



**Peak Tree Consultancy**

---

# Arboricultural Impact Assessment Review

**Site:** Land at Hole House Mill Marple Road Chisworth SK13 5DH

**Site Ref:** PTC/2318

**Prepared for:** High Peak Borough Council

**HPBC Ref:**HPK/2023/0118

**Date:**3/8/2023

**Ref No:** PTC/2318 /003.01



## Contact Details

Peak Tree Consultancy  
106 Mottram Road, Broadbottom, Cheshire SK146BB  
Tel:  
Email:

## Report Dates

|            | Date     | Ref            | Author           | Status    |
|------------|----------|----------------|------------------|-----------|
| Site visit | 2/8/2023 |                | Monica Gillespie | Completed |
| Report     | 3/8/2023 | PTC/2316/003.2 | Monica Gillespie | Completed |

## Limitations

The contents of this report are valid for 12 months. The information collected in relation to the trees is adequate for the purposes of this report only. This report has been prepared for the exclusive use of the commissioning client and unless otherwise agreed in writing by Peak Tree Consultancy Ltd. No other party may use or rely on the contents of the report. No liability is accepted by Peak Tree Consultancy Ltd. for any use of this report, other than for the purposes for which it was originally prepared and provided. No warranty, express or implied, is made as to the advice in this report. The content of this report is partly based on information provided by third parties. Unless otherwise stated, information obtained from any third party has not been independently verified by Peak Tree Consultancy Ltd.



## Contents

---

### Summary

- 1.0 Introduction
- 2.0 The Site and the Application
- 3.0 Arboricultural Impact of the Proposals
- 4.0 Proposed Mitigation
- 5.0 Conclusions and Recommendations



## 1.0 Introduction

- 1.1 **Instruction:** This Arboricultural Impact Assessment review was commissioned by High Peak Borough Council in relation to a planning application for demolition of existing mill outbuildings and conversion/erection of 25 no dwellings with associated car parking, landscaping and highway works at Hole House Mill, Marple Road, Chisworth (referred to as 'The Site'). We have been instructed to:
- Review the arboricultural information submitted with the application and ensure its compliance with BS5837:2012 – Trees in Relation to Design, Demolition and Construction - Recommendations (BS5837:2012) local and national planning policy.
  - Review other relevant submitted information where this specifically impacts upon trees on the site and / or the proposed arboricultural tree protection and or mitigation.
- 1.2 **National Planning Policy:** The Local Planning Authority (LPA) has a statutory obligation to ensure adequate provision is made for the preservation of trees through section 197 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990. The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) 2012 and subsequent revisions, sets out the government's planning policies for England and how these are expected to be applied.
- 1.3 **Local Plan Policy:** High Peak Borough Council 2016 includes the following policy in relation to trees:

### Policy EQ 9 Trees, Woodland and Hedgerows

The Council will protect existing trees, woodlands and hedgerows, in particular, ancient woodland, veteran trees and ancient or species-rich hedgerows from loss or deterioration.

This will be achieved by:

- Requiring that existing woodlands, healthy, mature trees and hedgerows are retained and integrated within a proposed development unless the need for, and benefits of, the development clearly outweigh their loss.
- Requiring new developments where appropriate to provide tree planting and soft landscaping, including where possible the replacement of any trees that are removed at a ratio of 2:1
- Resisting development that would directly or indirectly damage existing ancient woodland, veteran trees and ancient or species-rich hedgerows.

A detailed review of local planning policy has not been undertaken and other policies may have implications for trees that may need consideration.



1.4 **Tree policy:** High Peak Borough Council Tree Strategy (November 2016)

2.2.6 The Council will not grant planning permission for developments which directly or Indirectly threaten trees or woodlands of significant amenity or developments which have inadequate or inappropriate landscape proposals, unless there is adequate justification to do so.



