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1 THE PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT

1.1 Introduction

1.1.1 The development is linked to the operations conducted by Raybell and Sons Ltd at the Old Brickworks site off the A508 Harborough Road, Pitsford. The development seeks to gain retrospective planning permission for a parking area that has been provided at the South East corner of the site to the rear of the existing bungalows.

1.2 Application Documents

1.2.1 The following documents are submitted in conjunction with this application;
   • Site Location plan
   • Site Plan
   • Proposed Site Layout Plan
   • Parking Access Plan
   • Planning Statement
   • Tree Survey
   • Photopanel

1.3 The Site

1.3.1 The site is located off the A508 Harborough Road, approximately 1km north of the Pitsford turn.

1.3.2 In terms of sensitive receptors, the site sits approximately 80m away from Toll Bar Cottage and its associated stables and farm complex on the opposite side of the A508. Hill Farm lies approximately 400m to the northwest of the site and the complex of office units at Springhill Farm lie a similar distance to the southeast. Over 500m to the east is Pitsford Reservoir and Brixworth Country Park.

1.3.3 The adjoining bungalows are now owned by Raybell and Sons.

1.4 The Current Operation

1.4.1 The site is currently in use as a waste transfer and recycling centre dealing with commercial and construction waste. One other building on site is in use as B2 industrial unit let to an engineering operation and the company uses the new office building on site.

1.5 The Proposed Development

1.5.1 The development of the parking facility in south east corner of the site has been constructed to support the various onsite operations as mentioned in section 1.4.1.

1.5.2 The parking facility makes use of the previous gardened area of the recently acquired bungalows. The area which is 0.1 ha in size consists of a gravelled parking area and is bordered by a landscaped bank along the southern edge. The application for permission extends to the re-location of the boundary fence in accommodating the parking area.
1.5.3 Access to the parking has been created via a new entrance which opens onto the main access road into the site. The access is positioned to the immediate left as vehicles enter the site, and acts as a natural segregation of the parking facilities away from the onsite working activities.

1.5.4 The landscape bund provides a degree of visual screening, reducing the visual amenity effects on the surrounding area. The screening along with the retention of the boundary hedgerows and trees also has some security merit as vehicles are shielded from immediate view along the A508.

1.6 Specification

1.6.1 The works undertaken consists of the removal of the grassed gardened area to the rear of the bungalows situated in the South East corner of the Old Brickworks site. Access has been created via the opening up of a route along the side of the bungalow closest to the A508, through further grass stripping. The stripped grassed area has been surfaced with gravel, and brick edging provided around the retained trees on site. Wooden fencing has been provided around the new boundary of the bungalows. A visual indication of the work that has been carried out is shown by Photograph panel A that accompanies this application.

1.6.2 The landscape bund that has been created along the southern boundary of the parking area stands at approximately 1 meter high and has been created in order to minimise the visual effects of the parking facility has on the A508 and other sensitive receptors. The planting scheme consists of three varieties of plant species. These are as follows;

- *Viburnum tinis*;
- *Aucuba japonica ‘Variegata’*;
- *Prunus Laurocerasus* (Cherry Laurel).

1.6.3 The laurel plants have been planted approximately one metre apart in a linear fashion across the top of the bund. The *Viburnum tinis* and *Aucuba japonica ‘Variegata’* have been planted at random spaces across the face of the bund. The unplanted soil area will be sown with grass seed.

1.6.4 The south facing rear of the landscape bund will be screened by the mature hedging that is located along the boundary of the site and the adjacent fields. Thus, further minimising the visual impacts of the parking facility on the surrounding area.

1.7 Justification

1.7.1 The additional parking is needed to supplement the loss of the previous parking area that was positioned on the eastern boundary of the site along the A508 Harborough road. The facility to park vehicles in this location has been replaced by waste storage bays linked to the waste sorting operations in the adjacent recycling building. The change in the parking situation is highlighted by drawing GPP-RBS-OB-11-03 v2 proposed site layout.

1.7.2 The repositioning of the parking area to the south east corner allows for a separation between the working processes on site and the parking facilities. This provides an increase in on site safety as the various activities are more easily managed due to less traffic interference in relation to the waste sorting and transfer activities.
2 PLANNING POLICY CONTEXT

2.1 Planning History

2.1.1 The site is subject to four main planning permissions which provide the legal clearance for the onsite activities, in planning terms. The permissions DA/03/280/C, DA/04/1494C, DA/05/1273C, and 09/00054/WAS provide the evidence for the permitted activities on site.

2.1.2 The site is currently subject to an application to vary the hours of working, which has been submitted at the same time with this application.

2.1.3 This planning permission seeks retrospective permission for a parking area that is linked to the consented processes on site.

