Consultation Response from KC, Trees
2025/93438 Arena Young Peoples Centre, Moorlands Road, Dewsbury, WF13 2LF
Erection of 10-unit (class C2) special needs care home, day centre (class E(f)), administration and training building (class E(g)(i))
Date Responded: 05/03/2026 **Responding Officer: Hazel Irving** **Responding Ref:**

The drawing provided does not conform to BS5737:2012 and cannot be accepted. Additionally, the tree works outlined within the submitted tree survey plan does not conform with the landscaping plan. To move forward, we require the full arboricultural reports and separate plans as outlined in my previous comments. These must be produced by a suitably qualified arboriculturist.

As trees can affect and be affected by many aspects of site operations, during the conception and design process the project arboriculturist should be involved in ongoing review of layout, architectural, engineering and landscape drawings. All members of the design team should be made aware of the requirements for the successful retention of the retained trees and should make provision for these throughout the development process. I include the factors which should be taken into account during the design process from BS5837:2012 5.3.4 at the end of this document.

In response to the agent's comments regarding the proposed incursions into RPAs, I would emphasise that construction should be excluded from root protection areas of all retained trees. See BS5837:2012 3.7:

> *"Root protection area (RPA): layout design tool indicating the minimum area around a tree deemed to contain sufficient roots and rooting volume to maintain the tree's viability, and where the protection of the roots and soil structure is treated as a priority"*

Also see BS5837:2012 5.3.1*:*

> *"The default position should be that structures (see 3.10) are located outside the RPAs of trees to be retained. However, where there is an overriding justification for construction within the RPA, technical solutions might be available that prevent damage to the tree(s) (see Clause 7)."*

Whilst the degree of incursion into RPAs varies, I note that the proposed retaining wall would sever a significant portion of the RPA on the south side of the tree T7. This may cause the tree to become destabilised and threaten the building in the future and should be avoided.

Proposals should be sited outside of the existing and projected canopy-lines for the reasons previously discussed. See BS5837:2012 A1.1:

> *"Buildings need to be designed and constructed to accommodate the current and potential future influence of existing and removed vegetation, as well as planned new planting."*

Also see BS5837:2012 5.3.4 C):

> *"[…] Above-ground damage can occur to trees and structures by the continuous whipping of branches against the fabric of a building. Branch ends might have to be cut back periodically, possibly affecting the shape of the tree. Structures should therefore be designed and/or located with due consideration for a tree's ultimate growth, so as to reduce the need for frequent remedial pruning or other maintenance."*

In my professional view, there is no overriding justification for construction within RPAs in this case. Rather than seeking technical solutions to reduce damage to retained trees, it is prudent to seek a design solution, with the input of an arboricultural consultant. This is because the retained trees are not yet at their ultimate height and spread and the current proposals threaten the long-term health of trees. Future growth is an important design consideration for the longevity of the development. Failure to factor in the ultimate size of retained trees leads to ever increasing conflicts with structures as the trees continue to grow. These proposals would threaten the health and long-term retention of the trees, as repeated severe pruning (such as that shown on the landscaping plan) would be required to manage the canopies back from the proposed buildings. As previously pointed out, this

would also inflict a financial burden on the future occupiers of the building, whilst spoiling the natural form of the trees.

BS5837:2012 5.3.4

"A realistic assessment of the probable impact of any proposed development on the trees and vice versa should take into account the characteristics and condition of the trees, with due allowance and space for their future growth and maintenance requirements. To maximize the probability of successful tree retention, the following factors should be taken into account during the design process.

a) Shading. Shading by trees affects buildings and open spaces.
1. Shading of buildings. Shading of buildings by trees can be a problem, particularly where there are rooms which require natural light. Proposed buildings should be designed to take account of existing trees, their ultimate size and density of foliage, and the effect that these will have on the availability of light.
2. Shading of open spaces. Open spaces such as gardens and sitting areas should be designed to meet the normal requirement for direct sunlight for at least a part of the day.
NOTE 1
Shading can be desirable to reduce glare or excessive solar heating, or to provide for comfort during hot weather. The combination of shading, wind speed/turbulence reduction and evapo-transpiration effects of trees can be utilized in conjunction with the design of buildings and spaces to provide local microclimatic benefits.
b) Privacy and screening. It might be highly desirable for trees to provide screening to a building, e.g. for internal privacy, to reduce overlooking by neighbours or to mitigate undesirable views, such as busy roads, railway lines or industrial premises. In order to achieve the desired outcome, account should be taken of the proposed orientation and aspect of the building, the type of building, its use and location relative to the tree, and the species attributes of the tree.
c) Direct damage. Below-ground damage to structures can occur as a result of incremental root and stem growth. Above-ground damage can occur to trees and structures by the continuous whipping of branches against the fabric of a building. Branch ends might have to be cut back periodically, possibly affecting the shape of the tree. Structures should therefore be designed and/or located with due consideration for a tree's ultimate growth, so as to reduce the need for frequent remedial pruning or other maintenance.
NOTE 2
Exceptions might arise where this is a known and acceptable management outcome (e.g. cyclical maintenance of previously pollarded trees or where retention of desirable trees would otherwise not be feasible).
d) Future pressure for removal. The relationship of buildings to large trees can cause apprehension to occupiers or users of nearby buildings or spaces, resulting in pressure for the removal of the trees. Buildings and other structures should be sited allowing adequate space for a tree's natural development, with due consideration given to its predicted height and canopy spread. However, this does not mean that trees should not be retained within any particular distance of a structure (see Table A.1 for new planting).
e) Seasonal nuisance. Trees are naturally growing and shedding organisms. Leaves of some species can cause problems, particularly in the autumn, by blocking gullies and gutters. Fruit can cause slippery patches, and accumulation of honeydew can be damaging to surfaces and vehicles. Buildings, footpaths and hard-standing areas should be designed with due consideration to the proximity of retained trees, especially in terms of their foliage, flowering and fruiting habits. Where conflicts might arise, detailed design should address these issues, e.g. use of non-slip paving; provision of leaf guards or grilles on gutters and gullies; provision of access and means of maintenance