

Our Ref: Let LL53 EH-SMC01

Date; 8th January 2018

Land Lizard Ltd

Landscape Architectural Consultancy

Winners of the APEA UK Petroleum Industry Award for the Service Station of the Year 2012 – New Development Category. Land Lizard's contribution – Trees, TPOs, Landscape Design and Management.

Landscape architect to the Royal Museums, Greenwich World Heritage Site.

The Case Officer
Planning & Development Service
Staffordshire Moorlands District Council
Moorlands House
Stockwell Street
Leek
ST13 6HO

Dear Sir

Re; Proposed Residential Development on land at Sugar Street, Rushton Spencer, Staffordshire. Application No: SMD/2016/0015 – Approval of Reserved Matters – RM4, Soft Landscaping and APP/B3438/A/12/2180250 Conditions 7 Landscape Management Plan and Condition 11 Tree and Hedge Protection.

Land Lizard Ltd have been appointed by Bernel Ltd to review our documents relating to the planning and reserved matters approvals granted to the above proposal, following small changes made to the site layout since May 2016. In brief these changes are only relevant to the soft landscape design in so far as new culvert and water treatment plant and drainage runs. The current site layout, which includes these drainage works and the hard landscaping is illustrated by ctd drawing number 1773. AL105 Revision F.

SMD/2016/0015 RM4 Soft Landscaping.

Please find attached our drawing number LL53.1.01 Revision A which shows minor changes to accommodate the new culvert and the new water treatment plant in the public amenity areas. There are also minor changes to the planting around Plots 1 and 4. A new native hedgerow has also been introduced along the rear garden boundaries of Plots 7, 8 and 9 where they abut the amenity woodland. Such changes are reflected in the updated horticultural notes and schedules on the drawing.

APP/B3438/A/12/2180250 Conditions 7 Landscape Management Plan and Condition 11 Tree and Hedge Protection. The Landscape Management Plan and Tree and Hedge Protection Plan were addressed by Land Lizard's report and drawing LL53.1.2 dated 11th May 2016 as attached. There is no reference to these in the Approval of Reserved Matters although a Tree Survey and Assessment relating to the earlier layout did form part of the appealed proposal. We therefore seek confirmation of SMDC's approval of the current May 2016 documents changed to reflect the current situation, as at 2nd January 2018. These changes are as follows:

Our client is now Bernel Ltd, in place of Cheshire Acres Ltd.

<u>Paragraph 1.1</u> The Tree Protection Plan has been updated and is now drawing number LL53.1.02 revision A. The Landscape Design layout drawing number is now LL53.1.01 revision A. and the architect's drawing is ctd's 1773 AL105 Rev. F, Site Plan which also shows the Hard Landscape.

Paragraph 2.4 The drawing number should now be LL53.1.02 rev A.

Paragraph 3.1 The drawing number should now be ctd architect's 1773. AL105 Revision F.

Paragraph 3.2 The drawing number should now be Land Lizard's drawing LL53.1.01 Revision A.

<u>Paragraph 3.5</u> The dates recommended have been missed. It is therefore recommended that these works take place as soon as possible, avoiding the bird nesting and fledging season i.e. between mid February and end July, or as locally adjusted in the light of seasonal weather conditions.

Paragraph 3.10 The proposed rose hedge is included.

If and when referring to the 2012 Tree Survey and Assessment, it should be remembered that the footprints of buildings were amended by 2016 so that the implications assessment in that historic report are now out of date. The Arboricultural Implications Assessment table in Chapter 5 should now read as follows:

