

Arboricultural Impact Assessment (AIA)

Proposed development Bartons Road Havant PO9 5EY

Report reference 315/AIA/1

Client Fortitudo Ltd

25 August 2022

	Section
Summary	1
Introduction	2
Purpose of report	2.1
Context	2.2
Site description	2.3
The Development	3
Extent of changes proposed	3.1
Effect of the proposals	3.2
Recommendations and conclusions	4
Appendix	
Tree Survey and Schedule	A

This report, all plans and other associated material remains the property of Richard Nicholson Arboricultural Planning Consultant (RNapc) until paid for in full. Copyright and intellectual property rights remain with RNapc. The contents of this report are valid at the time of writing. RNapc shall not be liable for any use of this report other than for the purposes for which it was produced. If more than 12 months have elapsed since the date of this report, further advice should be taken before you rely on the contents of this report. Notwithstanding any provision within the RNapc Terms and Conditions, RNapc shall not be liable for any losses, however incurred, arising as a result of reliance on this report by the client or any third party more than 12 months after the date of this report

1 Summary

There are no trees on the site. To the north, on Bartons Road are two Maples. To the south on Martin Road are an Oak and two Horse Chestnuts. A Maple grows on the fence line with the garage on the south west boundary and a Monterey Pine to the south east of the site. Only the Oak and two Horse Chestnuts will be impacted by development and the issues are addressed and mitigated in this document.

This report provides assurance	This AIA document should provide the assurance required by the LPA Tree Officer in order to discharge their duty under the 1990 TCPA, and to meet their Local Plan policy requirements.
All the trees can be protected during development	Based on the design process, this assessment and site investigation, the trees can be protected from the risk of damage during the construction period.

2 Introduction

2.1 Purpose

This Arboricultural Impact Assessment has been written for the LPA to grant planning permission	This Arboricultural Impact Assessment (AIA) identifies and assesses the significance of the effect of direct and indirect impacts on trees and where necessary recommends mitigation. The AIA contains a Tree Survey Schedule (Appendix A). The Arboricultural Method Statement (315/AMS/1) sets out the parameters based on the physiological needs of the trees. Tree Protection Plan RNapc/315/TPP/1 shows the location and specification of temporary tree protection and the location of the minimal dig cellular confinement system.
--	--

2.2 Context

Local Plan Policy requirements are met	The pre-submission Havant Borough Local Plan 2036 states at Policy E18 Development affecting trees, hedgerows and woodlands will only be permitted where it: 1. Reflects, conserves or enhances the existing landscape and integrates the development into its surroundings, adding visual interest and amenity; 2. Adequately protects existing trees and hedgerows including their root systems prior to, during and after the construction process; and 3. Will not result in the loss or deterioration of ancient woodland and ancient or veteran trees.
---	--

	The Council will refuse planning permission for proposals that threaten the retention of important trees, hedgerows, and woodland, unless the need for, and benefits of development in that location clearly outweigh the impact of the proposal. Provision of new trees are expected as part of development proposals for new homes and commercial floorspace. Planning permission will be granted where it: 4. Facilitates adaptation to climate change by providing shade, shelter and cooling through new tree planting; and 5. Includes proposals for the successful implementation, maintenance and management of landscape and tree planting schemes.
The proposals comply with the National Planning Policy Framework	These proposals comply with the NPPF in terms of achieving sustainable development, good design and conserving the natural environment by retaining all the of the trees adjacent the site. Paragraphs 54 and 55 of the NPPF deal with planning conditions. Sufficient detail has been provided so an enforceable planning condition requiring the trees to be protected can be based on the accompanying Tree Protection Plan and AMS.
2.3 Site description	
Site factors will have affected the root protection area (RPA)	A notional circular RPA has been plotted for T003 Maple because there is evidence of rooting in the property next door. The RPA of the remaining trees have been affected by structures that I think has influenced a notional radial root development. I base this on my site observations and the original structures and surfacing before demolition of the Travis Perkins building. I have shown the RPAs as polygons in accordance with the recommendation in paragraphs 4.6.2 and 4.6.3 of BS5837:2012 <i>Trees in relation to design, demolition and construction – Recommendations</i> .
The significant trees are being retained...	There are no significant trees on the site. T001 and T002 Maples grow adjacent the highway. T003 is an unremarkable Maple that is growing in a position where it will damage the adjacent building. I have shown the tree to be removed but believe it is outside the ownership of the client, so it has been shown to be protected during construction. To the south, there are two Horse Chestnuts, one which has severe decay at the base and a fine Oak. The Monterey Pine has been surveyed for completeness but is unaffected by the proposals.
... and their importance in the landscape will be preserved	The Oak T007 is the best tree adjoining the site. It is a fine landscape asset and is visible from Petersfield Road, and Martin Road. The Horse Chestnuts T005 and T006 work as a pair and are important when viewed from Martin Road and St Albans Road.

