



Canopy Cover Supplementary Planning Document (SPD)

Statement of Consultation

November 2019

Consultation Statement for the Canopy Cover SPD

Contents

1. Introduction
2. SPD preparation and early stakeholder and community engagement
3. Who and how did we consult when preparing the supplementary planning document
4. Summary of the main issues raised by stakeholders during the preparation of this draft SPD, and how those issues have been addressed in the supplementary planning document

1. Introduction

This statement sets out the work involved in preparing the SPD and how the Council has involved the community and various stakeholders in preparing the Canopy Cover SPD.

In line with Regulation 12 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) 2012 regulations and with Wycombe Revised Statement of Community Involvement (July 2018), this statement provides details of:

- (i) the persons the local planning authority consulted when preparing the supplementary planning document;
- (ii) a summary of the main issues raised by those persons; and
- (iii) how those issues have been addressed in the supplementary planning document

After the consultation on the draft SPD, this consultation statement will be updated to reflect the feedback received and how this has been taken into account into the final version of the SPD. The final consultation statement will be published alongside the SPD for adoption.

2. SPD preparation and early stakeholder and community engagement

The Wycombe District Local Plan was adopted on 19 August 2019. This Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) provides detailed guidance to assist applicants with achieving canopy cover requirements as set out in policy DM34: Delivering Green Infrastructure and Biodiversity in Development.

This SPD, once adopted, will form a material consideration when determining planning applications.

The SPD covers all types of new development. Outside of town centres and on sites of half a hectare or more, a canopy coverage of 25% is required. On other sites, either within the town centres or less than half a hectare, the requirement is to maximise opportunities for canopy cover.

Presentations of the proposed contents of the Supplementary Planning Document were given to an Agents' Panel and a Community Panel on 11th September 2019. The presentations were followed by a question and answer session. This report sets out the questions asked and the Council's response to them.

Section 3 sets out in more detail who we consulted on the draft proposals for the SPD and how we did this.

Section 4 sets out the main issues raised during the SPD preparation and how we have taken these into account when preparing the draft SPD for consultation.

3. Who and how did we consult when preparing the supplementary planning document

As set out above, representatives of the Agent’s Panel and Community Panel were invited to attend a presentation at the Council Offices in Wycombe on 11th September to find out about the proposed content of the Canopy Cover SPD and to attend a question and answer session. The Agent’s Panel consists of local agents with an interest in planning in the Wycombe area. The Community Panel is made up of local representatives and stakeholders, including Housing Associations and the Chiltern Conservation Board. 13 local Agents attended the event and 6 people attend the Community Panel event.

4. Summary of the main issues raised by stakeholders during the preparation of this draft SPD, and how those issues have been addressed in the supplementary planning document

Issues and Comments	Council Response
Issue of timing, it is too front loaded. Other factors only have to be satisfied that they can be achieved, without knowing the full details.	Common issue for all technical documents, we need to be satisfied that the requirements of the policy can be met before giving Planning Permission.
Services/utilities might not be known at that time, (services have 3-month assessment period), that will impact on where trees can be located.	There are lots of factors affecting design, it all needs to be integrated and resolved upfront otherwise there can be no certainty that trees can be delivered.
SUDs much more difficult to position when compared to trees which is agreed later in the process. Could be forced to put SUDs all in one area, SUDs shouldn’t be directed by trees.	SuDS need to be considered alongside landscape features as they functions together when well designed. Trees can also be designed with the SUDS. Following proper process allows certainty of what will be delivered. See figure 2 of the SPD.
Planning permission getting more and more costly, clients can’t afford. It will put developers off from developing in Wycombe.	Some technical detail can be left to condition if we know delivery is feasible.
Full details for 25% should be treated by conditions.	It is only canopy cover within the site boundary that counts, irrespective of the location of the trunk. See ‘Canopy Cover Reductions K to N’ and Figure 16.
Clarity on how existing trees which are outside the site ownership but overhang into the site.	It is only canopy cover within the site boundary that counts, irrespective of the location of the trunk. See ‘Canopy Cover Reductions K to N’ and Figure 16.

Issues and Comments	Council Response
Need to be clear where it is appropriate to overlay trees. Urban planting is much more expensive.	Guidance on this is set out in 'Canopy Cover Reductions K to N' and Figure 16.
What happens if during the process of gaining planning permission the tree(s) are removed?	No single rule for what will happen if a tree is removed during planning process. Most likely that the loss will have to be made up with new canopy cover.
How would you incorporate a porous SUDs area with trees? Need to know these technicalities. SUDs need to align with trees SPD, particularly for Wycombe which is hilly.	Technical design details to be supplied by applicant. Further detail on this matter is set out in spreadsheet 3. New Canopy Cover, column M – reduction in soil volume and paragraph 3.3.23 – 3.3.25.
Policy could result in gardens being too shaded.	The aim would be to get a good balance through the location of new trees. Layout of new trees is discussed in section 3.3 of the SPD.
Issues for security putting trees in car parks.	Better treed locations have less crime. CCTV does not take precedence. See paragraph 3.3.17 of the SPD for further detail.
Will this policy affect conversions and change of use?	The policy threshold is for 25% in sites of over 0.5 ha and not in town centres, for sites outside of this the requirement is to only 'maximise'. This is most likely to be relevant for conversions and change of use.
How are you considering the site area? Whole area or net developable area?	Guidance on this is set out in Figure 9, and section 2.7 of the SPD. And Worksheet 1 – Summary tab of Canopy Calculator
Need to make clear the differences between 0.6 volume and other technical standard.	0.6m ³ is simplified rule of thumb calculation. The Canopy Calculator Spreadsheet has more appropriate calculation method based on work by Lindsey and Bassuk, so 0.6m ³ is no longer needed.
Need to be clear on what is a town centre.	A map of the three town centres is provided in figure 1 and in appendix 3.