

## Response to CDC Arboricultural Officer Comments

### Arboricultural impact assessment.

The proposal requires the removal of 13 of the 72 recorded features within the site. 3 category A, 6 category B and 4 category C/U. These removals are directly as a result of the proposals layout, with exception to T37. The majority of vegetation proposed for removal is hedgerow, with a number of hedgerows considered category B quality containing mature features. The redirected watercourse passes within the buffer of a small area of ancient woodland. On site observation confirms the buffer area contains lower quality features, and the redirected watercourse passes beneath equally lower quality features (Category C) on the ancient woodlands boundary. In line with ancient woodland guidance, enhancement of the ancient woodland will form suitable mitigation for this.

With reference to the AIA, can the following items be confirmed please:

- Confirm justification for T37 removal.
  - T37 is being removed to enable the construction of a bund around the eastern portion of the site. Please refer to the Tree Protection Plan contained within the updated Arboricultural Impact Assessment (June 2022).
- Confirm if hedgerows proposed for removal are protected under hedgerow regulations (if this is covered in ecological assessment please state).
  - With regards to the protection status of hedgerows, please refer to 'Annex EDP 2 Hedgerow Survey' included as ES Appendix 8.1 Ecological Baseline R007 Part 1.
- Method for operations upon ancient woodland border/buffer area. (See below comments for method statement).
  - Clarification for the methodology for working within the Ancient woodland buffer and within the RPA's of retained items has been added to the Arboricultural Method Statement in the updated Arboricultural Impact Assessment (June 2022).

### Arboricultural method statement.

An AMS is included within the report however, some further details will be required. Its acknowledged some of this information is likely unavailable currently. 3.14 states service locations, whilst remaining outside RPAs are subject to confirmation from the applicant. The AMS does not include a plan demonstrating tree protection fencing, though it is acknowledged the majority of vegetation sits outside the area of development. The AMS does not include a methodology for working within the ancient woodland buffer for redirecting drainage, and does not include details such as the site compounds location mentioned in 3.20.

With reference to the AMS, the following items are required:

- Methodology for working within the ancient woodland buffer.
  - Clarification for the methodology for working within the Ancient woodland buffer and within the RPA's of retained items has been added to the Arboricultural Method Statement in the updated Arboricultural Impact Assessment (June 2022).
- Confirmation of service locations.
  - Detailed service run locations are not currently known. As per paragraph 3.14 of the updated Arboricultural Impact Assessment (June 2022), "The routes of all services will be located outside of the RPAs of retained trees and hedgerows". It is considered that these details can be secured/controlled by condition if necessary.
- Confirmation of site compound location.
  - Details of the site compound location are not currently known. As per paragraph 3.14 of the updated Arboricultural Impact Assessment (June 2022), provision "should be made available in areas away from retained trees". It is considered that these details can be secured/controlled by condition if necessary.
- Full AMS/TPP plan including access.
  - The Tree Retention Removal Plan has been revised to a Tree Protection Plan within the updated Arboricultural Impact Assessment (June 2022). Furthermore, protective fencing will be erected within the redline boundary in areas where development should be excluded from RPA's.

### Ancient woodland.

It was agreed on site as part of the mitigation for incurring into the ancient woodlands buffer a strategy would be completed to improve and enhance the quality of the woodland. Further detail and discussion is required before I can support the submitted strategy, comments summarised below:

- The site holds no public access. Where the WMP outlines removal of structurally compromised trees, detail is required under what criteria is a tree considered structurally compromised. The woodland holds no public access as such removal of trees with cavities etc. would reflect a removal of habitat key for woodland biodiversity.
  - The original reference to structurally compromised trees in the Woodland Management Plan (May 2022) was in relation to the trees on the edge of the wood. To avoid confusion, this reference has been removed in the updated Woodland Management Plan (June 2022).
- The WMP proposes removal of invasive species. Species proposed for removal will need identifying and quantifying.
  - At the time of the survey (dormant months) no invasive species were identified. However, a 'catch-all' was included in the original Woodland Management Plan (May 2022). Clarification on this point has been included in the updated Woodland Management Plan (June 2022).
- The WMP mentions planting, but, this is not included in the management programme, nor is detail given to planting within, or upon the border/buffer. If trees are proposed for removal, replanting will certainly be a requirement, as will replanting in the buffer area which will see removals in order to redirect drainage.
  - The Woodland Management Plan relates to the woodland, and it is intended that any planting would be the same as what is present within the woodland (i.e. native species). This clarification has been provided in the updated Woodland Management Plan (June 2022).