

Trees & Development Sites Supplementary Planning Document

Public Participation Report

Chapter 1 - Introduction to the Supplementary Planning Document

1.1

<i>Representation No.</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Change To Plan Sought</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Change To Draft SPD</i>
---------------------------	---------------	-------------------------------	------------------------------	-----------------------------	----------------------------

Chapter 1 - Introduction to the Supplementary Planning Document

1.1

22223	Object	I would like the land behind "Kevrit" 30 Riddy Lane, Bourn, Cambs be included in village framework for future development. The land is set behind houses and the drive would be able to accommodate a refuse lorry and service vehicles. There would be no intensification of traffic on Riddy as there is a private drive to the land. The land or potential development does not overlook housing and would not encroach anyone's privacy. I believe a selective development would enhance the village.		Supplementary Planning Documents cannot make new policy, rather they expand upon policies in the Development Plan Documents (DPD) and provide additional guidance to developers and applicants on how these policies are implemented. Village Frameworks are defined in Policy DP/7 in the Development Control Policies DPD, and their boundaries are currently being considered by Planning Inspectors as part of the Examination of the Site Specific Policies DPD. Any change to the village framework boundary needs to be pursued through the DPD process and is not a matter that can be addressed in the Supplementary Planning Documents.	No change.
22222 - East of England Regional Assembly	Support	The Regional Planning Panel Standing Committee considered the attached report at the meeting of 27th June 2008 and endorsed the recommendation that: 'The four draft Supplementary Planning Documents prepared by South Cambridgeshire District Council are in general conformity with the RSS.'		Noted.	No change.

<i>Representation No.</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Change To Plan Sought</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Change To Draft SPD</i>
22156 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Support	In general support, but it is considered that the status of veteran trees has been overlooked and the following comments are offered to amplify this and other prospective SPDs which have direct relevance.		Support noted. The Council has identified areas of ancient woodland in the Biodiversity Strategy, together with measures to conserve them. The Council is also producing a Biodiversity SPD, which will also refer to veteran trees. It is not necessary to duplicate this information within the Trees SPD, however a reference to ancient woodland and veteran trees and cross-reference to the Biodiversity Strategy should be included.	Amend paragraph 2.11 to read: "Sites to be developed may also be important for species protected under wildlife legislation or contain ancient woodland or veteran trees which are a valuable biodiversity resource. Further guidance on these can be found in the Council's Biodiversity SPD and Biodiversity Strategy."
<hr/>					
<i>1.4</i>					
22059 - English Heritage	Support	Thoughtful planting of trees and landscaping are equally important in new development. Where greenfield sites are to be developed the existing features of the site should be considered, and those of importance retained; for instance, historic hedgerows. Where important archaeological remains exist, tree planting can cause damage and should be avoided. In existing neighbourhoods, street trees often add to and complement the townscape and maintenance programmes that recognise this are essential.		Support noted. Paragraph 3.1 requires comprehensive site surveys are undertaken to allow key components of a site to be identified, retained, incorporated and protected throughout development. Therefore any tree on or off the site that is impacted by the development will be identified by the Site Survey and can be assessed and those of importance retained. New planting will be addressed in the Landscaping SPD.	No change.
<hr/>					

<i>Representation No.</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Change To Plan Sought</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Change To Draft SPD</i>
<i>1.5</i>					
22102 - English Partnerships and Gallagher Longstanton Limited	Object	The draft SPD makes reference to documents that will be produced in the future (the Landscape and Biodiversity SPDs). Given these documents are not yet available it is not possible to determine the impact of the policies in those documents on the Trees SPD. Furthermore, it is not possible to carry out a comprehensive assessment as the implications of policy in other (as yet unpublished documents) cannot be determined. Furthermore, English Partnerships and Gallagher wish to reserve the right to revisit comments on this document when the Landscape and Biodiversity SPDs are published to ensure that complementary documents are adopted.	As such the document should be revised to make reference to 'emerging' SPD as this more accurately reflects the position.	Supplementary Planning Documents cannot introduce new policy, rather they expand upon policies in the adopted Development Plan Documents. There is no need to amend the reference to the Landscape and Biodiversity SPDs within the text of the SPD to indicate that they are "emerging". The SPDs are listed in Appendix 2 together with their status.	Ensure the status of SPDs listed in Appendix 2 reflects the latest position.
<hr/>					
<i>1.6</i>					
22087 - Natural England	Support	We support the aims of this SPD and in particular its objective to assist achievement of the LDF objectives for the conservation and enhancement of biodiversity and landscape character, including Development Control Policies DPD objectives NE/b: To protect and enhance the character and appearance of landscapes and natural heritage and NE/c: To protect and enhance biodiversity.		Support noted.	No change.
<hr/>					

