

Alderwood
Consulting Limited



**Arboricultural
Impact Assessment
in connection with redevelopment
at 1 Holst Way,
Waterlooville
PO7 5SJ**

Prepared by
Jonathan Fulcher DipArb FArborA

Report Reference: D2061AIA
Report Date: 21st October 2020

Alderwood Consulting Ltd, 1 Peartree Road, Southampton, SO19 7GU
Tel: 02380 444612 Mobile: 07736 230057
Email: jonathan@alder-wood.co.uk



Table of Contents

	Page
1 INTRODUCTION	3
2 SITE VISIT AND OBSERVATIONS	4
3 ARBORICULTURAL IMPACT APPRAISAL - TREES	5
4 ARBORICULTURAL IMPACT APPRAISAL - DEVELOPMENT	5
5 PROTECTIVE MEASURES	7
6 POST OCCUPANCY PRESSURES ON TREES	7
7 CONSENT CONDITIONS	8
8 SUMMARIES	8

Appendices

1 Qualifications and experience	10
2 Tree schedule and explanatory notes	11

Plan AC1

1 INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 **Brief:** I have been instructed by Leyson Building Consultancy for the applicant to inspect the significant trees close to the proposed redevelopment at 1 Holst Way, Waterloooville PO7 5SJ and to provide advice on the successful retention and incorporation of trees of amenity value within and closely adjacent to the proposals. In addition this report includes the following information in connection with the planning application:-
- a schedule of the relevant trees giving dimension data and an assessment of their condition; and
 - an assessment of the layout proposal with appropriate suggestions for reducing any impact on amenity.
- 1.2 **Proposed development:** The development proposed is alterations and additions (orangery and first floor extension) to the existing dwelling at 1 Holst Way, Waterloooville, with access as existing from Holst Way.
- 1.3 **Documents provided:** I have been provided with the following drawings:
- Suite of existing and proposed floor plans and elevations, drawings no. P1199.E.01.01 /01.02/01.03 and 1199.P.01.01 dated 01.10.20.
 - Site and block plans (block plan at 1:200) by Leyson Building Consultancy, drawing no. P1199.E.01.01 dated 01.10.20 based on the site survey and indicating the positions of trees on and adjacent to the site, with the proposed siting of the development. An annotated copy of this drawing with tree schedule numbering, tree root protection areas (RPAs) and indicating the location of special measures in respect of trees is attached as Plan AC1.
- 1.4 **Qualifications and experience:** I have based this report on my site observations and the provided information, and I have come to conclusions in the light of my experience. I have experience and qualifications in arboriculture, details of which are listed in Appendix 1.
- 1.5 **Tree constraints:** I have not myself seen specific tree preservation orders (TPOs) relating to this site. However, the Havant Borough Council website 'Where I Live' maps suggests that trees on and closely adjacent to the site are protected by TPO number 1223 with an 'Area' designation; and the site is

not in a Conservation Area. The proposal is to retain the trees and consider them in the planning submissions as if they were formally protected. Where tree work is proposed for trees protected by TPO, this report serves as an application for consent, with a planning permission being deemed consent for the proposed works. In any event this arboricultural impact assessment has been prepared in acknowledgement of the general planning principle that trees are a material consideration in the planning process, and in tacit acknowledgment of the Council's relevant tree policies.

- 1.6 **Validation:** Typically, the Local Planning Authority requirement for a planning application for a site where trees are involved is for the submission of a tree schedule, a tree constraints plan and an arboricultural impact assessment report in line with the BS5837:2012 recommendations. This D2061AIA report has been prepared in line with the BS5837:2012 recommendations and should allow the planning application to be validated in respect of tree information.

2 SITE VISIT AND OBSERVATIONS

- 2.1 **Site visit:** I carried out a site visit on 19th October 2020 to collect tree information to complete the tree schedule. All my observations were from ground level without detailed investigations and I estimated all dimensions unless otherwise indicated. I did not have access to trees outside the boundaries and have confined observations of them to what was visible from within the property. The weather at the time of the inspection was dry with high cloud, a light breeze and good visibility.
- 2.2 **Collection of data:** I inspected each significant tree and the numbering is indicated on the annotated site layout attached as Plan AC1. For each tree, I collected information as recommended in BS5837:2012 – *Trees in relation to design, demolition and construction - Recommendations*. I have recorded this information in the tree schedule at Appendix 2.
- 2.3 **Subjective assessment of trees:** The information collected at the site visit was used to prepare a tree schedule in line with the recommendations in BS5837:2012. Trees are categorised on the basis of their suitability for retention on a development site, and brief details of the reasons for each category allocation are provided. There are four categories, which are summarised below:

