



**Bassetlaw**  
DISTRICT COUNCIL  
— North Nottinghamshire —

Trees and Development  
Supplementary Planning Document

**Consultation Statement**  
February 2026

<https://www.bassetlaw.gov.uk/>



## 1. Introduction

- 1.1 This document has been prepared in order to demonstrate how the Council has followed the requirements of [The Town and Country Planning \(Local Planning\) \(England\) Regulations 2012](#) in preparing and adopting the Council's Trees and Development Supplementary Planning Document (SPD).
- 1.2 SPDs were introduced as part of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004. The [Planning Policy Guidance](#) is clear that an SPD needs to add further detail to policies in the adopted Bassetlaw Local Plan (May 2024) and that they can be used to provide further guidance for development on particular issues. They are a material consideration for determining planning applications, albeit they do not form part of the development plan.
- 1.3 The Trees and Development SPD provides further guidance for applicants and developers on how planning applications can address and satisfy requirements set out in the following Local Plan Policies:
  - Policy ST33: Design Quality
  - Policy ST38: Biodiversity and Geodiversity
  - Policy ST39: Trees, woodlands and hedgerows
  - Policy ST48: Reducing Carbon Emissions, Climate Change Mitigation and Adaptation
- 1.4 The SPD also assists local interpretation of relevant [National Planning Policy Framework](#) policy including conserving and enhancing the natural environment.

## 2. Local Planning Regulations and Habitats Regulation Assessment / Strategic Environmental Assessment Screenings

- 2.1 This consultation has been carried out in accordance with [The Town and Country Planning \(Local Planning\) \(England\) Regulations 2012](#) (as amended). In line with Regulation 12(a), before adopting an SPD, a Local Planning Authority must prepare a statement setting out who was consulted when preparing the SPD, a summary of the main issues raised and how these issues have been addressed. This document is the Consultation Statement for the SPD as required by Regulation 12(a).
- 2.2 Regulation 12(b) requires that the draft SPD must be published for a minimum of 4 weeks and that the Council specify the date by which representations must be made and the address to which they must be sent.
- 2.3 Regulation 35 requires the documents must be made available to the public at the principal office of the Council and other places the Council consider appropriate as well as publishing on the Council's website.
- 2.4 The Government's national [Planning Policy Guidance](#) states "SPDs do not require a sustainability appraisal but may in exceptional circumstances require a strategic environmental assessment if they are likely to have significant environmental effects that have not already been assessed during the preparation of the relevant strategic policies."
- 2.5 Every stage of the Bassetlaw [Local Plan's](#) preparation (from initial scoping through to Adoption) were subject to a comprehensive sustainability appraisal incorporating strategic environmental assessment with a number of changes to policies made to

address each individual report's recommendations. The [Bassetlaw Local Plan Habitats Regulation Assessment \(2023\)](#) concluded that the policies in the Plan (either alone or in combination) would not impact on any of the European Sites either within, or in close proximity, to Bassetlaw District.

- 2.6 As set out above, the SPD provides further guidance and detail to the relevant adopted [Local Plan](#) policies, and does not result in any significantly different effects over and above those already considered and assessed through the preparation of the recently adopted Local Plan and the relevant policies (listed above) which are the strategic policies that the SPD 'hangs off'.
- 2.7 Nevertheless, and for completeness, an SEA Screening Assessment was undertaken prior to consultation with Natural England, Historic England and the Environment Agency. All responded and confirmed that an SEA was not required.

### **3. Consultation Details**

- 3.1 Consultation on the draft SPD took place for a period of six weeks from 29 October to 10 December 2025. Consultation was in line with the Council's [Statement of Community Involvement](#) and involved contacting via email/letter all persons and organisations who had signed up to the Council's Planning Policy database.
- 3.2 The draft SPD and response form were made available on the Council's website and a hard copy was available to view during normal office hours at the Customer Service Desk at Bassetlaw District Council: Queen's Buildings, Potter Street, Worksop, S80 2AH, at Retford Town Hall and Harworth & Bircotes Town Hall, and all libraries in the district.
- 3.3 Consultation comments were invited by email to [planningpolicy@bassetlaw.gov.uk](mailto:planningpolicy@bassetlaw.gov.uk) , via an online form on the Council's website: [www.bassetlaw.gov.uk](http://www.bassetlaw.gov.uk), or by post via: Planning Policy, Queen's Buildings, Potter Street, Worksop, S80 2AH

### **4. Who was Consulted?**

- 4.1 In accordance with Regulation 12, interested parties, including everyone on the Planning Policy database, and those listed in Appendix 2 of the [Statement of Community Involvement](#), were notified of the consultation. This includes a variety of stakeholders, such as town and parish councils, residents, landowners, developers, statutory consultees and other local planning authorities.
- 4.2 At the close of the consultation, the Council had received responses from 8 organisations and 2 residents.

