Report by: Head of Streets and Open Spaces
To: West/Central Area Committee 23 September 2010
Wards: Castle, Newnham and Market

## Environmental Improvements Programme

1. DECISIONS TO BE MADE: -

- Midsummer Common \& Jesus Green Tree Planting Scheme Decision: Whether to approve the scheme for implementation at an estimated cost of $£ 50,000$.


## 2 EXISTING SCHEMES REQUIRING DECISIONS

### 2.1 Midsummer Common \& Jesus Green Tree Planting Scheme <br> This scheme proposes to plant trees on Midsummer Common and Jesus Green following the earlier preparation of Conservation Plans for these spaces which identified an ageing tree population and the need to plant for the long-term future.

The main aims of the tree planting proposals are:

- To maintain and enhance a healthy tree stock on Midsummer Common and Jesus Green for present and future generations;
- Sustain and enhance the existing local historic and important landscape character, of which the trees are a key part.

This can be achieved by introducing a long-term tree planting and replacement strategy. By planting trees to a positive, structured layout supported by a management plan we can ensure that future generations will enjoy these treasured resources.

West/Central Area Committee reserved funding in 2009 within the Environmental Improvement Programme for this scheme. Since that time a public workshop and a public consultation have taken place to gauge opinion on how best to approach the long term strategy of tree replacement.

The public workshop in July produced advice and guidance from the community groups associated with the spaces, local residents and other organisations that have a special interest in these spaces. This feedback, which can be found in Appendix 1 of this report, was taken into account when developing the information that was issued as part of a further public consultation on both the proposed planting and the management of the spaces in the longer term. The consultation leaflet and questionnaire can be found in Appendix 2 of this report.

The wider public consultation period was from Wednesday $25^{\text {th }}$ August to Friday $10^{\text {th }}$ September. Two public exhibitions were held during this period, the first during the afternoon of Thursday $26^{\text {th }}$ August and the second during the daytime on Saturday $4^{\text {th }}$ September. Both were well attended and successful in providing information on the proposals and gave members of the public an opportunity to discuss them with officers. The information was also available for comment online and at the City Council Customer Service Centre.

In total there were 293 responses received during the consultation period. A summary of the questionnaire results can be found in Appendix 3 of this report, and include responses that were received after the formal consultation period ended.

The consultation was very useful in highlighting concerns and issues related to the existing tree planting on Midsummer Common and Jesus Green as well as responses to the draft proposals.

One important result of the consultation responses will be the formulation of a detailed tree planting plan for the future, which will ensure that a clear tree replacement strategy is in place and that future residents of the City will also enjoy the trees on Jesus Green and Midsummer Common.

The results of the consultation questionnaire and resulting proposals and are summarised in the tables overleaf, including a summary of any comments received for each question.

MIDSUMMER COMMON AND JESUS GREE TREE PLANTING PROPOSALS
Final planting proposals in response to the public consultation held between Wednesday $25^{\text {th }}$ August to Friday $10^{\text {th }}$ September 2010

| QUESTION (refer to <br> questionnaire for <br> full question) | NUMBER OF <br> RESPONSES | MAJORITY RESPONSE | RESULTING PROPOSAL |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Questions 1 |  | Response revealed that the majority of the <br> responses were from private individuals. | N/A |
| Question 2 - <br> Midsummer <br> Common central <br> area. | 244 | $87.5 \%$ agreed to keep the central area open and <br> unplanted to accommodate events such as <br> midsummer fair etc. and 84.7\% agreed that the <br> entrances and exits to the Common should be <br> identified with tree planting. | Additional tree planting on <br> Butt Green and such <br> locations as the path junction <br> at the southern end of the <br> Cutter Ferry Bridge. |
| Question 3 (Area A) <br> - Midsummer <br> Common riverside <br> towpath west of the <br> Fort St. George. | 234 | $47.8 \%$ disagreed with removing young, mixed <br> species trees to replace with Willow. <br> $96.1 \%$ agreed with retaining the mature London <br> Plane to the east of the Fort St. George. | One tree to be planted to <br> help frame the view of the <br> Fort St. George from the <br> south. |
| Question 4 (Area B) - <br> Midsummer <br> Common riverside <br> towpath east of the <br> Fort St. George. | 184 | 66.8\% agreed with felling the diseased, young <br> and early mature mixed species trees and the <br> majority of these respondents agreed with <br> replacing them with Willow trees spaced <br> irregularly with groups of Black Poplar behind. | Willow to be planted along <br> the Midsummer Common <br> towpath east of the Fort. St. <br> George. |

