

Bob Phillips

From: Gareth Hare <gareth.hare@highpeak.gov.uk>
Sent: 25 August 2026 08:58
To: Bob Phillips
Cc: Ben Haywood
Subject: Appeal ref 6006040: Talbot Road

Good morning Bob. Please find my comments below relating to the abovementioned appeal and Charles Crawfords' proof of evidence:

From an Arboricultural perspective, and with regard to existing trees, the indicative layout within the refused application, and the one currently proposed with Charles Crawfords proof of evidence, appear similar. With existing trees largely sited around the periphery, the retention of the majority of B and C category trees appears to have been achieved although the precise detail of this is unclear. Arboricultural comments submitted on the 03/06/25 criticised the lack of an Arboricultural Impact Assessment to BS5837-2012. This still appears to be the case and although the design is indicative, an AIA would be a key document in progressing further detailed comments and on the part of the applicants, progressing further detailed design. One example of why this is critically important is at 5.4.3 of the proof: *Where trees are to be retained, there should be no changes to ground levels within their root protection areas to avoid damage to their roots (see section 5.6).* (5.6 deals with Earthworks and the substantial slope of the site). The constraints and the impact of proposed earthworks and level changes would be just one of the elements addressed.

The previous Arboricultural comments also make reference to tree lined streets and para 136 of the NPPF. This point is addressed specifically within the proof of evidence at 5.9.2: *Whilst this is an issue to be addressed at reserved matters stage, the illustrative layout shows extensive planting of street trees. Many streets on the layout front onto public open space, which allows ample opportunity for tree planting. A 3m wide verge has been allowed alongside the central street within the development to accommodate tree planting. As noted at paragraph 5.7.5 above, this verge could also accommodate a swale.*

Whilst the above is appreciated, it would have been good to have had the opportunity to engage with the designers on the broad principles of the street tree planting, sizes of trees at maturity, clearance to properties, whether a swale or other SUDS solution would be the best option etc. This kind of engagement- in the usual course of application submission- often results in higher quality and more sustainable schemes.

It is acknowledged that the detail put forward supports an outline proposal and demonstrates only one of the ways in which the site may be developed. Nevertheless, from an Arboricultural perspective, the proposals within Charles Crawfords' proof of evidence have the potential to deliver a positive scheme.

Arboricultural features, whether existing or proposed are a key element in the indicative details and supporting/developmental plans such as the urban design framework, drainage strategy etc. The landscape opportunity areas, SUDS, Natural Play, Pond and Boardwalk, Community Allotment and Biodiversity and Amenity Space, all feature trees as strong, key components within their indicative typologies.

This is supported by the design principles at 4.4.3 and particularly from an Arboricultural perspective, principles 2 and 16 are supportive of retained and proposed trees. More broadly, the design principles could be secured via condition (per 4.4.2) to ensure they are carried forward to any reserved matters scheme and this approach is supported.

As previously detailed, there are elements within the scheme which could have benefitted from further engagement prior to submission-such as the central verge/swale, the current lack of an AIA and the broad principles of the street tree planting, sizes of trees at maturity, clearance to properties etc.

However, these details could also be dealt with at reserved matters stage with sufficient positive engagement and collaborative working.

I am broadly satisfied, on balance, that the details put forward by Charles Crawford constitute sufficient information to demonstrate how the development can achieve high quality design and acceptable amenity standards. This would be re-enforced by the inclusion of the previously detailed design principles, by condition on any approval or inspectors' decision.

Kind regards

Gareth

Gareth Hare Arboriculture Officer

Development Services

High Peak Borough Council and Staffordshire Moorlands District Council

Mob: **07483385248**

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

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

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>
