportunity for additional tree planting along the north boundary, for both Millers and Vistry:
 - For Vistry, their north boundary is a prominent ridge line across the valley, and trees will soften and naturalise

N/A – responses to be provided as part of Vistry resubmission.

- For Millers, in the excel document, I've raised concerns over the retaining walls proposed close to the boundary and views up the hill / on approach southbound along Felks. Per the above, more tree planting would soften this, although would not negate all my reservations about the extent of retaining walls here.

Buffer planting has been strengthened.

- Two entrances / exists were requested for the MUGA (anti-bully / entrapment). Replacing the single central entrance with an entrance at 1/3 and 2/3 down the length of the edge would be ideal.

Updated as requested. See GLY0043 PP 01 B.

- Bins have been proposed at most entrances into POS areas, which is welcomed. However, additional bins should be provided anywhere there is more than 1 bench or seat. I.e., in the middle of the NEAP are three benches: a bin next to them would be expected.

Additional bin added by the picnic benches. Bins respaced only MUGA boundary to improve accessibility/proximity to other seating areas.

- Bike rack provided at LEAP, not NEAP. Why? Base expectation for bike rack and NEAP too.

Bike rack added to NEAP.

- Vistry plan ref. GLY0043 LP-V 03A. What is the teal boundary to the bottom south? Can't see on key or other plans.

N/A – responses to be provided as part of Vistry resubmission.

- For the LEAP and NEAP, the general advice is to avoid wood units due to maintained issues. However, as this will remain yours / Manco, we can accept but we'd recommend looking at high quality / spec material for the long-term benefits.

NEAP changed to metal units. LEAP to remain timber – agreed with Emma Mills 13/08.

- LEAP (in Vistry side): Good improvement, but note:
 - PE1 is inappropriate (too small and for young kids) for a LEAP. Request that it is replaced with a larger slide for old children.
 - Trip Trail (TT3 – TT5), please link the grass safety surfacing to form a single area, allowing for use of TT3 to TT5 without leaving it.

N/A – responses to be provided as part of Vistry resubmission.

- NEAP (Miller side): Better, but still issues / shortfall. See the following:
 - PE1, may be acceptable, depending on size. Do you have a product sheet that can be shared for that?

Product agreed with Emma Mills 13/08.

- PE3 is proposed in the LEAP, can a different (but still accessible) product be proposed.

Product retained within NEAP but substituted from LEAP.

PE5 is incorrectly detailed on key. Not 100% clear on what it is supposed to be.

Dino Swing. Please see GLY0043 PP 01B.

- PE4 and PE6 are too basic / small pieces of equipment. Larger and more complicated units, suitable for more mature children, are expected.

Equipment substitutions agreed with Emma mills 13/08.