Category A: Trees of high quality and value

Category B: Trees of moderate quality and value

Category C: Trees of low quality and value

Category U: Trees unsuitable for retention, usually to be removed

- 2.4 **The root protection areas and location of protective fencing:** BS5837:2012 gives recommendations for the areas of root protection to be equivalent to the area of a circle centred on the tree with a radius of least 12 times the trunk diameter. This distance is given for guidance for each tree in the tree schedule. In practice the siting of the specific protection measures may be different. The implication of the root protection area is that no significant disturbance should occur within it if the trees are to be successfully retained.

3 ARBORICULTURAL IMPACT APPRAISAL - TREES

- 3.1 **Overview:** The significant trees relating to the proposed development are two oak trees, one against the rear south boundary fence near the south east corner of the site; and one against the rear boundary fence of the adjacent property 3 Holst Way, about 2.5m from the west boundary fence of the rear garden of 1 Holst Way. The trees appear to be oaks in normal health and condition. The proposal is for these trees to be retained and protected during development.

4 ARBORICULTURAL IMPACT APPRAISAL - DEVELOPMENT

- 4.1 **Site access:** Site access will be by way of the existing pedestrian access along the side east elevation of the dwelling and by way of the gated access into the rear garden direct from Holst Way. The use of temporary ground protection (see 5.2 below) to supplement any existing surfaces and the proposed temporary fencing (see 5.1 below) will limit any harm to retained trees from site access to an acceptable minimum.
- 4.2 **Demolition and removal of structures:** There are no existing buildings within the RPAs of trees and proposed for removal. There will be no fires in connection with the development activities including demolition within 10m of the canopy of any retained tree, and no storage or mixing of harmful materials e.g. DERV fuel, concrete within 10m of the trunk of any retained tree. The combination of these measures with the temporary tree protective

fencing will reduce any risk of damage to retained trees to an acceptable minimum.

- 4.3 **Construction of new buildings – orangery:** The proposed orangery on the side east elevation of the existing dwelling is very marginally within the RPA of the oak T1. The incursion is a very small proportion of the whole RPA; and the past management of the tree will also have marginally reduced the dependency on the whole RPA. In consideration of all the circumstances, special design and construction of foundations seems disproportionate, and 'conventional' construction is proposed for the foundations for the orangery.
- 4.4 **Construction – first floor addition:** The proposals have a first floor addition over the existing rear extension. The existing structure is a fully founded masonry structure and the reasonable working assumption is that it will be itself an adequate base for the first-floor addition, which has a flat roof which will limit loading. There is no excavation work needed or proposed for this first-floor addition and no significant risk of harm to retain trees from its construction.
- 4.5 **Services:** The site is already serviced, and this establishes the principle of services to the site and their maintenance and repair. At present services are understood to a run out to Holst Way and may also run to the open land adjacent to 12 Byrd Close Bain Avenue and the proposal is for all new services to connect to existing within the building footprint and then to run out to Holst Way or Byrd Close as existing. The alterations and additions will not bring new requirements for new services and it is likely that the existing provisions will be adequate with no significant additional excavation.
- 4.6 **Construction access:** The RPAs of retained trees do not unduly affect construction access and provided that the fencing and ground protection as proposed is installed/retained, there will be no significant adverse effects on trees from construction access.
- 4.7 **Storage and movement of materials:** Materials will be delivered to the two points of site access and moved from there by hand to the development footprints. This is a comparatively modest domestic project with small amounts of materials and no requirement or space for mobile plant. There will be no significant risk of harm to retained trees from the storage and movement of materials.

5 PROTECTIVE MEASURES

- 5.1 **Protective fencing:** Temporary tree protective fencing is proposed for the retained trees. This will be erected across the rear garden at the location shown on plan AC1. It will be to the BS5837:2012 section 6.2 recommendations i.e. braced preformed galvanised steel mesh panels ('Heras' or similar). It will be installed prior to the commencement of any development-related activity including ground works and retained at the locations shown until construction is completed. It may be moved or removed only with notice to and consent from the Council. The fencing is shown giving a clearance from the building of no less than 2m, which gives room for the erection of scaffolding and pedestrian access. Provided that the fencing and ground protection are properly specified, installed and maintained, there will be no significant adverse effects on the health or amenity value of these trees. Tree protection will be additionally effected by temporary ground protection (see 5.2 below).
- 5.2 **Ground protection:** Temporary ground protection is proposed as an adjunct to the temporary fencing and special surfacing. It will be installed at the locations indicated on plan AC1. This temporary ground protection will allow pedestrian access for construction and the movement of small amounts of building materials. The ground protection will also act as a base for scaffolding if such access is required. The ground protection shall be as recommended in BS5837 i.e. it shall be scaffold planks, or plywood sheets at least 15mm thick, laid butt-jointed over a geotextile membrane installed on a layer of pulverised bark or similar laid on the existing ground surface i.e. with no significant excavation. The minimum areas where these measures apply are the protection zones as indicated on the attached plan AC1 by diamond hatching.

