



PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT

Land rear of 13–21 Mengham Road, Hayling Island,
Hampshire

December 2013

Arboricultural Impact Assessment - Addendum

In accordance with BS5837:2012 '*Trees in relation to design, demolition and construction – Recommendations*'

1.0 Introduction

My name is Peter Thurman. I am an Arboricultural and Horticultural Consultant and the Principal of The Thurman Consultancy based near Lewes in East Sussex

2.0 Background

I surveyed the trees on this site [in December 2006] and provided a full arboricultural report that included method statements and a tree protection plan in January 2007. [Our Ref: TTC/PT/01/07 – 02].

The method statements included one for the removal of hard surfacing and demolition of buildings near trees and another provided notes on the installation of driveways/paths etc. close to trees using the 'No Dig' methodology and cellular confinement construction systems.

This work was carried out following guidelines detailed in British Standard 5837:2005 '*Trees in relation to construction - Recommendations*'.

The proposed development *then [and now]* was for a block of eight flats, an entrance drive and car parking facilities.

The planning application was approved but never implemented.

PRINCIPAL • PETER THURMAN
FARBORA • MICHOR • FTHORT • DIPARB(RFS) • DIPHORT(KEW)HONS • CENV
BURCHETTS WELL • BURCHETTS
NORTH CHAILEY • EAST SUSSEX
BN8 4HE • ENGLAND
TELEPHONE + 44(0)1323 722532
Email: ThurmanConsult@btinternet.com
Website: www.thurmanconsultancy.com
VAT Reg. No: 760 4443 42

2-9-9-77 ガーデン・デザイナー&コンサルタント

3.0 New Development Proposals

Dunthorne Parker Architects of London have designed a new layout for this site and asked me to re-assess the trees.

The proposal is very similar to the previous one that was approved. It has the same footprint size but is located further to the north east and further away from Tree 7 [see Section 4.0 below].

It is to develop this existing car park into seven flats within a two-storey building.

All the flats have access to a private amenity space with parking and cycle parking located to the rear of the development.

The site lies at the rear of 13-21 Mengham Road on Hayling Island, which is characterised by traditional residences and small shops and stores. The design reflects the common surroundings materiality, including brickwork and render in particular.

4.0 The Trees

As instructed by the architects, I visited the site again earlier this year and report that:

T7 [see Fig 1], a mature and protected Lombardy poplar, remains in good condition and continues to have visual amenity value.

I still consider this to have the same BS Categorisation of B2 that I gave it in 2006. Its stem diameter has increased by just 2cm. The ivy growing up the main stem and into the crown should be severed at the base.



Fig 1 – T7 – Lombardy poplar

As in 2006, I consider all the other trees on site – suckering or self-sown specimens and mainly sycamores – to be of little or no amenity value.

Again, my categorisation for them remains as before – C or R in 2006 which in the revised Standard are called C or U.

My only additional comment would be that some of these trees are likely to be causing or will cause in the future, direct physical damage to existing structures such as garages and boundary fences. [See Figs 2 & 3 below]



Fig 2 – Sycamores T4 & T5 between two garages in central southern section of site



Fig 3 – Sycamore T3s in south east corner of site
[See original plans]

5.0 The British Standard 5837

My original work was in accordance with the 2005 revision of the Standard.

In 2012, the Standard was revised yet again.

However, in my opinion the changes made in the 2012 version are not pertinent to this site and that my former report remains applicable and appropriate to the new proposals.

6.0 Hard Surfaces near Trees

It is important to remember that the bulk of this site is a hard-surfaced car park. There are also garages and an air raid shelter. The latter is very close to T7.

It is likely that demolishing the garages and breaking up the air raid shelter and replacing with no-dig cellular-constructed drive and parking areas will improve the rooting environment of T7.

7.0 Further Information

Any [minor] adjustments to existing arboricultural method statements etc. may be provided as conditions of development approval.

This secondary phasing of information is one of the differences between the 2005 and 2012 versions of the Standard.

8.0 Landscaping

There is ample scope for new structural and ornamental landscaping on the site to ensure continued screening and long term tree cover.

Such appropriate landscaping/tree planting can, as before, be easily controlled by the imposition of a suitably worded condition attached to any consent.

9.0 Conclusions and Recommendations of this Addendum

In my opinion, the original tree survey and arboricultural impact assessment remains pertinent and relevant.

Therefore, a further detailed report is not required.

Any further or updated requirements can be dealt with by conditions.

I can find no arboricultural reason why the new development proposals should not be approved.

P. W. Thurman FARborA, MICFor, FIHort, DipArb(RFS), DipHort(KEW)Hons. CEnv
The Thurman Consultancy
December, 2013

The statements in this Report do not take account of the effects of extremes of climate vandalism or accident whether physical chemical or fire. The Thurman Consultancy cannot therefore accept any liability in connection with these factors nor where prescribed work is not carried out in a correct and professional manner in accordance with current good practice. The authority of this Report ceases at any stated time limit within it or if none stated after two years from the date of the survey or when any site conditions change or pruning or other works unspecified in the Report are carried out to or affecting the subject tree(s) whichever is the sooner.