3 PLANNING AND ENVIRONMENTAL CONSIDERATIONS

3.1 Landscape and Visual Impact

3.1.1 The parking facility has not had a detrimental effect on the visual amenity of the surrounding area. The facility is screened to the A508 by the existing tree line and hedgerow. The mature trees within the site have been retained and the root structure protected by limiting the extent of the gravel surface.

3.1.2 The site is visible from the properties on the opposite side of the valley, on the outskirts of Pitsford and from the path around Pitsford Reservoir; however these views are long distance and therefore the development has little resultant effect.

3.2 Environmental and Ecological Impacts

3.2.1 Minimal vegetation loss has occurred due to the nature and location of the parking area on the previous lawn area. The gravel will allow rain to penetrate to the tree roots.

3.2.2 In addition to this a landscaped bank has been created in order to retain the soil and minimise the loss of vegetation and retain the biodiversity of the South Eastern corner as much as is practicably possible in accommodating the parking area.

3.2.3 In terms of the ecological impacts on site, the parking area has been incorporated to make use of the previously managed and maintained grass area linked to the bungalow. Little ecological harm has been suffered by the creation of a gravelled parking area, due to the previous maintenance practices which would have reduced the amount of ecological activity in the grassed area.

3.2.4 A tree survey accompanies this application, which has considered the impacts that the creation of the parking area has had on the trees located along the site boundary. The tree survey is included in appendix 1.
3.2.5 The conclusion of the Tree Survey indicates that ‘there are currently no reasons to suspect that any significant decline in their health and condition will result’.

3.3 Sensitive Receptors

3.3.1 With relation to the previous permissions that have been obtained on site, the most vulnerable receptors to the site processes were considered to be the adjacent bungalows. These have subsequently been acquired by Raybell and Sons Ltd, and should be no longer considered as sensitive receptors due to their association with the working practices on site as employee quarters.

3.3.2 In terms of the surrounding area, the site sits approximately 80m away from Toll Bar Cottage and its associated stables and farm complex on the opposite side of the A508. Hill Farm lies approximately 400m to the northwest of the site and the complex of office units at Springhill Farm lie a similar distance to the southeast.

3.3.3 The parking area is shielded from view by the landscaping and retention of the existing hedgerow and treeline as mentioned in section 3.1.1. This also has a suppressing effect on noise that is created by vehicle movements in the parking area.

3.4 Noise

3.4.1 There has been no further noise emissions created by the parking area. The main noise emissions are produced by vehicle arrivals and departures at the beginning and end of each shift. This is line with the processes that are currently experienced and permitted on site. Therefore the development of the new parking area has not altered the noise levels experienced at the surrounding sensitive receptors.

3.5 Archaeology

3.5.1 The site is currently in use and therefore holds no archaeological interest.

3.6 Surface and Groundwater

3.6.1 The site is not contained within a groundwater protection zone.

3.7 Flood Risk Assessment

3.7.1 The site is not situated within a flood risk zone. Therefore, there is no need to undertake a flood risk assessment on the site.

3.8 Traffic and Transport

3.8.1 The development has not had an effect on the amount of traffic to and from the site. The parking facility has however allowed for increased efficiency in the management of traffic once it has entered the site. This has had positive implications for working practises and also vehicle and worker safety.
4 CONCLUSIONS

4.1.1 The development of the additional parking facility has allowed for increased space for the site users. This has enabled the site to work more efficiently through the creation of space for improved vehicular movement.

4.1.2 In addition to this, the containment of the parking facilities in the South East corner maintains a separation of the working practices from the parking facilities. This increases safety on site due to clearer boundaries between the work and non-work areas.

4.1.3 All reasonable preventative measures have been taken by the client with regards to the minimisation of vegetation loss. The retention of the trees and hedgerow that borders the A508 has been supplemented by the creation of a landscaped bank at the rear of the parking area.

4.1.4 These preventative measures also provide the visual and noise screening that allow for the existing surrounding amenities to remain at the current levels.
APPENDIX 1: Tree Survey prepared by RGS Tree Services
A pre-development tree survey in accordance with British Standard 5837 : 2005, addressing the specific issues of tree retention in the context of a proposed development.
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1.0 Terms of Reference

1.1 We are instructed by Mr. John Bell, to undertake a retrospective pre-development tree survey at The Old Brickworks site, which is to be in line with B.S. 5837 : 2005 ‘Trees in Relation to Construction - Recommendations’.

1.2 All trees have been inspected from ground level only. Should further more detailed inspection be deemed appropriate, this will be covered under Recommendations. Trees are dynamic living organisms, whose health and condition can be subject to rapid change, depending on a number of external and internal factors. The conclusions and recommendations contained in this report relate to the trees at the time of inspection.

