



Planning Application Ref No. FUL 2018 2651  
Response to Tree Officers comments. Received 3 December 2018

### 1. Tree Officers Comments.

*This proposed site lies to a southern suburb of the City known as the Cannon Park estate.*

*The site is furnished with a varied selection of tree species of varied age classes which includes; an ancient boundary hedgerow to the shared eastern boundary with Shultern Lane which is a sunken lane with ditch and bank archaeological/ landscape features. This hollow lane leads east to the Ivy farm (Canley Hamlet) Conservation Area. The Canley Crematorium is located to the east of Shultern Lanes eastern boundary.*

*There are currently two Tree Preservations in force to the site; City of Coventry (Shultern Lane No 1) TPO 2001 which protects trees to the east boundary, and City of Coventry (De Montfort Way No.1) TPO 1994, for trees to the southern boundary.*

#### RESPONSE:

We acknowledge the existing TPO's designations on site and would note our proposals do not impact upon their integrity.

### 2. Tree Officers Comments.

*The Tree Constraints Plan which informs towards the design layout, identifies a number of pinch points between the Root Protection Areas' retained trees and the proposed footprint. The close proximity of the 6 storey proposed build would create significant shade upon the leaf surface of the trees, woodland and hedges which lie to the build's NE – W shading arc. This reduction in light levels could have a negative effect upon the plant's efficiency of photosynthetic light capture, the local ecology and woodland vegetation.*

*I recommend that the applicant submits a revised layout to set back the development from the Shultern Lane hedgerow and woodland and to staggering back the proposed tiers from the visual vantage points within grounds of the Canley Crematorium.*

#### RESPONSE:

The comments have been taken on board and acknowledged in the revised drawing submission. The building footprint has been moved further away from the pinch point highlighted.

### 3. Tree Officers Comments.

The following TPO quality trees should be retained as they significantly contribute towards the local amenity of the area;- mature Pine group T20-26 to allow replacement of less quality Birch T17 for new access, woodland W1 which includes the specimen Lime tree T105.

Set back proposed 6<sup>th</sup> storey building from buffer of landscape features to eastern boundary.

Approved Tree pens to be appended with tree protection posters displayed at 10m centres (poster illustration to be submitted for approval)

#### RESPONSE:

As noted in the comments above (item 2), the revised drawings have the development set back further back from the eastern boundary. In relation to T20 –T26, we have looked at a realignment of the entrance area but have several compliance constraints to also acknowledge. Our Transport Consultants response to the above request to realign the entrance;

' The vehicular access has been positioned in the only location that is safe to allow us to accommodate the toucan crossing and deliver a vehicular access. The location is restricted by the existing accesses to the



20 December 2018

Planning Application Ref No. FUL 2018 2651  
Response to Tree Officers comments. Received 3 December 2018

Church, over spill car park (which will form the separate access to the student accommodation), service yard and the exit from the main shopping centre car park. This was discussed and agreed as the only safe location for the car park access with the Highway officer at Coventry.

The minimum distance from a pedestrian crossing to a junction is 20m (LTN 2/95 2.1.1.1), however in this case moving the proposed car park access closer to the pedestrian crossing would mean that the access is opposite the service yard and this would result in conflict with the yard traffic, queuing traffic at the crossing and movements in and out of the car park that would be a real safety concern.

As a Road Safety Audit Team Leader I would not approve of moving the junction closer to the crossing due to the conflicts above and the reduced forward visibility, which could result in significant risk to both pedestrians, cyclists and drivers'.

In relation to the loss of T105 and T19, we believe the opportunity to greatly improve the overall site wide development significantly outweighs maintaining these two trees. The Tree Replacement Strategy issued as part of the early submission demonstrates when read with the Landscape Planting plan proposals the significant increase in the quality and quantity of tree planting as part of the application.

The revised layout has managed to preserve T22, T23, T24, T25 and T26 with only the loss of T20 and T21. T20 is a poor specimen with a snapped out limb and areas of deadwood. T21 is a small Norway maple of no significant height, stature or impact on the surrounding amenity. The proposed trees in replacement of these losses will be of a much higher quality standard, more appropriate to the site and its surroundings and provide long term benefit.

#### **4. Tree Officers Comments.**

DTPP – pre commencement.

AMS- to identify how the safe construction within RPA's and crown spreads can take place without causing damage to the trees. The AMS should also to provide an example illustration of a Site Monitoring Sheet, the approved version would need to be signed off by a qualified arboriculturist at key phases eg tree pen construction prior to any site activity taking place, and for dismantling following the physical build phase. The SMS needs to be submitted to the LPA upon completion.

#### **RESPONSE:**

We trust item 4 can be provided as a Condition.