[redacted]

Subject: FW: Comments on Planning Application 24/02387/FUL
Date: 24 April 2025 14:04:02

[redacted]

Sent: 24 April 2025 13:51

[redacted]

Subject: Comments on Planning Application 24/02387/FUL

[redacted]

Here are my full comments on this application. Thank you for considering them.

[redacted]

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.

[redacted] (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.

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:

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. [redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted] the girths [redacted] 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 in AIA	31 Mar 25	impact of new brick wall on tree not included