

Comments for Planning Application APP/18/00450

Application Summary

Application Number: APP/18/00450

Address: Land at Forty Acre Farm, Havant Road, Havant

Proposal: Erection of 320 dwellings (including a 30% provision of affordable homes), 66 bed care home, provision of public open space, habitat mitigation zone, allotments, closure of existing access and creation of 2 new access points and associated infrastructure following demolition of existing buildings.

Case Officer: Lewis Oliver

Customer Details

Name: Mr Terry Smith

Address: 84 Stakes Road Purbrook Waterlooville

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Complainant

Stance: Customer made comments neither objecting to or supporting the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: Havant Borough Tree Wardens

Comment on Planning Application for Forty Acres Farm

Stance: Neutral

We have not had an opportunity to visit the site and have only been able to view it from the A2030 Havant Road. We have therefore relied upon the documents submitted with the proposal, in particular, the Arboricultural Assessment and Method Statement and the Tree Protection Plan, both prepared by Barrell Tree Consultancy, and the Planting Schedule prepared by fabrik.

It has been noted in public comments that documents were not available to view due to system problems and the time allowed for comments should be extended. We have found the same problems and agree with the call for an extension.

We note that the trees on the proposed development site have been individually inspected and, taking the report at face value, the removal of a number of trees can be justified on management grounds due to their poor condition. The removal of a relatively small number of additional trees is proposed to facilitate the development and none of those trees are considered to be of high value.

However, dead trees should not be dismissed as having no value. Woodpeckers make holes in them for nests and other species, including bats, live in disused woodpecker nests and other cavities. Beetle larvae live in dead wood.

Taken together, the total number of trees proposed for removal is significant and, as mature trees will be removed, it is important that trees in excess of that number, with the potential to grow to a similar size, are planted to mitigate the effects. It will take many years for the replacement trees to reach a similar size and visual significance to some of the trees removed.

We note and support the comment from the HBC Arboriculture Manager that 'The Landscape Master Plan must include high levels of shrub and tree planting as well as other landscape features to enhance this site - newly planted trees must be of a standard size so as to give immediate impact and amenity benefit.'

The proposed new tree planting scheme specified by the project landscape architect aims to 'supplement retained trees and enhance local character'. Planting needs to include species that are capable of growing to a substantial size rather than the lollipops that are often planted by developers.

There is a comprehensive list of species proposed for planting together with detailed planting instructions. However, it is unclear how many trees of which species will be planted or the length of native species hedges to be included. The Arboricultural Assessment and Method Statement notes in section 1.5 that "the final selection of species, sizes and location are flexible and open to amendment, as appropriate." This vagueness is unsatisfactory given the tree loss proposed. A definite proposal with species, sizes, numbers and locations would go a long way to satisfy concerns about the ultimate effectiveness of the proposed new planting.

We are pleased to see the retention of two distinct linear belts of existing trees and the proposed community orchard, although we note it is described as 'small'; the plan indicates 17 orchard trees which will probably not be large specimens.

The development needs to be closely monitored to ensure the proposals and mitigation arrangements, including protection and care of trees during development and tree planting, are delivered as stated.

According to the Planning Statement, Policy DM23 - Sites for Brent Geese and Waders states: 'Where a negative impact upon an important site cannot be avoided or mitigated and replacement feeding/roosting habitat is not or cannot be provided on a no net loss basis, the proposal will be refused.'

Whilst the proposed Habitat Mitigation Zone may be suitable for some bird species, it is questionable whether Brent Geese will find it attractive and, if it is treated as a public space, there is likely to be continuous disturbance from residents and others, particularly dog walkers. There is likely to be further disturbance from the proposed circulatory pedestrian loop to be created around the habitat mitigation zone. The removal of existing trees from this area may therefore not deliver

the intended outcome.

Terry Smith

Chairman

Havant Borough Tree Wardens

These comments are submitted on behalf of Havant Borough Tree Wardens; they do not necessarily represent the personal views of The Chairman.