

**Stephen Kilmartin**

**From:** Phil Johnson  
**Sent:** 15 August 2013 12:12  
**To:** Stephen Kilmartin  
**Subject:** Richmond Cottage, App.3/2013/0384  
 Hi Steve,

I'm not happy with the quality of the information provided with this application. This is surprising because Bowland Tree Consultancy tend to be pretty good... however in this case the information provided in the tree report is at odds with information provided in the application.

- The information provided by ML Planning states that the gap between the two groups of hawthorn trees is 7m wide, the arboricultural report states that it is 8m wide.
- A photo provided by ML Planning clearly shows that one of the hawthorn trees significantly overhangs the 7 or 8m wide gap - providing an obstruction to the gap which would need to be cleared - while the arboricultural survey shows the crowns of the trees to be much further apart. The arb survey states that G1 (the one shown by ML Planning in a photo overhanging the gap) requires no work and will be fenced off with protective fencing during construction.
- The fencing should protect both the RPZ and the crown of the trees - therefore it should be placed at the point appropriate for both (ie. the widest point away from the stem). In this case the disparity between the report and the photograph does not indicate a clear point - the photo suggests to me that this gap isn't wide enough for the track to go through without significant pruning work to the tree in G1.
- If the gap is 7m wide there would be a 1.5m gap either side of the track, if 8m a 2m wide gap either side. The changes in levels and fitting of a pipe suggests the edges of the track would slope down - it is not clear from the plans whether this slope would be incorporated into the 4m width of the track or whether it would be additional. This makes a significant difference to the impact on the trees. If the gap between the trees and the track is 1.5m the RPZ would be infringed upon as the RPZ is calculated at 1.87m.
- T5 clearly overhangs the proposed route of the track - there is no good reason for the track to pass so close to this tree... it should be moved further away.
- Other significant size trees have not been surveyed - it would have been helpful to have this additional information even if all it did was rule them out of consideration.
- No details of the positioning of tree protection fencing have been provided - this needs to be clearly marked on a plan and approved as part of the application. I'm not happy with simply adding this as a condition as I think it's stronger if it's fully agreed in advance. A condition could then be included to ensure that they comply with the agreed fencing. I believe it's better to do it this way as the positioning of protective fencing can actually have a direct impact on methods of construction possible, or even on positioning of buildings/access.
- If this application was to be approved I would be looking for a landscaping condition to reinstate the hedgerow via gapping up and potentially managing as a layed hedge in the future.
- No information has been provided about the landscape visual impact of this proposal - it is safe to say that there will be an impact, and while it is likely that the impact will be fairly low it will be particularly noticeable due to the track going in through the middle of a field and cutting across in an un-natural way (rather than following a field edge/hedgerow). I feel that reinstatement of the hedge (to a pre-defined management plan) would be reasonable mitigation for the proposals should permission be granted.

I do need to visit the site - as I also have reservations about the categorisation of the trees - photographs suggest to me that trees categorised C1 could be upgraded to category B, but I can't confirm this without a site visit. Additionally I want to double check the RPZ of the trees as it seems fairly small to me. I won't be able to do this until next Wednesday or Thursday - is this ok, or do you need it sooner than this? (ps. I'm not in tomorrow so if you need it quicker please speak to Dave). Some of the info I've provided above could potentially be altered once I've visited site.

Cheers,  
 -Phil

Phil Johnson  
 Countryside Officer  
 Ribble Valley Borough Council  
 Direct Dial: 01200 414 505