

From: [Rachael Simpkin](#)
To: [Planning \(SMDC\)](#)
Subject: FW: SMD/2021/0456 - S.73 Application re Land off Ayr Road, Cheadle - Landscaping
Date: 30 October 2024 10:10:33
Attachments: [image001.png](#)

From: Steve Massey

Sent: 29 October 2024 18:46

To: Rachael Simpkin

Subject: SMD/2021/0456 - S.73 Application re Land off Ayr Road, Cheadle - Landscaping
Rachael

Revised landscaping plans were received on 24/09/2024, also seeking to address outstanding discharge of Condition 7 (Landscaping) of planning permission SMD/2018/0180, and comprise:

D10551.001 Rev 01 - Landscape Masterplan

D10551.200 Rev 01 – Planting Schedule

D10551.201 Rev 01 – Planting Plan Sheet 1

D10551.202 Rev 01 – Planting Plan Sheet 2

D10551.203 Rev 01 – Planting Plan Sheet 3

D10551.400 Rev 01 – Landscape Management Plan

The revised landscaping scheme is broadly similar to previous submissions under various applications. In terms of proposed species, types of planting for hedges, plot frontages, open space areas etc the proposed landscaping scheme is a very standard treatment for a suburban housing estate, and overall I have no in principle objection, although there are some specific comments I could make as follows:

1. I have previously commented in relation to this site, but seemingly to no effect, that the Double Flowered Wild Cherry *Prunus avium* 'Plena' features strongly throughout the planting scheme, including across open space areas, but that the 'Plena' variety is sterile and therefore of no benefit to pollinating species of insects. For what it's worth I would once again request that *Prunus avium* 'Plena' is replaced on the Planting Schedule by the basic native *Prunus avium* (although some have already been planted and are therefore presumably 'Plena' anyway).
2. Planting Plan Sheet 1 indicates new native hedge planting along the site boundary either side of the main access road off Froghall Road and continuing along the side/rear boundaries of Nos 104 & 106 to meet the existing retained hedge at the rear of 100 Froghall Road. This is agreed/supported as, once established and grown up, the new hedge will (a) visually soften the harsh appearance (as seen from the development spine road) of the new timber board fence already installed along the boundary and (b) provide some additional screening/softening to address the visual impact of the new development on higher ground to the rear of those older Froghall Road properties.
3. It is also noted that no new hedging is indicated along the site boundary to the rear of 118 Ness Grove – again this is agreed/supported as the residents at No. 118 specifically stated they did not want new tree/hedge planting here.

4. Similarly it is noted that there is no planting proposed generally along the site boundary to the rear of 108 – 114 Ness Grove and at the side of 5 Ayr Road; I understand that an alternative retaining structure is now proposed along the boundary as the gravel board fence base already used is proving unsuccessful. Additional planting could potentially lead to future problems with the retaining structure and is therefore anyway best left out of the development landscaping scheme; in addition there could be difficulty accessing any new planting for establishment/maintenance if it was provided in a narrow gap between two parallel boundary structures (although it does raise the question of: if a narrow gap is retained/created, how will it be treated/maintained, and by whom?). In due course occupiers of older properties on Ness Grove/Ayr Road and new plots on the development can add planting within their gardens as/where they see fit.
5. Planting Plan Sheet 1 appears to indicate new native hedge planting along the northern (Donkey Lane) boundary of the site from Froghall Road up to the curtilage of The Gables 22 Donkey Lane – which once again is supported/agreed, partly as mitigation for pre-existing already (and unnecessarily) removed, and also to soften the hard/abrupt appearance of the newly constructed close-boarded fence, and new dwellings beyond, as viewed from the previously semi-rural Donkey Lane. HOWEVER, the drawing annotation for this stretch of hedge suggests that the number of plants currently specified would be substantially insufficient to create a hedge along the full length of this stretch. In addition, the Landscape Management Plan appears to indicate new native hedge planting extending no further than opposite 9 Donkey Lane – this, together with insufficient plant numbers specified leads me to suspect that the developer is not in fact proposing new hedge planting up to the curtilage of The Gables. For the avoidance of doubt, I would suggest that we should require new hedge planting, with sufficient plant numbers, to run from Froghall Road up to the corner of the curtilage of The Gables.
6. As an aside, it is noted that the Landscape Management Plan 10551.400 Rev 01 in fact gives no information or specification for any landscape management; it merely sets out in alternative schematic form the different vegetation types proposed to be planted/seeded under the planting scheme, so I'm not really sure what the purpose of this drawing is.
7. Another aside: I note from Google Streetview images that a fair amount of new planting has already been carried out, especially around the new site access off Froghall Road and along the spine road of the development, but in some cases tree species planted obviously are not as specified in the proposed planting scheme! Whilst the substitution of some tree species may not, in practice, create any serious issues, there are, for example, lost opportunities to plant what is specified in the plans as native Oak (= best value for wildlife) whereas non-native Maple has actually been planted instead, and so on. Leads me to question the purpose of the developer submitting and us approving detailed planting plans which have already not been followed!
8. A final anomaly noted: again from Google Streetview images I note that a new tree has been planted to the east (side) of the dwelling at Plot 1, but not in the position indicated on the landscape plan, rather it is directly in front of the detached garage to plot 1 currently used as the site marketing suite and the tree will inevitably need to be removed when the building is subsequently converted to garage use with paved access approach. Advisable that this tree is transplanted to a more appropriate position (as already indicated on the proposed planting scheme plans!) as soon as possible during the forthcoming dormant season to address this apparent lack of foresight while the tree is still young/small enough to transplant.

In the event that planning permission is granted (and as stated I have no overall in principle objection to the proposed landscaping scheme, although some details should be revised as variously noted above) I would request that the following condition be imposed (albeit existing compliance with their own submitted scheme is already

imprecise in places):

1. The planting scheme shown on TEP Drgs. Nos. (*insert drawing titles numbers, as may be updated by any further revisions to address my detailed comments*) shall be fully implemented before the end of the first available dormant season (November to February inclusive) following completion of the development hereby approved. The trees, shrubs etc planted in accordance with this landscaping scheme shall be properly maintained for a period of 5 years following planting. Any plants which within this period are damaged, become diseased, die, are removed, or otherwise fail to establish shall be replaced during the next suitable season

Steve Massey Arboricultural Officer

Development Services

High Peak Borough Council and Staffordshire Moorlands District Council

423071

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

www.staffsmoorlands.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>