[^0]| Question 5 (Area C) - Brunswick development area. | 228 | 91.7\% agreed that screening Elizabeth Way bridge and the Brunswick development site with groups of irregularly spaced large species trees would be the best approach. | Groups of trees proposed to the east of Cutter Ferry footbridge. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Question 6 (Area D) - between the Brunswick development site to Brunswick Walk | 222 | 74.8\% agreed that infill clusters of new tree planting on the slope but still allowing views to the river would be the preferred approach. | Tight groups of trees proposed on this boundary retaining views to the river for residents along Brunswick Terrace. ${ }^{2}$ This section would be subject to a positive outcome from further consultation with residents. |
| Question 7 (Area E) Butt Green | 228 | 75.3\% agreed to more tree planting along the paths and 91.5\% agreed to tree planting to soften the view of the toilet block. | Groups of trees are proposed along the diagonal path from Four Lamps and around the toilet block. The proposed planting will not encroach into the central area of the Common. |
| Question 8 (Area F) Victoria Avenue (east side) | 223 | 82.5\% of responses revealed that felling and replacing the London Plane as and when they become diseased and/or unsafe would be the preferred approach to the management of this significant avenue of trees. | No proposal at present time but response noted for future proposals and management plan. |
| Question 9 (Area M) Victoria Avenue (northwest) | 226 | $60.2 \%$ disagreed that removal of the random species mix on Jesus Green west of the Chestnut avenue. | Do nothing to this area. |

[^1]| Question 10 (Area G) <br> London Plane <br> avenue | 217 | 93.1\% agreed that felling and replacing with the same <br> species as and when the existing trees become diseased <br> and/or unsafe. | Continue with current <br> replacement regime of <br> replacing as and when the <br> existing trees become <br> diseased and/or unsafe. |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Question 10 (Area H) <br> Lower Park Street to <br> Victoria Avenue | 223 | 41.3\% agreed that more irregularly spaced trees adjacent <br> to the path and based on the existing mixed species choice <br> was the preferred approach. | Further tree planting along <br> the path. |
| Question 11 (Area I) <br> - Park Parade | 228 | 60.9\% agreed to felling the 3 no. Leylandii adjacent to the <br> tennis courts and replacing with Lime. <br> $76.7 \%$ disagreed with the proposal to fell the Copper <br> Beech along this boundary (non memorial trees) to replace <br> with Lime. | Propose to fell Leylandii <br> only and replace with Lime. |
| Question 12 (Area J) <br> Cherry avenue | 203 | $78.8 \%$ agreed to the approach of felling the existing cherry <br> trees as and when they become diseased and/or unsafe <br> and replacing them with the same or similar ornamental <br> specie trees. | No proposal at present time <br> but replace as and when the <br> existing trees become <br> diseased and/or unsafe. |
| Question 13 (Area K) <br> Swimming Pool | 202 | $55.4 \%$ agreed that the planting of a native species, <br> unclipped hedge to replace the existing Leylandii hedge <br> would be the best approach. | Proposal in line with the <br> Heritage Lottery Bid to plant <br> to the front, bulking up the <br> hedge line with a native <br> specie hedge, followed by a <br> phased removal of the <br> Leylandii. |
| Question 14 (Area L) <br> $:$ Towpath | 223 | $79.5 \%$ agreed to the planting of Willows north of the <br> towpath. <br> $79.1 \%$ agreed to the planting Lime to the south of the <br> towpath. | Additional tree planting <br> included where space <br> permits. |

The resulting proposals for both Midsummer Common and Jesus Green are also illustrated on plans, which can be found in Appendix 4 of this report.

The proposals for Midsummer Common would see the existing tree stock increased from 108 to 158 , with 50 new trees and 10 replacements. Any new trees will also include the provision of necessary cattle guarding.

The proposals for Jesus Green would see the existing tree stock increased from 228 to 247, with 20 new trees, 5 replacements as well as replacement of the Leylandii hedge with a native unclipped species.

Any trees proposed to be replaced as part of these proposals will still be subject to the City Council Tree Protocol Procedure.

Recommendation: That approval is given to implement this scheme to enable planting to take place during the imminent planting season at an estimated cost of $£ 50,000$.

Decision: Whether to approve the scheme for implementation at an estimated cost of $£ 50,000$.