1.3 This survey and report has been completed by Robert C Yates, who holds the Arboricultural Association Technician’s Certificate and the LANTRA award in Professional Tree Inspection. He is also a professional member of the Consulting Arborist Society and member of the Arboricultural Association.

2.0 Survey Methodology

2.1 The trees have been assessed using the current recommendations, as detailed in British Standard 5837 : 2005 ‘Trees in relation to Construction – Recommendations’, in order to arrive at a Retention Category for each individual tree or group of trees. A Root Protection Area (RPA) has been assigned to each tree, based on its stem diameter and in some cases crown spread, which has then been used to produce the Tree Constraints Plan (attached as appendix 2). For full details of the relevant assessment criteria and retention categories see Table 1 of B.S. 5837 (attached as appendix 3).

2.2 All surveyed trees and hedgerows have been given a notional identification e.g. T1 or H1. All collected survey data and work recommendations for individual trees, groups and hedgerows, is presented in the survey schedule which forms appendix 1 to this report. For the location of all trees see appendix 2 (Tree Constraints Plan).
3.0 Site Overview

3.1 The survey area comprises a small part of the Old Brickworks site, located to the rear of the two existing dwellings in the south east corner and adjacent to the highway (Harborough Road).

3.2 The development, which has recently been completed, comprises the construction of a car parking area surfaced with gravel and extending to approximately 1000 sq.mtrs. on the site of the former gardens of the two dwellings. This has involved some minimal excavation in some areas whilst in other areas the ground levels have been marginally increased.

4.0 Summary of Findings & Conclusions

4.1 A total of 6 no. individual trees and 1 no. hedgerow have been surveyed. A breakdown of the numbers of trees in each retention category can be seen in the table below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Retention Category</th>
<th>Individual Trees</th>
<th>Groups of Trees</th>
<th>Hedgerows</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R (remove)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.2 In summary; one tree (T5) has been placed in the A category, two trees (T4 & T6) in the B category, and the remaining trees (including the hedgerow H1) have been placed in the C category. No trees were found to be in such a condition to warrant removal (R category).

4.3 Given that the development is now complete, we have made a preliminary assessment of the potential impact of the works on the retained trees on site, and we can conclude that although some root disturbance may have occurred in respect of trees T3 & T4 there are currently no reasons to suspect that any significant decline in their health and condition will result (It should be noted that tree T3 (beech) will have been in a relatively poor condition for some considerable time prior to the development works). There are no significant implications for trees T1, T2, T5, T6 and the hedgerow H1.

5.0 Statutory Obligations

- It is a criminal offence under normal circumstances to disturb or destroy - whether intentional or unintentional - the nesting sites of wild birds or the roost sites of bats, under the 'Wildlife & Countryside Act 1981 and the 'Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000'.
**TREE SURVEY SCHEDULE : Appendix 1 to Report**

**KEY TO SURVEY CRITERIA & HEADINGS :**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tree No.</th>
<th>Notional ID given to each tree or group of trees (unless tagged)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Species</td>
<td>Botanical name with common name in brackets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age Class</td>
<td>Young trees – less than 1/3 normal life expectancy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Middle-aged trees – 1/3 to 2/3 normal life expectancy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mature trees – over 2/3 normal life expectancy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Over-mature – beyond usually expected life span</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Height</td>
<td>Estimated in metres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crown Spread</td>
<td>Crown spread (North / East / South / West ) measured from centre of trunk, in metres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crown clearance</td>
<td>Approximate height between lowest branch and ground level (metres)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stem dia.</td>
<td>Trunk diameter (mm) measured at 1.5m above ground level, or ground level (gl), if multi-stem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vigour</td>
<td>Objective assessment of a tree’s vigour (normal or low)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amenity</td>
<td>Subjective assessment of a tree’s contribution to the amenity value of the area: High to Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condition</td>
<td>Good, Fair or Poor, based on the general health and structural condition of the tree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommendations</td>
<td>Remedial works in order to facilitate retention, or recommendation to remove</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Ret.Cat. | Based on B.S.5837 Retention categories:  
|          | A = Those of High Quality & Value  
|          | B = Those of Moderate Quality & Value  
|          | (Sub-categories 1,2,3 in brackets)  
|          | C = Those of Low Quality & Value  
|          | R = Remove (or Fell) |
| RPA      | Root Protection Area, measured in metres from centre of tree, or may be expressed in m |
# APPENDIX 1 : SURVEY SCHEDULE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tree No.</th>
<th>Species (common name)</th>
<th>Age class</th>
<th>Height</th>
<th>Crown spread</th>
<th>Crown clearance</th>
<th>Stem dia.</th>
<th>Vigour</th>
<th>Amenity</th>
<th>Condition / Comments</th>
<th>Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T1</td>
<td>Thuja plicata [western red cedar]</td>
<td>middle-aged</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>Fair/poor - crown die-back / minor basal stem damage</td>
<td>no works required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T2</td>
<td>Prunus cerasifera 'Nigra' [myrobalan plum]</td>
<td>over-mature</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>550gl</td>
<td>normal</td>
<td>moderate/low</td>
<td>Fair/poor - twin stems from ground level / crown die-back south side</td>
<td>no works required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T3</td>
<td>Fagus sylvatica [beech]</td>
<td>middle-aged</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>normal</td>
<td>moderate</td>
<td>Fair/poor - beech bark disease / heavily biased crown of poor form / past branch failure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T4</td>
<td>Thuja plicata [western red cedar]</td>
<td>mature</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>600gl</td>
<td>normal</td>
<td>moderate</td>
<td>Fair - twin stems from 1.3m / slight yellowing of foliage / minor basal stem damage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T5</td>
<td>Taxus baccata [common yew]</td>
<td>young</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>250gl</td>
<td>normal</td>
<td>low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T6</td>
<td>Prunus laurocerasus [cherry laurel]</td>
<td>mature</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>300gl</td>
<td>normal</td>
<td>low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H1</td>
<td>Hedgerow: [Elm, Buddlia, Elder, Pyracantha]</td>
<td>young to mature</td>
<td>&lt; 4</td>
<td>not applicable</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>normal to low</td>
<td>moderate/low</td>
<td>Fair - thin hedgerow heavily clad with Honeysuckle &amp; Ivy</td>
<td>no works required</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## APPENDIX 3: BS 5837 TABLE 1 - CASCADE CHART FOR TREE QUALITY ASSESSMENT

