

APP/17/01274 - land rear of 51-57 Frogmore Lane, Waterlooville

Bernie Harverson

Wed 28/03, 20:46

Eaves, David;

Gargett, Jamie

David,

I refer to our meeting today and as promised have reviewed the response from the Johnston Consultancy and also the new evidence submitted in the form of cross section drawings.

I would refer you back to my report of 5th December 2017 when I listed 5 bullet points under Conclusions – with regards to the first four bullet points the response from the Johnston Consultancy does not answer any of my concerns.

As far as the new cross section evidence is concerned it only goes to reiterate my concerns over retaining walls and footpaths and car ports and Plot 2 all being within the RPA of trees T1 & T2 and yet this is dismissed as not significant.

I would refer them back to their own Method Statement at 8.6 Changes in Ground Surface within RPA's where it states there are no changes except for T2 – either there are levels changes or there are not and clearly there are. How can you then state that there will be a 'No Dig' construction when you have just stated that there will be a dig in the form of levels changes? Similarly at 8.7 there is a distinction made between Changes in Ground Surface and Ground Level – for me they are the same thing? The whole thing does not add up for me and no further info has been provided that would give me confidence that these trees would not suffer root damage so I have no alternative but to maintain my objection.

Best regards,

Bernie Harverson