## 3 BACKGROUND PAPERS

Appendix 1; Public workshop event record.
Appendix 2: Public consultation leaflet and questionnaire.
Appendix 3: Summary of Consultation Results.
Appendix 4: Tree Proposals for Jesus Green and Midsummer Common

## 4 IMPLICATIONS

a) Equal Opportunities Implications: These are taken into account on individual schemes.
b) Environmental Implications: All of the projects seek to bring about an improvement in the local environment.
c) Community Safety: This has been included as one of the assessment criteria agreed by Committee and is considered on each project.

## 7 INSPECTION OF PAPERS

To inspect or query the background paperwork or report, please contact,

## Andrew Preston

Environmental Projects Manager
Telephone: 01223457271
Email: andrew.preston@cambridge.gov.uk

## ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA - as agreed by Executive Councillor (Environment) on 18 March 2003 with amendments agreed 22 March 2005

The essential criteria for consideration of funding of Environmental Improvement works are:

- Schemes should have a direct, lasting and noticeable improvement to the appearance of a street or area.
- Schemes should be publicly visible and accessible.
- Schemes must have the owners consent if on private land - unless there are exceptional circumstances by which Area Committee may wish to act unilaterally and with full knowledge and responsibility for the implication of such action.
- Schemes must account for future maintenance costs.

Desirable criteria - potential schemes should be able to demonstrate some level of:

- Active involvement of local people.
- Benefit for a large number of people.
- 'Partnership’ funding.
- Potential for inclusion of employment training opportunities.
- Ease and simplicity of implementation.
- Potential for meeting key policy objectives (e.g. improving community safety or contributing to equal opportunities).

Categories of scheme ineligible for funding:

- Where a readily available alternative source of funding is available.
- Revenue projects.
- Schemes that have already received Council funding (unless it can be clearly demonstrated that this would not be 'top up' funding).
- Works that the City or County Council are under an immediate obligation to carry out (e.g. repair of dangerous footways)
- Play areas (as there are other more appropriate sources of funding including S106 monies)

The following categories of work were agreed as being eligible for funding by the Area Committees:

- Works in areas of predominately council owned housing
- Works to construct lay-bys where a comprehensive scheme can be carried out which not only relieves parking problems but achieves environmental improvement.


## APPENDIX 1

Public workshop Event Record 1 July 2010

| Tree management and planting on Jesus Green and Midsummer Common |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Workshop 1 July 2010 : Event Record |  |  |  |  |
| JESUS GREEN |  |  |  |  |
| Issues identified |  |  |  |  |
|  | Group 1 comments | Group 2 comments | Group 3 comments | Group 4 comments |
| Victoria Road Horse Chestnut Avenue | Co-ordinate with Midsummer common. Plant Oak + Elm in gaps between existing Chestnuts. | Follow same approach as Midsummer Common side of road. | Remove all existing chestnuts over next 5-15yrs to create gaps and replant to the outside of extg. Avenue with single large specie, e.g. London Plane, Oak. |  |
| London Plane avenue (Victoria Rd to Jesus Lock) | Replace London Plane in gaps as they fail. | Replace London Plane in gaps as they fail. Solve waterlogging problem. |  |  |
| Path from Victoria Road to Lower Park St | Retain and replace cherries (not major structural planting). Plant more long lived trees in scattered planting. |  |  |  |
| Bird cherry avenue (Jesus Lock to Park Parde) | Retain and replace bird cherries as they fail. | Allow to fail and replace in one activity. |  |  |
| Riverside path trees | Retain views of river. Replace trees as extg. Fail. Replace lost trees with riveside specie. | Gap up and strengthen boundary. | Informal planting with some native species. Retain views across river. |  |
| Jesus Green pool boundary | Remove Leylandii + replace with appropriate specie. Continue informal planting (mixed). |  | Remove Leylandii + replace with evergreen hedge and manage Limes. |  |
| Existing open spaces | Retain as open spaces without tree planting. | Retain as open spaces without tree planting. Perimeter trees planted in informal style to follow Midsummer Common. |  |  |
| Area around pavilion and lock keepers house | Area in need of enhancement (poor quality Birch). |  |  |  |
| End of footpath adjacent to tennis courts. | Remove Leylandii. |  |  |  |
| Path from Jesus Lock to Lower Park St |  | Plant new avenue. |  |  |


