

Minutes

SZC - Wickham Market Parish Council Non-Highways aspects of Southern Park & Ride (SP&R)

Environment

Project Title and Ref: SZC Project

Meeting Held on: 8 October 2020

Attendees:

Cllr Alexander Nicoll (SCC) - AN	Klaus Fortmann (CAPC) - KF
Alister Kratt (LDA) - AK	Phil Watson (SCC) - PW
Cllr Anne Westover (WMPC) - AW	Richard Bull (EDF) - RB
Arthur Stansfield (WMPC) - AS	Richard Cooper (Marlesford PC) - RC
Carolyn Barnes (ESC) – CB	Ruth Knight (LDA) - RK
David Chenery (WMPC) - DC	Cllr Stephen Leach (HPC) - SL
CLLr Dick Jenkinson (WMPC) – DJ	Steve Merry (SCC) (Chair) - SM
Fiona Judge (WMPC & SWG) - FJ	Stephen Henry (EDF) – SH
George DiMascio (EDF) - GD	
Ivor French (WMPC) - IF	

Meeting Type: MS Teams

Apologies: Tim De-Keyzer (SCC)
Nick Newton (ESC)

Meeting Minutes – 08/10/20

Reference	Matter	Action Owner	Action Deadline
1	Purpose		
1.1	SM set out the purpose of the meeting as being to discuss non-highway issues related to the southern park and ride site at Wickham Market. The Parish Councils of Campsea Ashe, Hacheston, Marlesford and Wickham Market have previously provided a written list of concerns and the meeting is an opportunity for EDF to respond to that list.		
1.2	AW clarified that the document referred to by RC was the comments document prepared by RC, AW and SL dated 13/08/20, as updated 29/09/20. Reference should also be made to minutes of a site meeting held 29/11/19.		
1.3	KF indicated that not all of the concerns relating to Campsea Ashe had been incorporated into the list due to time constraints.		
2.	Overview		
2.1	AW summarised the Parish Councils’ concerns in relation to the landscape treatment as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pleased that the woodland on the western boundary is now retained • Feel that the viewpoints and assessment downplay effects • Concerned that part of the bund along the northern boundary has been removed • Until around 20 years ago there was a hedgerow along the approximate alignment of the northern boundary – could a replacement hedgerow be planted? • The bunds should be located inside hedgerows with hedgerow trees introduced to existing hedgerows • The bridleway along the western boundary runs along the edge of the security fence with no space for screening and the boundary planting should be completed to link to the bund 		

SZC - Wickham Market Parish Council Non-Highways aspects of Southern Park & Ride (SP&R)

Environment

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concerned about the impact of the access road on the double hedgerow and veteran tree – more detail required on what is happening in this area especially given its importance Require clarity on the connectivity of public rights of way Any planting that is implemented should provide a long term legacy and planting on bunds is to be avoided A request has previously been made for planting along the slip road to be enhanced In addition, during discussion concern regarding control of lighting effects was discussed 		
3.	Boundary treatments		
3.1	<p>RB indicated that EDF will be proposing to extend the bunding along the full length of the northern boundary, as per previous proposals.</p> <p>AW confirmed that she was pleased to have that offer.</p> <p>AK confirmed that the length of the bund had been reduced due to a lack of available material on site.</p> <p>AN by Teams comment, indicated it was good to hear bund returned to extend originally envisaged and hoped this could now be fixed and agreed.</p>		
3.2	<p>RB indicated that where there are existing hedgerows around the boundaries enhancements will be possible. However, where there are not hedgerows at present across existing arable land introducing new hedgerows would be more difficult and subject to land control/agreements.</p> <p>AK suggested that the legal agreement on the land would be subject to returning the site to its current use. If the undertaking is a lease on the land and an obligation to return to the existing use, then there would be limited opportunities to introduce hedgerows through the middle of fields – RB indicated this would be the case.</p> <p>AK suggested it might be possible to plant hedgerows on top of the bunds to create a semi-permanent feeling of enclosure, accepting the possible challenges of establishment and ultimately their loss on removal.</p> <p>AW highlighted that in her experience planting on bunds is not successful as the bunds are generally too dry. Her preference would be legacy planting outside the bunds, to achieve a long-term fit with the landscape. It would be possible for the Parish Councils to talk to the landowner, but the preference would be for EDF to do that.</p> <p>AK suggested that EDF would look into what is feasible.</p> <p>AN by Teams comment, indicated agreement with AW that any planting must be capable of integrating over the long term and become a positive addition in the wider setting after the P&R is removed.</p> <p>RC highlighted that there would need to be a good standoff between any hedgerow and the bunds to allow the ground to be graded back out once the bunds are removed, without damaging the hedgerows.</p> <p>AK suggested EDF would look at the proximity of the hedgerows to the proposed bunds.</p> <p>AS mentioned that with changes in agricultural practices in the future, such as stewardship schemes, hedgerow planting may be beneficial to the landowner in the longer term.</p>	RB/AK	October
		RB	October

