

From: [Jane Curley](#)
To: [Planning Comments \(SMDC\)](#)
Subject: FW: Fwd: SMD/2024/0176 - Brough Park Leisure Centre - INITIAL COMMENTS
Date: 09 July 2024 13:08:27
Attachments: [ATT00007.png](#)

From: Steve Massey <>
Sent: Thursday, July 4, 2024 2:00:40 pm
To: Jane Curley <>
Subject: SMD/2024/0176 - Brough Park Leisure Centre - INITIAL COMMENTS

Hi Jane

Just some initial headline points, with further detail to follow – perhaps useful to have a chat first?

- Tree survey has not extended beyond the hedge to the NW of the building, where there are some mature ornamental trees along the path past the play area – but safe to say the proposed extension to the studios/gym at the NW corner, and the relocated bin store ASHP compound would have no detrimental impact on these trees.
- The proposed forward (SW) extension of the main pool would require removal of Beech tree T19. This is an early mature tree of good form in good condition and prominent position, I would suggest its theoretical remaining life would be more than the 20 – 40 year estimate in the application tree report. However, it is not an original tree from the Ball Haye House era and I can appreciate that the benefits of the proposed development would justifiably outweigh the loss of this tree. No objection on balance; scheme should make provision somewhere somehow for replacement planting elsewhere to mitigate the loss of this and any other trees.
- I do have concerns over some of the impact on trees arising from additional/reconfigured parking arrangements.
- T11 and T12 are probably the oldest Lime trees in Brough Park, could be at upper end of 200 years old and clearly part of the heritage/history of the site in addition to being significant individual trees of notable character. However, they have both (correctly) been identified as showing evidence of *Kretzschmaria deusta*, a very dangerous stem base/root decay fungus often leading to sudden stem snap and full tree failure (despite healthy crown condition). We are weighing up whether they could safely be retained in much reduced form to preserve part of the site heritage, although it is a distinct possibility that full removal of one or both is the most appropriate. If retained, it would be preferable that there is no development encroachment within their Root Protection Areas (RPAs for these 2 trees are not shown due to tree report recommendation of felling, but would be comparable radii to trees T6 & T7). However, bottom line is that due to their condition and requirement for dramatic management treatment, T11 and T12 should not

appropriately or reasonably be held as overriding constraints/objection to development proposals.

- Notwithstanding issues/conclusion with T11 and T12, other trees in this area would also be affected by the scheme and I'm not very comfortable with potential impacts on the landscape structure/setting of the leisure centre within the main town park simply to accommodate extra parking in the form proposed. Is this amount of additional parking critically required? Could we look at alternative layout to provide more parking with lesser/no impact?
- Specifically, tree T14 (mature Lime in good condition – again I'd suggest its potential remaining life exceeds 40 years) appears to be indicated for removal without explanation, its stem position is not directly in the way of new parking although proposals would have a potentially significant harmful impact on its root system (well within RPA). However, it has grown as part of a pair with adjacent T15, each individually substantially 1-sided but in combination forming a significant combined canopy and important part of the landscape structure at the front of the leisure centre.
- Parking and accessways shown encroaching into RPAs of several nearby trees (T13 – T17 inclusive, in addition to aforementioned T11 and T12, and indicated electrical services installations for car park lighting would provide further encroachment. Application tree report suggests no-dig cellular confinement load support construction specification for hard surfacing within RPAs, but I'm never really confident that developers implement timely and effective tree protection measures and special construction specifications unless brought to task by which time significant damage has often already occurred. Better to avoid harm rather than seek to minimise harm. I appreciate SMDC is both client/developer and LPA for this scheme which ought to give us considerable control, but that's just the theory.... It would be preferable to at least consider potential alternative parking provision/layout which could avoid or reduce harm to the important tree stock.
- A side issue: the scheme appears to propose quite a significant amount of blank/dead elevation – in particular to main frontage (pool extension) facing Park Road – and bin store/ASHP compound would also be very prominent – with little spatial opportunity for screening/filtering by new structural landscaping/replacement tree planting/landscape enhancement in keeping with the surroundings.

Steve Massey Arboricultural Officer

Development Services

High Peak Borough Council and Staffordshire Moorlands District Council

Tel: Mob:

www.highpeak.gov.uk | Follow HPBC on [X \(Formerly Twitter\)](#) | [Facebook](#)

www.staffs Moorlands.gov.uk | Follow SMDC on [X \(Formerly Twitter\)](#) | [Facebook](#)



High Peak
Borough Council



STAFFORDSHIRE
moorlands
DISTRICT COUNCIL
ACHIEVING EXCELLENCE

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>

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.staffsmoorlands.gov.uk/YourData>

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.staffsmoorlands.gov.uk/YourData>
