

## DCAdmin

---

**From:** Matthew Woodward  
**Sent:** 18 December 2018 10:20  
**To:** DCAdmin  
**Subject:** FW: 2017/92568 Land off Woodhead Road Honley

[Tree officer response to 2017/92568](#)

1 of 2

---

**From:** Joe Robertson  
**Sent:** 17 December 2018 14:27  
**To:** Matthew Woodward <Matthew.Woodward@kirklees.gov.uk>  
**Subject:** 2017/92568 Land off Woodhead Road Honley

Hi Matt

There is still no Arboricultural Method Statement, despite asking for it in my comments in August 2017, this requirement has also been flagged up twice since then. The Arboricultural Impact Assessment that has now been provided was signed/completed on the 4<sup>th</sup> Decembers 2018.

This Impact Assessment should have been done at the initial drafting stage. The info it contains should then have been used to guide the design to ensure that it avoids tree impacts. Unfortunately it's clear that the Impact Assessment is insufficient and, based on the plan that it provides at appendix 7, the layout needs amendments to avoid conflicts with TPO'd trees.

As it stands, the Impact Assessment has not included a shade pattern plan. However using the method set out in British Standard BS 5837, and the survey data given in the submitted Impact Assessment, I have plotted the projected shade patterns myself, a copy of this plan will follow shortly.

In addition section 5 of BS 5837, sets out that there should be a *"realistic assessment of the probable impact of any proposed development on the trees and vice versa"*. It goes on to give specific paragraphs detailing assessments of *"Shade of Building, Shade of Gardens, Direct Damage, Future Pressures to Fell and Seasonal Nuisance"*. This information should *"then be used to prepare the Impact Assessment"*. In this case the impact assessment that has been provided only gives a total of three sentences to assess the impact of shade, future pressures and seasonal nuisance. This is inadequate and insufficient for the purpose of addressing a scheme on this scale, in such close proximity to multiple TPO'd trees.

The following are more specific comments with regards to aspects of the current submission:

1. There's no information provided in the Impact Assessment with regards to the pumping station shown on the plan, specifically its construction, required excavation, where is it pumping to, location of associated utilities runs etc
2. In the Impact Assessment that has been provided many of the trees have been given category A-*"high quality trees"*, or category B-*"moderate quality trees"*, as set out by BS 5837. Given their identified value, there appears to have been insufficient consideration given to these trees as site constraints.
3. plots 55 and 54 will be completely dominated by trees and their location is unacceptable
4. plot 17 and 18 will experience shade issue, with 18's garden having a large section covered by overhanging branches.

5. plot 19 and 20 are dominated by trees to a point that their location is unacceptable
6. plot 21 - 53 are too close, they will have shade issues and on many of these plots much of their outside amenity space is beneath the crown spreads of the trees.
7. The part of the road which encroaches into the Root Protection Area of Tree 18, will need to be adoptable. Therefore, the no dig system specified in section 3.4.2.1 of the Impact Assessment can not be used at this location. The simplest solution is to move the road out side of the Root Protection Area.
8. In section 3.4.7 of the Impact Assessment, the shade argument/mitigation set out by the Impact Assessment is untenable and has been shown to be so at appeal (Ref APP/Z4718/W/16/3150356). While I note that the trees are deciduous son not in leaf in winter, none the less they will be in leaf throughout, late spring, summer and early autumn, when occupants will most desire/expected access to light. Therefore, they will be in leaf when there will be the greatest conflict with trees. The gutter guards and none slip surfaces specified here, on their own, will not address issues of this scale, these need addressing through amendments to lay out.
9. The root pruning requirement set out in section 3.3.1 of the Impact Assessment ,will impact on trees. Amendment to the layout would avoid the need for this, something which appears not to have been considered as apart of the assessment.
10. Section 3.4.5.1 of the Impact Assessment, sets out that no utilities info was provided to aid the assessment. This level of information needs to be provided to us in support of a detail planning application on a site of this type and scale. Without it we have no idea of where the utilities, especially drainage, on a site of this scale will be going, and if implementation of these will require further impact on trees.
11. Section 3.4.8.2 of the Impact Assessment appears to show an area of banking under protected trees, is this banking new or existing, is this to be regraded to form garden, will this have impact on the trees?
12. Section 4.8 of the Impact Assessment's conclusions sets out the need for an Arboricultural Method Statement. Without this method statement and supporting tree protection plan, we can not see what tree protection measures are to be employed, or fully assess the impact in more detail.

Given the above I believe that the proposal does not meet UDP policies BE2 or NE9, neither does it meet Local Plan Policies PLP 33 or PLP 24 and none of the information that has been provided has demonstrated that this proposal is complaint with these policies. Therefore, I can not support this proposal and would strongly object to it in its current form.

Thanks

Joe

Joe Robertson  
(Tree Officer)

Planning Services (Tree Section)  
Kirklees Council  
Investment and Regeneration  
PO BoxB93, Civic 3  
Huddersfield  
HD1 2JR

T: 01484 414909

This email and any attachments are confidential. If you have received it in error – notify the sender immediately, delete it from your system, and do not use, copy or disclose the information in any way. Kirklees Council monitors all emails sent or received.