

**Consultation Response from KC,
 Trees**
2020/93308 Former Spotted Cow Pub, New Hey Road, Huddersfield, HD3 4BU
Erection of an A1 foodstore with associated parking, servicing areas and landscaping
Date Responded: 17/11/20
**Responding Officer: Nick
 Goddard**
Responding Ref: 61/92

The Arboricultural Impact Assessment states there is to be no incursion of the built element within the RPA of trees. The Arboricultural Implications Plan however shows clearly there will be for trees T5 and G13. The root protection area (RPA) for G13 should extend at least 7.3m from the stem of the trees according to the data in the tree survey. The plan in the JCA report shows the developed part of the site within 5.1m of the trees in places. There is no information to suggest why this is or what impact this may have on the RPA or how the trees will be protected, either in the AIA or the AMS

The Boundary Treatments Site Plan, shows that there is to be sheet piling and a gabion wall installed along the edge of the loading area and within the RPA of G13. The retaining wall is between 1-1.5m tall and in places is within 6m of the protected trees. There is also to be an acoustic fence installed along the site's north-western boundary which at its western end will be within the RPA of G13 and within 1m of the stem of the end tree in this group, no details of this installation within the RPA have been provided.

Also concerning is the grading of an otherwise flat area of land within the RPA of G13, depicted on pretty much all the plans. This would have a significant impact upon the health of the trees along this boundary. The land between the retaining wall and the boundary of the site should remain untouched in terms of levels and this should be very clear on all plans.

AMS states no utilities will be positioned within RPA of trees however the existing culvert is to be excavated and repaired, where it has collapsed, and to have a new manhole installed within the RPA of G13. According to drawing 09-122-502 this is all to be done in accordance with a method statement and yet no information regarding this work has been provided. Nor indeed has any explanation been given as to why the culvert cannot be redirected under the loading area from the new manhole, this would allow the remainder of the rooting area of these trees to be left undisturbed.

If the culvert has to remain and be repaired it may be possible to provide a method of working to repair any damaged sections of the culvert however it's likely that doing this will result in significant damage to the roots simply because of its location. Can the applicant provide details of how much work is required to repair the culvert and on what sections of it? Presumably this detail will have been considered by the applicant and the culvert surveyed in detail; the specific areas of repair could be shown on a plan to accompany an AMS. Unfortunately, I suspect that once approved we will be informed the whole culvert needs to be replaced and the cumulative effect of this and adjacent housing development could result in the trees' rapid decline and/or loss which is not something I could support.

There is also a 6m high lighting column proposed in the RPA and canopy of the end trees of G13. How is this going to impact upon the roots and will it not have long term implications for the maintenance of the tree. There does appear to be room to position this lighting column outside the RPA of the trees and still have it lighting the same area, has this been considered and if so, why is it not possible.

It is a similar question regarding the parking bay at the eastern end of the RPA of G13. To construct this required a 0.5m high retaining wall and sheet piling, all within the RPA. Given the other infringements proposed to the RPA of these trees can this parking bay not be dropped from the plans; doing so would afford much more space around the tree and give more room for the lighting column.

The issues raised are all details I would expect to be covered by an AIA and if impacts cannot be avoided there should be a site specific AMS that provides details of the protection measures necessary to ensure successful tree retention. At present there is a substantial lack of quality and detailed information and there appear to be avoidable impacts to the protected trees and therefore these proposals do not comply with policy LP24 and LP33. For these reasons I cannot support the proposals.