<i>Representation No.</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Change To Plan Sought</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Change To Draft SPD</i>
<i>1.8</i> 22103 - English Partnerships and Gallagher Longstanton Limited	Object	The change is requested to ensure that the policy recognises that there are different types of planning applications require different levels of detail. For example outline planning applications aim to secure the principle of development and should provide sufficient detail to allow robust environmental impact assessment in line with the regulations set out in Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) (England and Wales) Regulations 1999 (as amended 2006 and 2007). However, reserved matters or full applications can provide more detail given the level of design details that are produced.	English Partnerships and Gallagher request that bullet two of this paragraph be reworded as follows: 'Undertake full surveys of existing landscape and biodiversity features, to a level of detail appropriate to the type of application, and conserve the environmental aspects of the site'.	Paragraph 1.8 summarises the content of a large number of policies contained in the Development Plan Documents (DPD), as it is not practicable to replicate them all in the SPD. The wording of bullet point 2 accurately reflects that contained in policies in the Area Action Plans (such as Policy CE/17 in the Cambridge East Area Action Plan). Had the actual policy text from the DPDs been included in the SPD it would not be possible to amend it, as SPD cannot alter policy. As such, the summary of the policy wording is accurate, and therefore should not be amended. Notwithstanding paragraph 4.1, which sets out the survey requirements, acknowledges that every development will be different in scale and complexity and that the survey requirements outlined may be required in part or full.	No change.

<i>Representation No.</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Change To Plan Sought</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Change To Draft SPD</i>
---------------------------	---------------	-------------------------------	------------------------------	-----------------------------	----------------------------

Chapter 2 - The Need to Consider Trees

2.1

22200 - Cambridge Preservation Society	Object	No references are made to tall hedges or hedges with standard trees and their preservation / maintenance etc; veteran trees are not mentioned and if there is a list and if all veteran trees are protected by TPO or Conservation Area designation of other protective designation.		<p>SCDC cannot legally protect hedges although a hedge may fall under the Hedgerow regulations. Hedges on a development site would be considered in their context to the site and suitability to retain, enhance etc.</p> <p>Standard trees within a hedge may be protected through a Conservation Area or Tree Preservation Order designation. However it is not common practice to serve a TPO on trees within falling distance of the Highway as they can fall under the Highways Act and in certain circumstances can be removed without requiring consent from the local authority.</p> <p>Veteran trees by their nature would be exempt from a TPO being served. If a tree is protected by a TPO and is now considered a veteran then SCDC can 'manage' the tree through applications for tree works. Veteran trees are valuable resource, for both landscaping and biodiversity. There is already useful guidance in the Council's Biodiversity Strategy, including a map showing Ancient & Semi Ancient Woodland and Ancient Replanted Woodland. Rather than repeat this detailed information it would be useful to add a cross-reference to the Council's Biodiversity Strategy.</p>	Amend paragraph 2.11 to read: "Sites to be developed may also be important for species protected under wildlife legislation or contain ancient woodland or veteran trees which are a valuable biodiversity resource. Further guidance on these can be found in the Council's Biodiversity SPD and Biodiversity Strategy."
22197 - Cambridge Preservation Society	Object	Capital letters Dutch Elm Disease.		Agree.	Amend second sentence of paragraph 2.1 to read: "One of the least wooded counties also having suffered extensive loss of Elm due to the Dutch Elm Disease and more recently Beech, Horse Chestnut and Ash."

<i>Representation No.</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Change To Plan Sought</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Change To Draft SPD</i>
2.2					
22198 - Cambridge Preservation Society	Object	In bold and improved phrasing covering the qualities of trees to make fresh air for all.		Agree, the 5th bullet point should be consistent with the others and should be amended accordingly.	Amend the 5th bullet of paragraph 2.2 to read: "Fresh air for all; trees provide clean air as they take in carbon dioxide and release oxygen as part of their living process, acting as carbon sinks."
22105 - English Partnerships and Gallagher Longstanton Limited	Object	English Partnerships and Gallagher request that 'Enhancing a new development' be revised to acknowledge that retention of existing trees on a new development will not always add a sense of maturity or enhance property value, particularly if the trees are of poor quality, inappropriate species or mix of species. In some cases the environment would be enhanced by comprehensive new landscaping which long term would add greater value than interim retention of existing trees.	English Partnerships and Gallagher request that the sentence be reworded as follows: 'existing trees on a new development can add a sense of maturity ...'	It is acknowledged that not all trees will add to a sense of maturity or add to property value, and the text should be amended to change "will" to "can".	Amend 8th bullet of paragraph 2.2 to read: "Enhancing a new development; existing trees on a new development can add a sense of maturity to a new building and can enhance property value if incorporated at the design stage."
22104 - English Partnerships and Gallagher Longstanton Limited	Object	The text as drafted is inappropriate for inclusion in a planning document.	English Partnerships and Gallagher request that the third sentence of 'Providing a 'feel good factor"' be deleted.	Paragraph 2.2 identifies the role of trees within the built and natural environment. Not only do trees have 'natural' functions, for example for landscaping and biodiversity, but they also have a role in good design, place making and creating sustainable communities in accordance with the aims of Government guidance in Planning Policy Statement 1 (PPS). 'Feel good factor' is an indicator that places are livable spaces and not simply a collection of bricks and mortar. Not only is bird song an indicator that there is biodiversity in place (encouraged by PPS9), but the shade and bursts of colour provided by trees all have their part in good design and creating living spaces. Therefore, inclusion of this text is appropriate.	No change.

