

ARBORICULTURAL IMPLICATIONS ASSESSMENT.

For Mr James, 6 Netherfield Close Havant.

Produced by Andrew Skeet ONDipArb MW1980

Mr James is submitting a planning application for a minor add-on at the back of number 6. This is a single storey brick built extension to the kitchen, building out into the back garden by just under 2m and at a width of 3m to correspond with the existing kitchen build-out. I have been requested to comment on how this proposal may affect two oaks and one Horse Chestnut nearby.

In the rear garden are two trees at the far end:

- oak #1 near the south west corner
- horse chestnut near the south east corner

In the neighbouring garden 5 Netherfield Close is oak #2 which again is at the far end of the garden, 4m off the boundary dividing 5 and 6.

Oaks #1 and #2 appear to be ancient boundary trees and fall within the veteran category.

- Oak #1: the main stem flares out from 1.4m dia at chest height, to well over 2m dia at ground level and is classically burred buttressed and generally sculptured by time. It has a small crown in proportion to the main stem size, possibly has been pollarded or reduced heavily and repeatedly. It is in good physiological condition.
- Horse Chestnut: this is a small sickly tree which looks to have been pollarded and formed a small compact crown since, the foliage tends to be dull and yellowing throughout.
- Oak #3: this is a very similar tree to oak #1, again carrying a great sense of history and longevity. It appears to be in good physiological condition.

I am unable to comment on the structural/safe condition of the trees but there were no glaring serious defects that caught my attention.

The proposed add-on falls wholly within the Root Protection Area (RPA) of both oaks but is right on the edge of oak #1 RPA and close to the edge of oak #2 RPA and is outside the Horse Chestnut RPA.

When excavating for the footings, some fine root fibre will probably be found emanating from all 3 trees but principally from oak #2.

I understand there is no construction outside of the proposed footprint for, by way of example, drainage or incoming utilities.

The proposal is well clear of the branches of all trees and is not overhung by any branches.

My view is that none of the trees will be harmed during construction as proposed. By this I mean that there will be no adverse effect on the health, stability or long term prospects of any tree.

Oak #1 RPA is 798 square metres and oak #2 RPA is 693 square metres. Especially in the case of oak #2 some of the RPA is under existing buildings (not newly built) but the trees have had decades to adapt their root systems as required so it may be safe to say the RPAs are not compromised.

The proposed construction falls within the overlap of both these RPAs so any fine root loss could be from either oak (but more likely oak #2). The proposed construction will require excavating into a mere 6-7 square metres and is therefore not of any significance to either tree given their very large square metre area. By contrast an excavation of this size at the base of either tree could be seriously harmful to the tree.

Because of the poor condition of the Horse Chestnut and the fact that construction is well outside of its branch spread and just outside its RPA, this tree does merit any detailed comment.

I am advising that no special precautions are necessary when excavating and building.

So far as concerns the possibility of damage to the above-ground parts of the trees, the risk is almost non-existent because oak #1 is so far away and oak #2 is 4 metres into a neighbouring garden. I am recommending that BS5837 spec protective fencing is not necessary and so would be an unjustifiable requirement to place on the applicant. I would consider ground protection to be unnecessary.

I would though, recommend roping or taping off any parts of the garden that the builders will not need access to and requiring them to not use this roped off area for storage. This will minimise the risk of toxic materials seeping into the RPAs, for example from mortar, mortar additives, fuel or oil from any machines in use.

PAGE 2 OF 3

BS 5837 DATA

Tree ID	Tree Name	Physiological Condition	Dia at 1.5m	RPA radius	Class	Crown spread	Height (est)	Age
oak#1	Common Oak	good	1.5m	18m	A	as drawn*	14m	Veteran
oak#2	Common Oak	good	1.4m	17m	A	as drawn*	18m	Veteran
	Horse Chestnut	poor	0.5m	6m	C	as drawn*	10m	Mature

*crown spreads over the applicants garden are measured, off-site crown spreads are estimated assuming trees are roughly symmetrical.