SZC - Wickham Market Parish Council Non-Highways aspects of Southern Park & Ride (SP&R)

Environment

	<p>RB undertook to take away an action to speak to the landowner and establish if additional hedgerow planting would be possible.</p> <p>AN indicated by Teams message, that it would be good to build landowner support/involvement at the outset.</p>		
3.3	<p>AW explained that there were concerns about the relationship between the boundary on the western boundary and the construction area. There does not appear to be any mitigation between the bridleway and the site, which would allow open view across it. GD highlighted that the roadway within the park and ride site creates a pinch point on this boundary and screening may need to be in the form of the fencing installed rather than any planting. EDF will take away an action to investigate how much space there is between the bridleway and the fence line.</p> <p>AW suggested that the design should have worked round the need for a hedgerow along the fence line, which the LVIA should have identified.</p> <p>RK highlighted that the landscape proposals do show a proposed hedgerow along the outside of the security fence.</p> <p>RC suggested that if there is not space for a hedgerow with the current alignment of the bridleway, the possibility of diverting the bridleway to the west should be considered. Screening of the security fence may not be required in that situation.</p> <p>AK indicated that looking at the area to the east would be preferential due to the legal implications of a diversion.</p> <p>RC indicated that moving the bridleway to the west would probably be supported by the public bodies, in his opinion, if it isn't possible to push east enough to fit in planting.</p> <p>SM asked why the internal road couldn't be moved further east to ease the pinch point.</p> <p>AW indicated by Teams message, that the fence, lighting and other ancillary facilities would need to be considered.</p> <p>RB indicated that the proposals already indicate a hedgerow at the pinch point. EDF can commit to ensure that the length of hedgerow will be extended along the whole edge of the PRoW in that area.</p> <p>AK undertook that EDF will review the proposed hedgerow to ensure it is achievable.</p> <p>RB confirmed that diversion of a BW was unlikely to be possible at this point and alterations in design to accommodate the hedgerow would be preferable</p>	<p>GD/AK/ RK</p> <p>RB/GD/ AK/RK</p>	<p>October</p> <p>October</p>
3.4	<p>AW indicated that more detail is required in relation to how the access point works with the existing mature hedgerow. A site visit was undertaken in November 2019 with ESC and Nick Newton shared many of the concerns of the Parish Councils. The Site Clearance Plan indicates a 40m swathe of removal, through the existing hedgerow, track, watercourse and it isn't clear if the veteran oak can be retained. There is no tree survey and it is not clear from the restoration plan what is retained and how the hedgerows are restored.</p> <p>AN indicated by Teams message, that clarity around the existing hedge and oak tree needs to be achieved ASAP.</p> <p>AW indicated that there are clear views from Wickham Market and that the oak tree can be seen. This is not identified on plans or in the assessment and it is not clear how the tree will be preserved or managed. The Parish Councils are not comfortable that that this has been properly assessed.</p>		

SZC - Wickham Market Parish Council Non-Highways aspects of Southern Park & Ride (SP&R)