<i>Representation No.</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Change To Plan Sought</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Change To Draft SPD</i>
---------------------------	---------------	-------------------------------	------------------------------	-----------------------------	----------------------------

2.5

<i>Representation No.</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Change To Plan Sought</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Change To Draft SPD</i>
22052 - Forestry Commission	Object	The Trees & Development SPD is welcomed and, as one would expect, appears to be accurate and consistent with the Authority's responsibilities with respect to the Town & Country Planning Act. However, apart from a single reference to the Forestry Act in relation to TPO's, there are important omissions with regard to the Forestry Commission's statutory responsibilities. This could lead to some confusion, or indeed mislead the reader. Wording to include in the SPD is provided.	<p>The document should, therefore, make reference to the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The Forestry Commission is the Government Department with statutory responsibility for trees and woodland. The responsibilities and powers of the Forestry Commissioners in relation to planning are derived mainly from the Forestry Act 1967 and the Environmental Impact Assessment Regulations 1999. 2. The Forestry Act (1967) (www.forestry.gov.uk/forestry/INFD-677JBL) as amended requires landowners to apply for a licence for the felling of growing trees. There are certain specific exemptions for the need for a felling licence, but it may be necessary for an owner (or their agent) to make an application to the Forestry Commission to fell trees covered by a Tree Preservation Order even where permission from the Local Authority has been granted. In such cases the Forestry Commission consults the Local Authority before making a decision. 3. The Environmental Impact Assessment (Forestry) (England and Wales) Regulations 1999 (SI 1999/2228) (www.hmso.gov.uk/si/si1999/19992228.htm) require anyone who wishes to carry out a relevant project (i.e. afforestation, deforestation, forestry roads or quarries) to obtain consent from the Forestry Commission. There may be a need for a Forestry EIA to be carried out even where the Local Authority has determined that a Planning EIA is not required. In such cases the Forestry Commission is obliged to consider the impact of the change of land use. 	General support for the SPD noted. Agree, it is important to recognise the duties of the Forestry Commission and that they may need to be contacted. In addition, reference should also be made to ancient woodland and veteran trees.	<p>Amend paragraph 2.11 to read: "Sites to be developed, including vegetation and individual trees, may also be important for species protected under wildlife legislation or contain ancient woodland or veteran trees which are a valuable biodiversity resource. Further guidance on these can be found in the Council's Biodiversity SPD and Biodiversity Strategy."</p> <p>Add a new paragraph after 2.11 to read: "The Forestry Commission is the Government Department with statutory responsibility for trees and woodland. The responsibilities and powers of the Forestry Commissioners in relation to planning are derived mainly from the Forestry Act 1967 and the Environmental Impact Assessment Regulations 1999. It may be advisable to contact them to determine if compliance with their statutory duties may be required."</p>

<i>Representation No.</i>	<i>Nature Representation Summary</i>	<i>Change To Plan Sought</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Change To Draft SPD</i>
		<p>4. Government policy, as set out in the 1994 Sustainable Forestry document, is to operate a general presumption against the conversion of woodland and trees to other use and to protect or ancient and semi-natural woodlands.</p> <p>5. In 1998, the Government published its England Forestry Strategy "A new focus for England's woodland" (www.forestry.gov.uk/forestry/hcou-4ucf8j). The Strategy stated that, "We will continue to exercise a general presumption against the conversion of woodland to other land uses unless there are overriding public benefits, for example to restore important semi-natural habitats. In these situations we will seek to ensure that equivalent areas of new woodland are planted in compensation." The Strategy was revised by DEFRA in 2007 ("England's Trees, Woods and Forests" www.defra.gov.uk/wildlife-countryside/rddteam/forestry.htm), but makes no direct reference to this issue.</p> <p>6. The Government's Policy for England's Ancient and Native woodland ("Keepers of time. A statement of policy for England's ancient and native woodland." Defra, Forestry Commission 2005) states that, "The existing area of ancient woodland should be maintained and there should be a net increase in the area of native woodland".</p> <p>7. PPS9 ("Planning Policy Statement 9: Biodiversity and Geological Conservation." ODPM 2005) also contains specific references to ancient woodland:</p>		