Tree Number	Species	Impact	Advice
Plot 1 TE1*	Acer pseudoplatanus Sycamore	None from the building. However a trench will need to be dug to enable foundations. This could take up to max 250mm of fibrous root off the outer edge of the RPZ over a 3m length. This is considered to be a negligible impact. The proposed garden fence between Plots 1 and 2 will require fence posts at say 2.5 – 3m centres (see architect's detail). These can be hand dug to avoid damage to major roots, which are unlikely to be thick in this location towards the edge of the RPZ (root protection zone.)	Tree protection fence to be erected as close as possible to the building. A 1m wide standoff has been shown to enable foundation digging and bricklaying.
Plots 4 & 5 TE6* and TE16*-18	Fraxinus excelsior Ash	None	Nil
Plot 5 TE15*	Betula pubescens Downy birch in holly hedge.	The garage wall will touch the edge of the RPZ. Excavation to 250mm wide strip foundation will involve a 0.6m incision into the edge of the RPZ. This is a negligible impact.	The tree protection fence is to be erected with as close as possible to the proposed building. A 1m standoff is shown to facilitate construction activity.
Plot 6 TE 11	Salix capraea Goat Willow	A similar situation will occur regarding the garage to Plot 6. A negligible quantity of perimeter fibrous root will be lost. The replacement of the originally proposed brick wall with a garden fence to the south of the garage has avoided a segment of root loss. Fence post holes can be hand dug and posts placed accordingly to avoid severance of any major roots which are unlikely in this location.	A 1m standoff has been allowed for excavation, placing of a strip foundation up to 250mm wide and bricklaying.
		The calculated RPZ for this tree will also be impacted by the proposed water treatment plant, although to a lesser degree than the proposed, but now defunct, base to a footbridge over the canal, accepted at appeal. The current proposal will intrude into the outer northeastern edge of the RPZ by up to 2.2m over 8m length. This area will be permanently lost as new water treatment tanks and manholes will be sited underground. However there is still considerable porous area retained and the tree will be taking water from the canal.	A 2m standoff has been allowed to facilitate excavation and installation of these tanks and manholes. It has been emphasised to the designer that all connections are to be protected from root ingress as willows have a strong ability to find water. However the canal is adjacent and will service this need to a significant degree.
	This tree, and TE12 below, is recommended to be heavily pruned or coppiced. The reduction in canopy will compensate for relatively low root loss to accommodate the water treatment plant. These trees have been retained following discussion on site with the Tree Officer in advance of the 2016 report. However, if it is no longer thought important to retain this tree, it could be removed allowing open views across the canal and through the site from the rear of houses on the opposite canal bank. In this situation the water treatment plant and housing engineers need to recall that both these trees are willows and their removal is likely to reduce the quantity of water taken from the soil.		
TE12	Salix cinnerea Grey Willow	The calculated RPZ for this tree will also be impacted by the proposed manholes associated with the water treatment plant. These will intrude into the outer north northeastern edge of the RPZ	A 2m standoff has been allowed to facilitate excavation and installation of this manhole. It has been

		by up to 2.2m over 2m length and between 1m-0m over 2.5m. This area will be permanently lost. However, as for TE11 there is still considerable porous area retained and the tree will be taking water from the canal. The comment above also applies to TE12 if it is no longer thought necessary to retain it. A couple of smaller, more ornamental trees such as crab apple, could be planted instead.	emphasised to the designer that all connections are to be protected from root ingress as willows have a strong ability to find water. However the canal is adjacent and will service this need to a significant degree.
TE14	<i>Crataegus</i> <i>monogyna</i> Hawthorn	The garden wall to Plot 7 will be just beyond the outer edge of the RPZ. The strip foundation beneath will therefore involve a trench which could take 150mm off the outer feeder roots over say 1m length. This is considered to be a negligible impact. Meanwhile, as previously identified, the canopy will need to be raised to around 3m on the east side to allow wall construction but also the movement of people into the amenity woodland.	A 1m standoff has been allowed from the proposed garden wall to allow construction.
Plots 8 & 9 W1	Existing young amenity woodland	A new culvert is proposed to run along the south side of the new garden boundaries to Plots 8 and 9.	The tree protection fence will be sited 1m south of the proposed culvert with 2m standoff around proposed manholes. It is considered that this culvert is likely to be installed at the outset of the construction works and it can therefore be created from the garden, northeast, side of the trench. A standoff of 3m is to be allowed from any retained tree trunk.

If there are any queries please do not hesitate to contact us at the address below. Yours faithfully

For Land Lizard Ltd

Elizabeth Hill Dip LA, CMLI. M.Arbor.A.

Chartered Landscape Architect and Associate Member of the Arboricultural Association.