

From: Harris, David (ETE)
Sent: Thursday, August 15, 2024 6:06 PM
To: Eaves, David
Cc: Hampshire Arb Consultancy
Subject: APP/24/00274 Langstone Technology Park. Phase 2 only. Arb comments.

CAUTION: This email came from outside of the council - only open links and attachments that you're expecting.

Good afternoon David,

APP/24/00274 | Submission of reserved matters (appearance, landscaping, layout and scale) for Phase 2 only (excluding phases 2a and 2b) pursuant to outline planning permission APP/22/00172 for phased demolition of existing buildings and the erection of new flexible use employment floorspace (Use Classes E(g)(i)-(iii)/B2/B8) and ancillary uses (Use Classes E(b), E(d) and E(f)); and associated works. | Langstone Technology Park, 2B Langstone Road, Havant, PO9 1SA.

I am guided by the previous comments made by my colleague Wayne Isaacson, issued in June 2024.

The arb method statement (AMS) provided by SJ Stephens Associates, ref: 1746 dated 24/07/24, is noted.

As there are no trees to be retained within this element of phase 2, I am content that the AMS provides reassurance of proposed tree planting within the confines of the phase 2 boundary.

The proposed landscape detail, provided by PRC Architecture and Planning, indicates the use of three tree types to be planted as 18-20cm girth rootballed trees.

I would suggest that this stock size, particularly for rootballed trees, is too large to encourage reasonable establishment and planting success.

The applicant would be well advised to re-visit the stock sizes, and down-size to much smaller container grown specimens, which would generally be less expensive to purchase, and would give a much better chance of reasonable establishment success if well maintained. Such trees to be planted in the very tree-hostile tarmac environment of the car park will need to be extremely heat and drought tolerant, whilst also being resilient to salt laden winds.

In order to assess the likely success of acceptable soil volume, I am guided by the GreenBlue Urban Soil Volume Guide, version 1.1.

This guide states that soil volumes required for successful establishment and growth for "small" trees; with canopy diameters in maturity of around 3m, would be around 5.5 cubic metres.

The guide recommends the acceptable soil volume for "medium" trees; with a canopy diameter in maturity of around 4.5m, as 10cubic metres.

The current tree choice proposed by the applicant is:

Acer campestre "William Caldwell" – (Field maple with an upright canopy) an upright variety.

Carpinus betulus “Frans Fontane” (Hornbeam with a broadly upright canopy)– a pyramidal canopy shaped tree.

Corylus columna (Turkish hazel) – a broadly pyramidal canopy shaped tree.

All three of these trees are described in the Soil Volume Guide as being “medium”, with the field maple being described as “medium to large” in maturity.

Therefore the proposed tree soil volumes appear to be too small for the selected tree types.

Also, field maple is well known for dropping sticky “honeydew” caused by aphid infestations during the summer months; and Turkish hazel frequently produces and drops fist-sized clusters of spiky covered nuts during the later summer months – both of which make them questionable choices in terms of their seasonal maintenance burden when used near car parking areas.

The hornbeam variety starts life as an upright canopied tree, but soon becomes more spreading as it matures, and it often requires very much more space in maturity than it does as a semi-mature tree. Hornbeam also has been observed to produce honeydew caused by aphid infestations, and this under-reported phenomenon appears to be on the increase owing to our hotter summers.

It is unlikely that the projected canopy radius after 25 years, as shown on the landscape general arrangement plan, will be accurate, as the hornbeam and Turkish hazels in particular will usually be much larger trees at this age, than indicated on the plan.

I appreciate that the tree choice may be a matter for the landscape architect team to comment upon, but from a professional arboricultural viewpoint, the genus/species choice appears to be inappropriate, the stock size is too large, and the soil volumes seem too small to encourage reasonable establishment and allow the trees to thrive.

Perhaps the applicant may wish to re-assess the tree planting layout on the northern and eastern elements of the scheme, where currently the plans indicate the use of “drought tolerant turf” and a “double staggered native hedge”. Instead, perhaps move trees from the northern and eastern parking bays, incorporate acceptable build-outs, and plant trees in a co-joined planting trench along the northern and eastern element of the scheme. This would go some way to address the soil volume inadequacies.

Please do come back to me to discuss as necessary.

Kind regards.

Dave Harris
Tree Officer – External Works.
Hampshire Arb Consultancy.

My working week is Monday-Thursday.

Team email: arb@hants.gov.uk

Web: www.hants.gov.uk/roads

 [@Hantshighways](https://twitter.com/Hantshighways)



© Hampshire County Council 2017 | [Disclaimer](#) | [Privacy Statement](#)
Tel: 0300 555 1388