

Karen Wooden

From: Richard Nash
Sent: 12 July 2013 10:51
To: bst shared
Subject: APP/13/00075 - 17 Seafarers Walk - Further Tree Comments

Richard Nash
Planning Officer
Development Control
Havant Borough Council
Public Service Plaza
Civic Centre Road
Havant
PO9 2AX

Direct Line: 02392 446461
richard.nash@havant.gov.uk
www.havant.gov.uk

From: Jamie Gargett
Sent: 12 July 2013 10:46
To: Richard Nash
Subject: RE: Samphire House APP/13/00075

Rich

I am satisfied with the justification laid out in Section A and as such have no objection to the scheme. It would have been useful to have had this information laid out with in the AIA.

Section B does not stand up to scrutiny and is as I fist stated of not practical assistance in this particular project.

Thanks

J

Jamie Gargett
Arboriculturalist
Planning & Built Environment
Havant Borough Council
Public Service Plaza
Havant
PO9 2AX
023 9244 6525
jamie.gargett@havant.gov.uk

From: Richard Nash
Sent: 11 July 2013 08:31
To: Jamie Gargett
Subject: FW: Samphire House APP/13/00075

Hello Jamie

Please see below. Please could you let me have your further comments?

Thanks

Richard

Richard Nash
Planning Officer
Development Control
Havant Borough Council
Public Service Plaza
Civic Centre Road
Havant
PO9 2AX

Direct Line: 02392 446461
richard.nash@havant.gov.uk
www.havant.gov.uk

From: Technical Arboriculture [mailto:info@techarb.co.uk]
Sent: 10 July 2013 13:14
To: Richard Nash
Cc: Barry Bowhill
Subject: Samphire House APP/13/00075

Richard

I refer to the arboricultural concerns raised by Jamie in respect of 17 Seafarer Walk, Hayling Island.

I have tried to contact Jamie to discuss the matter further without success.

It appears that the main concerns are (a) encroachment into the root protection area (RPA) of retained poplars T1 to T4 and (b) the use of an illustrative cross section.

(a) encroachment into the RPA of retained poplars T1 to T4

It is evident on site that a degree of tree works have occurred prior to the development proposal. This includes the removal of neighbouring trees of similar size occupying the space between the retained trees and the proposed development. Therefore this land would have been occupied by the roots of those trees, which I am informed by my client were felled within the last 18 months under consent from HBC. I refer to paragraph 34 of the submitted arboricultural impact appraisal which states that I consider any encroachment to be minor and acceptable. This is because I consider that a reasonably significant portion of plotted RPA of T1-T4 would have been occupied by the roots of those trees. The car port encroaches into the periphery of the RPAs of T1 and T4. I have calculated the encroachment into the RPA of T1 to be 0.81m² of a total plotted RPA of 81m² this being 1% of RPA. I have calculated the encroachment into the RPA of T4 to be 4.36m² of a total RPA of 177m² this being 2.46% of RPA.

Furthermore poplar as a species is well able to withstand such a minor incursion. Moreover, the recent pollarding has removed a significant amount of crown volume, thus one could argue that a degree of root volume loss will have occurred in response as the tree moves to maintain a dynamic equilibrium between roots and shoots. This could justify a reduced RPA however I have chosen to plot the RPA at full extent for the stem diameter. At paragraph 31 I state that I am of the opinion that a low impact foundation is unwarranted on the basis of site conditions, however I do state that if the arboricultural officer is of the opinion that one is required then information on the use of such foundations is provided. I have discussed the matter with the architect and a low impact foundation could be installed with details supplied as part of a condition if this was required by the arboricultural officer.

(b) the use of an illustrative cross section.

I presume the arboricultural officer is referring to the cross section for low impact surfacing. The use of an illustrative cross section is intended. It provides an idea of how the access could be achieved, however, as project arboricultural consultant, my role is to provide guidance based on recommendations contained with *British Standard 5837:2012 Trees in relation to design, demolition and construction*. Detailed sections of foundations and roads are the remit (and within the professional scope) of the architect/structural engineer therefore I would expect detailed cross sections, if required, to be submitted by those professionals as part of a planning condition attached to consent should the arboricultural officer require them.

I have discussed levels with the architect. From both our site observations the land between the existing hard surfaced drive and the car port is flat and approximately 2 – 3 metres width of new surface is required to link the existing drive with the car port. Neither of us can understand the concerns over levels. Any raising of levels to flow onto the installed cellular confinement system would be done on the existing drive.

I trust this demonstrates that the trees will remain viable and will allow you to issue consent on this scheme.

If you have any further queries please contact me.

Regards

Kevin

Kevin Cloud BSc Hons, Tech Cert Arbor A, F Arbor A
Cardiff Law School certified Expert Witness
Director and Principal Consultant



Technical Arboriculture

Technical Arboriculture Limited, 10 Albany Court, Bishops Waltham, Hampshire, SO32 1AZ.
T 01489 896655 M 07828 335729 Email info@techarb.co.uk Web www.techarb.co.uk



Registered in England and Wales No: 6018958
VAT Registration No: 936 3872 90

This e-mail and any files transmitted with it are confidential and intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed. The use, dissemination, forwarding, printing or copying of this e-mail is strictly prohibited. If you have received this e-mail in error please notify the sender immediately. Technical Arboriculture Limited has taken reasonable precautions to ensure that no viruses are transmitted to any third party but accepts no liability for any loss or damage as a result of the use of this e-mail.