

08 February 2010

FROM:

Joe Russell-Wells
Parks and Landscape
37914

TO:

Neil Crowther
Planning Services

ANGELS NURSERY SITE YAPTON ROAD BARNHAM – BN/27/09

1.1 Arboriculture Implication Assessment.

The survey, by its own admission is incomplete. The eastern section of the site access has not been accessed by the Tree Surveyor who incorrectly states the lack of trees in that only 'overgrown shrubs and hedges' exist in this section. However we visited the site on 2nd February and noted several trees of significance in this eastern section and they need to be identified and categorised as part of the outline application.

The section surveyed has failed to identify additional trees for example the Horse Chestnut near to T18 and young Oak trees growing between T15 and T18 on the Tree Constraints plan. They could be a material consideration as part of a proposed open space or considered for relocation appropriately in another part of the development site.

Some trees species have been incorrectly identified, for example T19 to T23 are a line of *Populus x euramericana* 'Hybrid Black and not White Poplar.

The Tree Constraints Plan has not been produced to scale. It cannot therefore be relied upon to provide the correct information with regard to tree location. It is imperative that this information is plotted onto a scale plan and submitted as part of the outline application.

The tree assessment is not conclusive. The retention of trees within the development only show two Oaks T15 and T16 on the plan. However other trees to be retained within the development site are shown on the Tree Constraints Plan but without protective fencing. Clarification of the trees to be retained within the the development including protective fencing must be made with the outline application in accordance with BS5837 (2005). Applying tree protection conditions on a reserve matters application will not protect the trees if they are already condemned by outline permission.

The report gives the measured tree diameter at breast height (dbh) and the root protection area calculated in Appendix 1 of the Tree Constraints Plan. Showing a protective fence on an un-scaled plan cannot be relied upon and is inadequate to protect the trees from harmful development activities. There is an inaccuracy

with some of the dbh measurements which need to be checked so that correct RPA distance can be plotted and the arboriculture constraints shown accurately.

In conclusion the following must be addressed:

- The survey must be complete and accurate (with particular reference to the inclusion of all trees, correct species and dbh)
- This must be reflected in the Tree Constraints Plan provided to scale
- The Tree Constraints Plan must reflect accurately the trees to be retained as part of the development, clearly identifying the location of protective fencing.

1.2 Biodiversity

Due to the Phase 1 habitat survey being undertaken during the dormant part of the year (November 2009) further surveys should be completed to ensure that the presence or absence of protected species such as reptiles is identified.

The surveys undertaken are inconclusive e.g. those for badgers and bats. Further survey work would be required as condition to any permission

The various other recommendations in the report under Section 4 will need to be conditioned with any outline permission. A construction phase management plan should form part of a condition of any permission.

1.3 Public Open Space

There is a requirement for both public open space and play provision to be provided with the development.

The Council's SPG remains relevant - under this there is a requirement for 0.53 ha of open space to be provided within the site boundary. For a development of 100 houses the provision of two play areas should be provided to serve this development. Due to the proximity of the adjacent proposed community facilities it is appropriate for an off site sum to be provided for play facilities to be located there for a proportion of the requirement with a smaller play facility located within the open space on the development.

The location of all play areas is critical to their success or failure. All play areas must be located allowing a buffer of POS between these areas and housing.

An indication of the future management responsibility for areas of open space should be provided, though it is understood this is an outline application.

1.4 SUDS

The drainage of the site has not been provided and therefore whether any SUDS are included. If included by their nature they are included with POS areas. The full implications of any scheme must be provided to ensure this sits well with any POS provision. This information must be provided as part of the outline application.

1.5 Landscaping

The reference of the retention of vegetation on the boundaries of the site is noted. However as noted above (item 1.1) any such vegetation must be suitable protected for the development work by appropriate fencing. This will need to be identified on a plan.

The provision of detailed landscaping for the development as a whole must be conditioned with any permission. Some indicative planting has been illustrated with the plan provided this must be provided in detail before development can commence.

No landscaping has been indicated on the road frontage of the development – this must be included.

1.6 Summary

The information provided with the application is insufficient. Further information as stated above must be provided in order to give a recommendation.

Joe Russell-Wells