

Response ID ANON-B3JU-DSQ2-E

Submitted to **Local Development Plan Main Issues Report 2019 Consultation**
Submitted on **2019-05-11 05:40:42**

About You

What is your name?

Name:

Paul Young

What is your organisation?

Organisation:

On behalf of:

How can we contact you?

Email:

[REDACTED]

Telephone:

Address:

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Additional Documents

Please include comments on other documents below:

Please include comments on other documents below::

Main Issues Report

Consultation Response

Question 17 – Natural Environment

Policy NE5: Trees and Woodland

Supplementary Guidance: Trees and Woodland

I am concerned about the policy position on the protection of trees as set out in Policy NE5: Trees and Woodland and Supplementary Guidance: Trees and Woodland

The existing Supplementary Guidance goes beyond the requirements of the Policy and takes a far more restrictive approach. Of particular concern in this regard is paragraph 8.4.2, in which it is stated that buildings and associated infrastructure (including garden ground) should generally be located outwith the "zone of influence" of existing or proposed trees. A tree's zone of influence is defined as the distance equal to its mature height, measured from the base of the tree. In applying a blanket restriction on development within the zone of influence of all trees, regardless of the value of those trees, the Supplementary Guidance is at odds with the approach advocated in Policy NE5 imposing additional restrictions over and above those set out in the Policy itself. At the same time, this is also contrary to other existing guidance on tree protection measures referenced in the Supplementary Guidance.

The current Supplementary Guidance goes beyond providing further detail on the provisions of Policy NE5, but rather imposes additional restrictions which are neither advocated by the Policy itself nor consistent with the general approach taken within this.

The current Supplementary Guidance makes reference to relevant British Standards and other national guidance, but the provisions of the zone of influence are not consistent with any of the standards or guides.

The current Supplementary Guidance is too rigid in its approach and is neither based on a comprehensive tree strategy nor consensus driven.

As a result of the current Supplementary Guidance trees are potentially being cut down unnecessarily.

The zone of influence concept is making development sites unnecessarily non-viable.

The zone of influence should not be continued in the new LDP.

Additional Files

If you have further information you would like to provide you may upload it here.:

No file was uploaded