

## Carly Miskell

---

**From:** Carly Miskell  
**Sent:** 21 February 2022 12:34  
**To:** Carly Miskell  
**Subject:** FW: The Dog Inn

---

**From:** Nicola Hopkins  
**Sent:** 21 February 2022 10:27  
**To:** Carly Miskell  
**Subject:** FW: The Dog Inn

Hi,

Please can these comments be attached to 3/2021/0275

Thanks

---

**From:** Alex Shutt  
**Sent:** 18 February 2022 16:07  
**To:** Nicola Hopkins  
**Subject:** RE: The Dog Inn

Hi Nicola,

Following on from our site visit yesterday please see below regards trees and biodiversity.

T1 & G2 = Although they offer very good habitat value particularly to nesting birds, the retention within the proposed development is not realistic due to their suppressed form, tight unions and low retention category. If this development is approved then it should be with these trees removed, albeit after the current nesting season or any future nesting season.

T2 = Requires the heavy ivy stripping from the tree firstly to ascertain whether or not it is suitable for retention /protection and to increase its safe useful life expectancy by removing the false sail weight. Again albeit after the current nesting season or any future nesting season, due to the high habitat potential. I would request a prior to commencement condition for this work.

T3 = Is borderline justified for a TPO primarily due to species and young age but it is third party so just needs the RPA's to be protected throughout the development process as is with the rest of the 3<sup>rd</sup> party or shared boundary vegetation as outlined within the AIA.

There are some options to lessen the impact of the development for the houses to the south of the site. Boundary treatment could be conditioned by installing a 1.8m fence around the perimeter but leaving a gap for maintenance cuts.

Green fences with or without ivy could be installed which will create a living screen that will both enhance the biodiversity of the site and increase screening both in and out of the development. A downside to this could be the beech hedgerows being suppressed by the ivy but maintenance can prevent this.

Is there a maintenance schedule for the land on the edge and bisecting the development or will it be owned by the respective dwellings?

Has there been a bat survey submitted for the demolition of the garage/store?

I could not see any bird or bat box plan submitted with the application which is a requirement for biodiversity enhancement as well as mitigating the potential loss of habitat, T1 and G1.

Let me know what you think and if you require any more information.

Thanks

Alex

---

**From:** Nicola Hopkins  
**Sent:** 11 February 2022 15:01  
**To:** Alex Shutt  
**Subject:** FW: The Dog Inn

Hi,

**Application Number: 3/2021/0275**  
**Proposal: Proposed erection of 8 new dwellings and associated works.**  
**Location: Land Behind The Dog Inn Market Place Longridge**

Do we need to consider a TPO at the above site given the contents of the arb report and the proposed development? Also what conditions would be required?

Yours,

Nicola