



## **Development Management in Birmingham Examination**

### **Birmingham City Council Hearing Statement**

#### **Matter 3: Environment and Sustainability Policies**

**October 2020**



contained in the adopted Birmingham Development Plan (EBD1).

**Q26. Is there any overlap between Policy DM2 and Policy DM10 of the Plan?**

26.1 Yes, there is overlap. Point 3 of DM10 relates to separation distances, which can

## Policy DM4 Landscaping and Trees

### Q31. Is the Policy consistent with national policy? Do the proposed amendments by the Council address the shortcomings in this respect?

- 31.1 Yes. DM4 is consistent with national policy. See Trees Background Note (EBD31). Paragraph 170 of the NPPF states that planning policies and decisions should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by protecting and enhancing valued landscapes and recognise the benefit of trees and woodland. (Paraphrased).
- 31.2 Paragraph 175 also states that *development resulting in the loss or deterioration of irreplaceable habitats (such as ancient woodland and ancient or veteran trees) should be refused, unless there are wholly exceptional reasons and a suitable*
- 31.3 Policy DM4 is consistent with the NPPF in encouraging development to take opportunities to provide high quality landscapes that enhance the landscape character and green infrastructure network of the city.
- 31.4 Policy DM4 supports the objectives of the NPPF by requiring development proposals to *quality, woodland, and/or hedgerows of visual or nature conservation value, including but not limited to trees or woodland which are subject to a Tree Preservation Order,* Where development would result in the loss of any trees, woodland or hedgerows, adequate replacement planting will be required.
- 31.5 The Council has proposed changes to the policy and supporting text (CSD4 Schedule of Proposed Minor Changes) but would like to propose additional changes to Part 3 of the policy to ensure complete consistency with the NPPF as below.
- 31.6 Further proposed change to Part 3 of DM4:  
~~Development proposals must seek to avoid the loss of, and minimise the risk of harm to, existing trees, woodland, and/or hedgerows of visual or nature conservation value, including but not limited to trees or woodland which are subject to a Tree Preservation Order or which are designated as~~ **Development resulting in the loss or deterioration of Ancient Woodland or Ancient/ Veteran Trees will be refused, unless there are wholly exceptional reasons and a suitable compensation strategy exists.** Where trees and/or woodlands are proposed to be lost as a part of development, this loss must be justified as a part of an Arboricultural Impact Assessment (AIA) submitted with the application.+

### Q32.



not clear in the policy, so the Council is amenable to clarifying this in the supporting

**Q39. Should the Policy recognise and give value to the ecological and landscape value of lost trees?**

39.1 The CAVAT methodology takes into account the landscape value of a tree, thus the policy recognises and give value to the landscape value of lost trees. It does not,

42.3 Ú[ |æ ÁÚĜ ĀU •cā cā|^Ā^ā @[ ˇ!@[ ā•qĭ Ā@ĀÖÜĀ# [ Ā^ˇ ā^•Ā#Ā^, Ā