<i>Representation No.</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Change To Plan Sought</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Change To Draft SPD</i>
			<p>"Local planning authorities should identify any areas of ancient woodland in their areas that do not have statutory protection (e.g. as a SSSI). They should not grant planning permission for any development that would result in its loss or deterioration unless the need for, and benefits of, the development in that location outweigh the loss of woodland habitat."</p> <p>8. PPS9 also states that "aged and veteran" trees are important for biodiversity and "their loss should be avoided".</p>		
<hr/>					
2.6					
22053 - Forestry Commission	Support	<p>Thank you for consulting the Forestry Commission. You may be aware that the Forestry Commission is the Government Department with statutory responsibility for trees and woodlands.</p> <p>The Trees & Development SPD is welcomed and, as one would expect, appears to be accurate and consistent with the Authority's responsibilities with respect to the Town & Country Planning Act.</p>		Support noted.	No change.
<hr/>					

<i>Representation No.</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Change To Plan Sought</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Change To Draft SPD</i>
2.7					
22106 - English Partnerships and Gallagher Longstanton Limited	Object	The text as drafted does not distinguish whether it is appropriate to preserve existing trees, which is set out in the Act. Section 197a of the Town & Country Planning Act 1990 states 'It shall be the duty of the local planning authority - (a) to ensure, whenever it is appropriate, that in granting planning permission for any development adequate provision is made, by the imposition of conditions, for the preservation or planting of trees ...'	Accordingly, the SPD should be amended to accurately reflect the content of the Act, including the text 'whenever it is appropriate'.	Agree the text should be amended to more accurately reflect Section 197a of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.	Amend paragraph 2.7 to read: "The Town and Country Act 1990 (section 197) specifically charges the Local Planning Authority with the duty to ensure, whenever it is appropriate, when granting planning permission that adequate provision is made for the preservation and planting of trees through planning conditions and the serving of Tree Preservation Orders (TPOs)." Delete paragraph 2.6, to avoid repetition. Delete the heading "Legal Framework" and move the heading "Statutory Legislation" to precede paragraph 2.5.
2.8					
22168 - Great Shelford Parish Council	Object	This should be re-worded, you wouldn't get permission to wilfully damage or destroy trees.		The wording in paragraph 2.8 is consistent with that in of Section 198(3) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, (referred to in Section 211) that states that "a tree preservation order may, in particular, make provision - (a) for prohibiting (subject to any exemptions for which provision may be made by the order) the cutting down, topping, lopping, uprooting, wilful damage or wilful destruction of trees except with the consent of the local planning authority, and for enabling that authority to give their consent subject to conditions;" Although it is unlikely that permission would be given for wilful damage to trees, given that this section of the SPD is dealing with statutory legislation relating to trees, it is important that it accurately reflects the wording of the legislation. It should therefore be retained. Paragraph 2.8 identifies that trees can be afforded statutory protection. However, it would be helpful to make clear that contravention of the legislation can result in legal action.	Insert the following text after paragraph 2.8: "Contravention of the statutory legislation relating to trees may result in the local planning authority taking legal action."

<i>Representation No.</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Change To Plan Sought</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Change To Draft SPD</i>
2.9					
22169 - Great Shelford Parish Council	Object	Should explain here that consent is needed for works to TPO trees and if a tree is removed it should be replaced.		Section 206 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 states that "(1) If any tree in respect of which a tree preservation order is for the time being in force; (a) is removed, uprooted or destroyed in contravention of the order...it shall be the duty of the owner of the land to plant another tree of an appropriate size and species at the same place as soon as he reasonably can." Agree it would be helpful to explain this in the SPD.	Add a new paragraph after paragraph 2.10: "If any tree subject to a TPO which has been identified for retention or for which prior consent for works or removal is removed, uprooted or destroyed in contravention to a TPO it will be the responsibility of the land owner to plant another tree of an appropriate size and species at the same place as soon as he reasonably can." Re-number remaining paragraphs accordingly.
2.10					
22170 - Great Shelford Parish Council	Object	Would it be useful to briefly highlight items relating to trees in the Biodiversity Strategy in this report e.g. preservation of veteran trees and their importance to wildlife. Suspect there is an assumption by developers that a tree with a fair bit of dead wood should be removed.		Agree it would be useful to add guidance about veteran trees and their importance to wildlife. The Council is currently producing a Biodiversity SPD and this could usefully be cross-referred to, together with the Biodiversity Strategy. The proposed amendments to paragraph 2.11 in response to representation 22156 will address this issue.	No further change.
2.11					
22088 - Natural England	Object	Suggestion for re-wording of paragraph 2.11.	Suggestion for re-wording of paragraph 2.11 to read: "Sites to be developed, including vegetation and individual trees, may also be important for species protected under wildlife legislation; this is covered in the SCDC Biodiversity SPD".	Although wider vegetation would not fall within the remit of the Trees SPD, it would be considered as part of the Biodiversity SPD. As this paragraph is cross-referring to the Biodiversity SPD, it could usefully be added. The proposed amendments to paragraph 2.11 in response to representations 22156 and 22052 will address this issue.	No further change.