## 2.0 The site and the application

- 2.1 **The site:** The site was visited by Monica Gillespie on 2/8/2023 to assess the tree survey and Arboricultural Impact Assessment (AIA) of Woodsage Consulting Ltd dated 25th November 2022. A general assessment of the site and its context was also made. The weather at the time of inspection was warm and dry with clear visibility.
- 2.2 **Background information:** Following a search of the Council's interactive planning map and supporting evidence the following relevant information in relation to the site has been identified. If the Planning Officer is aware of any further relevant facts, they should bring these to my attention.

| Designation                      | On site                 | Off Site |
|----------------------------------|-------------------------|----------|
| Tree preservation Order          | HPBC TPO 50 – Area TPO  | No       |
| Conservation Area                | Yes - Hole House CA     |          |
| Ancient or veteran tree (s)      | No                      | No       |
| Ancient woodland                 | No                      | No       |
| Nature conservation designations | No                      | No       |
| Landscape Character region       | Settled Valley Pastures |          |
| Green Belt                       | Yes                     | Yes      |
| Countryside                      | Yes                     | Yes      |
| Public Right of way              | No                      | HP7/75/2 |

### 2.3 Planning History:

- 2.3.1 There have been a number of applications to develop the site. The previous submission was a reserved matters application for access, appearance landscaping and layout and scale for B1 office units and 22 no houses (HPK/2015/0145). The application was approved but not instigated.

Conditions were attached to the approval relating to arboricultural issues and included the requirement to provide tree protection and a detailed Arboricultural Method Statement. The permission has now lapsed.

### 2.4 The application and supporting information:

- 2.4.1 **The current application HPK/2023/0118** is for demolition of existing mill outbuildings and conversion/erection of 25 no dwellings with associated car parking, landscaping and highway works.



#### 2.4.2 Information supplied and reviewed for this consultation.

| Document                                       | Reference              | Author                       | Date          |
|------------------------------------------------|------------------------|------------------------------|---------------|
| Design and Access                              | -                      | Jda Architects               | 23/3/2023     |
| Exiting Layout                                 | 1225/A/DR/009<br>Rev - | Jda Architects               | 9/3/2023      |
| Proposed Layout                                | 1225/A/DR/010<br>Rev F | Jda Architects               | 16/3/2023     |
| Arboricultural Report – BS5837 – Tree schedule | WC-129.1b              | Woodsage Consulting Ltd      | 25/11/2022    |
| Ecology Report                                 | -                      | Dunelm Ecology               | March 2019    |
| Biodiversity Impact Assessment                 | -                      | Rachel Hacking Ecology       | December 2022 |
| Landscape Management Plan                      | C/6805/LMP/Nov'22      | Trevor Bridge Associates Ltd | November 2022 |
| Landscape proposals                            | 6805.01 & 6805.02      | Trevor Bridge Associates Ltd | November 2022 |

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 has not been considered to only that it has not been directly referred to in this report.

#### 2.4.3 Assessment of BS5837:2012 Tree Survey: The tree survey provided by Woodsage Consulting Ltd tree survey generally complies with Section 4.4 of the BS5837 (2012). It would be useful if the results of Root Protection Area (RPA) calculations were included in the tables append to the reports.



### 3.0 Arboricultural Impact of the Proposals

#### 3.1 The Trees

3.1.1 A total of **25 trees** and **13 groups** were identified in the tree report.

#### 3.1.2 The Tree Quality Assessment:

Cascade Chart for Tree Quality Assessment BS5837:2012 has been used to assist in determining which trees would be suitable or unsuitable for retention. Woodsage Consulting Ltd have assessed the trees using this methodology. I broadly agree with their assessments of tree. A summary of the assessment is given in table 1 below.

|        | Category A<br>high quality & life<br>expectancy 40<br>years+ | Category B<br>Moderate quality<br>& life expectancy<br>20 years+ | Category C<br>low quality & life<br>expectancy 10 years+<br>Or young trees | Category U<br>Can't be retained<br>in current context<br>for more than 10<br>years |
|--------|--------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Trees  |                                                              | 18                                                               | 4                                                                          | 3                                                                                  |
| Groups |                                                              | 6                                                                | 7                                                                          |                                                                                    |

Table 1: BS5837:2012 Category Grading of arboricultural features

#### 3.1.3 Category A & B trees to be removed to accommodate development.

Where possible category A and B trees should be retained and accommodated with the proposed development.

