

APP/23/01078 46 Warblington Road - reconsult.

Demolition of existing dwelling and replacement with 4No 2bed, 8No 3bed and 3No 4bed dwellings. | Fowley Cottage, 46 Warblington Road, Emsworth, PO10 7HH

Hello all,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the application - APP/23/01078 46 Warblington Road.

I offer the following additional comments (in blue) as an arboricultural re-consultation.

I have based this on the initial comments from February 2024 and having read the David Archer briefing note of 09.04.24:

1. T9 Poplar – a reduction on a poplar usually promotes a vigorous vegetative response so future pressure for pruning to maintain a 2.5 clearance is foreseeable. Being an offsite tree, the disturbance in the RPA may well promote vigorous suckering within the adjacent property which can be very aggravating and difficult to manage. *The incursion is low, but a crown reduction of 3.5m is not insubstantial. Please limit the cut size to minimise the impact.*

2. Pruning, such as that proposed to T25 pine, is very hard to do without leaving the tree in a poor form. Very specific work schedule is needed and evidence of the resultant form (photographs indicating cut points) to be supplied please. *Now resolved thank you.*

3. RPA's have been plotted as circles where known constraints will modify the actual rooting area. This will result in a greater percentage of the RPA being affected by the proposal. This must be updated to reflect the likely impact of features such as the drive, the sewer and Curlew Close to the west and existing buildings and hard surfacing. This will result in a far larger impact to trees T6 (TPO'd, Cat B- arguably A), T7 (TPO'd, Cat B,), 11 (TPO'd), 12 (TPO'd Cat A), 16 (Cat B) than indicated. DA commented: *"The RPAS have been largely left as circles as there are no features in the site that would constitute an effective root barrier to the retained trees with the possible exception of the house in Curlew Close impacting in a very minor way on the RPA of the Snow Gum, T16 (1% - 2%). The existing main drive on the site does not act as a barrier to the Monterey Pines, T6 & T7, as the construction of the drive, gravel, is not substantial enough to be a root barrier. The same applies to Arboriculture | Ecology | Landscape Direct: 07542 528120 Office: 0333 772 1152 admin@davidarcherassociates.co.uk www.davidarcherassociates.co.uk Page 2 of 3 Arcadian Prospect Ltd – trading as David Archer Associates Company Reg No.: 10627581 (England & Wales) Registered Office: Chesham House, Eastbourne Road, Halland, East Sussex BN8 6PT the foundations of the garden shed. Any other hard surface is also built without substantial foundations likely to constitute a root barrier."* *I am unable to accept this statement as fact. Curlew Close is an asphalt drive. The access drive to the property is not a standard construction, but it will have resulted in compacted soil beneath which will be less favourable to root development than uncompacted soil. Emsworth is largely clay which is highly susceptible to compaction, especially when wet. The present of a tennis court will probably have aided the proposal in terms of T11 where 'sensitive demolition' (please confirm if this is as defined in para 3.5.4) is needed, but trees 11, 12 & 16 have much larger proportions of their RPA's potentially affected than the 1-2% stated. I recommend that trial holes are dug to determine the presence or absence of roots in sensitive areas and appropriate methodologies proposed once this is done.*

4. Incursion to the RPA of trees 6&7 represents a significant area being altered near aged trees – even with no-dig systems being used, this is unacceptable. DA's briefing note cites the BS: *"As detailed in Para 2.3.1. Table 3 the incursions into the RPAs of trees T6 & T7, over and above the existing levels of gravel surfacing, total 19.5% % 12.6% respectively. Both these impacts fall below the 20% upper limit as set out in the British Standard (BS5837 2012 Para 7.4.2.3.)"* The total amount of the potential RPA that will be altered will be more significant given the existing driveway constraints (see above) and it is known that older trees are less able to respond to damage or changing conditions. Old age and unfavourable growing conditions contribute to stress, therefore it is foreseeable that the proposals will have a negative impact. I agree with the recommendation that the soil is improved for rooting (the soil within the RPAs after construction of the drive should be improved by use of compressed air injection with the addition of 'Bio-char' injected into the soil horizon to improve water retention and O₂ permeability) where it will not be affected by construction, but I strongly recommend this is done at the earliest opportunity if the consent is granted – waiting until after the impact has been made may be too late so it is recommended that roots are encouraged by improved conditions before excavation or surface treatments are changed. This is easily achieved by moving the requirement to para 3.1 Prestart Requirements in the AMS.

5. The key concern is that the drainage strategy has not been considered in conjunction with trees – surface water drains are shown straight through the centre of T7 (TPO'd pine) and unacceptably close to T6 (TPO'd pine). This appears to have been addressed: at this time I am unable to view revised drainage documents on the HBC portal so can these either be supplied direct please, or the portal updated to make them available. Together with the removal of the connection to Curlew Close it is anticipated that these revisions will remove the primary concerns.

7. New connections to the existing sewer are similarly not addressed. As above – assuming this is the foul water drain referred to in para 5 of the briefing note – please confirm.

8. The new connection to Curlew Close is shown as no dig, but there is a potential for level differences to be present that mean tying into the existing surface is impossible – this needs to be assessed and addressed in the method statement. 9. The position of the southernmost property does not appear to have taken the tree constraints fully into consideration, and a different orientation or position could have a lesser impact. As above, now addressed thank you.

10. According to the AIA plan, all of the vegetation across the frontage is being removed. AIA tree removal plan Site proposal plan 1879857 This includes a TPO silver birch that (at least from the Streetview image of September 2023) seems to be in reasonable form and condition. The mass removal seems excessive and will have a moderate to high adverse and potentially permanent impact on the local street scene. This will be contrary to CS16 and DM8.1 of the Havant Borough Core Strategy (2011) and the National Planning Policy Framework. This does not accord with the proposed site plan which shows trees here being retained, and new planting indicated. This needs to be resolved and the proposals to agree across the different drawings. Revisions to address this are in process, thank you. Please issue when available.

11. No consideration has been given to protecting the public highway tree to the east of the drive on the frontage of Warblington lane, or the grass verge in which it grows. The pressure for construction vehicles to park on this verge is highly foreseeable and must be addressed so the tree can be retained safely. 12. At present, there is insufficient detail of G1 through G5 to be able

to understand the impact that the removal of these groups will have. Some quantitative (e.g. no. of trees/square meterage affected) and qualitative data is needed to be able to assess this fully. Having been to site I am now comfortable with the detail provided, but would ask that if trees are found within groups that are currently not visible because of the density of the vegetation that are more substantial (250mm Ø) that these are recorded and mitigated. I think this unlikely.

13. No proposals have been put forward to demonstrate how the loss of trees will be mitigated. It is recommended that this is a PRE COMMENCEMENT condition and that a schedule of trees to be planted that at least replicates the characteristics and biodiversity of those lost is submitted and agreed upon. This should include method of planting, stock type and species range, as well as a fully resources maintenance programme to ensure trees and plants establish successfully. This comment stands, without prior understanding of the landscaping that is proposed it is impossible to determine whether this is acceptable or not.

The attention this has received is appreciated and the primary concerns are largely quelled. I'd welcome detail on how the presence or absence of roots might be determined in the disputed areas, and a response to the early improvement of the rooting area.

Kind regards,
Sarah Kiss – HCC arboriculture.