Environment

	<p>KF highlighted views from Campsea Ashe into the site and that planting to the south east will be important.</p> <p>RB provided a commitment to better understand what can be retained and how the site access works. A decision will be made as to the best location for the entry point to retain the tree.</p>	RB/GD/ AK/RK	October
3.5	<p>AW stated that there is a campsite along the back road to Campsea Ashe (at Brick Kiln Cottages) that is marketed for dark skies and has clear views across to the park and ride. RB and RK confirmed that the proposals show the hedgerow to the south of the park and ride (along the northern edge of the A12) having infill planting within existing gaps. This would create a continuous hedgerow. Bunding would be up to 3m in height (except for an area up to 1m high over an existing underground utility).</p> <p>AK suggested a hedgerow on top of the bund could be explored.</p> <p>AW reiterated that planting on the bund would not be a good idea as it is unlikely to grow well. She highlighted that the assessment claims that visibility from Campsea Ashe would be limited, but that advanced planting inside the A12 would be ideal.</p> <p>KF highlighted that around 30 properties would see the proposals from Campsea Ashe. Secondary offsite planting along a field boundary south of the A12, towards Hacheston, would help with this and interrupt views. There could also be other benefits in terms of noise reduction from the A12.</p> <p>AW suggested that it was likely that the landowner in this area was the same as the landowner for the site, but that would need to be confirmed. AW also indicated via Teams message, that there has not yet been any discussion around off-site planting within the same landowners ownership through s106.</p> <p>AK suggested EDF could explore what might be possible within the highway boundary initially.</p> <p>AN queried via Teams message, what the available land was on the other side of the A12 at this point and if it was Highways England or SCC land. RC and AW confirmed via Teams message, that the road is not trunked at that location and would be SCC land.</p> <p>SM stated that there is not much room within the highway boundary in that area and confirmed via Teams message, that there is approx. 4m from the edge of the carriageway, so would be tight for planting as there is also a French drain in that distance.</p> <p>AN indicated by Teams message, that planting in this area was still worth investigating, especially to help Campsea Ashe.</p> <p>AW stated that the bulk of the existing planting is located around the slip roads. In her opinion planting would need to be south of the A12 to be effective.</p> <p>AK indicated that EDF should take a step by step approach to considering any further planting.</p> <p>RB stated that it was positive that the proposal already include infill planting within the existing hedgerow. EDF will consider the other options that could enhance this.</p>	RB/GD/ AK/RK	November
3.6	<p>AW queried the route north of the A12 between the existing public rights of way and whether the yellow pedestrian surfacing symbol indicated on the landscape masterplan is correct (south of the bund). It would be welcomed to improve connectivity if it is correct.</p> <p>RK undertook to take the point away and confirm if it was the intention to provide this connection.</p>	RK	October

PROTECTIVE MARKING

SZC - Wickham Market Parish Council Non-Highways aspects of Southern Park & Ride (SP&R)

