
TO: HBC Planning Services
FROM: Consultee Hampshire County Council
Arboricultural Consultancy
SUBJECT: **land at Palk Road**
DATE: Tuesday, 18 June 2024
REF: APP/22/01231
YOUR REF:

Dear Case Officer.

1. I have carried out a review of the relevant documents available on the HBC planning portal and provided comments in a previous response. The following is my further response to clarification provided by the applicant's planning consultant.
2. Please note this is as desktop review only, as I have not had instruction for a site visit. In the absence of a site visit I must assume any submitted descriptions and assessments of the trees and the site to be true, fair, and accurate.
3. I will deal with each point in turn and have copied their comment in italics.
4. *"It is recognised that the comments have been made based on desktop review only and that a site visit has not taken place. Therefore we attach two photos of the trees for visual reference, which shows that the trees are not of significance nor stature to warrant a 'B' category: [2 pictures provided] An Expected Remaining Contribution (ERC) of +20 years does not automatically warrant a higher category. The ERCs recorded during the survey are as per BS5837:2012 and are given in the context of how long a tree would last at a minimum if there was no-development and if the trees were to be left in situ.*

The photographs in my opinion show that tree T4 should be regarded as category 'B'. The picture of T6 would also suggest this is worthy of category 'B', but I would accept 'C'. significant remaining contributions support the higher categories.

5. *"Both trees are consistent with being self-seeded and given their locational context of being next to the railway and will be significantly pruned prior to maturity as required to give clearance from the rails regardless. From experience, pruning by railways would not be conducted in a sympathetic manner. It is considered that National Rail likely would not have significant objection with having the trees removed completely due to loss of amenity if they required it."*

The fact that the trees may be self-seeded is irrelevant, as is the likely pruning regime of National Rail. I accept that the pruning will not be obvious from the railway side. My advisory comment was that the pruning proposed is unnecessary and will be detrimental to the form and appearance of the trees. The view of this will be for the development/ residents' side.

6. *The trees are not afforded any statutory protection and the pruning specified is to manage overhanging material (both roots and branches), which outside of development could be conducted without prior permission from the tree owner or local authority. Management of trespassing material back to no further than the boundary line is in accordance with common*

law precedent, regardless of the resulting amenity of the trees. It is also considered that one-sided pruning to the trees would not have a significant visual impact when viewed from the opposite side in railway land, with the pruning being partially screened by their own remaining structures.

Agreed. But this does not make it necessary, or good for the trees or the site.

7. *Given the current presence of hard surfacing it is considered that the new surfacing will be of no greater impact than the current context.*

Agreed, providing levels are favourable.

It is also reminded that given the existence of existing surfacing, as per section 4.6.2 of BS5837:2012, RPAs can be adjusted from the standard circular plot due to existing development features – this would have meant that the RPAs could have been shown completely outside of the site boundary with no special care having to be taken for potential roots, however, in the interest of considering impacts to the trees standard RPAs have been shown and sensitive methodology specified to ensure that an appropriate amount of consideration has been given.

This is incorrect. BS5837:2012 does provide for the variation of RPAs, but the total RPA area must still be maintained. Any 'modifications to the shape of the RPA should reflect a soundly based arboricultural assessment of likely root distribution'. Any deviation would also need to consider the other structures such as the railway platform. For this reason, showing the RPAs outside of the boundary, or at the extent of the existing hard surface would have been not have been acceptable.

8. *The consultation response suggests that the only guidance we have submitted is to 'work in a sensitive manner'. However more than this has been supplied - the annotations given on the Tree Protection Plan and methodologies included within the corresponding Method Statement give details as to how works within retained RPAs should proceed, including the need for supervision and input from an arboriculturist.*

Agreed. The associated method statement provides further details.

9. In summary, my initial comments were advisory, and I have no objections to the proposal in arboricultural terms. But please reference both TPP and AMS documents in any planning consent.

10.

Wayne Isaacson

Dip Arb L6 (ABC) MICFor MArborA

Chartered Arboriculturist

Arboricultural Association Registered Consultant