

CONSULTEE RESPONSE (Council's arboriculturist)

Date of report: 26 May 2022

Reference: WA/50/22/PL

Proposal: 1no. 4 bed dwelling with detached garage and associated parking (resubmission following WA/8/22/PL). This application is a Departure from the Development Plan and is in CIL Zone 3 and is CIL Liable as a new dwelling.

Location: Oak Bank, Wandleys Lane, Walberton, BN18 0QR

Case Officer: Ms M Tomalova

Comments on application:

I have considered this application by means of a desktop review, using the information and plans submitted as well as online resources. Previous consideration from site and familiarity with surrounding area provides further insight to the proposal.

The applicants have submitted a Method Statement along with a Tree Protection Plan for this project, prepared by Bernie Harverson / Arboricultural Consultant. These were in support of the preceding application WA/8/22/PL. Tree Survey data is comprehensive and accords with the requirements of BS5837:2012. I agree with the retention category rating for T1 oak, the only significant tree overlapping the development and subject of a Tree Preservation Order.

The above report and plan were specific to the preceding application but do not comprehensively associate with the current proposal (block plan) shown on drawing no. 21034/001P Rev F.

T1 is a tree of such importance (high amenity/landscape value, potential heritage tree) and sensitivity (mature, growing in increasingly hostile surroundings) that it should represent a major constraint to development. It is therefore pleasing to see no major construction proposed within the root protection area (RPA) and crown spread, although sensitive working would be required to ensure no overspill into a Construction Exclusion Zone.

Tree Protection Fencing will need to be as per Figure 2, BS5837:2012 (*Default specification for protective barrier*) to be 'fit for purpose'.

There is no approved surface water drainage strategy. As such, if infiltration is not viable then they may need to pursue a connection to the nearby ditch (roadside of T1 oak) involving major work (including excavation) within the RPA.

Foul water and other service-runs in and out of site have not been shown and while it may be straightforward to connect to existing apparatus there remains a risk of further RPA incursion to satisfy those requirements.

Conclusions:

I would support a scheme that avoids any disturbance of ground conditions within the RPA of T1.

There is insufficient detail to be confident of avoiding harmful impacts from excavation within the RPA and/or enhancement of existing surface water drainage features.

There is important arboricultural information yet to be submitted in support of the layout, such that approval at this stage would leave T1 inadequately protected.

As it stands, I am unable to lend this scheme my support and so register an **OBJECTION** for reasons stated above.

Recommendation:

The applicant should invite their arboricultural consultant to provide a revised Method Statement and Tree Protection Plan and submit that for our approval.

We should have a surface water drainage strategy (approved by our Drainage Engineer) and detailed plan showing utility routes (Gas, Elec., Foul and Mains water), that do not conflict with RPA of T1, prior to granting consent for this application.

Mark Warwick
Tree Officer / Neighbourhood Services