

FYI: Josephine Lacey

Thank you for inviting us to comment on this proposal.

I offer the following comments:

There is an inconsistency between the two arboricultural reports on the stem diameter of the tree T1 oak offsite in woodland. Given that this is a critical dimension for determining the protection area needed for this tree, the actual measured one is used from the report reference Q0333\Cox\CIR\2023_V1 aerial tree inspection. This is measured as 966mm at 1.5m agl. The dimension used in the TPP is smaller dimension, cited as estimated at 900*. This means that the RPA plotted on the tree protection plan is smaller than it needs to be. This must be amended please.

The report states at 8.3 that T1 is to have its overextended laterals removed as they are an actionable nuisance'. No evidence of this nuisance is provided. Overhang alone is not an actionable nuisance. The tree belongs to third party and through not currently subject to a TPO, permission to carry out any significant works that may reduce the vitality of T1 must be obtained from the owner (believed to be HBC) as must right of access and the right to carry out works to any third party tree from their land.

Para 8.3 states 'An aerial inspection will be carried out to examine the large cavity on the main stem and the results may show a need for further works on safety grounds'. Details of this report do not indicate that it is dangerous.

Para 8.6 Changes in Ground Surface within RPAs states 'There is no change of ground surface per se for the most part within the RPA of T1 Oak as this area has historically been patio and raised beds.' There is a significant difference between construction within and RPA and patio/planting beds: the former will alter hydrology, root severance, available soil volumes for root growth etc.

As there is already a visible, adverse impact on the tree (attributed to the nearby developments in the tree condition survey at paragraph 4: *"The subject tree has apical dieback and a sparse canopy. A reduction in vitality and thinning canopy has likely been caused by the development of the residential estate and associated ground works approximately 8yrs ago"*) any further incursion to the RPA is to be avoided. Pile and raft construction may be acceptable (posited as an option but not stated at the chosen method in para 8.9 foundations), but there must be a detailed methodology and design submitted for approval pre commencement. The detail should include maintaining current soil hydrology. Standard strip foundations will not be acceptable where they are affecting this amount of the RPA (more when correctly plotted)

The design seems to have taken no account of the presence of T1 in its design: the proposal looks to nearly double the footprint of the existing accommodation, and all towards the tree. I feel there are alternative, less impactful designs that could be explored that would extend away from the tree to the west for example.

With the current level of detail on foundation/construction type, and the inaccurate plotting of the RPA at this time I am unable to support the application. Further detail on RPA size, construction type and consideration of the actual layout of the proposal is required please.

Kind regards,
Sarah Kiss

Sarah Kiss – MICFor, Dip Arb (RFS), F.Arbor.A
Veteran tree specialist – consulting level

Tree Officer – External Works