

6.5 Landscape

6.5.1 The comments raised in respect of landscape issues during Phase Two Consultation are summarised in Table 6.4 together with the Applicant's response.

Table 6.4: Comments on landscape received in Phase Two Consultation

Ref	Comment	SC	LA	LI	No. CC	CC IDs	Applicant's response	Change
Landscape								
Reasons for supporting the proposals								
6.5.2	Proposals are well thought out and should be adhered to.	GLA	-	-	27	10117; 10100; 10113; 10115; 10096; 10098; 10099; 10092; 10094; 10095; 10089; 10090; 10091; 10086; 10087; 10088; 10080; 10083; 10084; 10078; 10056; 10045; 10047; 95; 86; 99; 78	Support is noted and welcomed.	N
6.5.3	The proposed landscaping will improve the look of the local area and make it look less industrial.	-	WCC	-	23	10098; 10088; 10118; 10119; 10111; 10112; 10116; 10106; 10108; 10109; 10102; 10103; 10105; 10093; 10097; 10101; 10081; 10082; 10085; 94; 80; 68; 10046	Support is noted and welcomed.	N

Ref	Comment	SC	LA	LI	No. CC	CC IDs	Applicant's response	Change
Landscape								
6.5.4	Overall the landscaping approach, including planting more trees and shrubs, would benefit the natural environment.	-	-	-	3	10104; 10107; 10114		N
6.5.5	Support green (brown) roof/walls as they provide ecological, drainage and visual benefits.	GLA	LBE	-	3	82; 83; 79		N
6.5.6	Other reasons for supporting the landscaping proposals include: a) the area would become popular with visitors; b) easy to maintain; c) create a visual buffer along the canal; d) provide ecological enhancements as well as sustainable water management; e) support habitat creation; f) integrate with the wider landscape.	GLA	LBE	LVRP A	2	10110; 5		N
Reasons for challenging the proposals								
6.5.7	There are concerns that the landscaping proposals: a) do not integrate with the wider landscape;	-	-	LVRP A	3	10120; 10079; 10077	The landscaping has been designed to integrate with the wider landscape through habitat enhancement and creation including open woodland, tree planting and scrub planting along the Edmonton EcoPark's eastern	N

Ref	Comment	SC	LA	LI	No. CC	CC IDs	Applicant's response	Change
Landscape								
							boundary, as well as marginal planting along Enfield Ditch. Landscaping would also be provided along on the western edge of the River Lee Navigation opposite the Edmonton EcoPark.	
	b) are difficult to imagine in practice;						Further information on landscape, including examples of proposed landscaping, is provided in the Design and Access Statement (AD05.07).	N
	c) might not benefit the wider community unless residents have access to the landscaped areas;						Part of the landscaping proposed is located outside of the Edmonton EcoPark along Lee Park Way and is therefore accessible to the public. The landscaping along the eastern edge of the Edmonton EcoPark will also be accessible to members of the public visiting the Reuse and Recycling Centre.	N
	d) planting is an insufficient landscaping measure.						Planting is one element of the approach to landscaping; for further information please refer to the Design and Access Statement and Design Code Principles (AD02.02). Detail of landscaping will be developed prior to implementation.	N
Comments on trees/shrubs/planting								
6.5.8	Planting should encourage habitat creation/establish a wildlife corridor along the waterways	-	-	LVRP A	6	66; 10099; 10118; 82; 79; 10047	The proposals include a habitat enhancement and creation including open woodland, tree planting and scrub planting along the eastern boundary, as well as marginal planting along Enfield Ditch. The proposals also include meadow planting (species rich mown grass) along the western boundary of	N

Ref	Comment	SC	LA	LI	No. CC	CC IDs	Applicant's response	Change
Landscape								
							the Edmonton EcoPark and tree planting is proposed around Lee Park Way.	
6.5.9	The following plant types are requested:	NG	-	-	3	79; 87; 77	Wildflowers are included in the planting schedule in the Design Code Principles.	N
	a) wildflowers;							
	b) nutrient rich plants that can be composted;						All plants (trees, shrubs, meadow, grass) can be composted and should have a reasonable nutrient content.	N
	c) native species with good biodiversity value;						It is the intention that the vast majority of the trees and shrubs would be native. A small number of ornamental shrubs would be used in locations which require smaller species with high amenity value, for example next to EcoPark House.	N
	d) reed beds to clean water run off on the site;						There are no waterbodies which are considered to be suitable for reed beds.	N
	e) fruit bushes;						Fruiting native species including blackthorn, hawthorn and rose have been included in the indicative species mixes set out in the Design Code Principles for their wildlife value.	N
f) slow and low growing species (near National Grid overhead line)	There is only a small area of the scheme which is located underneath or adjacent to National Grid overhead lines – this is at the junction with Advent Way and Lee Park Way. In this location only slow and low growing tree and shrub planting is proposed.	N						