| Tree management and planting on Jesus Green and Midsummer Common |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Workshop 1 July 2010 : Event Record |  |  |  |  |
| MIDSUMMER COMMON |  |  |  |  |
| Issues identified |  |  |  |  |
|  | Group 1 comments | Group 2 comments | Group 3 comments | Group 4 comments |
| Victoria Road Horse Chestnut Avenue* | Plant succession trees in gaps as far forward to road as poss. Elm/Oak? | Undecided on approach to planting location. Species choice - Carpinus, Tilia cordata, Fraxinus | Remove all existing chestnuts over next 5-15yrs to create gaps and replant to the outside of extg. Avenue with single large specie, e.g. London Plane, Oak. | Screen traffic movement. Retain avenue. Could fell all and start again. |
| Central open spaces | Keep existing areas clear of any tree planting with mixed species perimeter planting |  |  | Retain open spaces and focus on boundaries. Do not jeopardise meadow areas. |
| Area around footpaths to the north of Parsonage St and Auckland Rd | Plant single, long lived trees informally, particularly at junctions of paths, e.g. Oak + Elm. |  | Plant clusters of trees to create soft edge. |  |
| Riverside path | Replace recently felled Beech with large species tree | Strengthen river boundary possibly with Willow. | Consider green corridor and not formal line of trees with views kept to opposite bank. Suitable native species such as Willow. Arrange in clusters of trees with understorey and seating. Play with light and shadow. Plant between boat houses on opposite bank. | Informal planting and could be done in phases with Willow, London Plane, Black Poplar. |
| Butt Green (Maids Causeway) | Screen toilet block | Species mix too varied. |  |  |
| Elizabeth Way bridge | Plant specimen trees from orchard towards Elizabeth Way bridge | Screen views. |  |  |
| Brunswick development |  | Plant to screen development from Common. |  | Replant avenue in front of Brunswick development and possibly in front of allotments |
| Southern boundary Area around Fort St. George |  | Plant on contour line. Consider bold line or groups of large species trees but protect views from houses. |  | Possible conflict between views for residents and users of common. Preserve views to river. |
|  |  | Plant groups of native specie trees. | Consider new planting. |  |
| Specimen Trees |  |  | Plant large, broad canopied trees such as Oak as shown on drawing. Plant at path junctions and bridge points as waymarkers. |  |
| Walnut Tree Avenue |  |  |  | Plant Walnut trees. |

APPENDIX 2 : PUBLIC CONSULTATION LEAFLET AND QUESTIONNAIRE
 Jesus Green because Conservation Plans for these spaces identified an ageing tree population and the need to plant for the long-term future. The tree planting is to be funded by West/Central Area Committee Environmental Improvement Programme.
The aim of the tree planting is to restore the historic planting layout and sustain the local landscape character. By planting trees to a positive, structured layout and supported by a longterm management plan we should ensure that future generations will enjoy these treasured
The Council has met with and taken advice and guidance from the community groups associated with the spaces, local residents and other organisations who have a special interest in these spaces. The proposals are a result of those discussions.
The Council would now welcome your views on these proposals and asks you to complete the enclosed questionnaire. There information is given on the form.

[^2]



## CAMBRIDGE CITY COUNCIL

## TREE PLANTING on JESUS GREEN AND MIDSUMMER COMMON

This questionnaire is accompanied by a plan showing the proposals and their locations. We would welcome your views. In each question there is space which can be used to expand your answer or give us more feedback.

## WAYS TO RETURN YOUR RESPONSE FORM:

1. Complete the on-line survey form which you will find at www.cambridge.gov.uk, OR
2. Download, complete and email to parks@cambridge.gov.uk, OR
3. Visit the Cambridge City Council Customer Service Centre, Mandela House, Regent Street, Cambridge and complete the questionnaire, OR
4. Visit our manned exhibitions on Midsummer Common on Thursday 26th August 2010 between 3.00p.m. and 6.00p.m. or on Jesus Green on Saturday 4th September 2010 between 10.00a.m. and 3.30p.m. and respond there.

Please respond by noon on $10^{\text {th }}$ September 2010 in order for your comments to be considered.

