
From: Irene Fletcher
Sent: 06 February 2024 12:32
To: Joseph Swift
Cc: Emma Rivett
Subject: Response to comments, DM/23/2610

Hi Joe,

Firstly, with regard to the RAVEN 2 assessment referred to by the applicants, I have also carried out my own assessment using this methodology. I was accompanied by Emma.

With regard to T20, I found extensive decay and extensive hollowing, plus a large quantity of dead wood in the crown, major storm damage, habitat spaces, bark loss and other epiphytic plants (lichen). I therefore consider this tree to be a veteran.

T19, I noted extensive decay, a large quantity of dead wood in the crown, major storm damage, habitat spaces, possible water pool, bark loss and epiphytic plants (lichen), I therefore consider this tree to be a veteran.

T17, I noted extensive decay, extensive hollowing, senescence and you have noted retrenchment, also large quantity of dead wood, major storm damage, habitat spaces, sap run, bark loss fungi (x 2), other epiphytic plants (Lichen), I therefore consider this tree to be a veteran.

With regard to T16 , I noted large quantity of dead wood, major storm damage, habitat spaces, sap run, bark loss and other epiphytic plants. I therefore consider this tree to be a veteran.

I also consider that, should these trees have been examined when in full leaf, other features, such as retrenchment may be noted. I therefore consider my previous comments to be relevant. T30 also has the potential to be veteran , although it has not been fully assessed.

With regard to further points, , I do not consider permanent hard surfacing within the RPAs of these trees to be ' unavoidable' and, bearing in mind the age of the trees, para 7.1.2 of the BS referred to advises that ' the older the tree, the less successfully it will adapt '. 5.2.4 advises that ' adequate space should be allowed for their long term physical retention and future maintenance'. I do not consider that this requirement can be met and my previous comments apply.

Concerning point 3 of their response to my comments, once again, I do not consider that ' significant detrimental impacts caused by pruning can be avoided or minimised'. I consider the trees, above, to be veterans, therefore works are unacceptable. Previous comments apply.

Point 4, as above.

Point 5, I do not accept that because the oaks are retained, that this makes it acceptable to lose the pines. Dangerous trees may, of course be removed, where appropriate, subject to relevant consents, where required.

Point 6, Landscaping Matters, as per my previous comments.

Irene

Irene Fletcher
Tree Officer
Development Management

