
From: Steve Massey
Sent: 28 September 2023 14:09
To: Jo Gregory
Cc: Mark Waleczek; Planning Comments (SMDC)
Subject: SMD/2022/0592 - Land at Oakamoor Road, Cheadle - FURTHER COMMENTS IN RESPONSE TO APPLICANT'S TREES TECHNICAL NOTE

Categories:

Jo

Further to the Arboricultural Impact Assessment Technical Note (hereafter "TN") dated September 2023, I have the following additional comments:

The TN suggests that the tree species in the carr woodland Group G4 are naturally vigorous and robust, and would be likely to withstand the minor encroachment, as currently indicated, into their combined Root Protection Area (RPA); this may be the case in general terms and as a group they are described as healthy, although the actual condition of the specific trees within G4 has not been individually assessed.

The TN suggests that any significant engineering measures subsequently found to be necessary to adequately support the north-east edge of the proposed turning head as currently indicated – to address the low lying and marshy ground conditions within and around Group G4 – may be assessed for additional encroachment into/impact on the RPA of G4 as part of any subsequent reserved matters/detailed application. This approach may be acceptable in principle, as the application is for outline planning permission with details of layout reserved for future consideration, but only if it is made clear in the event of grant of outline permission at this stage that the outline permission confers no approval/support/encouragement for the internal road layout, and only as long as the approval of access details at this stage as part of the outline planning permission explicitly relates only to the location and form of the proposed new site access off Oakamoor Road and does not relate to or approve the internal road layout. There would be the high possibility that in the event of substantial engineering measures proving necessary to support the turning head encroaching into soft ground conditions, this could be found to be unacceptable in relation to impact on Group G4 leading to refusal of internal road layout details and/or a need for localised amended layout design to avoid significant impact on G4 (a point acknowledged in the TN). However, the applicant may be more reluctant to submit further layout amendments at that stage if they have by then secured an outline planning permission for a specified quantum of development which refers to/depends on the indicative road layout already submitted.

With reference to G4 canopy clearance from the front elevations of Plots 28 – 32 the illustrative masterplan S3-J (also used as the base plan in the Arb Impact Assessment) shows the G4 canopy to be, at closest, c.5m from the front elevation (of Plot 30, at the centre of these dwellings), supporting the 5 – 7m clearance suggested at paragraph 1.3 of the TN. However, from Statmap aerial photos (dated 2018 – 2021) the canopy appears to extend a bit further southwards in practice and would at closest give a more realistic minimum clearance of only c.3m; an additional 2 – 5 years growth of these trees (described as vigorous species in paragraph 1.2 of the TN) since the air photos were taken is likely to have further reduced the available clearance. Whilst the TN correctly notes that details of layout are a reserved matter for future consideration (by which time there may be even further canopy growth from these vigorous trees!) it already appears that the proximity relationship between dwellings at Plots 28 – 32 and the G4 canopy extent would not be acceptable as currently indicated, and I would again question whether it would be appropriate to grant outline planning permission based on an illustrative layout which in this regard fails to demonstrate that the proposed development would be acceptably accommodated with reference to existing constraints.

I would again point to the comments of Staffs Wildlife Trust who from an ecological/hydrological perspective have suggested a minimum 10m undeveloped buffer around the existing carr woodland (G4) and its associated marshy

grassland; something along these lines would also automatically design out the tree-related issue noted above (and at least give the opportunity to ease some of the visual impact concerns I have previously raised), and if the site has to be developed at all I would support the Trust's 10m buffer approach.

Steve Massey

Arboricultural Officer / Development Services
Staffordshire Moorlands District Council and High Peak Borough Council

Moorlands House, Stockwell Street, Leek, Staffordshire Moorlands ST13 6HQ
Tel:

E-mail:

www.staffsmoorlands.gov.uk www.highpeak.gov.uk

Do you really need to print out this Email? Be green - keep it on the screen.

This email is intended for the addressee(s) only and may contain sensitive, privileged or confidential information that could be protectively marked. If you are not the addressee please do not use the information in any way. If you have received this email in error please notify the sender immediately and delete it from your system. Thank you.

The Council may be required to disclose this email or any responses to it under the Freedom of Information Act 2000. The way in which we handle personal information is set out in our privacy notice and is available at <https://www.highpeak.gov.uk/YourData>