## 5. What Were the Main Issues Raised During Consultation?

5.1 [Appendix 1](#) sets out in more detail a summary of the issues that were raised and how they have been addressed; as well as a limited number of changes to the SPD, where considered appropriate.

5.2 The main issues raised are as follows:

- Lincolnshire County Council requested that reference be made to consulting NCC's Historic Environment team to request a search of the Historic Environment Record.
- The Woodland Trust commended the Council for producing comprehensive guidance that recognises the fundamental importance of trees to Bassetlaw's landscape, ecology, and communities. They made recommendations to:
  - Provide measurable canopy cover targets
  - Strengthen alignment with the Local Nature Recovery Strategy
  - Enhance guidance for protection of ancient woodland and veteran trees
  - Strengthen biodiversity net gain integration
  - Strengthen the approach taken to tree lined streets
  - Enhance biosecurity and climate adaptation guidance
  - Strengthen guidance for the protection and enhancement of hedgerows
  - Enhance the value trees make to the historic environment
  - Amend guidance to extend tree management and maintenance periods
  - Establish a central tree database
  - Enhance replacement planting and tree categorisation guidance
- Anglian Water supported the SPD. Specifically, the recognition that trees can support water quality improvements. Also recognised that the delivery of infrastructure and tree planting needs to be compatible.
- Historic England requested that the SPD:
  - Makes greater reference to the role of heritage and the historic environment and how trees are valuable parts of the landscape.
  - Recognises that trees can be heritage features that contribute to heritage landscapes and that new development must protect the significance of these assets whilst recognising the need for appropriate species planting within the vicinity of heritage assets.
  - Should clarify the value of trees and hedgerows within Conservation Areas.

Appendix 1 – Summary of Consultation Responses and Changes Made to the SPD

Name/ Organisation	Content Summary	BDC Response	SPD Amendments
Environment Agency	No comments	-	-
Nottingham and Nottinghamshire Integrated Care Board	No comments	-	-
Lincolnshire County Council – Senior Historic Environment Officer	Pleased to see the inclusion of section 5.6 regarding trees and the historic environment. Recommend the inclusion of a sentence to advise those undertaking woodland schemes to contact the Nottinghamshire County Council Historic Environment Team to request a search of the record in order to identify any heritage assets that maybe affected by tree planting.	Section 5.6 has been amended to ensure tree planting and the historic environment is appropriately considered.	Add to paragraph 5.7: Nottinghamshire County Council’s Historic Environment Team can provide a search of the historic environment record to identify heritage assets that maybe affected by tree planting.
Natural England	No comments	-	-
Woodland Trust	<p>Commend the Council for producing comprehensive guidance that recognises the fundamental importance of trees to Bassetlaw's landscape, ecology, and communities.</p> <p>Bassetlaw's remarkable tree and woodland heritage — including over 10,000 hectares of woodland and 600 hectares of ancient woodland, nearly double the national average — represents an irreplaceable asset that must be protected and enhanced through the planning system. The northern extent of Sherwood Forest and the district's veteran trees are of national and international significance, contributing not only to local character and identity but also to critical ecological networks and climate resilience.</p> <p>This SPD provides a strong foundation for integrating trees into development processes, drawing appropriately on BS 5837:2012 and relevant national policy. However, to ensure the document delivers transformational outcomes for nature recovery, climate mitigation, and biodiversity enhancement, recommend strengthening several key areas. Recommendations are structured to enhance policy ambition, clarify protection standards, and ensure robust long-term stewardship.</p> <p><b>Section 2</b> The SPD effectively articulates the multiple benefits of trees and establishes the SPD's role in supporting Local Plan policies ST39 and ST48. The recognition of trees' contributions to climate mitigation, biodiversity, mental health, and place-making is commendable.</p> <p>Recommend the SPD explicitly embeds measurable canopy cover targets to provide clear benchmarks for success. Specifically:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 30% canopy cover target for all new developments, ensuring substantial tree integration from the outset rather than minimal compliance.</li> <li>• Progressive canopy cover increase across the district, with specific targets for urban areas, public land, and different development typologies.</li> <li>• Annual monitoring and public reporting of canopy cover changes, tree planting delivery, and survival rates to ensure accountability.</li> </ul> <p>The SPD should strengthen its strategic alignment with the Nottinghamshire Local Nature Recovery Strategy (LNRS) referenced in paragraph 3.12 by explicitly committing to the Lawton principles of creating "bigger, better, and more joined-up" habitats, ensuring tree planting and retention contributes to landscape-scale</p>	<p>The requirement for canopy cover targets for all development and for development typologies has not been considered or costed through the Local Plan process. At this stage the Council cannot introduce these requirements – they are considered to be new planning policy and an additional cost to development and can only be considered through the Local Plan process. However, the amount of trees planted under Policy ST48 will be reported annually in the AMR.</p> <p>To reinforce the links between the SPD and the LNRS additional text will be added to paragraph 3.12 to highlight the contribution trees and new planting can make to delivering the Lawton principle.</p>	<p>No change required.</p> <p>Add to last sentence of paragraph 3.12: <u>'landscape scale to contribute to delivering 'bigger, better and more joined up' habitats, ensuring tree planting and retention contributes to landscape-scale ecological connectivity.'</u></p>

