



Mr P Bennett
Kalotec Ltd
Cams Hall
FAREHAM
PO16 8AB

My Ref: D1526AIAL2

6th May 2016

Dear Mr Bennett,

**RE: LAND AT REAR OF 111 LONDON ROAD, COWPLAIN PO8 8XJ
PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT**

In accordance with your instructions I have prepared tree information relevant to the proposed development to the standard normally required by the Local Planning Authority in support of a planning application. My assessment of the impact of the proposals with appropriate protection and amelioration measures is set out below. This letter is effectively an Arboricultural Impact Assessment (AIA) as recommended in paragraph 5.4 of BS 5837:2012 *Trees in relation to design, demolition and construction - Recommendations* and is written as a part of the formal submissions to the Local Planning Authority in support of the planning application.

1 The proposal

- 1.1 Development:** The proposal is the construction of a detached dwelling including associated car parking and with access from London Road at land at the rear of 111 London Road, Cowplain, Waterlooville. The proposed layout is shown on the Kalotec Ltd drawing no. 2016.LR.06 dated March 2016. This drawing is based on a site survey and shows the relevant trees on and closely adjacent to the site of the proposed development. This drawing has been annotated with tree numbers and tree protection measures and a copy is attached as draft tree protection plan AC2.
- 1.2 Planning background:** Planning permission for the construction of 4 No. 3 bed houses including associated access, car parking and landscaping at land r/o 111 London Road, Cowplain was granted by Havant Borough Council on 22nd October 2014 (HBC ref : APP/14/00439). A condition of consent (Condition 7) required the development to be carried out in accordance with the Arboricultural Impact Assessment and Tree Protection Plan 2013.078 PL02.

That planning permission accepted tree/building relationships, based on approved submissions and subject to appropriate compliance. References are made to that planning permission in the following letter where appropriate.

- 1.3 **Previous arboricultural submissions:** The APP/14/00439 application was supported with an arboricultural report by Bernie Harverson Arboricultural Consultant ref: 0609.bjh.Mar14. That report provided tree information to BS 5837:2012 and is the report referred to in the consent condition 7. References are made in this letter to the Bernie Harverson (BH) report where applicable, and the assessment is based on the BH report tree schedule information, as approved by Havant Borough Council. This letter is effectively an addendum to the BH report and should be read with it.

- 1.4 **Current arboricultural submission:** This letter of report is provided in support of the proposal for the dwelling on Plot 1. It assumes development for other parts of the site in accordance with relevant planning permissions and approved submissions, with references in this report for the avoidance of doubt where relevant.

2 Trees

- 2.1 **Tree schedule:** Tree information for relevant trees as recommended in BS 5837:2012 *Trees in relation to design, demolition and construction* has been extracted from the BH report and set out in the tree schedule attached at Appendix 1.
- 2.2 **Formal tree controls:** I have not myself checked with Havant Borough Council to find out the extent of formal tree protection for the site, and the BH report is silent on the subject. Notwithstanding the presence of any TPO, the proposal is to retain trees. 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.

3 Issues relevant to the trees

- 3.1 **Demolition - structures:** There are no structures proposed for demolition within the root protection areas (RPAs) of retained trees and no significant risk to retained trees from demolition. Additional precautions will include temporary tree protective fencing (see paragraph 4.1 below) and no fires within 10m of the canopy of any retained tree, and no storage or mixing of harmful materials c.g. DERV fuel, concrete within 10m of the trunk of any retained tree. The combination of these measures will reduce any risk of damage to retained trees to an acceptable minimum.

- 3.2 **Existing surfaces:** There is no significant existing surfacing within the RPAs of trees proposed for retention. There will be no adverse effects on trees from activities relating to existing surfacing.
- 3.3 **Services:** The site is already full serviced and the intention is to continue to use those existing services which will run out to and have their connections to London Road. There should be no requirement for special installation measures for services in respect of trees.
- 3.4 **Construction:** The proposed dwelling and integral garage are outside the RPAs of trees proposed for retention. In consideration of all the circumstances special foundations in respect of the risk of damage to tree roots are considered to be disproportionate to the risk of harm and are not proposed.
- 3.5 **New surfacing and access:** Part of the turning head of the access serving the proposed dwellings is within the RPAs of trees T2 and T3. The BH report showed this area of the access to be installed using permeable surfacing, installed using a 'no-dig' construction to incorporate a cellular confinement system ('Cellweb' or similar) filled with washed aggregate with a treated and pegged board edging or pinned railway sleepers. That proposal, acceptable in the previous application, is not replicated here, as the details for it have already been submitted and approved.
- 3.6 **Construction access:** Construction access will be predominantly from the central access road that will run at right angles into the site from London Road. Temporary protective fencing will allow construction access to the rear elevation of the dwelling on Plot 1 without adverse effects on trees. With these safeguards in place there will be no significant risk to retained trees from construction access.
- 3.7 **Materials delivery, storage and handling:** The nature of the site, the existing access and the available space suggest that materials will be delivered to the London Road site access, and moved by small mobile plant into the site. The existing access and the space through the centre of the site is outside RPAs and provides reasonable space for materials storage. There is access into the rear parts of the site without significant adverse effects on trees. No phytotoxic materials shall be stored or mixed within the protection zones of trees to be retained.