- There **no category A trees** were identified.
- **7 category B trees** are shown for removal. This includes 6 Hybrid black poplars (T17 T20 and T22-T24<sup>1</sup>) all of which are protected by a TPO. The justification for the removal of these trees is their long-term retention would be unrealistic given their size and proximity to Plots 21 and 22. Previously the layout has allowed for the retention of these trees. This species naturally has brittle wood and as they start to decline, they increasingly lose limbs. This limits their suitability for retention in close proximity to residential dwellings. To accommodate these trees **plots 21 and 22** would have to be removed from the scheme. Removing these trees needs to be balanced against the proposed mitigation.

<sup>1</sup> **NOTE:** the Ecology report notes that 1 of the poplars has low bat roost potential nevertheless appropriate investigations should be undertaken before the trees are removed



- The cypress **T8** is also to be removed to accommodate **plots 18-19**.
- **G5** (comprising approx.40 stems) is defined as category B and to be removed to accommodate **Plot15**.
- Removing these trees needs to be balanced against the proposed mitigation.

#### 3.1.4 Category C and U trees to be removed

These trees are of low quality or not suitable for retention irrespective of the proposals. They can be retained if it is appropriate but they should not unduly influence the design of the proposals. Although replacement planting in line with the local plan policy would be required

- There are **6 Category C** and **3 Category U trees** to be removed.

#### 3.1.5 Retained Trees

The majority of the trees to be retained are the groups of trees that comprise the woodland area to east of the site around the old mill ponds (**G7, G8, G9, G10 and G11**) and individual trees (**T12 - T16 & T25**).

The other retained trees are to the west of the site **T2-T6** and groups **G1, G3 and G4**.

There is a wooded area to the south of the site (**G13**) which is also retained, it is not clear if this is in the ownership of the applicant or not. It is outside the red line of the application site but is part of the same land registry title as other areas within the application site. The ownership of this group will influence how it is managed in the future and therefore how it impacts upon the proposals.

### 3.2. Root Protection and other Constraints

- 3.2.1 **Root Protection Areas (RPA's)** The RPA is the minimum area required to ensure there is sufficient roots and rooting volume to maintain the trees vitality. This is calculated in accordance with table D.1 and **Section 4.6 of BS5837:2012**. Woodsage Consulting's report does not specifically include the results of Root Protection Area (RPA) calculations the tree survey table schedule although the RPAs area shown on the plans provided.



### 3.2.2 Encroachment into RPA's or retained trees:

- **Access** and parking bays impact on the Root protection areas of **T6, T24, T25, G7, G9 and G10**. The areas effected are either existing hardstanding or less than 11% of the total RPA will be effected. The Arboricultural Method Statement (AMS) submitted with the AIA includes a specification for the use of a Geo-cellular confinement system to reduce the impact on the tree roots of upgrading the access road.
- **Ground protection.** Where it is necessary for the tree protection fencing is set back around **G11, G13, T24 and T25** Ground protection, to *BS 5837:2012* specification, will be used. This is also detailed in the *Arboricultural Method Statement*

### 3.2.3 Shading

Trees to be retained in the proposed development will require space to be successfully retained after the development is finished. Therefore, consideration needs to be given to the pressures of residential occupation in relation to shading from trees and minor nuisances. Consideration also needs to be given to the growth potential of retained trees.

The Woodsage Consulting Ltd report shows the impact of shading in Appendix 5. This is mainly an issue for **plots 17 and 18** which are impacted on by **G13**. The future management of **G13** will be important in ensuring the impact of these trees is managed.



## 4.0 Proposed Mitigation

- 4.1 **Tree Protection and Method statement.** The Arboricultural Impact Assessment report of Woodsage Consulting Ltd addresses the arboricultural issues on site in relation to the existing trees. It also includes an Arboricultural Method statement (AMS).

In terms of mitigation the report relies upon the submitted landscaping schemes. As discussed in section 4.2. Woodsage Consulting Ltd's report identifies the need for a woodland management plan to be commissioned with the aim to enhance the amenity and ecological potential of the retained woodland areas.

## 4.2 Landscaping and tree planting.

- 4.2.1 I have reviewed the Landscaping scheme submitted, along with the recommendations of the Ecology Report and the Biodiversity Net Gain Assessment, in so far as they relate to mitigation in terms of tree planting and tree and woodland management.

