

Comments for Planning Application APP/20/00241

Application Summary

Application Number: APP/20/00241

Address: Land adjacent Saxted House, 5 Tower Street, Emsworth, PO10 7BH

Proposal: Construction of 1No. 5 bed detached dwelling with car ports and detached garage (alternative design for one of two dwellings granted planning consent in 2003 (ref: 03/53651/016) and partially implemented.

Case Officer: Lesley Wells



Comment Details

Commenter Type: Further Comments

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: Re. App/20/00241 - Land adjacent to 19 Tower St.

I must apologise for having identified two areas of concern that I have objections to after the deadline for comments on this application:

- 'New semi-mature planting'
- Protection of exposed section of listed boundary wall

- 'New semi-mature planting'

The two drawings titled Site Location & Block Plan (23/07/20) and Site Plan (23/07/20) both show a tightly spaced row of trees located close to the western boundary wall and close to the side flanking wall of 3 Orange Row. While a legend (in very small type size) nearby states 'new semi-mature planting', this feature does not exist. All other arboricultural features shown on these two drawings do exist and have been itemised and analysed in the revised Arboricultural Method Statement (07/08/20). Even trees to be removed and replaced are identified.

a) The Arboricultural Method Statement (AMS) makes no reference to this new planting feature. If this location is being proposed as the site of a significant planting of trees then there should be a professional assessment with reference to suitable species, ground conditions, spacings and proximity to buildings, , etc, in the ABS to support this new landscape feature.

There is also no reference to this 'semi-mature planting' feature in any other application documents. A 'semi-mature' planting implies trees. The absence of basic information on such issues as, deciduous or evergreen, native or foreign species, the mature heights, future

sustainability and maintenance of trees in this location must mean that no decision or permission on this feature should be granted at this stage.

b) I am aware that planting as many as eight trees so close and alongside the exterior wall of 3 Orange Row will have the potential to cause structural problems. There are already internal cracks indicative of structural movement within no. 3. Who will be responsible in the event of structural damage to no. 3 caused by the action of neighbouring tree roots?

c) To plant eight trees so close together as if they were ready made hedging plants is a mistake and will result in the trees being very competitive for water in the dryer summers that are predicted to continue. Clay present in the ground will be subject to increased shrinkage due to the uptake of ground water from these trees and create another risk to the structural integrity of no. 3.

d) The issue of privacy for users of the elevated rear terraces of 1 to 3 Orange Row has been mitigated by recent repositioning of the proposed property. However, the issue of access to light for the rear of these properties due to the lower level of the ground floor rooms compared to the site levels, must be maintained. Trees should not be planted to fill in the only gap on the boundary wall at the rear of no. 3 which allows daylight through in the morning. What ever height these trees grow to there will be a loss of light in ground floor rooms and in particular the kitchens at the rear of these properties in the mornings. The properties at no's 1 to 3 Orange Row were positioned in a stepped manner to allow each property to benefit from the morning light from the East over the boundary wall.

- Protection of exposed section of boundary wall

I was informed by the applicant a few years ago that the western wall that runs north to south between Orange Row courtyard and the site is a listed wall. The tree protection fencing proposed for the Construction Exclusion Zone on the site could also provide much needed protection for the listed boundary wall and the flanking wall of no. 3 Orange Row if it is extended to run parallel to the wall.

I would be grateful if you could take the above comments into your considerations on this application.