

Adam Walker

From: Nick Goddard
Sent: 22 February 2021 13:29
To: Adam Walker
Subject: RE: Proposed new Lidl store at New Hey Road - Response to Tree Officer Comments [NLP-DMS.FID496520]

Hi Adam

Sorry It's taken a while to get back to you. I'm glad we have received a new AMS and info regarding this site. The reassurances from Adam Jackson are not enough however, the big concerns I highlighted are not addressed by the revised tree information. The AMS does provide much better assurance that trees can be protected though there is still a mistake on the Tree Protection Plan which needs to be amended, see below.

The problems I highlighted previously are mostly down to project level decisions and not the Arb Consultant's information. The big concerns regarding the retaining wall along G13 and the culvert in the same area are still unresolved for me. I've tried to detail why below but at the moment I think the plans are misleading or could be misinterpreted.

Retaining Wall

The retaining wall along the service yard area, adjacent to G13, is shown as retaining wall type D, which shows no change to ground level behind it. I would ask therefore why all the plans for the site show chevrons pointing in to the site. This indicates a banking at this point, something which does not exist at present and the Council should ensure is not permitted by these proposals because, and I think everyone agrees, grading the ground in the RPA of protected trees would be harmful to them.

Any contractor carrying out ground works on the site is going to see chevrons, demarking grading under the canopy of these trees, on every single plan except for the Retaining Wall Sections drawing, 09-122-411. I hope this was a simple oversight when the proposals were drawn and then copied in to every other relevant plan. The Retaining Wall General Arrangement shows grading; the Proposed Boundary Treatments Site Plan shows grading; the Proposed Site Plan with tracking shows grading. It is all too easy to envisage the land being graded by a contractor as a result of these plans, and whether this is done by mistake or not the harm to the trees this would cause would be permanent.

Culvert

I can see that there is now an annotation on the TPP to say no works are proposed for the existing culvert under this application. My problem is however, that the Culvert Diversion General Arrangement shows a Phase 3 which is to repair any collapsed and damaged sections of the culvert within the RPA of G13. This was why I raised my concerns in the first place and this has not altered as far as I can tell. Is this plan not forming part of this application?

The general arrangement plan also has two key symbols for root protection areas which are to be treated differently to minimise impacts, however I cannot see where these areas are on the plan as they appear to be missing. Unfortunately I can only stress again, similar to the grading chevrons this is misleading and could easily result in mistakes being made on site if approved in this form.

Lighting column

Again I can see that the AIA and AMS now reflect that there is a lighting column in the RPA of G13 however my question was, can it be moved? It does not appear that the lighting column has been moved nor any explanation as to why it cannot be moved outside of the RPA of G13. I appreciate that the root pruning may be minor however the principle of BS5837, is that impacts should be avoided first. Given the proximity of the retaining wall works along the service yard and the impact to the RPA of G13 from the car park retaining wall I think it is not too much to ask that an alternative location for the lighting column be explored.

AMS and Tree Protection Plan

The Tree Protection Plan, ref 16383-B/AJB, shows a protective fence line going across a retaining wall in the TPA of G13. The wall is to be constructed using sheet piling and presumably will require the same hand dug trench to find and sever roots as has been applied to T5. The plan needs to show blue in that area and the fence location needs to be such that the wall can actually be constructed which at present it can't. I assume this is an oversight and can be easily rectified.

I tried to ring just before, happy to discuss if it will help
Nick

Nick Goddard
Arboricultural Officer

Planning & Building Control
Growth and Regeneration
Civic 1, High Street, Huddersfield, HD1 2NF

Tel: 01484 414909
Website www.kirklees.gov.uk/trees

From: Adam Walker <Adam.Walker@kirklees.gov.uk>
Sent: 12 February 2021 10:51
To: Nick Goddard <Nick.Goddard@kirklees.gov.uk>
Subject: Proposed new Lidl store at New Hey Road - Response to Tree Officer Comments [NLP-DMS.FID496520]

Hi Nick,

Response from the applicant to your consultation comments.

Please can you review and let me have your comments?

If you want a formal re-consultation let me know.

Adam

From: Adam Jackson <adam.jackson@lichfields.uk>
Sent: 10 February 2021 17:34
To: Adam Walker <Adam.Walker@kirklees.gov.uk>
Cc: Sue <sue@fdalandscape.co.uk>; THOMAS HANREY <Thomas.Hanrey@lidl.co.uk>; Jonathan Wallace <jonathan.wallace@lichfields.uk>
Subject: New Hey Road - Response to Tree Officer Comments [NLP-DMS.FID496520]

Afternoon Adam

Following the comments made by your trees officer please find attached an updated Arboricultural Impact Assessment and Arboricultural Method Statement. Please can these be substituted into the application to supersede those submitted with the application in October.

The reports respond to each of the points raised in the consultation comments but just to pick up on a couple of the more significant issues:

- The tree officer's response queried the impact on the existing trees from what they perceived as the grading of land between the trees and the retaining walls near the delivery bay. We can confirm that there will be no changes in levels to this land. The retaining walls are proposed in this location for the precise reason of maintaining existing ground levels in tree rooting zones
- No works are proposed to the existing culvert within the tree routing zones – the culvert diversion is located outside the influencing distance of trees. This has been annotated on the drawings within the AIA for clarity.
- There will need to be some root pruning for T5 and G15 for the car park and lighting column. It should be noted that the degree of root pruning required is minimal and is considered to have little impact on the long-term health of the trees in question.

If you have any further questions on this matter please get in touch.

On a related note, when do you expect to be able to issues Align's report?

Kind regards

Adam Jackson

Associate Director

Lichfields, 3rd Floor, 15 St Paul's Street, Leeds LS1 2JG

T 0113 397 1397 / M 07341773569 / E adam.jackson@lichfields.uk

lichfields.uk  



How many homes?
What the new Standard Method could mean for your area

[VIEW RESOURCE](#)

The advertisement features a green background with a white text box on the left containing the headline and a call-to-action button. On the right, there is a vertical strip of aerial photographs showing residential areas with varying levels of greenery and building density.

This email is for the use of the addressee. It may contain information which is confidential and exempt from disclosure. If you are not the intended recipient you must not copy, distribute or disseminate this email or attachments to anyone other than the addressee. If you receive this communication in error please advise us by telephone as soon as possible.

Nathaniel Lichfield & Partners Limited is registered in England, no. 2778116. Our registered office is at The Minster Building, 21 Mincing Lane, London, EC3R 7AG.