Name/ Organisation	Content Summary	BDC Response	SPD Amendments
	<p>ecological connectivity. This should include specific guidance on creating and maintaining wildlife corridors through strategic tree and hedgerow networks.</p> <p>Recommend introducing a dedicated objective to protect and restore ancient woodland, ancient and veteran trees, and ancient hedgerows as irreplaceable features central to Bassetlaw's natural heritage and the district's identity as custodians of Sherwood Forest's legacy.</p> <p><b>Enhanced Protection for Ancient Woodland and Veteran Trees</b> Sections 5.8-5.12 correctly identify ancient woodland and veteran trees as requiring special consideration, referencing NPPF paragraph 193c and establishing buffer zone requirements (15x diameter or 5m beyond canopy for veteran trees). Recommend significantly strengthening the policy wording to reflect the absolute priority that must be given to irreplaceable habitats. Specifically, the SPD should adopt the recommended NPPF policy wording verbatim: "Development resulting in the loss or deterioration of ancient woodland, ancient or veteran trees should be refused unless there are wholly exceptional reasons, and a suitable compensation strategy exists."</p> <p>Paragraph 5.10 should be strengthened by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• stating that compensation cannot offset the loss of ancient woodland or veteran trees, and that any compensation strategy must be additional to - not a replacement for — protection.</li> <li>• clarifying that "wholly exceptional reasons" means circumstances of national infrastructure significance, not merely local economic benefit or development viability challenges.</li> <li>• requiring independent ancient woodland and veteran tree assessments for all applications within 500m of known or potential ancient woodland sites or veteran trees.</li> </ul> <p><b>Buffer Zones:</b> While 15x diameter buffers for veteran trees align with current guidance, recommend adopting 50m minimum buffer zones for ancient woodland, reflecting Natural England and Forestry Commission best practice. These buffers should:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• be free from development, storage, or construction activities.</li> <li>• maintain existing hydrology and avoid changes to water tables.</li> <li>• include ecological enhancements such as native woodland edge habitat creation.</li> <li>• be secured through planning conditions or S106 agreements with long-term management requirements.</li> </ul> <p>Strongly recommend Bassetlaw commits to a systematic programme of Tree Preservation Orders (TPOs) for all identified ancient and veteran trees, working with the Ancient Tree Inventory to map and protect them.</p> <p><b>Strengthening Biodiversity Net Gain Integration</b> Paragraph 3.7 references the 10% BNG requirement and notes that tree planting can contribute to net gain, cross-referring to a separate BNG SPD. To maximise the ecological value of tree-related interventions, recommend this SPD provides clearer guidance on BNG delivery through trees and woodland:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• minimum 20% BNG for all major developments (not just the statutory 10%), recognising that higher gains are achievable through strategic tree and woodland planting and that leading local authorities are adopting this higher threshold.</li> </ul>	<p>An SPD provides more detail about adopted Local Plan policies which appropriately recognise the status and value of ancient woodlands and their importance to Bassetlaw's heritage and identity.</p> <p>For clarity, paragraph 5.10 will be amended to explicitly align with national policy.</p> <p>For clarity, paragraph 5.10 will be amended to explicitly align with national policy. The Government's ancient woodland guidance makes no reference to a 500m standard therefore the SPD reflects national guidance. To ensure flexibility ancient woodland assessments will be requested in response to site specific conditions.</p> <p>The 15x diameter identified by the SPD aligns with Government guidance for ancient woodland and veteran trees. It is not considered appropriate to adopt a different buffer zone standard which would be introducing new policy which an SPD cannot do. The SPD explains the Council's expectations for buffer zones.</p> <p>The Council is currently reviewing its TPO register which includes ancient and veteran trees.</p> <p>The requirement for higher BNG, longer term maintenance and the Urban Greening Factor has not been considered or costed through the Local Plan process. At this stage the Council cannot introduce</p>	<p>No change required.</p> <p>Add paragraphs 5.17-5.23 to better align with the NPPF and provide more guidance about ancient and veteran woodland.</p> <p>Add paragraphs 5.17-5.23 to better align with the NPPF and provide more guidance about ancient and veteran woodland.</p> <p>No change required.</p> <p>No change required.</p> <p>No change required.</p>