6 POST OCCUPANCY PRESSURES ON TREES

- 6.1 **Effects on trees post occupancy:** The location and character of the proposal has been achieved in consideration of all the site factors including the presence of trees. The proposed orangery will increase the fenestration to the internal amenity spaces, improving ambient light with its overhead clerestory and reducing the dependency on a single rear aspect for daylight. The nearest tree T1 will be less influential on the orangery than it is on the existing rear extension. The additional floor on the rear extension will accommodate a bedroom, which doesn't normally require significant daylight. In any event, the first floor addition will not bring significant new

pressure for tree works and where formal tree protection measures apply, the Council will be able to resist unreasonable applications for tree work, with such decisions likely to be supported at appeal.

7 CONSENT CONDITIONS

- 7.1 **Conditions:** In tree terms the proposals include elements that have the potential to affect retained trees e.g. the installation of temporary protective measures. In these circumstances it would be reasonable for any additional details that the Council requires to be submitted post-consent, as determined by the Council and defined in appropriate conditions.
- 7.2 **Arboricultural method statement heads of terms:** The recommendation in BS5837:2012 is that where details might need to be submitted to allow for changes that might occur after planning permission has been granted, heads of terms for an arboricultural method statement (AMS) would be appropriate. That is appropriate for sites with a range of arboricultural protection measures and methods to be determined. For this site, the development is reasonably straightforward and a separate AMS seems disproportionate and is not proposed.

8 SUMMARIES

- 8.1 **Summary of control during development:** In order to minimise any adverse effects on the retained trees identified, I advise that:-
- Temporary tree protective fencing is installed at appropriate locations before commencement of development and is retained until the completion of development
 - Tree protective fencing may be moved only with the consent of the Council
 - Temporary ground protection is installed at appropriate locations before commencement of development and is retained until the completion of development
 - Ground protection may be moved only with the consent of the Council
 - There will be no fires within 10m of the canopy of any retained tree, and no storage or mixing of harmful materials e.g. DERV fuel, concrete within 10m of the trunk of any retained tree

- 8.2 **Summary of the impact on local amenity:** This layout retains the significant trees on and adjacent to the site, with scope for proper provisions for their protection during development, and their subsequent management, where they lie within the site. If adequate precautions to protect the retained trees are implemented as recommended in this report and as may reasonably be required by consent conditions, the overall impact of the proposal on local amenity will be low and limited to the short term only. The proposals also take proper account of potential pressures for pruning and felling post-occupancy. Where formal tree protection measures apply, the Council could properly refuse consent for inappropriate works and could expect to be supported in such decisions at appeal. These submissions demonstrate that it is reasonably practicable to redevelop in accordance with the proposals for the submitted scheme without significant harm to retained trees. Any additional information required for reassurance can reasonably be required by way of conditions attached to the planning permission. There are therefore no supportable or reasonable grounds for refusing permission in terms of trees.