1 Are you responding to this consultation....
PLEASE TICK ONLY ONE BOX
a) As a private individual
b) On behalf of a group or organisation (please tell us which one)
$\square$

c) In some other capacity
(please tell us what your interest is)
$\square_{3}$
$\square$

## QUESTIONS 2-7 RELATE TO MIDSUMMER COMMON ONLY

$2 \begin{aligned} & \text { The Common is well used by the public in many ways. In order to retain its key functions, } \\ & \text { e.g. as Midsummer and Strawberry Fairs, the centre of the Common should be kept open. }\end{aligned}$
Historically single trees have been planted to indicate where footpaths and bridges meet the Common, the Council would like to continue planting in these locations.

|  | Strongly Agree | Agree | Unsure | Disagree | Strongly Disagree |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| a) Keep central area of common clear for fairs etc. | $\Sigma_{1}$ | $\square_{2}$ | $\square_{3}$ | $\Sigma_{4}$ |  |
| b) Identify entrances/exits to the common with individual trees | $\square_{1}$ | $\square$ 2 | $\square 3$ | $\square 4$ | $\square 5$ |

Comments


## Comments

On the riverside path between the Fort St George and the Elizabeth Way bridge the proposal is to restore the historic riverside layout and keep the views of the river open. The mature London Planes and the veteran pollarded willows would be retained.

Which of the approaches below do you prefer?
PLEASE TICK ONLY ONE BOX
Option a) Fell remaining young and early mature mixed species and replace with Willows (to be pollarded) at REGULAR
 spacings and a few Black Poplar in groups behind the Willow OR

Option b) Fell remaining young and early mature mixed species and replace with Willows (to be pollarded) at IRREGULAR
 spacings and a few Black Poplar in groups behind the Willow OR

Option c) Don't know/unsure $\square$

## Comments

5 Area C Southern boundary; the Brunswick development site.Refer to planThe proposal is to strengthen the boundary between Midsummer Commonand its neighbours.Which of the approaches below do you prefer?
PLEASE TICK ONLY ONE BOX
Option a) to screen Elizabeth Way bridge andthe new Brunswick development with a fewgroups of irregularly spaced trees that willmature to large, forest scale specimens OROption b) to leave the area open OR$\square_{2}$
Option c) Don't know/unsure$\square 3$

Comments

## 6

 Southern boundary; west of Brunswick site to Brunswick Walk. TheArea D proposal is to strengthen the boundary.

Refer to plan

## Which of the approaches below do you prefer?

PLEASE TICK ONLY ONE BOX
Option a) Infill trees to be regularly spaced trees parallel to the boundary OR


Option b) Infill trees to be informal clusters following the slope allowing views to the river OR
Option c) Don't know/unsure $\square$

Comments

| 7 Area E | Butt Green is the area between Midsummer Common and Maid's Causeway. The proposal is to provide a more coherent layout, soften the building with planting and to define routes across Midsummer Common. |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Refer to plan | Please tell us whether you like these proposals or not. |  |  |  |  |
|  | Strongly Agree | Agree | Unsure | Disagree | Strongly Disagree |
| a) A | re trees beside the paths $\quad \square_{1}$ |  |  |  | 5 |
| b) Pla the im | near the toilet block to soften ct of the building | $\square_{2}$ | $\square 3$ | $\square_{4}$ | $\square 5$ |

Comments

# QUESTION 8 RELATES TO THE HORSE CHESTNUT TREES GROWING ALONG VICTORIA AVENUE AND, THEREFORE, INVOLVES BOTH MIDSUMMER COMMON AND JESUS GREEN. 



Comments

## QUESTIONS 9-14 RELATE TO JESUS GREEN ONLY

## 9

Area M
West of Victoria Avenue Chestnuts. The proposal is to provide a coherent layout for the future because the current mix of tree species and their spacing would not achieve this.

Please tell us whether you like this proposal or not.
Refer to plan

| Strongly <br> Agree$\quad$ Agree $\quad$ Unsure | Disagree | Strongly <br> Disagree |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |

Remove informal/random mix planting to the west of the chestnut trees and plant with a line of single species, medium/large Agree Agree Unsure Disagree Disagree

 $\square_{5}$

Comments

| 10 | London Plane avenue footpath. The proposal is to establish the long-term management of the avenue. |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Area G Please tell us whether you like this proposal orRefer to plan |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Strongly Agree | Agree Unsure | Disagree | Strongly Disagree |
| Fell and replace trees with the same species, in the same location, when they fail |  |  |  |  |
| Area H <br> Refer to plan | Lower Park Street to Victoria Avenue. The proposal is to rationalise the number of species and make the layout more coherent. |  |  |  |
|  | Which of these approaches do you prefer? |  |  |  |
|  | PLEASE TICK ONLY ONE BOX |  |  |  |
| Option a) Provide a formal avenue along the path with regularly spaced, large, single specie trees OR |  |  |  |  |
| Option b) Provide informal, irregularly spaced trees adjacent to the path based on the existing species choice OR |  |  |  |  |
| Option c) Do nothing to the area OR $\quad \square_{3}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Option d) Don't know /unsure $\quad \square_{4}$ |  |  |  |  |

## Comments

## 11

Park Parade. The proposal is to restore the historic boundary planting. Please tell us whether you like this proposal or not.