Name/ Organisation	Content Summary	BDC Response	SPD Amendments
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 50-year maintenance and monitoring requirements for all BNG sites involving tree and woodland habitats, reflecting the time required for these habitats to mature and deliver ecological functionality.</li> <li>• reference the Urban Greening Factor approach for major developments, setting minimum scores (e.g. 0.4 for residential, 0.3 for commercial) that drive substantial tree canopy and vegetation coverage beyond minimum planning requirements.</li> <li>• exclusion of ancient woodland and veteran trees from net gain calculations, clearly stating that loss or deterioration of irreplaceable habitats always results in net biodiversity loss that cannot be compensated through the metric.</li> <li>• habitat-specific BNG delivery, prioritising woodland and hedgerow units within the local nature recovery network rather than accepting off-site trading that may deliver poor strategic outcomes.</li> </ul> <p>4. Comprehensive Tree Strategy and Canopy Cover Framework The SPD provides detailed guidance on tree surveys, protection, and incorporation (Sections 6-7) but lacks an overarching strategic framework for district-wide canopy enhancement. Strongly recommend Bassetlaw develops and embeds within this SPD a 16-year Tree and Woodland Action Plan that establishes clear targets and delivery mechanisms: Canopy Cover Targets:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 30% canopy cover in all new developments (residential and commercial), embedded as a design standard from the outset.</li> <li>• 25% canopy cover on Council-owned land by year 12, demonstrating public sector leadership.</li> <li>• progressive district-wide canopy increase of 7% over 16 years, with interim milestones and area-specific targets recognising different starting points in urban and rural contexts.</li> </ul> <p>Tree-Lined Streets: Paragraph 3.8 references NPPF paragraph 136 support for tree-lined streets. Recommend strengthening Section 8 by making tree-lined streets the default expectation for all new streets, with applicants required to demonstrate "clear and justified reasons" for any departure from this standard. Guidance should specify:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Minimum tree planting densities (e.g. one tree per 10-15m of street frontage).</li> <li>• Species selection criteria prioritising large-canopy native species where space allows.</li> <li>• Integration with SuDS through rain gardens and bioswales.</li> </ul> <p>To enhance biosecurity and climate adaptation, all tree planting should use UK and Ireland Sourced and Grown (UKISG)-certified stock from appropriate seed zones. This ensures genetic provenance suited to local conditions and reduces disease transmission risks. The SPD should:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Mandate UKISG certification for all trees planted through planning conditions.</li> <li>• Encourage establishment of local tree nurseries to support UKISG supply, provide local employment, and reduce transport emissions.</li> <li>• Provide guidance on species diversification to enhance resilience against pests, diseases, and climate change.</li> </ul>	<p>these requirements – they are considered to be new planning policy and an additional cost to development and can only be considered through the Local Plan process.</p> <p>The SPD recognises that ancient woodland and veteran trees are irreplaceable habitats and as such must have bespoke compensation agreed with the LPA, outside of the Metric, at a 4:1 ratio. Priorities for woodland and hedgerows will be informed by the LNRS and the availability of units within the local nature recovery network.</p> <p>The requirement for canopy cover targets for all development and for the district has not been considered or costed through the Local Plan process. At this stage the Council cannot introduce these requirements – they are considered to be new planning policy and an additional cost to development and can only be considered through the Local Plan process.</p> <p>The requirement for tree lined streets for all new streets has not been considered or costed through the Local Plan process. At this stage the Council cannot introduce these requirements – they are considered to be new planning policy and an additional cost to development and can only be considered through the Local Plan process. However, the new Bassetlaw Design Code contains various codes that promote tree planting within SUDS and within residential and commercial areas which reflects this point.</p> <p>Introducing a requirement to use UKISG trees would be introducing new policy which the SPD cannot do. However, the SPD can encourage the use of such stock. The establishment of local tree nurseries is not a matter for the SPD.</p>	<p>No change required.</p> <p>No change required.</p> <p>No change required.</p> <p>No change required.</p> <p>Add to paragraph 7.6: <u>The Council encourages the use of UK and Ireland Sourced and Grown (UKISG)-certified stock from appropriate seed zones. This ensures genetic provenance suited to local conditions and reduces disease transmission risks.</u></p>

