

## **Arboricultural implication assessment of planning application**

**Application No:** HPK/2015/0573

**Site location :** Buxton

**Case Officer:** Karen Taylor

**Date of report :** 21/1/2016

### **1. Brief**

1.1 I have been asked by Development Control provide revised comments on the above application in relation to the following:

- a) The quality and provision of information in support of the application in relation to trees and landscape.
- b) The presence of any trees important for amenity and or biodiversity.
- c) Direct and indirect Implications for all tree cover on and adjacent to the site.
- d) Compliment with BS 5837 (2012) Trees in relation to Construction.
- e) Compliance with appropriate policy and guidance in particular the Council's own planning and tree policies.
- f) The sustainability and appropriateness of the proposed landscaping

1.2 Following the assessment I will make recommendations with regards to the following.

- a) Whether on arboricultural grounds the application should be approved or refused.
- b) If approved what conditions should be applied.
- c) If refused what action would be required to make application acceptable.
- d) Whether any Tree Preservation Orders should be made.

### **2. Background information**

2.1 Following a search of the Council's GIS information available and the application and supporting evidence the following relevant information in relation to the site has been identified. If the planners are aware of any further relevant facts they should bring these to my attention.

<b>Designation</b>	<b>On site</b>	<b>Off Site</b>
Tree preservation Order	DCC TPO NO 54	No
Conservation Area	No	No
Landscape Character region	Settled Valley pastures	Settled Valley pastures
ESA, SPA, SSSI Peak District National Park	No	Yes

### 3. The application and supporting information

- 3.1 The application is for proposed residential development comprising 15 dwellings, access, landscaping and associated works (including demolition of existing buildings).
- 3.2 This is not an exhaustive list of all documentation supplied with the application only the key documents referred to in this assessment. Omission from this list does not infer that the documents have not been considered to only that it has not been directly referred to in this report.

Document	Reference	Dated or stamped
Tree survey (Plan)	Arboricultural Constraints Plan No.2748/DR.12 - 100.	Dec 12
	Arboricultural Constraints Plan – TEP D5318.001 - 4	9/10/2015
Arboricultural Constraints Report	ACS constraints plan /Tree protection plan LDS258-02D	April 2013
Drainage strategy -h Betts associates	PER33 -101	August 2015
Landscaping scheme	LDS 258 –01E	April 2013

- 3.3 The tree survey provided limited information about the trees on the site and is no 3 years out of date (December 2012) and it refers to the now superseded BS5837 (2005).
- 3.4 Revised tree constraints plans have been provided with this application.

### 4. The trees

- 4.1 There many mature trees on the site principally beech, lime and sycamore which are protected by a TPO. The trees are in a prominent location on elevated land. The trees at the entrance and adjacent to the existing driveway form a prominent landscape feature. These trees are important in landscape and amenity terms. These are categorised in the arboricultural constraints report as category B trees (as defined by BS5837), there is a case for them to be considered as category A trees. Indeed the report at 3.04 agrees that the trees at the entrance to the site are of high amenity

*they have a high visual amenity being particularly prominent from the surrounding A roads and moorland footpaths.*

4.2 Given the maturity of the trees they are also important for biodiversity with the potential for bat roosts and other niche habitats. Several trees are identified in the Ecological assessment report as having potential for bat roost.

## 5. Impact of proposals on trees

5.1 The proposal includes the removal of 11 trees and 2 groups. 8 of the trees to be felled are mature specimens being removed to accommodate this development. A summary of the trees is given below in table 1

**Table 1**

<b>Tree No</b>	<b>Species</b>	<b>Proposals</b>	<b>Bat potential</b>	<b>DBH</b>
803	Sycamore	Retain	Cat 3	650
804	Beech	Retain - remove dead limb	Cat 3	650
805	Beech	Previously down to be felled Fell (2012) assuming that the recent constraints plan supersedes this and the tree is now to be retained.	Cat 2	1070
806	Sycamore	Retain remove deadwood	Cat 3	790
807	Beech	Retain remove deadwood	Cat 3	670
808	Lime	Retain	Cat 3	600
809	Lime	Previously down to be felled Fell (2012) assuming that the recent constraints plan supersedes this and the tree is now to be retained.	Cat 3	600
<b>810</b>	<b>Cypress</b>	<b>Fell low landscape value</b>	<b>Cat 3</b>	
811	Lime	Retain - remove deadwood	Cat 3	700
812	Lime	Retain	Cat 3	700
813	Lime	Retain - remove deadwood	Cat 3	600
814	Sycamore	Retain	Cat 3	600
815	Sycamore	Retain	Cat 3	250
816	Ash	Retain	Cat 3	350
818	Sycamore	Retain	Cat 3	600
819	Sycamore	Previously down to be felled Fell (2012) assuming that the recent constraints plan supersedes this and the tree is now to be retained.	Cat 3	150
820	Sycamore	Previously down to be felled Fell (2012) assuming that the recent constraints plan supersedes this and the tree is now to be retained.	Cat 3	285 Ms
821	Beech	Trees has failed and no longer present – should be replaced as part of landscaping.	<b>Cat 2</b>	1105
822	Cypress x8	No neighbours land they intend to fell.	Cat 3	300
823	Sycamore	The arboricultural method statement states that this tree is to be retained and suggests that its is possible to protect the trees rooting area with ground protection .  This contradicts the drainage proposals which should the plan in this area graded. Within 50% of the rooting area. Given the levels on site I consider that the Arboricultural method statement needs to	Cat 3	600

