

21st July 2020

Our Ref: TEP7760.003
Your Ref: HPK/2018/0315
HPK/2020/0064

Tom Popplewell is dealing with this matter
Direct Dial: **01925 844 069**
email: tompopplewell@tep.uk.com

Persimmon Homes (North West)
30-34 Crofts Bank Road
Urmston
Manchester
M41 0UH

For the Attention of: Rob Holcroft

Dear Rob

LAND AT TRENCHARD DRIVE, HARPUR HILL, BUXTON

This note accompanies Arboricultural Method Statement (D7760.002-006 Version 2.0) and Detailed Planting Plan D7961.002-011C and explains changes in tree retention, removal, protection and planting that they show.

Background

At the time of writing, planning permission for development of land at Trenchard Drive has been granted (HPK/2018/0315). An arboricultural impact assessment (11772 Issue 01) was undertaken in support of the application, which identified a requirement to remove all trees along Trenchard Drive except for a cluster of pine and lime trees at the northern corner (Drawing Ref: UG_11772_ARB_TRPb_01 Rev P01). However, the planning layout (HH.BUXT-SDA.01 Rev P) indicated 7 retained trees along the road frontage in addition to the cluster at the northern corner. These additional trees were not based on the arboricultural assessment drawings and were shown in error. It was never intended that these trees would be retained.

The planning permission under which construction is underway references the Rev P layout but not the arboricultural assessment. Therefore, for the avoidance of doubt, the tree protection fencing has been installed around the remaining trees on Trenchard Drive in accordance with the letter of the consent. However, the approved layout and approved tree removal and protection detail appear to be in conflict and not technically compatible. This must therefore be resolved either by an amendment to the layout or construction methods to retain the trees, or the removal of the trees to allow construction.

Review of tree retention

Since the original planning application, the removal of trees in accordance with the planning permission along Trenchard Drive has been completed. TEP surveyed the remaining trees in



**THE
ENVIRONMENT
PARTNERSHIP**

Genesis Centre,
Birchwood Science Park,
Warrington
WA3 7BH

Tel: 01925 844004
Fax: 01925 844002
tep@tep.uk.com
www.tep.uk.com

Other Offices:

Market Harborough | Gateshead | London | Cornwall

PLANNING | DESIGN | ENVIRONMENT



**INVESTORS
IN PEOPLE** | Gold

June 2020 to review the possibility and wisdom of making changes to the approved scheme to accommodate some or all of them and regularise the planning context so that this part of the site can be completed. On Drawing D7760.002 the trees in question are labelled as T16, T17, T18, T19, T20, T21 and G19 (the latter being the cluster of trees at the north whose retention is not under question).

- **T16:** A common ash in poor condition. This tree has Chalara ash dieback disease, with Class 2 symptoms¹ which have developed since the original tree survey. Irrespective of the development, this tree cannot be safely retained adjacent to the public highway.
- **T17:** A 'Crimson King' Norway maple in good condition, approximately 2.5m from the kerb edge and 300-400mm higher than the road. This tree cannot be retained because of the requirement for a new pedestrian pavement along Trenchard Drive. The pavement would be 2m in width and would therefore pass less than 1m from the stem of the tree. Irrespective of the requirement for buried services within the footpath, which are necessary, this amount and proximity of hard surfacing would be damaging to the tree and it would be unlikely to survive. A pervious and above ground construction could not be used to alleviate construction effects because the base of the tree is much higher than the road. A typical above-ground pavement construction depth of 150mm would result in a pavement c.0.5m higher than the highway, which would be unsafe and impractical.
- **T18:** A common ash in poor condition. This tree has Chalara ash dieback disease, with Class 3 symptoms which have developed since the original tree survey. Irrespective of the development, this tree cannot be safely retained adjacent to the public highway.
- **T19:** A 'Crimson King' Norway maple in good condition, approximately 2.5m from the kerb edge and 300-400mm higher than the road. This tree cannot be retained because of the requirement for a new pedestrian pavement along Trenchard Drive. The pavement would be 2m in width and would therefore pass less than 1m from the stem of the tree. Irrespective of the requirement for buried services within the footpath, which are necessary, this amount and proximity of hard surfacing would be damaging to the tree and it would be unlikely to survive. A pervious and above ground construction could not be used to alleviate construction effects because the base of the tree is much higher than the road. A typical above-ground pavement construction depth of 150mm would result in a pavement c.0.5m higher than the highway, which would be unsafe and impractical.
- **T20:** A sycamore in good condition, larger than other trees along Trenchard Drive and with a low canopy overhanging the highway to the centreline. Approximately 3m from the kerb and 300mm higher than the road. It would be desirable to retain this tree and a range of possible options has been considered. In any scenario except a major change to the layout and the loss of at least two plots from the approved development

¹ Suffolk method, based on <https://treecouncil.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2019/11/Tree-Council-Ash-Dieback-Toolkit-2.0.pdf>

layout it cannot be retained in accordance with BS5837 or with any reasonable prospect of success.