Name/ Organisation	Content Summary	BDC Response	SPD Amendments
	<p>Recommend adoption of Tree Equity Mapping methodology to ensure tree planting prioritises areas with low canopy cover, high deprivation, and limited green space access. This should inform:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• strategic allocation of Council-led tree planting programmes.</li> <li>• prioritisation of off-site BNG contributions.</li> <li>• community engagement and stewardship initiatives in under-served neighbourhoods.</li> </ul> <p>Hedgerow Protection and Enhancement Paragraph 3.4 references the Hedgerow Regulations 1997, but the SPD lacks comprehensive guidance on hedgerow protection, assessment, and enhancement. Given hedgerows' critical importance for habitat connectivity, carbon storage, and landscape character, recommend a dedicated hedgerow policy section that includes:</p> <p>Protection Standards:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Recognition of ancient hedgerows as irreplaceable features requiring the same protection hierarchy as ancient woodland.</li> <li>• Presumption against loss of important hedgerows under the Hedgerow Regulations.</li> <li>• Requirement for expert hedgerow surveys using standard methodologies to assess age, ecological value, and historical significance.</li> </ul> <p>Replacement Ratios: Where hedgerow loss is unavoidable and justified:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• replacement ratio for non-ancient hedgerow losses (10m of new hedgerow for every m lost), reflecting the time required for ecological functionality to develop.</li> <li>• replacement hedgerows must use native, locally-appropriate species mixes with UKISG provenance.</li> </ul> <p>Management Requirements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• long-term management plans (minimum 30 years) for retained and new hedgerows.</li> <li>• guidance on hedgerow management techniques (e.g., laying, coppicing) that enhance structural diversity and ecological value.</li> <li>• integration with field margins, buffer strips, and wildlife corridors.</li> </ul> <p>Climate Resilience and Nature-Based Solutions Paragraph 7.3 recognises trees' role in urban cooling and climate adaptation, and Section 1.3 references Policy ST48 on climate change mitigation. To strengthen climate resilience outcomes, recommend:</p> <p>Nature-Based Solutions:</p>	<p>Priorities for tree planting will be informed by the recently adopted LNRS which aligns with the use of BNG contributions and would inform community and stewardship initiatives. Introducing Tree Equity Mapping would require the introduction of new planning policy which the SPD cannot cover.</p> <p>To recognise the value hedgerows have in Bassetlaw for nature, landscape and climate two new sections will be added to: set out the planning application requirements when hedgerows exist on or near to a site, and, to provide guidance about how to introduce new hedgerows through development.</p> <p>The BNG metric will be used to ensure replacement ratio of hedgerows is appropriate. This will be assessed by the Council's Ecologist and where appropriate Tree Officer. The SPD states that native species should be used and will encourage use of UKISG planting (as above).</p> <p>Management plans will cover the same timeframe as trees, 10 years. Additional guidance will be incorporated in the strengthened hedgerow section about management.</p>	<p>No change required.</p> <p>Add paragraphs 5.24-5.29 to provide more detailed guidance about hedgerows.</p> <p>For clarity, additional text will be added: <u>Where hedges are lost, Policy ST39 requires that suitable replacement planting or restoration of existing hedges, is carried out within the site or the locality including appropriate provision for maintenance and management. The aim of replacement planting or restoration should be to ensure that there is no overall reduction in hedgerow length and canopy in the locality.</u></p> <p><u>For many sites the Statutory Biodiversity Metric should be used to inform the type and amount of replacement planting or restoration required for hedgerow habitat. It should be applied in a way that reflects the requirement of Policy ST39 for suitable replacement planting or restoration.</u></p> <p>Add new paragraphs 7.7-7.10 to explain the Council's expectations for hedgerow management.</p>