## Area 1

Refer to plan

|  | Strongly Agree | Agree | Unsure | Disagree | Strongly Disagree |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| a) Fell the Leylandii trees adjacent to the tennis courts and replace them with lime trees | $\square_{1}$ |  | $\square 3$ | $\square 4$ | 5 |
| b) Fell the copper beech trees and replace with lime trees | $\square 1$ | $\square 2$ | $\square 3$ | $\square 4$ | $\square 5$ |

## Comments

| 12 | Cherry Avenue from Jesus Lock to Park Parade. The proposal is to <br> establish the long-term management of the avenue and to achieve this the <br> options are listed below. |
| :--- | :--- |
| Area J | Which of these approaches do you prefer? |
| Refer to plan | PLEASE TICK ONLY ONE BOX |

Options a) Fell all existing trees at the same time and replace with small ornamental specie trees OR

Option b) Fell trees as they fail and replace with small ornamental specie trees
Option c) Don't know/unsure $\quad \square_{3}$

## Comments

 Leylandii hedge beneath. The Leylandii have grown too high and the proposal is to remove them and plant a new hedge using native species.Refer to plan
Which of these approaches do you prefer?
PLEASE TICK ONLY ONE BOX
Option a) An informal, unclipped hedge OR
Option b) A formal, clipped hedge OR


Option c) Don't know/unsure
$\square 3$

Comments

14
Area L
Refer to plan

Towpath. The proposal is to restore the historic planting layout.
Which of these approaches do you prefer?
PLEASE TICK ONLY ONE BOX

|  | Strongly <br> Agree | Agree | Unsure | Disagree | Strongly <br> Disagree |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| a) Where possible plant Willows to the <br> north of the towpath to tie in with <br> riverside planting from Grantchester to <br> Clayhithe (Haling Way) | $\square$ | $\square_{1}$ | $\square_{2}$ | $\square_{3}$ | $\square_{4}$ |

Comments

## WAYS TO RETURN YOUR RESPONSE FORM:

1. Complete the on-line survey form which you will find at www.cambridge.gov.uk, OR
2. Download, complete and email to parks@cambridge.gov.uk, OR
3. Visit the Cambridge City Council Customer Service Centre, Mandela House, Regent Street, Cambridge and complete, OR
4. Visit our manned exhibitions on Midsummer Common on Thursday 26th August 2010 between 3.00p.m. and 6.00p.m. or on Jesus Green on Saturday 4th September 2010 between 10.00a.m. and 3.30p.m. and respond there.

Return address for your completed questionnaire (you don't need a stamp):
Phil Back Associates Ltd., FREEPOST RSEH-LKKL-AGXY, Boston House, 212-214 High Street, Boston Spa, WETHERBY LS23 6AD

## Please respond by noon on $10^{\text {th }}$ September 2010 in order for your comments to be considered.

Thank you for your time.

APPENDIX 3 : QUESTIONNAIRE RESPONSE SUMMARY

## Question 1

## Are you responding to this consultation....

$\left.\begin{array}{l|l|l|} & & \begin{array}{c}\text { Response } \\ \text { Percent }\end{array} \\ \text { Response } \\ \text { Count }\end{array}\right\}$

## $\square$ Which organisation or group do you represent?

$\square$ Please tell us what the nature of your interest is.

## Question 2: Midsummer general

The Common is well used by the public in many ways. In order to retain its key functions, e.g. as Midsummer and Strawberry Fairs, the centre of the common should be kept open.