Ref	Comment	SC	LA	LI	No. CC	CC IDs	Applicant's response	Change
Landscape								
6.5.10	Other suggestions include any hard surface that is not used by vehicles/pedestrians to be planted with trees and wild flowers	-	-	-	1	82	There are no areas of hard standing proposed which do not have an operational function. The exception is the former EfW facility plot which will be safeguarded for future waste management uses and therefore would be hard landscaped.	N
Comments on the eastern boundary								
6.5.11	Support for the following landscaping measures: a) embedding the eastern section of the ERF into the topography of the landscape as it would reduce the overall visual impact and provide biodiversity opportunities;	GLA	LBE	-	0	-	Support for the proposed landscaping on the eastern boundary is noted and welcomed.	N
	b) emphasis on the eastern corridor is welcomed but there is a need for high quality spaces between the buildings						The landscaping strategy includes spaces between buildings. It should be acknowledged that the Edmonton EcoPark is an operational waste management site and that it must also ensure that it confirms with all operational requirements.	N
Other specific suggestions/questions/comments								
6.5.12	Other suggestions /requests include: a) should not disrupt local residents;	CRT	LBE	LVRP A	2	10075; 88	The landscaping proposals will not disrupt local residents;	N
	b) should reduce the visual impact;						The landscaping strategy has been designed to reduce the visual impact of	N

Ref	Comment	SC	LA	LI	No. CC	CC IDs	Applicant's response	Change
Landscape								
							the proposed ERF and RRF, for example through planting along the eastern edge.	
	c) should maximise natural habitat;						The Project proposes the creation of new habitats and enhancement of existing habitats.	N
	d) should comply with DMD policy requirements and Enfield's Biodiversity Action Plan;						The landscaping approach is in general conformity with Enfield Development Management Document and the Biodiversity Action Plan; refer to the Planning Statement (AD05.02) and Design Code Principles for further information.	N
	e) should include the towpath opposite the entrance;						Land opposite the proposed new access off Lee Park Way is not within the Application Site and the Project does not justify landscaping that far north.	N
	f) should include provisions for the cleared site to ensure that some of the lost features (such as the pond) are replaced and that the site overall makes a positive contribution to the visual amenity;						The approach to landscaping will make a positive contribution to visual amenity. Whilst there is not enough space on the Edmonton EcoPark to retain all existing features, such as the ornamental pond, the small loss of habitat is mitigated through new habitat creation and enhancement.	N
	g) should redefine the entrance from Lea Park and Advent Way as a combined Regional Park and EcoPark entrance						The Project includes landscaping improvements along Lee Park Way and resurfacing of the road. These measures, along with EcoPark House, will create an appropriate gateway to	N

Ref	Comment	SC	LA	LI	No. CC	CC IDs	Applicant's response	Change
Landscape								
							the Edmonton EcoPark. The Project will improve the overall environment in this part of the Lee Valley Regional Park (LVRP) however it is beyond the scope of the Project to create a new gateway to the LVRP itself.	
Requests for more information								
6.5.13	Will the green area adjacent to the existing facility be retained post construction and used as an additional space for planting and habitat creation or will it become fragmented by various infrastructure elements	-	-	LVRP A	0	-	Part of the existing green area would be used for the exit ramp from the ERF. The remainder is proposed for meadow and new native tree planting.	N

Account taken of Phase Two landscape comments

- 6.5.14 Many comments supported the Project's approach to landscaping, noting that it would improve the look of the area, provide ecological enhancements, and integrate with the wider landscape.
- 6.5.15 Others considered that the landscaping proposals do not integrate with the wider landscape and that residents would not benefit unless they had access to the landscaped areas. The landscaping has been designed to integrate with the wider landscape through habitat creation and enhancement along the Edmonton EcoPark's eastern boundary. Part of the landscaping proposed is outside the Edmonton EcoPark along Lee Park Way which is accessible to the public.
- 6.5.16 Respondents suggested that planting should encourage habitat creation and a number of plant types were suggested many of which are already incorporated, for example wildflowers and native species.

One comment suggested that the landscaping should include the tow path opposite the new access, this is outside the scope of the Project, however improvements are proposed along Lee Park Way. Another comment considered that hard surfaces not used by vehicles/pedestrians should be planted with trees and wildflowers. There are not any areas of

hardstanding proposed which do not have an operational function with the exception of the former EfW facility plot which will be safeguarded for future waste management use and as such is not appropriate for landscaping.