<i>Representation No.</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Change To Plan Sought</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Change To Draft SPD</i>
22107 - English Partnerships and Gallagher Longstanton Limited	Object	This paragraph refers to the Biodiversity SPD. Given this document is not yet available it is not possible to determine the impact of the policies in this document on the Trees SPD. Furthermore, English Partnerships and Gallagher wish to reserve the right to revisit comments on this document when the biodiversity SPD is published to ensure that complementary documents are adopted.	As such the document should be revised to make reference to 'emerging' SPD that will set out details of important species to be protected under wildlife legislation as this is a more accurate reflection of the position.	Supplementary Planning Documents cannot introduce new policy, rather they expand upon policies in the adopted Development Plan Documents. There is no need to amend the reference to the Biodiversity SPD within the text of the SPD to indicate that it is "emerging". The SPD is listed in Appendix 2 together with its status.	Ensure the status of SPDs listed in Appendix 2 reflects the latest position.

<i>Representation No.</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Change To Plan Sought</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Change To Draft SPD</i>
---------------------------	---------------	-------------------------------	------------------------------	-----------------------------	----------------------------

Chapter 3 - The Development Process

3.1

22108 - English Partnerships and Gallagher Longstanton Limited	Object	This indicates that the Standard (BS5387) recognises that trees are one of a number of design factors and that their retention should be balanced against new planting and the overall value that they will contribute to a development. Furthermore, BS5387 states that the presence of small trees (where these are less than 150mm stem diameter) '... should not be allowed to dominate site layout considerations'. Therefore whilst it is recognised that retention of trees within a development is a consideration this should be informed by the value of the trees on site, their effect on the masterplan and the wider design proposals including new planting.	As such English Partnerships and Gallagher request that paragraph 3.1 be revised as follows: 'A good quality design cannot be achieved if the opportunities and constraints of a site are not identified and considered. Comprehensive site surveys will allow for key components of a site to be retained and will ensure that where appropriate new trees can be incorporated and existing trees protected.'	Agree the revised wording more closely reflects the aims of the British Standards and paragraph 3.1 should be amended accordingly.	Amend paragraph 3.1 to read: "A good quality design cannot be achieved if the opportunities and constraints of a site are not identified and considered. Comprehensive site surveys will allow for key components of a site to be retained and will ensure that where appropriate new trees can be incorporated and existing trees protected."
--	--------	--	---	--	---

3.2

22109 - English Partnerships and Gallagher Longstanton Limited	Object	Whilst existing trees can be an important factor that shapes development of a masterplan, it should be acknowledged that they are one of a number of opportunities and constraints that inform a design led process to deliver high quality design solutions. If undue emphasis is given to trees this could be at the expense of other factors, particularly if the different values of trees is not recognised. The SPD as worded implies that all trees, regardless of their value or contribution to the landscape, amenity or overall scheme design should be retained and that this is an absolute factor rather than part of a balanced consideration of the site's characteristics and the overall vision for the masterplan.	Accordingly, English Partnerships and Gallagher request that this paragraph is revised as follows: 'Where there are existing mature trees, of high value (as defined by BS5837 (2005)), on a proposed development site consideration should be given to the incorporation of those trees in the overall layout of the development, particularly in public areas. Front elevations of buildings facing onto trees or proposed new planting must also be considered / addressed for the longevity of the enhancements that trees bring to development.'	Agree that trees are one of a number of factors that should be considered in the design process, and that whilst the Council would seek to retain and incorporate mature trees within the development, it should not be at the expense of good design. However, each site is different with varying opportunities and constraints, and in following industry guidance (BS5837 2005) an Arboricultural Implications Assessment will be undertaken. This will assess whether mature trees are worthy of retention and should be included within the design. Any design that does not incorporate such trees will need to be justified. Paragraph 3.2 could clarify this position, and should be reworded.	Amend paragraph 3.2 to read: "Where there are existing mature trees on a proposed development site careful consideration should be given to the incorporation of those trees in the overall layout of the development, particularly in public areas. Front elevations of buildings facing onto trees or proposed new planting must be well thought out for the longevity of the enhancements that trees bring to development."
--	--------	---	--	---	---