### TREES FOR REMOVAL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category and definition</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Identification on plan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Category R</strong>&lt;br&gt;Those in such a condition that any existing value would be lost within 10 years and which should in the current context be removed for reasons of sound arboricultural management</td>
<td><strong>• Trees that have a serious, irremediable, structural defect, such that their early loss is expected due to collapse, including those that will become unviable after removal of other R category trees (i.e. where, for whatever reason, the loss of companion shelter cannot be mitigated by pruning)</strong>&lt;br&gt;<strong>Trees that are dead or are showing signs of significant, immediate, and irreversible overall decline</strong>&lt;br&gt;<strong>• Trees infected with pathogens of significance to the health and/or safety of other trees nearby (e.g. Dutch elm disease), or very low quality trees suppressing adjacent trees of better quality</strong>&lt;br&gt;<strong>NOTE Habitat reinstatement may be appropriate (e.g. R category tree used as a bat roost: installation of bat box in nearby tree).</strong></td>
<td><strong>DARK RED / MAGENTA</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TREES TO BE CONSIDERED FOR RETENTION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category and definition</th>
<th>Criteria — Subcategories</th>
<th>Identification on plan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Category A</strong>&lt;br&gt;Those of high quality and value: in such a condition as to be able to make a substantial contribution (a minimum of 40 years is suggested)</td>
<td><strong>1 Mainly arboricultural values</strong>&lt;br&gt;Trees that are particularly good examples of their species, especially if rare or unusual, or essential components of groups, or of formal or semi-formal arboricultural features (e.g. the dominant and/or principal trees within an avenue)</td>
<td><strong>LIGHT GREEN</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2 Mainly landscape values</strong>&lt;br&gt;Trees, groups or woodlands which provide a definite screening or softening effect to the locality in relation to views into or out of the site, or those of particular visual importance (e.g. avenues or other arboricultural features assessed as groups)</td>
<td><strong>3 Mainly cultural values, including conservation</strong>&lt;br&gt;Trees, groups or woodlands of significant conservation, historical, commemorative or other value (e.g. veteran trees or woodland pasture)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Category B</strong>&lt;br&gt;Those of moderate quality and value: those in such a condition as to make a significant contribution (a minimum of 20 years is suggested)</td>
<td>Trees that might be included in the high category, but are downgraded because of impaired condition (e.g. presence of remediable defects including unsympathetic past management and minor storm damage)</td>
<td><strong>MID BLUE</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Category C</strong>&lt;br&gt;Those of low quality and value: currently in adequate condition to remain until new planting could be established (a minimum of 10 years 15 suggested), or young trees with a stem diameter below 150 mm</td>
<td>Trees not qualifying in higher categories</td>
<td><strong>GREY</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NOTE</strong>&lt;br&gt;Whilst C category trees will usually not be retained where they would impose a significant constraint on development, young trees with a stem diameter of less than 150 mm should be considered for relocation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>