
TO: HBC Planning Services
FROM: Consultee Hampshire County Council
Arboricultural Consultancy
SUBJECT: **88 Elm Grove, Hayling Island**
DATE: Tuesday, 30 April 2024
REF: APP/24/00036
YOUR REF:

Dear Case Officer.

1. I have carried out a review of the relevant documents available on the HBC planning portal and provide the following comments. 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 the submitted descriptions and assessments of the trees and the site to be true, fair, and accurate.
2. It is the potential impact that the proposal may cause to one tree T1, which is in question.
3. The first additional tree information offered by the applicant (author unknown) states that *"referring to BS5837 it is only trees over 150mm that need to be plotted"*. This is incorrect. All trees over 75mm stem diameter, including trees off site that overhang or are within 15 times the stem diameter need to be included.
4. An Arboricultural Impact Assessment prepared by Mr Fulcher has been submitted which discusses the impact to the tree and proposes temporary ground protection over the verge for the duration of works.
5. Whilst this will go some way to prevent soil compaction of the retained verge, the unavoidable loss of rooting area/ soil volume has not been considered. It has been noted that the tree is growing in a narrow verge therefore is already constrained on two sides. For this reason, the extending the crossover by 1.5m will have a greater impact, than if the tree had unhindered rooting potential on the other sides. It is not so much the root pruning that will have the impact but the significant loss of rooting area/soil volume.
6. The proposed ground protection will not protect the trees stem from accidental impact damage from machinery or construction work.
7. The submitted impact assessment also omits to consider the impact of extending the crossover into, or closer to the canopy of the tree. This will lead to impact damage to the branches by vehicles or to pruning back to provide clearance for vehicular access.
8. In summary, it is my opinion that the proposal will have detrimental impacts to the tree, which are unavoidable, and would lead to future deterioration of the tree and the amenity it provides.

Wayne Isaacson
Dip Arb L6 (ABC) MICFor MArborA
Chartered Arboriculturist
Arboricultural Association Registered Consultant