

Consultation Response from KC, Trees
2023/91649 11, Wood Street, Skelmanthorpe, Huddersfield, HD8 9BN
Demolition and rebuild boundary wall
Date Responded: 15/09/2023 Responding Officer: D. Atkinson Responding Ref: 03/22
<p>Thank you for the consultation and I apologise for the late reply.</p> <p>The Arboricultural Impact Assessment (Report Reference: AIA-1550-1), argues that the trees subject to the TPO (T7 and T9 in the report) are justifiable Arboricultural Management losses on the grounds of the present and increasing conflict they pose to the neighbouring retaining wall and public highway.</p> <p>And as a result, categorises them as “U”, Those in such a condition that they cannot realistically be retained as living trees in the context of the current land use for longer than 10 years, due to the alleged tree related hazard (BS5837:2012 paragraph 4.5.8). In addition to guidance within BS5837 in Annex A Table A1 that trees with a growth potential above 600mm stem diameter at 1.5m height should be planted no closer than 2m to a masonry boundary wall. The location of trees T1, T3, T5, T6, T7 and T8 would appear to conflict with this guidance.</p> <p>So for the assessment of T7, trees can see the argument. Its position in relation to surrounding structures does limit it remaining years to enough to give it a lesser tree quality assessment.</p> <p>However, the assessment of T9 being category C seems to be unnecessarily downgraded. The tree is double the 2m recommended minimum distance to masonry boundary wall and from the survey schedule it is a “Visually prominent tree” that “exhibits good vitality and vigour with no major defects evident save for minor snags and dead wood”.</p> <p>Trees aren’t convinced that T9 should be included in the same thinking as T7, in that a tree related hazard (BS5837:2012 paragraph 4.5.8) or lumping it in with T7 should downgrade it.</p> <p>Trees of generally high quality and/or value which have a defect or defects that do not reduce their retention span below the suggested 40 year threshold which seems to be the case for T9, should be placed in category A, i.e. they should not be downgraded as a result of minor imperfections.</p> <p>Overall, from an arboriculture perspective there remains an objection to the proposal. This is because it is conflicting with the adopted Kirklees Local Plan Strategy and Policies Policy LP33 as it directly threatens trees of significant amenity and trees team are not convinced that the proposed is necessary and that there aren’t other options available to repair/maintain the wall.</p> <p>If on planning balance the application is granted or if it’s granted on appeal, there should be pre-commencement conditions for the agreement a Tree Protection Plan for the trees/shrubs that are retained and a detailed compensatory replacement planting plan and maintenance schedule following the guidance in BS 8545:2014 be provided the shows replacement</p>

planting that uses the space available to plant several medium to large growing tree species so that they have space to develop into good quality trees in the future.