Name/ Organisation	Content Summary	BDC Response	SPD Amendments
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• promotion of woodland and tree-based SuDS, including rain gardens, swales, and wet woodland creation for flood attenuation.</li> <li>• guidance on riparian tree planting along watercourses to reduce flood risk, improve water quality, and create ecological corridors.</li> <li>• integration of trees with green roofs and walls in urban intensification areas where ground-level planting is limited.</li> </ul> <p>Species Selection for Climate Adaptation: Expand paragraph 7.7-7.8 to include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• climate envelope modelling to select species resilient to projected future conditions.</li> <li>• guidance on diversification strategies (no single species exceeding 10% of total planting).</li> <li>• recognition of the value of native species for supporting specialist wildlife while acknowledging some non-native climate-adapted species may have roles in specific contexts.</li> </ul> <p>Carbon Sequestration: Clearer articulation of trees' carbon storage benefits, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• estimated carbon sequestration rates for different woodland types and planting densities.</li> <li>• recognition of ancient woodland and veteran trees as high-carbon-density habitats.</li> <li>• integration with carbon accounting in planning decisions for major developments.</li> </ul> <p>Heritage and Historic Landscapes Sections 5.6-5.7 and paragraph 7.12 address heritage considerations, including impacts on scheduled monuments and conservation areas. Support these provisions and recommend:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• early engagement with Historic England and the Council's Conservation team for all applications affecting heritage assets, integrated into pre-application advice processes.</li> <li>• specific guidance on parkland and historic landscape tree assessment, recognising veteran trees and ancient woodland in historic parks as having dual heritage and ecological significance.</li> <li>• recognition that appropriate tree planting can enhance heritage settings by restoring historic landscape features, screening inappropriate development, and reinforcing landscape character.</li> </ul>	<p>Design matters including for trees within new development and through SUDS is covered by the Bassetlaw Design Code.</p> <p>Species selection is addressed by the SPD. But for clarity additional text will be included to provide more detail, including for street trees. The SPD cannot introduce a requirement for no single species to exceed 10% of the total planting as this is new policy.</p> <p>The approach taken to new tree planting required as a consequence of development to mitigate the impacts of climate change is set out in the Planning Obligations SPD.</p> <p>A sentence will be added to clarify expectations for pre-application/application engagement with Historic England and the Council's Conservation team. A sentence will be added to clarify that specific landscape and tree assessments may be required for proposals affecting historic parks. A new paragraph will be added to strengthen the value of trees in the historic environment.</p>	<p>No change required.</p> <p>Add new paragraphs 8.8-8.9 to provide additional guidance about species selection.</p> <p>No change required.</p> <p>Add the following to section 5.7 and 5.8: <u>Tree planting proposals should ensure that heritage assets (designated and non-designated) and their settings are appropriately conserved and enhanced through proposals. Careful consideration should be given to setting and visual experience of heritage assets, especially in key views from and to heritage assets. Nottinghamshire County Council's Historic Environment Team can provide a search of the historic environment record to identify heritage assets that maybe affected by tree planting.</u></p> <p><u>Trees may impact listed buildings, so affect the setting of listed buildings. Therefore, it will be necessary to consult with the Council's Conservation team regarding new tree planting where a listed building is present or adjacent to the development site.</u></p> <p><u>Tree planting would usually be inappropriate within scheduled monuments and would require separate Scheduled Monument Consent. Historic England should be consulted in relation</u></p>

Name/ Organisation	Content Summary	BDC Response	SPD Amendments
	<p>Sections 6.27-6.30 and 9.1-9.4 address aftercare conditions, long-term management plans, and maintenance requirements. To ensure planted trees reach maturity and deliver intended benefits, recommend:</p> <p>Extended Maintenance Periods:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• minimum 10-year establishment period with active management, as proposed, but with clearer enforcement mechanisms.</li> <li>• consideration of 15-year maintenance for large-canopy species that require longer establishment periods.</li> <li>• clear responsibility in S106 agreements specifying who manages trees, funding mechanisms (e.g. commuted sums), and trigger points for intervention.</li> </ul> <p>Monitoring and Enforcement:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• establishment of a central tree database tracking all trees planted, protected, and removed through the planning system.</li> <li>• annual public reporting on tree planting delivery, survival rates, canopy cover changes, and BNG habitat creation.</li> <li>• arboricultural site monitoring (paragraph 6.26) should be a condition for all major developments, with regular reporting to the Council's Tree Officer.</li> </ul> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• enforcement protocols for breaches of Tree Protection Plans, including stop notices and requirement for compensatory planting at 3:1 ratios.</li> </ul> <p>Community Engagement:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• guidance on community involvement in tree planting and stewardship, building local ownership and long-term care capacity.</li> <li>• recognition of volunteer groups, tree wardens, and community orchards as partners in delivery.</li> </ul> <p>Technical Refinements and Clarifications</p>	<p>The SPD provides for a standard 10 year maintenance period. However, highlighting provision of a 15 year maintenance plan for larger canopy trees in some circumstances will be added.</p> <p>The details of S106 agreements will be determined on a site specific basis to enable positive management and delivery of tree management.</p> <p>The Council will be introducing an annual monitoring system for trees through the AMR. This is a publicly available document so there is no need for additional public reporting.</p> <p>Monitoring of new trees forms part of BNG monitoring so will be covered through that monitoring process. Further information is within the Biodiversity Net Gain SPD.</p> <p>Enforcement protocols are better covered through the Council's overarching enforcement protocol.</p> <p>Whilst community involvement in tree planting is an important mechanism, the SPD is designed to provide further guidance on tree planting through new development, and not to provide guidance for communities about tree planting.</p>	<p><u>to any proposals in and around scheduled monuments.</u></p> <p><u>Planting may also be inappropriate in areas of non-designated archaeology. Local authority archaeological advisors should be consulted where proposals may affect non-designated archaeology.</u></p> <p><u>Some woodlands were planted in designed parks and gardens. The ecological value of these woodlands varies. Some may include areas of ancient woodland or wood pasture, and many are long-established. Some are more recent. Their landscape and heritage value are often significant. A map of registered historic parks and gardens can be viewed online on the Defra Magic map system: <a href="https://magic.defra.gov.uk/">https://magic.defra.gov.uk/</a>. Specific tree and landscape assessments may be required for proposals in these locations.</u></p> <p>Add to paragraph 6.30: <u>Where large-canopy species that require longer establishment periods are proposed a longer term maintenance plan covering a 15-year period may be required.</u></p> <p>No change required.</p> <p>No change required.</p> <p>No change required.</p> <p>No change required.</p> <p>No change required.</p>