Environment

4.	Lighting		
4.1	<p>AW indicated that lighting effects on residential properties are not fully considered in the ES and also indicated that some of the public rights of way around Wickham Market would be used at night and should have been considered. The ES indicates that lighting will be dimmed in areas that are not in use, but the concern remains that the site would be operational for all but four hours per day.</p> <p>RC stressed that this is important because it will be looked at very closely by residents and there is general concern. With lighting columns up to 10m high it is important to consider how this can be substantially mitigated.</p> <p>AN indicated via Teams message, that the lighting issue has been voiced several times and in other meetings so it would be good to hear RB's thoughts.</p> <p>RB set out that that the challenge for the site is to balance the visual effects of the lighting with the safety and security requirements of the operational site. Considerable thought has been given to the lighting design and EDF are aware of the dark sky sensitivities in the area. This has been a key factor in the design considerations.</p> <p>RC highlighted that the elevated position of the site is recognised in the ES.</p> <p>KF added by Teams message, that when it is cloudy/foggy at night the lighting would create a large area of visual impact.</p> <p>AW acknowledged that the Five Crossways roundabout lighting is intensive but effects are localised and clarified via Teams message that the cumulative effects will result in a larger area of light spill.</p> <p>AK indicated that EDF would take away an action to provide clarification of the measures that have and could be put in place to reduce lighting effects/control lighting levels.</p> <p>RK setting out the detail of the approach to the lighting assessment, utilising viewpoints from the daytime LVIA, which were agreed with ESC and SCC but removing some locations e.g. on unlit footpaths in rural areas that would not be used at night. No further viewpoints from residential properties were requested.</p> <p>AK stated that there would need to be further discussion with the lighting engineers to understand how the lighting would be controlled and how far the light would be shed, as well as to gain further understanding of how views looking out of windows towards lighting would be affected. AK noted that there is a difference in assessment between a view towards light from a private dwelling and light being shed on a property/land.</p> <p>AW indicated by Teams message, that there are very dark skies at Brick Kiln campsite as well – people stay there to star gaze.</p> <p>AW suggested that not considering effects from residential properties was an omission from the assessment. Only one footpath on the edge of Wickham Market is considered but others are likely to have some visibility. This needs to be taken seriously.</p> <p>AN indicated via Teams message, that overlooking the residential issue re lighting seems an oversight and I wonder why SCC/ESC didn't consult community via PCs, or did they?</p> <p>KF indicated via Teams message that first floor bedrooms in Campsea Ashe overlook the site at night.</p> <p>AW indicated by Teams message, that there had been no consultation on night-time viewpoints and I was worrying that other key viewpoints had not been identified.</p>	<p>RB/GD/ AK/RK</p> <p>AK</p>	<p>October</p> <p>November</p>

SZC - Wickham Market Parish Council Non-Highways aspects of Southern Park & Ride (SP&R)

Environment

4.2	<p>IF queried whether during quiet periods and/or when the park and ride is not being heavily used during shift times the lighting could be turned off. He has seen it work in other places, with lower level lighting at certain times.</p> <p>RB provided a commitment to investigate whether there were times where that might be possible.</p> <p>GD highlighted that there would be a management system in relation to the lighting which is already set out in the ES.</p>	RB/GD	October
5.	Assessment		
5.1	<p>RC indicated that there was a line of sight between Marlesford Hall and the site. The only viewpoint is located on a footpath below the Hall. A viewpoint should be added from the Hall itself.</p> <p>AK indicated that the definition of the effect on the setting of an historic/listed building is different to any visual effects and would be assessed in the historic environment chapter. . The point is understood. AK noted that the view from a private property is different to the view from a publicly accessible area.</p> <p>AW queried via Teams message, if the impact on historic parkland was covered under the heritage impacts document.</p> <p>SL queried via Teams message, if there should be viewpoints from all listed building close by.</p>		
5.2	<p>KF stated that the southern park and ride volume of the ES indicates that effects would be localised, with para 6.4.11 indicating that Campsea Ashe is 1.6km from the site. Para 6.4.41 does not mention Campsea Ashe or Brick Kiln, suggesting that they would experience effects which would not be greater than negligible, but there are views to the site.</p> <p>RK confirmed that the LVIA indicates that Campsea Ashe is located outside of the Zone of Visual Influence (ZVI) – the area where significant visual effects would occur. AK added that this does not mean there would be no visibility, but that there would not be significant visibility. RK noted that the assessment approach was agreed with both councils.</p> <p>AK suggested that EDF would go away, review the assessment including the ZVI and assessment and report back. RB committed to do that.</p>	RB/AK/ RK	November
5.3	<p>AN reiterated that the park and ride site is located in an elevated position. He felt that the ZVI was drawn very tightly and he wasn't convinced. He requested that residential amenity was looked at again as it doesn't look right.</p> <p>AW stated that the discussion was focussing on the ZVI when the ES Figure also showed the ZTV in purple. Lots of other viewpoints are provided but there are other views within the area of the ZTV. It has been raised for many years that the site is very visible.</p>		
5.4	<p>AS asked if infra-red security has been considered. This could mean that lighting would not be required when the park and ride was not in use.</p> <p>RB indicated that the park and ride would require a lesser degree of security than the main site. He would take the point away to consider.</p>	RB	October
6.	Noise		