		specialy address these changes in level		
<b>824</b>	<b>Sycamore</b>	<b>Fell to accommodate development</b>	<b>Cat 3</b>	<b>660</b>
825	Beech	Retain	Cat 3	860
<b>826</b>	<b>Sycamore</b>	<b>Fell to accommodate development</b>	<b>Cat 3</b>	<b>770</b>
<b>827</b>	<b>Sycamore</b>	<b>Fell to accommodate development</b>	<b>Cat 3</b>	<b>670</b>
<b>828</b>	<b>Sycamore</b>	<b>Fell to accommodate development</b>	<b>Cat 3</b>	<b>640</b>
829	Group syc and willow		Cat 3	
830	Lime	Retain	Cat 3	850
831	Lime	Retain	Cat 3	600
832	Lime	Retain remove deadwood	Cat 3	560
833	Lime	Retain remove deadwood	Cat 3	555
834	Beech	Retain	Cat 3	740
835	Beech	Retain	Cat 2	880
836	Beech	Previously down to be felled Fell (2012) assuming that the recent constraints plan supersedes this and the tree is now to be retained.	Cat 2	1180
837	Beech	Previously down to be felled Fell (2012) assuming that the recent constraints plan supersedes this and the tree is now to be retained.	Cat 3	830

- 5.2 The majority of the mature trees on site are being retained and more are shown to retained than previous application.
- 5.3 Previous application indicated that 39 trees were to be planted the new application has increased the planting of heavy standard to 72.
- 5.4 Some tree works were recommended as part of the arboricultural report 2012 plan. Any tree works required should form part of a method statement if the application is approved or an application should be made Derbyshire County Council
- 5.5 The existing access is to be retained as a pedestrian access only. The impact of this will be significantly less than the previous proposals which indicated that this would be the main vehicle access. However any works within the root protection area as defined by BS5837:2012 will need to use a no dig technique and be subject to a specific condition.
- 5.6 There are significant changes in level across the site and localised undulations that will make it extremely difficult if not impossible to retain the existing ground level adjacent to roads and properties. These changes in level area most critical adjacent to the following trees
- 830-834 The new access encroaches into the RPA of these trees. The method statement indicates no dig techniques will be used. However its does not adequately address fully how this will fit with the changes in level across the site.

The method statement only says:

*Finished levels of adjacent ground will be designed to tie in with the CCS surface (this may be higher than would otherwise be specified).*

- The drainage proposals indicate a drain along this access which would – if laid in a trench – would negate the use of no dig techniques in this area
- The RPA of T825 is encroached upon by construction of plots 6-8 and also the drainage proposals which show this area as being graded to address the changes of level. Whether the successful retention of this tree, the best individual specimen on the site, is possible is very much in doubt. If approval is granted a specific condition will be required for this tree to ensure that the developer finds a solution to the changes in level that do not impinge in to the RPA of this tree.

5.7 The trees lining the driveway will come under pressure for drastic tree surgery or felling once the development is constructed. It is unclear who will be responsible for their management. These are mature trees and will require regular inspection and pruning to limit the risk from falling branches. Which will affect the users of the access and the gardens of neighbouring properties. Whilst the actual risk may be relatively low, the loss of limbs from trees naturally is perceived by the public and near by residents much higher than it is and can cause significant distress.

Although the trees are to the north of the properties and will not impact on direct sunlight they will have an overall impact on the regards of plots 1-3. Minor nuisances such as falling leaves and debris from the trees in conjunction with the perceived threat will increase pressure for inappropriate pruning or felling of the trees.

## **6. Summary and recommendations**

6.1 The proposals as set out in the application would have a negative impact on these mature protected trees and landscape must be considered as such as part of any decision as it would be contrary to local plan policy OC10 - trees and woodlands.

6.2 The impact on the trees is divided into 2 parts the immediate effect of the removal of trees and the long term impact of the proposal on the remaining tree cover. I consider that the later will have the greatest impact. The information provided is not sufficient to demonstrate the protected trees can be retained.

- 6.3 The proximity of construction within the vicinity of T825 needs consideration, in relation to the levels and the amount of the RPA impinged on by construction.
- 6.4 If an approval is given to this scheme I recommend that the following is considered.
- The drainage strategy as set out not approved and an alternative scheme is provided which avoids the root protection area or clearly demonstrates how damage to the root system is avoided.
  - A condition requiring that an amended Arboricultural method statement is to be re submitted with:
    1. Confirmation that an engineer as has approved the no dig specification fit for purpose.
    2. Inclusion of the supervision of the construction of the no dig surface by a suitably qualified arboricultural in liaison with the LPA.
    3. Details of how construction traffic will be managed to minimise impact on the trees.
    4. Any changes of ground level within RPA's
    5. A baseline risk assessment of the trees to be retained and the works required to minimise risk.

## **8. Conditions**

If approved please contact me with regards to conditions because I consider that there are a couple of issues that need specifically worded conditions to address the issues encountered

**Monica Gillespie**  
**Arboricultural Officer**  
**High Peak Borough Council**