

# PLANNING CONSULTATION REPLY

To: Rachael Roddis	Date: 07.02.2022
From: Edward Jowett	Extn: 2557

**APPLICATION: Darley Cliff Hall, Kingwell Road, Worsbrough, S70 4AG.**

**2 0 2 1 1 5 6 7**

## Site Appraisal

The site was visited by Edward Jowett and the trees were briefly inspected.

One letter of objection has been received in relation to the proposal; the trees help with pollution caused by the A61 Upper Sheffield Road and the age of the Copper Beech Tree.

The application is to remove and replace Holly (T1), Cherry (T2), Pine (T3), Silver Lime (T4) and Copper Beech (T5) and replace with 26 new native deciduous trees.

The Holly and the Cherry tree are both relatively insignificant and would not merit protection in their own right. Regardless of this they are protected, however they do have significant issues with the Cherry having lost limbs in the past with decay present as well as extensive bacterial canker. The Holly is in slightly better condition but does have some structural issues and some cavities which are as a result of past management. Both trees ultimately have a limited long term future and will ultimately decline quite rapidly and as such their removal and replacement is considered acceptable.

The Pine tree is a poor specimen which is having a detrimental effect on the Oak which it is growing into. The Oak is a far superior specimen and as such the removal of this tree to enable the continued development of the Oak is considered sensible and appropriate management to keep one good specimen rather than ending with two poor specimens due to the competition between them.

The Silver Lime has a major crack in the main union. This tree is therefore hazardous and needs to be removed as soon as possible given the size of the tree and threat to both the applicants and neighbouring properties.

The Copper Beech is a large mature high value specimen. The reason given for removal is due to the damage to the listed wall. The documents provided are very basic with the tree survey simply asserting that the tree requires removal due to the damage to the wall. This is clearly unacceptable and I fail to see what the author aimed to achieve by simply making a comment and then not detailing the rationale. Regrettably this document is of no use in making the decision on this tree. This should be referred back to the consultant really for their reasoning on their comment to be provided. Having looked at the tree however, the reason is evident and entirely obvious (which raises the question of why this was not detailed in the discussion) and I have no desire to waste the applicant time in pursuing this with the consultant.

Even if a repair to the wall could be made then unfortunately the level of damage caused to the tree in effecting that repair would be catastrophic given that excavations would have to be made (particularly in light of the retaining nature of the

wall) on two sides to within approximately half a meter. This would undoubtedly leave the tree unstable as the depth of the wall would necessitate the removal of any structural roots on those two sides. Not repairing the wall is also not an option as in places it is clearly being pushed out and will ultimately be a hazard to neighbouring properties. It is therefore with deep regret that I must agree to the removal of this tree.

It is acknowledged that the trees provide amenity and help with pollution, however as outlined above those subject to removal are in serious decline and it is proposed to replace the trees subject to removal with other trees which will extend the overall life of the woodland area.

The trees will require replacing and plans detailing this have been provided (Drawing numbers 4R1 Rev A.1 Tree Removal and Replacement Planting Scheme Rear Garden received 4<sup>th</sup> February 2022 and 4R1 Rev A.1 Tree Removal and Replacement Planting Scheme Front Garden received 4<sup>th</sup> February 2022) these are comprehensive and go well beyond what is required for direct replacement of the trees to be removed.

I can confirm with regret that the removal and replacement of the trees subject to this application are required and/or appropriate and as such there is no objection from an arboricultural perspective.

**Note:** Assessments of tree condition and safety are based on a simple visual inspection from ground level. Comments should not be taken as a definitive assessment of tree health, as this should be carried out by a suitably qualified arboriculturist, possibly including a high level inspection. The applicant should be reminded of the owner's legal responsibilities to ensure that trees are regularly inspected and maintained in a safe condition.

## **Recommendations**

### APPROVE

The above works are approved subject to conditions