Name/ Organisation	Content Summary	BDC Response	SPD Amendments
	<p>Tree Categorisation: Paragraph 6.14 references the tree categorisation system (U, A, B, C) but could be strengthened by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• explicit statement that Category A and B trees should be retained wherever possible, with loss requiring exceptional justification.</li> <li>• guidance that layouts should be designed around high-quality trees rather than expecting engineering solutions to mitigate conflicts.</li> </ul> <p>Compensation for Tree Loss: Paragraph 6.31 addresses replacement planting but should specify:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• minimum replacement ratios (e.g. 2:1 for Category B trees, 3:1 for Category A trees) based on ecological value.</li> <li>• size specifications for replacement trees aligned with BS 8545:2014.</li> <li>• financial contributions where on-site replacement is not feasible, calculated to deliver equivalent canopy cover and ecological value off-site.</li> </ul>	<p>The SPD highlights that replacement planting must follow the specifications set out in BS 8545:2014. It is not necessary to repeat the details in the SPD. However, new text will be added to clarify the approach to be taken to replacement planting and links to the BNG metric. Financial contributions are covered by the Planning Obligations SPD.</p>	<p>Add new paragraph: <u>The aim of replacement planting should be to ensure that there is no overall reduction in canopy cover, or the contribution made by trees to amenity in the locality and that both should be restored within a reasonable timescale. The canopy of a large tree can't be replaced within a reasonable timescale by planting a single tree, irrespective of the size of planting stock. Achieving a 'like for like' replacement of tree canopy will often require the planting of multiple trees. The level and type of planting that is appropriate will need to be assessed on a case-by-case basis.</u></p> <p><u>On larger sites the Statutory Biodiversity Metric will be the appropriate mechanism for establishing the amount of replacement planting required (for urban trees using the 'urban tree' habitat metric) provided that its application is informed by the requirements of Policy ST39.</u></p>
<b>Anglian Water</b>	<p>Supports the SPD in:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Its identification that trees can support water quality improvements and flood prevention</li> <li>• Highlighting that groundworks including utility excavations can damage tree roots</li> <li>• Identifying that water resources and the water table can impact tree health</li> <li>• Recognising that tree planting – depending on selected species – may need on going watering</li> <li>• Requiring developers to consider utility access in tree planting scheme design</li> </ul>	<p>Support welcome and noted.</p>	<p>No change required.</p>
<b>Resident</b>	<p>In danger of ruining North Notts with over-development. There appears to be little consideration for wildlife, green spaces, and halting spiralling pollution, water shortages, and congestion. Only designated brown land should now be built on. This insatiable drive for "economic growth" is a ruinous and unsustainable fallacy.</p>	<p>The SPD provides further guidance to protect and enhance tree cover in the district through new development. The SPD reinforces the approach taken in the Local Plan to habitat connectivity, enhancing open spaces, delivering nature based solutions for water management and providing climate resilience.</p>	<p>No change required.</p>
<b>Resident</b>	<p>Both good plans in theory</p>	<p>Support welcome and noted.</p>	<p>No change required.</p>
<b>Coal Authority</b>	<p>No comments</p>	<p>-</p>	<p>-</p>
<b>Historic England</b>	<p>Section 1.1: would benefit from a reference to the role of heritage and heritage landscapes and how trees are a valuable part of heritage landscapes.</p> <p>Section 2.1: trees can contribute to conserving and enhancing the historic environment, restoring heritage features and landscapes and creating the heritage landscapes of the future.</p> <p>Section 3.4: welcome a reference to historic hedgerows and their role within designed landscapes and heritage landscapes and the need to protect and conserve these important heritage features.</p>	<p>For clarity, heritage will be added to 1.1.</p> <p>Heritage is covered by the last bullet point. For clarity, a new bullet point will be added to focus on the historic environment and trees.</p> <p>Support welcome and noted.</p>	<p>Add: but also for their role in supporting biodiversity and nature recovery, enhancing <u>heritage</u>, ...</p> <p>Add new bullet point: <u>Contribute to local heritage. Trees can conserve and enhance the historic environment, restoring heritage features and landscapes and creating the heritage landscapes of the future.</u></p> <p>No change required.</p>