4 Protective measures

- 4.1 **Protection for above-ground parts of retained trees:** The three trees identified in the schedule will be protected by the existing boundary fencing, supplemented with temporary fencing erected at the locations indicated on the draft tree protection plan AC2 by a dashed red line with diagonal hatching. This fencing will be to the BS 5837:2012 section 6.2 recommendations i.e. preformed galvanised steel mesh panels ('Heras' or similar) braced with stabiliser struts and base plates secured with ground pins to resist impacts. The

fencing will be installed at the locations shown and retained until construction is completed. The temporary fencing may be moved or removed only with notice to and consent from the Council. The satisfactory installation of the protective fencing may be confirmed in writing to the Council on inspection by a person suitably qualified in arboriculture.

5 Other issues

- 5.1 **Post occupancy:** The location and character of the proposals have been achieved in consideration of all the site factors including the presence of trees. The dwelling on Plot 1 has its main amenity outlook to the rear west, where the retained trees form a very useful rear boundary marker and partial screen between the dwelling and existing properties to the west. The rear elevation has been set back to give a reasonable separation between the dwelling and the rear site boundary, with the trees further away behind the boundary fence. It is likely to be in new occupant's best interests to retain these trees. The Council should be able to resist unreasonable applications relating to inappropriate tree works, and could reasonably expect to be supported in their decision at appeal.

6 CONSENT CONDITIONS

- 6.1 **Arboricultural method statement heads of terms:** The recommendation in BS 5837:2012 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. Here the tree issues are not complex. Adherence to the precautions set out above and the details given in the BH report would lead to a satisfactory outcome for retained trees and no additional submissions are needed.

7 SUMMARY

- 7.1 **Summary of the impact on local amenity:** This layout retains the significant trees adjacent to the site, with scope for reasonable and proportionate provisions for their protection during development. 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. The Council could properly refuse consent for inappropriate works and could expect to be supported in such decisions at appeal.

The details given in this letter show that, provided the protective measures set out are put in place, trees will not be adversely affected by the proposed development. For this reason, the proposals should be acceptable to the Council in tree terms and there should be no tree-related grounds for a refusal of planning permission.

Please call me if you would like to discuss any of these points.

Yours sincerely

A black rectangular box redacting the signature of Jonathan Fulcher.

Jonathan Fulcher DipArb FARborA

Encs

Appendix 1
Land r/o 111 London Road, Cowplain
Tree Schedule and Explanatory Notes

Based on the Bernie Harverson Arboricultural Consultant report ref: 0609.bjh.Mar14 tree schedule

Tree No	Species	Height (m)	Trunk Diameter (cm)	Crown spread (m)	Life stage	General observations	Estimated contribution in years	BS 5837 cat	Root protection distance (m)
T1	Oak (<i>Quercus robur</i>)	14	78	<8	M	As given in the Bernie Harverson Arboricultural Consultant ref: 0609.bjh.Mar14. Tree retention is assumed. Note that the root protection distances for trees T2 and T3 have been reduced by 15% from the BS 5837 distance, as approved by Havant Borough Council in the APP/14/00439 permission.	>40	B1	9.4
T2	Oak	20	86	<8	M		>40	C1	8.3
T3	Oak	18	80	<8	M		>40	C2	8.2

Appendix 1
Land r/o 111 London Road, Cowplain
Tree Schedule and Explanatory Notes




Based on the Bernie Harverson Arboricultural Consultant report ref: 0609.bjh.Mar14 tree schedule

Abbreviations:

m	: Metre
>	: Greater than
<	: Less than

Explanatory Notes

- **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
- **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:** Categories U, A, B and C, as advised in BS 5837:2012.
- **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, rounded up for practicality; the distance may not be the same as the distance for protective fencing. **Note:** For trees with multiple stems the protection area is determined using the calculation method in BS 5837:2012 i.e. the square root of the sum of the diameter squared of the stems.



Plan AC2

Draft Tree Protection Plan for Arboricultural Impact Assessment

Proposed development (Plot 1) at land to the rear of 111 London Road, Cowplain

Report Ref: D1525A1A12


Location of trees with tree schedule numbering indicating location of BS 5837:2012 section 5.2 tree protective fencing

Key

- Location of trees indicating extent of BS5837 tree protective areas
- Location of temporary fencing and protective areas

The original of this drawing was produced in colour. A monochrome copy should not be relied upon.

Alderwood Consulting Ltd, Cowplain, Warrington, Cheshire, WA11 2JQ
Tel: 01925 227 424 Fax: 01925 227 425
Email: info@alderwood.co.uk Website: www.alderwood.co.uk



CLIENT	Sovereign Land Developments		
SITE	Plot 1 - Land to the rear of 111 London Road		
TITLE	Technical Plan		
SCALE	1:200(A3)	DRAWING NO.	2016.LR.06
DATE	March 16	CHECKED	
DRAWN	FCB	REVISION	

Kaloteco Limited, Castle Hill, Farnham, Hampshire, GU14 7JH
Telephone: 01252 227 424 Fax: 01252 227 425
Website: www.kaloteco.co.uk

COPYRIGHT © KALOTECO LIMITED