Historically, single trees have been planted to indicate where footpaths and bridges meet the Common, the Council would like to continue planting in these locations.

|  | Strongly agree | Agree | Unsure | Disagree | Strongly disagree | Response Count |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Keep central area of Common clear for fairs etc. | $\begin{aligned} & 50.0 \% \\ & (120) \end{aligned}$ | 37.5\% (90) | 3.8\% (9) | 5.8\% (14) | 2.9\% (7) | 240 |
| Identify entrances/exits to the common with individual trees | $\begin{aligned} & 45.3 \% \\ & (107) \end{aligned}$ | 39.4\% (93) | 10.6\% (25) | 3.4\% (8) | 1.3\% (3) | 236 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | 47 |
|  |  |  |  | Comments? |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | answered question |  | 244 |
|  |  |  |  | skipped question |  | 23 |

## Question 3: Area A

## $\square$ On the riverside at Midsummer Common the priorities are to restore the historic planting layout and to plant trees to frame the Fort St. George public house.

Please tell us whether you like these proposals or not.

|  | Strongly <br> agree | Agree | Unsure | DisagreeStrongly <br> disagree | Response <br> Count |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Remove young mixed specie trees <br> to the west of the Fort St. George <br> public house and replace with willow <br> (managed as pollards) | $11.7 \%(27)$ | $20.0 \%(46)$ | $20.4 \%(47)$ | $21.3 \%(49)$ | $26.5 \%(61)$ |



## Question 4 : Area B

## On the riverside path between the Fort St George and the Elizabeth Way bridge the proposal is to restore the historic riverside layout and keep the views of the river open. The mature London Planes and the veteran pollarded willows would be retained.

Which of the approaches below do you prefer?





Question 6: Area D

## Southern boundary; west of Brunswick site to Brunswick Walk. The proposal is to strengthen the boundary.

Which of the approaches below do you prefer?

|  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Infill trees to be regularly spaced <br> trees parallel to the boundary |  | Response <br> PercentResponse <br> Count <br> Infill trees to be informal <br> clusters following the slope <br> allowing views to the river <br> Don't know/unsure | $\square$ |



| Question 7 : Area E |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Butt Green is the area between Midsummer Common and Maid's Causeway. The proposal is to provide a more coherent layout, soften the building with planting, and to define routes across Midsummer Common. <br> Please tell us whether you like these proposals or not. |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Strongly agree | Agree | Unsure | Disagree | Strongly disagree | Response Count |
| Add more trees beside the paths | 42.9\% (94) | 32.4\% (71) | 11.0\% (24) | 8.7\% (19) | 5.0\% (11) | 219 |
| Plant near the toilet block to soften the impact of the building | $\begin{aligned} & 63.2 \% \\ & (141) \end{aligned}$ | 28.3\% (63) | 3.6\% (8) | 1.8\% (4) | 3.1\% (7) | 223 |
| Comments? 49 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| answered question 228 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| skipped question 39 |  |  |  |  |  |  |





## West of Victoria Avenue Chestnuts. The proposal is to provide a coherent layout for the future because the current mix of tree species and their spacing would not achieve this.

Please tell us whether you like this proposal or not.

|  | Strongly agree | Agree | Unsure | Disagree | Strongly disagree | Response Count |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Remove informal/random mix planting to the west of the chestnut trees and plant with a line of single species, medium/large trees | 7.1\% (16) | 16.4\% (37) | 16.4\% (37) | 20.4\% (46) | 39.8\% (90) | 226 |
|  |  |  |  | Comments? |  | 75 |
|  |  |  |  | answered question |  | 226 |
|  |  |  |  | skipped question |  | 41 |

Comments relating to Area M


## Question 10: Area G $\square$ London Plane avenue footpath. The proposal is to establish the long-term management of the avenue.

Please tell us whether you like this proposal or not.

|  | Strongly agree | Agree | Unsure | Disagree | Strongly disagree | Response Count |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Fell and replace trees with the same species, in the same location, when they fail | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 61.3\% } \\ & \text { (133) } \end{aligned}$ | 31.8\% (69) | 3.2\% (7) | 1.4\% (3) | 2.3\% (5) | 217 |
|  |  |  |  | answered question |  | 217 |
|  |  |  |  | skipped question |  | 50 |





## Question 11 : Area I <br> Park Parade. The proposal is to restore the historic boundary planting.

Please tell us whether you like this proposal or not.