<i>Representation No.</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Change To Plan Sought</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Change To Draft SPD</i>
22157 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Object	Planning Policy Statement 9 notes that "Local planning authorities should identify any areas of ancient woodland. 'Aged' or 'veteran' trees are particularly valuable, and their loss should be avoided. Planning authorities should encourage the conservation of such trees as part of development proposals."		The Council has identified areas of ancient woodland in the Biodiversity Strategy, together with measures to conserve them. The Council is also producing a Biodiversity SPD, which will also refer to veteran trees. It is not necessary to duplicate this information within the Trees SPD, however a cross-reference to the Biodiversity Strategy should be included. The proposed amendments to paragraph 2.11 in response to representations 22156 and 22052 will address this issue.	No further change.
3.3					
22199 - Cambridge Preservation Society	Object	Unfortunately not only landscape architects design major spaces - thus it should state "Landscape Architects and other designers".	It should state "Landscape Architects and other designers".	Agree, amend reference to 'landscape architects' to 'landscape professionals'.	Amend the second sentence of paragraph 3.3 to read: "Landscape professionals are advised to consider sections 13 and 14 of BS 5837 2005; dealing with new planting, future requirements and relationships to development."
22110 - English Partnerships and Gallagher Longstanton Limited	Object	English Partnerships and Gallagher note that this paragraph refers to the Landscape SPD providing guidance on site visits as invaluable to assessing a site prior to submission of any landscape scheme. The paragraph is not clear whether this is a reference to site visits by SCDC officers or by the applicant and as the Landscape SPD is not yet available it is not possible to cross reference the documents to gain clarity. As such the document should be revised to either provide clarity as to the intent of the final sentence or to remove the sentence and deal with the issue in the Landscape SPD when it is published.		There will inevitably some overlap between the Trees SPD and the SPDs covering Landscape and Biodiversity, as the issues can be indistinguishable. Paragraph 3.3 refers to landscaping issues for completeness and cross-refers to the Landscape SPD which will provide further guidance in these matters. There is no need to amend the Trees SPD to elaborate on matters that will be addressed in another SPD.	No change.

<i>Representation No.</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Change To Plan Sought</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Change To Draft SPD</i>
3.4					
22111 - English Partnerships and Gallagher Longstanton Limited	Object	Paragraph 3.4 makes reference to landscape proposals and arboricultural information being presented by a 'competent arboricultural consultant'. Whilst it is agreed that arboricultural information should be prepared by such a consultant, landscape proposals are often produced by landscape architects or other designers, who are competent to produce these documents. BS5387 states that 'prior to commencing the topographical survey, it may be appropriate to seek the advice of an arboriculturalist to identify all trees that are relevant for inclusion in the survey'. However the Standard does not state the need for an arboriculturalist to undertake landscape proposals, although the introduction refers to the use of 'a competent person'.	Therefore, the reference to landscape proposals being prepared by an arboricultural consultant is inappropriate and the text should be revised as follows: 'Development proposals, where appropriate, should include landscape proposals and arboricultural information. The data and information should be clearly presented to allow the officer to make a concise and comprehensive assessment of the proposals.'	Paragraph 3.4 seeks to ensure that there is sufficient information on landscape proposals and arboricultural information, and that it is presented clearly for officers to be able to make an assessment on site. It is agreed that it need not be the arboricultural consultant who prepares this information, and this should be amended.	Amend paragraph 3.4 to read: "Development proposals should include landscape proposals and arboricultural information. The data and information should be clearly presented to allow the officer to make a concise and comprehensive assessment of the proposals."
3.7					
22034 - University of Cambridge	Object	While we welcome the encouragement given to pre-application consultations, we are concerned that the introduction of charges for such consultations will be counter productive in that it will dissuade prospective applicants from seeking advice. This may result in extra cost to the LPA in the additional time taken to deal with unsatisfactory applications.	Indicate that pre-application advice will continue to be provided free of charge.	It is not appropriate for the SPD to refer to whether there are any charges for Council services as the position may change over time and the SPD would quickly become out of date. Applicants are encouraged to contact the Council before submitting any planning application, and would be able to ascertain whether there are any charges for pre-application consultations.	No change.

<i>Representation No.</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Change To Plan Sought</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Change To Draft SPD</i>
3.9 22112 - English Partnerships and Gallagher Longstanton Limited	Object	The SPD should recognise that in some instances, particularly large scale developments, it will not be possible to submit details on all the trees. Reasons include the level of information that can reasonably be requested at the outline application stage, given the implications in terms of cost and time for preparing such detailed survey information, when the principle of development is yet to be established. Furthermore, where development is proposed that will be delivered over a number of years it should be recognised the value of trees will change. In this case it would be more appropriate to provide the information at the later stage when it would directly influence the detailed design of the scheme.	It is also noted that a caveat is included in the SCDC validation checklist as to why it may not be possible to include the information referenced in the draft SPD. For consistency it is requested that the SPD be revised to introduce the same wording as that included in the Validation Checklist.	Paragraph 3.9 states that when submitting planning applications it is important that all the required information and data relating to trees is provided. Paragraph 3.10 refers to submitting detail at an early stage in the process to allow evaluation of the losses, gains and requirements of a development. Paragraph 3.9 does not specify the level of detail or information required, which it is accepted will vary according to the type of planning application, development proposal and site. Paragraph 3.10 refers to the information required in paragraph 3.9. Neither paragraph is advocating the inclusion of detailed information with all planning applications, although it is important that sufficient information is provided to judge the impact of the proposed development. Paragraph 4.1 sets out the survey requirements and acknowledges that every development will be different in scale and complexity and that the survey requirements outlined may be required in part or full. As a result, there is already sufficient recognition within the SPD that the level of detail will vary accordingly. In addition, applicants are encouraged to contact the Council before submitting any planning application, and would be able to discuss what information is required to accompany the planning application, which will be determined on a case-by-case basis. There is therefore no need to add wording similar to that contained in the Validation Checklist.	No change.

