

PLANNING CONSULTATION RESPONSE

Application No	23/01707/FUL
Proposal	Provision of concrete yard for goods provisions (retrospective) and alteration of the existing access
Address	Cherry Lane Tickhill Garden Centre Bawtry Road Tickhill Doncaster

Date of Consultation Reply	29th January 2024
Consultee	Tree Officer - Phil Hulbert



Consultation Assessment and Justification:

Thank you for consulting me on this application and please accept my apologies for the late reply. I have taken note of the various representations and Consultation responses.

I have a strong objection to the proposed removal of two Category A trees, specifically lime trees, as outlined in the development planning application referenced above. As the designated Tree Officer, it is my responsibility to ensure that any proposed development aligns with industry standards and guidelines, particularly BS 5837:2012 - Trees in relation to design, demolition, and construction.

The two lime trees in question are integral components of a unique and distinctive feature on the road into Tickhill. Their presence not only contributes to the aesthetic appeal of the area but also holds significant ecological and cultural value. The removal of these trees would undeniably have a detrimental impact on the visual character and biodiversity of the locality.

BS 5837:2012 emphasises the importance of preserving existing trees and integrating them harmoniously into development plans. The removal of these Category A trees contradicts this fundamental principle and fails to demonstrate a genuine commitment to sustainable development practices.

Furthermore, my assessment of the proposed root pruning raises concerns about the potential destabilisation of any affected tree. Root pruning is a sensitive procedure that must be approached with utmost care and consideration. The outlined root pruning measures, as presented in the application, pose a significant risk to the structural integrity of the trees. Such actions have the potential to compromise their health, stability, and overall longevity.

In the SPD Section 17 Trees and Hedgerows – specifically section 17.3.8 Trees of high quality and value (Category A 1, 2 and/or 3), as defined by BS5837 should be retained; trees of moderate quality and value (Category B 1, 2 and/or 3), as defined by BS5837 should normally be retained and therefore I object to this application

1.
Consultation Informative

Planning Obligations

Consultation Conditions

1.