### 4.2.2 Landscaping scheme

The locations and details of proposed tree planting can be found in the Landscape Proposal Plans (Drawing No: 6805.01 and 6805.02). This scheme includes the planting of **31 heavy-standard trees and 37 feathered trees** of largely native species.

HPBC policy requires where possible a 2:1 replacement.

Based on the information provided in the arboricultural report a total of **85 trees (13 Individual trees and 72 trees in groups)** will be removed to accommodate the proposals.

The proposed replacement planting does not equate to the 2:1 replacement policy in the local plan policy EQ9.



#### 4.2.3 Ecology report

The Ecology Report submitted with the application was undertaken in 2019 and is now out of date. This was used as the basis to assess the BNG for the site. The Ecology Report makes some recommendations for managing invasive species in the wooded areas including removal and control of Rhododendron, Himalayan balsam and variegated yellow archangel. It also recommends the planting of native trees.

4.2.4 **Outstanding issues.** I have based my comments on the information submitted with the application. There are other issues that may arise which could impact on the trees to be retained, in particular:

- Changes in levels on the site including regrading and the construction of retaining structures.
- Changes to drainage of the site.
- Location of services
- Future amendment to proposals in particular layout and landscaping.

#### Section 4: Summary of impact

| Impact                                                         | Reason                                                                    | Important trees |                                                | Other trees                                  |            |
|----------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------|------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------|------------|
|                                                                |                                                                           | Category A      | Category B                                     | Category C                                   | Category U |
| Trees to be removed                                            | <i>Building Construction, New surfacing, services, and / or proximity</i> |                 | T8 T17<br>T18 T19<br>T20 T22<br>T23<br>G5 (40) | T7 T10 T21<br>G2 (10)<br>G6 (12)<br>G12 (10) | T1 T9 T11  |
| Retained trees that may be damaged through disturbance to RPAs | <i>Removal regrading /retaining structures /fences/landscaping</i>        |                 | T6, T13<br>T24 T25<br>G7, G9, G13              | G10                                          |            |
| <b>Total trees to be felled</b>                                | <b>85 trees</b>                                                           |                 |                                                |                                              |            |
| <b>Proposed planting</b>                                       | <b>68 trees</b>                                                           |                 |                                                |                                              |            |

Table 2: Impact of current proposals on trees on the site



## 5.0 Conclusions and Recommendations

5.1 **Arboricultural Impact:** The proposals will lead to the loss of 13 individual trees and 4 groups of trees. This includes the loss of 8 Poplars protected by TPO T17-T24. These protected trees were retained in the approved scheme in HPK/2015/ 0145 and their retention would be desirable but would require altering the lay out and removing two plots from the layout.

5.2 **Tree Protection:** The Arboricultural impacts of the proposals and the protection of the retained trees during construction have been adequately dealt with by the submitted Arboricultural Impact Assessment (AIA) and Arboricultural Method Statement (AMS).

5.3 **Mitigation:** The proposed mitigation in terms of future landscape management and replacement tree planting is not adequate and does not accord with Local Plan Policy EQ 9. The main issues are:

- The proposed tree planting is not adequate and is not on a 2:1 basis
- The landscape management plan does not adequately secure the establishment of planted trees:
  - Some of the proposed planting is within individual plots and not covered by the Landscape Management Plan therefore the future establishment, replacement and retention of these trees is not secured.
  - The planting within the woodland area is unlikely to establish well as the specification for ground preparation and maintenance is limited. These trees would benefit from being part of a more comprehensive woodland management scheme.
  - The specification for tree establishment does not include provision for watering.
- The existing trees and woodland have not been adequately integrated into the proposed development, in particular there is no woodland management plan to fully develop the potential of the wooded area as an amenity and biodiversity asset. Without appropriate management the condition and amenity of this wooded area is likely to deteriorate.

5.4 **Recommendations:** This application is seeking approval for landscaping therefore before approval is granted a revised landscaping scheme, Landscape Management Plan and Woodland Management Plan should be provided. These will need to demonstrate that there will be adequate tree replacement and that the future management of the woodland area can be secured for both amenity and biodiversity. The proposals for woodland management should take into account the heritage aspects of the site.