<i>Representation No.</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Change To Plan Sought</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Change To Draft SPD</i>
<i>3.12</i>					
22171 - Great Shelford Parish Council	Object	Could there be a section 3.13 stating the protection of trees will be monitored regularly (PC could have a hand in this for example ensuring fences remain in place).		Conditions are often placed on planning applications, for example requiring landscaping schemes within a certain timeframe, and that any failures within a five year period from their planting will require replacements. As such, there is already a monitoring mechanism in place.	No change.

<i>Representation No.</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Change To Plan Sought</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Change To Draft SPD</i>
---------------------------	---------------	-------------------------------	------------------------------	-----------------------------	----------------------------

Chapter 4 - Survey Requirements

4.1

22113 - English Partnerships and Gallagher Longstanton Limited	Object	English Partnerships and Gallagher request that the SPD is revised so that information on the types applications the requirements relate to is included, as it will provide clarity for applicants. This could include model conditions that will be used to secure the later submission of details that cannot be provided for example at the outline application stage.		Paragraph 4.1 sets out the survey requirements and acknowledges that every development will be different in scale and complexity and that the survey requirements outlined may be required in part or full. As a result, there is already sufficient recognition within the SPD that the level of detail will vary accordingly. It is not possible to foresee every eventuality and provide comprehensive information within the SPD, as each case is dealt with on its individual merits. The type of application will determine detail. It is recommended that a pre-site meeting or conversation is held with the appropriate officer before submitting any planning application. Such discussion can clarify details required, and at which stage, prior to any application being submitted.	No change.
--	--------	---	--	--	------------

4.3

22114 - English Partnerships and Gallagher Longstanton Limited	Object	Paragraph 4.3 states that a tree survey should be undertaken 'independently of proposals for the site'. This wording is considered to be superfluous and English Partnerships and Gallagher recommend that it be deleted.		Paragraph 4.3 refers to a tree survey being undertaken independently of proposals for the site to make it clear that the survey must consider all trees on, and where appropriate, adjoining the site and not just those which may be directly affected by the development proposals. The wording reflects that in BS5837 (2005), which states that "a tree survey should be undertaken by an arboriculturist and should record information about the trees on a site independently of and prior to any specific design for development."	No change.
--	--------	---	--	---	------------

<i>Representation No.</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Change To Plan Sought</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Change To Draft SPD</i>
<i>4.4</i>					
22115 - English Partnerships and Gallagher Longstanton Limited	Object	Paragraph 4.4 states that it is not acceptable to include grouping of trees which will be affected by development proposals. Instead the SPD states that each tree must be individually plotted. This is regardless of whether the tree exists as part of a group, and in fact may be harmed if part of the group was removed.	It is requested that the bullet referring to group numbering be revised as follows: 'Group numbering will be acceptable where trees are growing together'.	Bullet point 3 of paragraph 4.4 states that group numbering is not acceptable where development is within the crown spread of an individual within the group, as group numbering would not enable individual trees to be identified. This is needed to distinguish between the impact from the development proposal on an individual tree and a group of trees. Bullet point 3 does state that group numbering may be acceptable where not directly affected by the development proposal, which provides some flexibility in appropriate circumstances. The wording reflects BS5837 (2005) which states that trees forming groups should be identified and considered as groups, however, an assessment of individuals within any group should still be undertaken if they are open grown or if there is a need to differentiate between them. For this reason it is acceptable where groups fall within development proposals to identify them individually so the trees can be assessed on individual or group merit.	No change.
<i>4.11</i>					
22116 - English Partnerships and Gallagher Longstanton Limited	Object	Paragraph 4.11 makes reference to further information on the content of a Tree Constraints Plan being contained in Appendix 2. Appendix 2 contains contact details for various organisations and key national guidance it does not include further direct information.	As such it is recommended that the reference to Appendix 2 is deleted.	Appendix 2 includes relevant further information, including the Building Research Establishment's Site Layout planning for daylight and sunlight: a guide to good practice. Paragraph 4.11 could make it clear where this information can be found.	Amend the last sentence of paragraph 4.11 to read: "This information can be included on a scale plan or discussed prior to a planning application being submitted; further information can be found in Appendix 2 - National Information."