3 The Development

3.1 Extent of changes proposed

Maple T003 and Horse Chestnut T005 should be removed by others	Maple T003 has the potential to damage the garage building immediately adjacent it. Horse Chestnut T005 has severe decay at the base. While there is evidence of response growth around the edge of the decay on the north side of the stem, the extent of decay hollowing out the base of the tree and its position adjacent the road near a junction means that its retention is an unacceptable risk. Like the Maple T003, T005 is outside the control of the client.
Only the cycle/emergency access structure will impact on the trees	The RPA of T004 Monterey Pine has been limited on the site side by an extensive area of concrete surfacing and hard standing. This tree will be unaffected by the proposals. The proposed new access onto Martin Road is to be constructed within the RPA of Horse Chestnuts T005 and T006 and marginally, Oak T007. Any mitigation for T006 will accommodate the RPA of T005.
There are no changes in level proposed, apart from the access	New surfacing for car parking can be built without special engineered surfacing, except for the two southernmost bays because the RPA of trees is unaffected and because it is a replacement for what was removed. Apart from the special surface for the two accesses there are no other changes in level proposed that affect retained trees.

3.2 Effect of proposals

No negative impact on landscape and amenity	None of the trees that are being retained, except possibly Maple T003 are within the control of the client. Decisions over felling the trees are for others. There will be no negative impact on the local amenity due to the activities on the site.
Sensitivity: Oak are tolerant of root disturbance, Horse Chestnut Intermediate	While Oak as a genus is more tolerant of root disturbance than Horse Chestnut, the precautionary principle has been applied in designing the new access to Martin Road to avoid as much as possible damaging any of the trees. The RPA of Horse Chestnut T006 is more affected than that of the Oak T007. Both trees will have root systems extending beneath the footpath and in the case of the Oak, beneath the garage hard surfacing. There might be some rooting beneath the highway but preferentially the trees will root beneath the existing verge where resources are more freely available and root-limiting soil compaction is less of an issue. This pattern might have been altered by the many services in the footpath and verge and any leaking drains or poorly reinstated services in the highway.
Magnitude: Mitigation reduces the impact on the rooting environment	The magnitude of impact on T006 and T007 has been reduced by adopting a minimal dig solution. The principle of a minimal dig surface is shown in the accompanying Arboricultural Method Statement (315/AMS/1) which includes an illustrative cross section.

The structures will need to be designed by an Engineer. One is a pedestrian access, the other a cycle access and emergency access that will need to take vehicles. To further mitigate the impact, I am recommending that it be constructed at the end of development, so it is not used for construction access.

Protective fencing will be used to protect the trees Plan RNapc/315/TPP/1 shows the location of the protective fencing. No ground protection is required, although working practices for installing the minimal dig surface will require temporary ground protection. To the south, I have recommended that there is no construction access from Martin Road. This is to avoid the difficulties of protecting the Oak and Horse Chestnut while allowing unrestricted access on the public thoroughfare.

There are no liveability issues... ...associated with the proposals that will cause issues with retained trees in the future.

4 Recommendation and conclusions

Tree Protection Plan RNapc/315/TPP/1; Arboricultural Method Statement 315/AMS/1

Subject to the final design of the new access, the scheme is acceptable in arboricultural terms Planning conditions will be required to ensure compliance with the documents during the build process.

A **Appendix A Tree Survey
Schedule**

Reference	Common Name	Retention Category	Stem Diameter (mm)	Multiple Stem diameter (mm)	RPA: Radius (m), Area (m ²)	General Observations	Height (m)	Crown spread North	Crown spread East	Crown spread South	Crown spread West	Crown Clearance (m)	Life Stage	Physiological Condition	Structural Condition	Remaining Contribution
[T001]	Silver Maple	C2		370, 320, 430, 500,	Radius: 9.9 Area: 308	Off-site tree. Previously topped at 9m	12	7	9	6	6	6	Mature	Fair	Fair	10+ Years]
[T002]	Silver Maple	C2		240, 420, 490, 200,	Radius: 8.6 Area: 232	Off-site tree. One stem removed. Poor form. Near busy junction with static traffic. Previously topped at 9m	13	7	8	7	8	6	Mature	Poor	Poor	10+ Years]
T003	Norway Maple	C2		300, 300, 300, 350, 250, 200,	Radius: 8.4 Area: 222	Off-site tree. Recommend removal	13	5	5	4	4	2	Early Mature	Fair	Poor	<10 years
T004	Monterey Pine	B1	900		Radius: 10.8 Area: 366	Off-site tree	15	8	8	8	7	2	Early Mature	Fair	Fair	40+
T005	Horse Chestnut	U	950		0	Off-site tree. Major decay at base. Occluding but hollow stem. This tree does not merit retention due to decay.	18	6	7	6	2		Mature	Poor	Poor	0
T006	Horse Chestnut	B2	850		Radius: 10.2 Area: 327	Off-site tree. Damage to stem N side. This tree will form the constraint to the east side of the proposed access.	18	6	3	7	6		Mature	Fair	Fair	20+ years
T007	English Oak	A2	1100		Radius: 13.2 Area: 547	Off-site tree. This tree will form the constraint to the west side of the access. Services in verges. Storm damage N side	16	8	10	7	7		Mature	Good	Good	40+ years