[redacted]

**From:** DevelopmentControl
**Sent:** 24 April 2025 14:12
**To:** DevelopmentControl
**Subject:** Comments for Planning Application 24/02387/FUL

# Comments summary

Dear Sir/Madam,

Planning Application comments have been made. A summary of the comments is provided below.

Comments were submitted at 24/04/2025 2:11 PM from [redacted].

## Application Summary

| | |
|---|---|
| Address: | 26 - 28 High Street Fenstanton Huntingdon PE28 9JZ |
| Proposal: | Proposed erection of a self-build detached dwelling along with conversion of an existing garage into carport and associated works |
| Case Officer: | [redacted] |

Click for further information

## Customer Details

| | |
|---|---|
| Name: | [redacted] |
| Email: | [redacted] |
| Address: | 9 Bell Lane Fenstanton Huntingdon |

## Comments Details

| | |
|---|---|
| Commenter Type: | Member of the Public |
| Stance: | Customer objects to the Planning Application |
| Reasons for comment: | |
| Comments: | The current plan may have a significant detrimental impact on a protected, notable, mature ash tree, which is on my land, adjacent to the proposed construction site. For this reason, I ask that planning permission be refused until further measures are agreed that satisfactorily mitigate the risk to the tree.<br><br>In brief, through omissions and inaccuracies, this proposal undervalues the significance of this tree (T1 in the plans) both as an aesthetic feature of the local landscape and as a contributor to current and future biodiversity and environmental health.<br><br>1) The Tree Preservation Order (TPO) on this tree is not acknowledged and measurements for the arboricultural plan are not accurate, thus providing insufficient protection for tree:<br><br>The arboricultural consultee (4 Mar 25) notes with surprise that this tree (among others) is not protected by a Tree Preservation Order, since in her view it is important to local amenity and is of sufficient ecological, historical and landscape value to be worthy of a Tree Protection Order. |

In fact, T1 is protected by TPO 007/71. However, the planning proposal does not mention this.

The arboricultural consultee questions why the tree has not been classified as an 'A' grade tree. She also questions whether the Root Protection Area (RPA) given in the first Arboricultural Impact Assessment (AIA 19 Dec 24), which was arrived at without actual measurement of the tree, is adequate. She notes that without correct measurements the design requirement of the foundations, landscaping, and anti-compaction measures are all conjecture.

Many of the measurements she requests have been provided in a second AIA (31 Mar 25), but these are based on faulty measurements. Moreover, the new plans in the AIA plot the RPA with a radius that is smaller than even the faulty new measurements, again underestimating the needs of the tree.

The developer did measure the girth of the tree on 6 Mar 25, but the girths he measured would correspond to a much larger DBH and RPA than is given in this new assessment. My own measurements (following the British Standard) suggest that the Root Protection radius for the tree should be almost 12 metres (11.6m). The new AIA suggests that it should be 10.2m. The plan included in the report shows a radius of only 9m.

These differences are significant and I would like to see them addressed.

In addition, I believe the relevant British Standard for the calculation of the Root Protection radius allows it to be increased to protect more valuable or vulnerable trees. Shouldn't this be considered?

Finally, I am concerned that the AIA states that its proposed protections ("engineering solutions") are merely recommendations and are not binding. It also states that Planning Permission overrides the protections of a TPO. Surely more accurate and enforceable provisions need to be in place to protect the tree before any development begins.

2) Genetic diversity and Ash dieback:

An expert who examined this tree recently told me that its environmental value is in fact greatly increased by the fact that it shows no signs of Ash dieback. It may well have a distinct genetic resistance that could prove important in the preservation of Ash trees nationwide.

It would be a matter of great regret to allow improperly planned construction to shorten the life of a tree that could otherwise remain as one of a select few in the landscape and contribute to the preservation of the species.

Table of Omissions and Inaccuracies

Document Date Uploaded Omission Inaccuracy

Arb. Impact Assessment 31 Mar 25 TPO protection 007/71

Arb. Impact Assessment 31 Mar 25 possible genetic value
in context of ash dieback

Arb. Impact Assessment 31 Mar 25 gives DBH 849 and RPA 10.2m (actually c. 1m and 12m)

Arb. Impact Assessment 31 Mar 25 Plan shows RPA of 9m (not 12m or even 10.2m)
thus underestimating true risk to tree roots

Arb. Impact Assessment 31 Mar 25 need to reduce crown? previous AIA had crown reduction of 3m; why missing now

Arb. Impact Assessment 31 Mar 25 Table gives crown height as 4m (was 2m, see below)

why has this changed?

Arb. Impact Assessment 19 Dec 24 includes crown reduction of 3m

Arb. Impact Assessment 19 Dec 24 Table gives crown height of 2m

Arb. Impact Assessment 19 Dec 24 no DBH or RPA

Biodiversity Checklist 19 Dec 24 states development not w/in 250m of pond (actually w/in 100m of pond)

Proposed Site Plan Rev 31 Mar 25 revised RPA missing gives old RPA of 7-7.5m from prev. plans (dripline)

Proposed Plan w consent 31 Mar 25 extent of new brick wall not made clear

Arb. Impact Assessment 31 Mar 25 impact of new brick wall on tree not included in AIA

---

Kind regards