Jonathan Fulcher **DipArb FARborA**

Brief qualifications and experience of Jonathan Fulcher

1. **Qualifications:** I hold the City and Guilds Certificate in Arboriculture, and the Royal Forestry Society's Professional Diploma in Arboriculture, which is one of the premier qualifications within the Arboricultural Profession. I am also a Registered Consultant of the Arboricultural Association.
2. **Practical experience:** I have worked in local government tree management for over twenty years. After cutting my teeth as an arborist at London Borough of Redbridge, I moved to London Borough of Islington where I supervised direct works for three years. I joined New Forest District Council in 1987, where I made and administered Tree Preservation Orders and advised on arboricultural issues relating to planning applications. In 1991, I moved to Poole Borough Council as Senior Arboricultural Officer, leading a small professional team providing a comprehensive arboricultural service to the Council. Duties included arboricultural consultancy on major development proposals, acting as arboricultural witness at Public Inquiries and setting and running tree work contracts. I joined Barrell Treecare as a self-employed arboricultural consultant in March 1998, leaving in early 2003 to become a fully independent consultant. My clients include local and national development companies, schools, public utilities and Local Planning Authorities. From 2003-2008 I was also one of a small number of arboricultural consultants appointed by the Department for Communities and Local Government (DCLG) for the determination of Tree Preservation Order application appeals. This function was transferred to the Planning Inspectorate in 2008, when I was appointed as a contracted Inspector for Tree Preservation Order application and High Hedge appeals, serving until 2016.
3. **Continuing professional development:** I am a Fellow of the Arboricultural Association by examination, and have served the Association as a member of their Local Authority Committee, including one year as committee chair. I have been co-organiser of national seminars on Tree Strategies and Tree Preservation Order Enforcement, and given papers and chaired sessions at the Association's annual conferences. I am currently a member of the Association's Consultants Working Party, have until recently been interim lead assessor for the Association's Registered Consultant scheme and am currently an assessor for that scheme. I keep professionally current through professional reading, subscription to professional journals and by regular attendance at seminars and conferences.

Appendix 2
1 Holst Way, Waterlooville
Tree Schedule and Explanatory Notes

Tree No	Species	Height (m)	Trunk Diameter (cm)	Crown spread (m)		Crown height above ground	Life stage	General observations	Estimated contribution in years	BS 5837 cat	Root protection distance (m)
T1	Oak (<i>Quercus robur</i>)	14	84	6	6	4.5	EM	Pruned by crown reduction overall several years ago giving uniform crown form	40+	A	10.2
				6	6						
T2	Oak	16	85?	6	6	4.5	EM	On adjacent property. Slightly thin in crown	20+	B	10.2
				6	6						

Appendix 2
1 Holst Way, Waterloo
Tree Schedule and Explanatory Notes

Explanatory Notes

Abbreviations:

m	: Metre
nm	: Not measured
>	: Greater than
<	: Less than

- **Species:** Species identification is based on visual observations.
- **Height:** Height is estimated to the nearest metre.
- **Trunk diameter:** Trunk diameter for accessible trees has been measured with a diameter tape and recorded in centimetres.
- **Crown spread:** Crown spread for trees within the site is estimated at the four cardinal compass points. The distances given as appropriate correspond to crown spreads to the four cardinal compass points as shown in the grid below:

N	E
W	S

- **Crown height above ground:** The height of the crown clearance above the ground over the site is estimated to the nearest 0.5m.
- **Life stage:** The life stage categories correspond to the classes given in BS 5837:2012, which are Young (Y), Semi-mature (SM), Early Mature (EM), Mature (M) and Over-mature (OM). There are no over mature or veteran trees included in the schedule.
- **General observations:** These comment on the health and physiological and structural condition of the tree, with management recommendations where appropriate.
- **Estimated contribution in years:** <10, 10+, 20+, 40+, as advised in BS 5837:2012.
- **BS 5837 category:** As advised in BS 5837:2012. This grading is based on the estimated remaining contribution in years i.e. A - more than 40; B - 20-40; C - 10-20; U - less than 10.
- **Root protection area:** The area of root protection should be equivalent to the area of a circle centred on the tree with a radius of least 12 times the trunk diameter. This column gives the radius of such a circle; the distance may not be the same as the distance for protective fencing.



© Crown copyright and database rights 2020 OS 100038864
Site Plan - scale 1:1250



Plan AC1

Tree Protection Plan for Arboricultural Impact Assessment	
Proposed redevelopments at 8 Salter Road, Poole	Report Ref: D2061.A1A
Location of trees with tree schedule numbering indicating location of BS5837:2012 section 6.2 tree protective fencing and ground protection	

Key	
	Location of trees indicating species, BS5837 category and BS5837 root protection area
	Location of temporary fencing and protected areas
	Location of BS 5837 temporary ground protection

This original of this drawing was produced in colour. An unauthorised copy should not be relied upon.

Alderwood Consulting Ltd, 1 Sparrow Street,
Southampton, SO13 7SL
Tel: 0238 444433, Email: info@alderswood.co.uk
Email: info@alderswood.co.uk



Client:	Mr Dave Dougan		
Project:	1 Holst Way, Waterboville, Hampshire PO7 5SU		
Title:	Rear and Side Extension		
Drawing No.	1199 E.01.01	Rev:	
Scale:	As scaled	Date:	01.10.20
Drawn By:	TC	Checked By:	LBC
Issue:	Planning Application		