Name/ Organisation	Content Summary	BDC Response	SPD Amendments
	<p>Section 5.1: could address how new development should respond to existing trees and hedgerows and ensure that these are protected, as well as looking at new tree planting. Any new planting should consider its local environment and be appropriate in the context of the wider historic environment.</p> <p>Section 5.3: consider strengthening the wording. Every effort should be made to ensure these trees are protected rather than considered.</p> <p>Section 5.6: consider breaking this down into two paragraphs. Firstly, consider trees and hedgerows as heritage features contributing to and becoming heritage landscapes, and the need for new development to protect the significance of these heritage features/assets. Any loss of these heritage features should be resisted and every effort made for their retention. Then consider, wider heritage assets and the role of trees/ hedgerows in contributing to their significance and the need to protect them for the value they add to heritage assets. Lastly, consider a paragraph on the potential pitfalls of trees/hedgerows and the need for appropriate species planting and maintenance within the vicinity of heritage assets.</p> <p>Welcome the reference to Conservation Areas, and it should be clear what the value of trees and hedgerows within Conservation Areas can be, adding to their significance and local distinctiveness. Every effort should be made to ensure their retention and for any new planting to be appropriate in the context of the historic environment. A reference should be included to relevant Conservation Area Appraisals and Management Plans.</p> <p>Section 6.14: does this take into consideration the historic environment?</p> <p>Section 6: a heritage assessment may be required to accompany a planning application, depending on the nature and scale of works.</p> <p>Section 7.5: would benefit from additional detail regarding how development proposals need to consider and respond to the historic environment and the significance of heritage assets.</p> <p>Section 7.8: add in historic environment.</p> <p>Section 7.12: should reference the significance of heritage assets.</p> <p>Welcome section 7.13.</p>	<p>For clarity paragraph 5.1 will be re-worded to provide clearer links to the approach taken by the Bassetlaw Design Code. This includes references to the historic environment.</p> <p>For clarity paragraph 5.3 will be re-worded to emphasise the importance of protecting existing mature trees on sites.</p> <p>The emphasis of paragraph 5.6 is tree planting and heritage assets. To strengthen the SPD additional text will ensure the role existing trees make to historic environments is recognised.</p> <p>For clarity, additional text will be included to emphasise the contribution trees make to Conservation Areas, and how new planting should be approached.</p> <p>The tree categorisation method is used to assess trees for planning, ecological, or forestry purposes, for retention, based on condition, species, value, and remaining life. The Tree Officer and Conservation Officer will ensure that contribution to heritage is captured within the survey process.</p> <p>For clarity reference to a heritage assessment will be made in paragraph 6.9.</p> <p>For clarity, add new bullet point to reference the historic environment.</p> <p>This is covered by new bullet point identified above.</p> <p>For clarity, the first sentence of paragraph 7.12 will be changed accordingly.</p> <p>Support welcome and noted.</p>	<p>Reframe first sentence to: Development should seek to enhance local character and positively respond to a site's context, including the wider historic and natural environment.</p> <p>Change paragraph 5.3 to: Where there are existing mature trees on a proposed development site, or immediately adjacent which could be impacted by a proposal, <u>their retention and protection</u> within the overall layout of the development, should be the aim wherever possible, preferably in public areas.</p> <p>Add new paragraph 5.7: <u>Additionally, trees of high landscape or heritage value are important features in their own right. Their loss or other negative effects should be avoided, for example by selecting an alternative site for development or designing the scheme to avoid harm. The removal of trees, or works to trees, may also have consequences for the visual historic environment, the character of landscape or townscape or the setting of heritage assets. It is important that their contribution for the value they add to heritage assets is recognised and protected.</u></p> <p>Add new text: <u>Trees and hedgerows can add to the value, significance and local distinctiveness of Conservation Areas. Every effort should be made to ensure their retention. Where new planting is appropriate reference should be made to the relevant Conservation Area Appraisals and Management Plans.</u></p> <p>No change required.</p> <p>Add to paragraph 6.2: <u>Depending on the nature and scale of the proposal, a heritage/ecological assessment may be required to accompany a planning application.</u></p> <p>Add: <u>The proposal positively responds to the historic environment and the significance of heritage assets in determining the most appropriate design solution</u></p> <p>No change required.</p> <p>Change to: Tree planting should ensure that <u>the significance of heritage assets and their settings</u> are appropriately conserved and enhanced.</p> <p>No change required.</p>