SZC - Wickham Market Parish Council Non-Highways aspects of Southern Park & Ride (SP&R)

Environment

6.1	<p>RC mentioned that there is a kart track on or adjacent to the site that has been used for racing radio-controlled cars. This had a considerable noise impact. The operation of the park and ride will also have an impact but is described as negligible in the ES.</p> <p>RB indicated that the speed of vehicles within the park and ride would be controlled and noise from traffic on the A12 is likely to be greater.</p> <p>RC highlighted that the noise of reversing alarms could be particularly intrusive. That should be controlled. The use of electric buses should also be considered.</p> <p>RB indicated that the use of electric buses would be ideal if it is a viable option, but it is not possible to commit to that at this stage.</p> <p>RC highlighted that the use of electric buses would reduce noise on the A12.</p> <p>RB took an action to look at the approach to reversing alarms.</p> <p>SM indicated that the generally all vehicles would be moving in a forward direction through the park and ride.</p>	RB	October
6.2	<p>AN highlighted that Suffolk County are actively looking at an electric taxi bus service. The county have an aspiration to decarbonise and to use electric buses – EDF becoming involved with that would be good.</p> <p>RB asked for AN to share further details to allow upwards briefing within EDF.</p> <p>AN agreed to forward details along with an invitation to a virtual meeting on 4th November that EDF could attend.</p>	AN	4/11/20
7.	Connectivity		
7.1	<p>AW raised the need to improve the link to the Five Crossways roundabout and to Marlesford. These need to be provided for and enhanced. Hedgerow planting would be good and should be identified within the LVIA as landscape mitigation. The route should go all the way to Wickham Market but the key stretch is from the park and ride to Five Crossways and to Marlesford.</p> <p>RC indicated there needs to be a landscape solution to the route to Marlesford.</p> <p>SM indicated that there needs to be a safe crossing point at the Five Crossways roundabout, but there is the thorny issue of a layby on the slip road.</p> <p>AW highlighted that the DCO boundary is too tight to the road. A strip of the adjacent field is required for a decent footway/cycleway and a hedgerow along it.</p> <p>RB indicated that this is on the list of transport issues and agrees that a safe route to Wickham Market should be promoted.</p> <p>SM indicated that the DCO boundary currently includes approx. 3m from the edge of the carriageway, which would be room for a footway but not a hedgerow.</p> <p>AW indicated that planting would allow further mitigation. There is scope either side of the slip road for enhancement.</p> <p>RB acknowledged that there is already an action to look at a route to Wickham Market and Marlesford. He agreed to add to that looking into the provision of vegetation.</p>	RB	November
7.2	<p>KF highlighted that the proposals are all very car based. Campsea Ashe has a train station – he asked if it would be possible to use trains to access the park and ride, allowing foot and cycle passengers to access the facility.</p> <p>SM indicated that the route had been looked at and it would be very difficult to get from Campsea Ashe to Wickham Market by foot or cycle.</p>		
8.	Advance planting		

SZC - Wickham Market Parish Council Non-Highways aspects of Southern Park & Ride (SP&R)

Environment

8.1	RC requested that early planting is undertaken. He highlighted that the park and ride is currently due to commence construction in year 2 – could that not be brought forward to allow an earlier start and an earlier start on landscape planting. RB agreed to look at the programme and that it would make sense for one park and ride to come forward before the other.	RB	October
9.	Close		
9.1	RC indicated that he was pleased with how the meeting had gone, including the commitments to make changes and to look at issues further. How will the group see what changes? RB indicated that any significant changes such as extending the bunding will be undertaken formally whilst changes such as hedges can be incorporated directly into the proposals. EDF will have the opportunity to share these changes and the meeting notes will indicate the route map for any changes and whether they will be non-material or not. RC asked EDF to keep the group informed. RB committed to do so.	RB RB	November Ongoing
9.2	AW asked PW or CB to provide feedback to Nick Newton. CB agreed to provide feedback to Nick Newton and Lisa Chandler. PW also agreed via Teams message to brief Nick Newton.	CB PW	