It would be possible physically to avoid the stem of T20 by inverting the approved arrangement for Plot 48 to reposition the driveway and garage to the east of the dwelling. However, within this arrangement it would be necessary to prune the lower branches of the tree, which are below head height, for access. Furthermore, a proportion of the tree's roots would still be removed where they extend within the footprint of Plots 47 and 48, even if the dwellings were moved as far from the tree as possible within the plot. Finally, a significant part of the root protection area would be covered by a new pedestrian pavement along Trenchard Drive. This would not be as close as T17 and T19 but still exceeding the recommended maximum of 20% in BS5837. This pavement could therefore not be built without removing the tree, except by the use of a non-standard above ground and permeable construction. Such a construction would also be required for the paved areas and access footpaths serving Plots 47 and 48. This type of construction would increase ground levels to between c.150mm above existing levels, which are already higher than the adjacent highway by c.300mm. This approach would not be guaranteed success, would require the local authority to adopt a non-standard pavement construction, and the resultant pavement would be at c.400-500mm higher than the road. This would be unsafe and impractical. A further challenge to this technical solution would also be the dropped kerbs that would be required for access to new driveways, which would punctuate this raised arrangement leaving an unsatisfactory streetscape and possible further safety issues. Finally, gas, electric and fibre utilities must all be buried within the pavement, which would effectively preclude the use of a 'no-dig' construction. On consideration of these constraints in combination, it is concluded that it is not realistically feasible to retain the tree.

- **T21:** A common ash in poor condition. This tree has Chalara ash dieback disease, with Class 2 symptoms which have developed since the original tree survey. Irrespective of the development, this tree cannot be safely retained adjacent to the public highway.
- **G19:** Pine and lime dominated group that can be retained.

Tree Protection

The arrangement of gardens to the rear of Plots 144, 145, 146, 147, 152 and 153 has been updated to increase the retention of existing trees which are to the north of the existing dwelling at 75 Burlow Road. This layout has been incorporated in the AMS and a detail for the construction of a retaining wall around the perimeter of the trees is included at D7760.006 (AMS05: Retaining Wall Construction).

Minor adjustments to tree protection fencing arrangements have been made as necessary to reflect the current layout and associated changes in tree removal and retention. These are presented within Arboricultural Method Statement D7760.002-004 Version 2.0 (dated July 2020).

Tree Planting

The tree planting scheme has been updated to include additional trees (see drawings D7961.001C to D7961.011C). The previous iteration of this scheme already included 5no. *Acer campestre* 'Elsrijk' in gardens fronting Trenchard Drive. The updated design also includes:

1. 1no. additional downy birch tree in Plot 48 on Trenchard Drive frontage (close to the location of T20); and
2. Understorey planting beneath trees to the north of Plot 50 and 51 beneath G19 to improve screening and greening of the streetscape.

The planting has also been augmented to offset the previously unaccounted tree removal in other locations across the site, comprising:

3. 1no. Scots pine to the east of Plot 53;
4. 1no. pear tree to the west of Plot 70;
5. 2no. silver birch to the east of Plot 93;
6. 1no. crab apple in Plot 107;
7. Understorey planting beneath retained trees within enlarged group to rear of Plots 144 to 147, 152 and 153;
8. 1no. field maple and 1no. small leaved lime in open space to the south as future replacements for ash trees which may decline due to Chalara ash dieback.

Recommendations

The updated Arboricultural Method Statement and Detailed Planting Plans should be submitted for formal approval by the LPA to rationalise the permission and construction detail. Once approved, the additional trees along Trenchard Drive should be removed. The design of foundations should be reviewed by an engineer in respect of the changes in tree removal and planting, to confirm compliance with NHBC standards. Tree protection measures should be reviewed and adjusted across the site as necessary, particularly around Plots 144 to 147, 152 and 153. An arboriculturist should be retained to perform a watching brief during the construction of a retaining wall as detailed in AMS 05 (D7760.006).

Yours sincerely,



Tom Popplewell BSc (hons) MICE
Principal Arboricultural Consultant
TEP