|  | Strongly <br> agree | Agree | Unsure | DisagreeStrongly <br> disagree | Response <br> Count |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Fell the Leylandii trees adjacent to <br> the tennis courts and replace them <br> with lime trees | $\mathbf{3 6 . 8 \% ( 8 4 )}$ | $24.1 \%(55)$ | $10.1 \%(23)$ | $10.1 \%(23)$ | $18.9 \%(43)$ |



| Question 12: Area J |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\square$ Cherry Avenue from Jesus Lock to Park Parade. The proposal is to establish the long-term management of the avenue and to achieve this the options are listed below. <br> Which of these approaches do you prefer? |  |  |
|  | Response Percent | Response Count |
| Fell all existing trees at the same time and replace with small ornamental specie trees | 8.4\% | 17 |
| Fell trees as they fail and replace with small ornamental specie trees | 78.8\% | 160 |
| Don't know /unsure $\square$ | 12.8\% | 26 |
| Comments? 101 |  |  |
| answered question 203 |  |  |
| skipped question 64 |  |  |
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## Question 13 : Area K

Swimming pool. The swimming pool is surrounded by mature lime trees and a Leylandii hedge beneath.

## The Leylandii have grown too high and the proposal is to remove them and plant a new hedge using native species.

Which of these approaches do you prefer?


|  | 70 |
| ---: | ---: |
| Comments? |  |
| answered question | 202 |
| skipped question | 65 |

Comments relating to Area K


Question 14 : Area L

## $\square$ Towpath. The proposal is to restore the historic planting layout.

## Which of these approaches do you prefer?

|  | Strongly agree | Agree | Unsure | Disagree | Strongly disagree | Response Count |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Where possible plant Willows to the north of the towpath to tie in with riverside planting from Grantchester to Clayhithe (Haling Way) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 48.9\% } \\ & (107) \end{aligned}$ | 30.6\% (67) | 8.2\% (18) | 6.8\% (15) | 5.5\% (12) | 219 |
| Plant lime trees south of the towpath where trees have been removed and not replaced | 43.7\% (90) | 35.4\% (73) | 12.1\% (25) | 6.8\% (14) | 1.9\% (4) | 206 |
|  |  |  |  | Comments? |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | answered question |  | 223 |
|  |  |  |  | skipped question |  | 44 |



APPENDIX 4 : TREE PLANTING PROPOSALS
Replace leylandii hedge ( 145 m long) wi. in mona, Corylus avellana, (Crataegus monogyna, Corylus auropaeus
Cornus sanguinea, Euonymus eur and Viburnum Opulus)
2no. Tilia tomentosa 1 no. Tilia tomentosa

TREE SPECIES
Latin name (Common name)
Aesculus hippocastanum (Horse Chestnut)
Corylus avellana (Hazel) Corylus avellana (Hazel) Crataegus monogyna (Hawthorn) Euonymus europaeus (Spindle) Platanus x hispanica (London Plane)
Tilia tormentosa (Silver Lime)

2no. Platanus hispanica $0 \cos +\frac{1}{9}$

| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Scale } \\ & 1: 1250 @ \text { A1 } \end{aligned}$ | By: CBJ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Date } \\ & 14.09 .10 \end{aligned}$ | Project: Jesus Green Tree Enhancements |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| "This map is reproduced from Ordnance Survey material with the permission of Her Majesty's Stationery Office © Crown copyright. Unauthorised reproduction infringes Crown copyright and may lead to prosecution or civil proceedings." Cambridge City Council (Licence No. 100019730) 2010 |  |  | Drawing: <br> 2010-11 TREE PLANTING PROPOSALS |  |
| DO NOT SCALE <br> The drawing is not based on detail site surveys. Position of any proposed trees are subject to locations of existing underground/above ground services. <br> Figured dimensions must be taken in preference to scaled dimensions. Contractors, sub-contractors and suppliers must verify all dimensions on site before commencing any work or making any shop drawings. Discrepancies to be brought to the contract administrator's / landscape architect's attention. |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | Job Ref / DWG.No EIP 020-159-02 | Revision |




[^0]:    ${ }^{1}$ It should be noted that some of this planting is replacement planting for trees felled in 2009.

[^1]:    ${ }^{2}$ We are cognisant of the North Terrace residents' petition submitted as part of the consultation process and wish to point out the additional tree planting is proposed to the north of Brunswick Terrace only and that planting will maintain views to the river. We will carry out further consultation with residents before any planting takes place.

[^2]:    The closing date for this survey is noon on $10^{\text {th }}$ September after which the results will be
    analysed and the final planting scheme produced. The analysis and planting scheme will be presented to West/Central Area Committee at a special Environmental Improvement

    Programme meeting to be held on 23 September 2010 in the committee rooms at The
    Guildhall at 7.30 p.m.