<i>Representation No.</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Change To Plan Sought</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Change To Draft SPD</i>
4.15					
22117 - English Partnerships and Gallagher Longstanton Limited	Object	Paragraph 4.15 refers to the preparation of an arboricultural implications assessment. As stated above an arboricultural implications assessment can only be provided at the detailed stage of applications and this should be reflected in the SPD.		Paragraph 4.15 refers to an Arboricultural Implications Assessment (AIA), which are included in the industry's best practice. It details what AIAs are required to include. It does not state that an AIA will be required with every planning application. Paragraph 4.1 acknowledges that every development site is different in scale and complexity and that the requirements detailed in the chapter will be required in part or full.	No change.
4.16					
22172 - Great Shelford Parish Council	Object	4.16, 4.17 and 4.18 Surely there should be some mention of the repercussions if trees are wilfully damaged and destroyed.		Agree it would be helpful to make clear that contravention of the legislation can result in legal action.	Insert the following text after paragraph 2.8: "Contravention of the statutory legislation relating to trees may result in the local planning authority taking legal action."
4.21					
22201 - Cambridge Preservation Society	Object	New Planting and Street Tree planting - this should provide a clear reference for developers and other site owners / managers to plant not just small trees but also substantial trees which are long-lived and of forest tree scale (e.g. oaks / beech / maple) and requiring more space to ensure long-term green and sustainable living benefiting local people and wildlife and adequate scale in view of taller buildings and features proposed.		Paragraph 4.21 already refers to new industry practice and materials to enable the establishment of trees within the built environment for longevity and so that they do not become a nuisance in their maturity. This should ensure that sufficient space is provided for their long-term growth. It is important that trees are suited to their environment and this can be dealt with at the landscape design stage. The Landscape SPD will provide further guidance on the sorts of trees that will be appropriate, therefore there is no need to add further detail in the Trees SPD.	No change.

<i>Representation No.</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Change To Plan Sought</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Change To Draft SPD</i>
22158 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Object	We note that SPDs for Landscape and Biodiversity (pg17) are in preparation so it would appear that much of the landscaping and biodiversity detail will be provided in these and the implication is that this SPD needs to be read in conjunction with them. Whilst there is no need to repeat information, it would be helpful to provide a small section that gives some guidance on the most appropriate times of year for tree work and new planting. Within the tree work section a reference should be made on the need to consider breeding birds and bats, and the implications this might have. This can then be cross-referenced to the Biodiversity SPD.		Agree that it is important to consider existing biodiversity when undertaking new planting, and a note should be added to this effect. The Biodiversity and Landscaping SPDs will provide further guidance on this issue.	Add a note after paragraph 4.21 to read: "NOTE - Any tree works which are undertaken need to consider breeding birds and bats which are afforded statutory protection. Further information is provided in the Landscaping and Biodiversity SPDs." Delete "For full details see SPD on Landscaping."
22173 - Great Shelford Parish Council	Object	It would be useful to include a section on the trees best suited to different sites. Often new developments have small ornamental trees and no forest trees. However the latter are very important in creating skyline detail in the long term. Developers should allow enough space to accommodate large trees.		It is important that trees are suited to their environment and this can be dealt with at the landscape design stage. Providing detailed guidance on the types of trees best suited to different sites is not appropriate, given each site and development proposal is treated on its individual merits. However the Landscape SPD will provide further information. Guidance on species of trees in keeping with the area and designing in trees to the built environment is given in the Cambridgeshire Design Guidelines and the Cambridgeshire Design Guide for streets and the public realm. These could usefully be referenced in Appendix 2.	Add the following into a new section 'Local Information' within Appendix 2 before 'National Information': "- Cambridgeshire Design Guidelines - Cambridgeshire County Council; - Cambridgeshire Design Guide for streets and the public realm - Cambridgeshire County Council"

<i>Representation No.</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Change To Plan Sought</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Change To Draft SPD</i>
22118 - English Partnerships and Gallagher Longstanton Limited	Object	<p>English Partnerships and Gallagher note that reference is made to the Landscaping SPD at paragraph 4.21. Given this SPD is not yet available, appropriate references should be made to the document within the Trees SPD. Paragraph 4.21 deals exclusively with planting new trees, but references the Landscape SPD for 'full details'. Therefore if there are further details that are pertinent to including new trees within developments this information should be contained in the Trees SPD, not an as yet unpublished document. This approach would provide greater clarity to applicants. Accordingly English Partnerships and Gallagher request that the additional information be included and the reference to the Landscape SPD deleted.</p>		<p>There will inevitably be overlap between the Trees SPD and the SPDs on Biodiversity and Landscaping, as the issues coincide. However, it is not appropriate to include detailed landscaping information within the Trees SPD. Therefore reference to the Landscape SPD should be retained to direct the reader to the appropriate place to find further detailed information.</p>	No change.