

**Consultation Response from KC,
Trees**

**2025/90306 Shelley Community Football Club, Storthes Hall Park, Kirkburton, Huddersfield,
HD8 0WA**

**Discharge of details reserved by condition 4 (Arboricultural Method Statement) of previous
permission 2024/93261 for erection of football changing rooms**

Date Responded: 21/02/2025

Responding Officer: H Irving

Responding Ref:

An AMS (Ref: WC-335.2a) has been received to satisfy Condition 4 of the planning permission; however, the AMS does not adequately demonstrate how the trees will be protected.

The tree protection plan shows the ground around the proposed to be covered with hardstanding. However, from the photos it appears that there is no hardstanding in this location; the ground is currently bare earth. See *Fig 1*.



Figure 1 Photo included within the planning statement from Robert Halstead Chartered Surveyors & Town Planners, dated November 2024

The tree protection fencing (TPF) does not exclude the construction from the RPAs nor the canopies of the retained trees. The TPF should be aligned to protect the entirety of all canopies and RPAs as far as is practicable. In this case, this would include the entire canopy and RPA of T003, T004, T005, T006, T007, T008, T009 and T010.

The TPF shown around T002 could be aligned to include all the canopy and exclude more of the RPA from the construction zone. Where it is not practical to erect TPF to exclude construction from the entire RPA, then there is a minimum requirement of ground protection. This should be laid to reduce any damage to the rooting area due to soil compaction caused by storage of materials, vehicles or machinery etc. within the RPAs of protected trees.

To prevent accidental damage during construction, access facilitation would be required to G001 to cut back any branches which could conflict with the development to prevent tear-outs. G001 is comprised of young and semi-mature trees which will quickly grow larger. They are already overhanging the site of the proposed. Therefore, it is likely that the trees will conflict with the building in the long-term if the proposed is constructed in this location.

T001 and T002 share a homogenous canopy. Removing T001 would open up T002 to the possibility of windthrow.

The proposals state that toilets and showers will be installed in the proposed changing facility. No drainage routes have been assessed as part of the AMS. No trenching with the RPAs of retained trees is permitted.

From an arboricultural perspective it would be preferable for the new changing rooms to be erected clear of T001 and G001, by relocating them to the south of the current proposed location. This would avoid the need for a healthy tree to be removed, prevent future conflicts between the proposed and retained trees and prevent indirect impacts (such as future pressure to remove G001 and the potential loss of T002 to windthrow).

There is an objection from an arboricultural perspective.