

Alderwood
Consulting Limited



**Arboricultural
Impact Assessment
in connection with garage development
at 24 Kingsway, Chandlers Ford
SO53 1EN**

Prepared by
Jonathan Fulcher DipArb FArborA

Report Reference: D2220AIA

Report Date: 12th May 2022

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 the applicant to inspect the significant trees close to the proposed development at 24 Kingsway, Chandlers Ford, Eastleigh SO53 1EN and to provide advice on the successful retention and incorporation of trees of amenity value within and closely adjacent to the site. 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 the construction of a detached garage at 24 Kingsway, Chandlers Ford, Eastleigh with access as existing from Kingsway.
- 1.3 **Documents provided:** I have been provided with the following drawings:
- Combination Site, Location and Block Plan Layout plans by Urban Architecture drawing no. P22005 – P01 dated March 2022 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.
 - ‘Proposed double garage details’ drawing by Urban Architecture drawing no. P22005 – P02 dated April 2022 with plans and elevations of the proposed garage.
- 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. The Eastleigh Borough Council website suggests that trees on (between the road and the front elevation of the dwelling) and closely adjacent to the site are protected by tree preservation order ref: 58-H with one or more ‘Area’ designations; and the site is not within a Conservation Area. The proposal is to retain the trees identified in the tree schedule at

Appendix 2 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 D2220AIA 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 10th May 2022 to collect tree information to enable me to prepare 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 permissive 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 damp and overcast with 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 RPA 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 on and near the front road boundary. The four trees identified as been relevant to the proposals are all oaks, more or less in line but intermittently spaced along the road edge of the site and all are part of a similar line of similar trees on this north west side of Kingsway. The trees generally appear to be in normal health and condition, and are part of the local tree population that contributes to the attractive landscape character of the area. 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 vehicular access, with minor levels changes in respect of the access to the proposed garage. Otherwise, the proposal is to retain the existing access unchanged (and see 4.3 and 4.5 below).
- 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 **Existing surfaces:** The existing site access from Kingsway will be retained and act as ground protection for the nearby trees, as it does now. Much of the existing surfacing is within RPAs of retained trees, and precautions in respect of changes to surfacing will be appropriate. These will generally be as set out in paragraph 4.5 below.

- 4.4 **Construction of garage:** The proposed garage is within the RPAs of trees proposed for retention. The construction methods proposed for the garage are essentially a 'no-dig' form of foundations constituting pile or piers and ground beams, with the undersides of the ground beams at or above the original ground level, supporting a timber frame timber clad structure. This would mean that the only excavations would be for the piles, typically small 300mmx300mm diameter excavations at the corners of the structure, with additional piles on the elevations as prescribed by the foundation designers. The internal floor may be either a suspended floor connected to the ground beams; or a reinforced slab. If a reinforced slab, the same constraints would apply as for the garage structure – no significant excavation, with the undersides of any supporting ribs at or above ground level e.g. using sacrificial shuttering and with an impermeable membrane under to ensure no toxic concrete runoff. In any event the effect would be for the internal floor to be elevated and the drive access surfacing would need to be changed to allow it to flow through to the new garage floor (and see 4.5 below).
- 4.5 **Changes to surfaces:** The existing shingle surfacing into the site and across the front south east elevation of the dwelling will be retained. The only changes required are those to allow the access to rise slightly to the floor of the proposed garage. The existing shingle is laid over a geotextile membrane which will be retained. There will be no excavation into previously undisturbed ground below this membrane. In the area where the levels changes are proposed, which is the apron / run-up to the garage entrance, the existing shingle will be removed by hand using hand tools. Levels will be raised using a good quality granular material laid over the existing geotextile membrane and gently consolidated. A new geotextile membrane will be laid over this subbase and the shingle replaced to bring the surface up to a gentle ramp to the garage threshold. If edge retentions are required, they will be wood e.g. gravel boards, sleepers secured with driven wood pins or steel road pins. The restrictions on excavation and the use of a geotextile membrane in accordance with the guidelines in Section 7.4 of BS 5837 will limit the risk of damage to tree roots to an acceptable level.
- 4.6 **Services:** The site is already serviced, and this establishes the principle of services to the site and their maintenance and repair. At present services run out to Kingsway and although generically the proposal would be for all replacement and new services to do the same, the only service proposed for the garage is power e.g. for lighting and that will connect back to the existing dwelling outside RPAs. There are therefore no special measures proposed for the installation of services in respect of the risk of harm to tree roots.

- 4.7 **Construction access:** This is a small-scale domestic development using small amounts of materials cut on site, with construction access all pedestrian or on surfaces already used for vehicular access. The RPAs of retained trees do not unduly affect construction access and provided that the protection measures, existing and proposed, are installed/retained, there will be no significant adverse effects on trees from construction access.
- 4.8 **Storage and movement of materials:** Materials will be delivered to site at the existing Kingsway access and may be stored on the existing surface. Materials will be moved to the footprint of the proposed garage by hand. There will be no significant risk of harm to 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 at the locations 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) facings. 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. **Note:** The substantial evergreen hedge on the road boundary occupies space between the road and the existing surfacing and while it is retained it effectively blocks any access along the boundary except at the drive access. This hedge may reasonably serve as the above-ground tree protection measures on the south west side of the access, where additional temporary fencing measures are not really necessary.
- 5.2 **Ground protection:** The existing surfacing acts a ground protection where it lies within RPAs. This surfacing will be retained (and see 4.3 and 4.5 above) and there are no areas associated with the garage proposals where temporary ground protection in addition to this surfacing is needed.

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 garage has no residential occupation component so there are no issues of concern relating to sunlight, daylight and the perception of proximity. The crowns of the nearest trees are well above the roof of the proposed garage with no conflict now or in the foreseeable future with low

branches. The pitched roof of the proposed structure will allow detritus e.g. leaves, acorns to be shed without significant build-up and in any event the garage will be only marginally inside the crown spread of the nearest trees. The garage development will not bring significant new pressures on trees 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 piled foundations, the installation of temporary tree protection 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
 - Replacement surfacing within RPAs shall be installed with a 'no-dig' specification

- 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 develop 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**

Appendix 1

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
24 Kingsway, Chandlers Ford
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>)	18	92	8	8	8	EM		40+	A	11.1
				8	8						
T2	Oak	16	78	8	8	8	EM		40+	A	9.3
				8	8						
T3	Oak	16	40	3	3	7	EM	Suppressed, slightly one-sided crown form	20+	B	4.8
				3	3						
T4	Oak	18	96	7	7	9	EM		40+	A	11.4
				7	7						

Appendix 2
24 Kingsway, Chandlers Ford
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.

Rear garden



Site Block Plan

Scale 1:200



Plan AC1

Tree Protection Plan for Arboricultural Impact Assessment

Proposed garage development at 24 Kingsway, Chandlers Ford

Report Ref: D2220A1A


Location of trees with tree schedule numbering indicating location of BS 5837:2012 section 6.2 tree protective fencing, ground protection, and special measures relating to surfacing

Key

	Location of trees indicating species, BS5837 category and BS5837 root protection area
	Location of temporary fencing or existing features acting as fencing and protected areas
	Location of existing surfacing acting as ground protection / areas for special measures for surface changes

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

Alderwood Consulting Ltd, 3 Phoenix Road, Southampton SO9 7DT
Tel: 02380 444113 Mobile: 07766 200077
Email: info@alderwood.co.uk



Ordnance Survey (c) Crown Copyright 2022. All rights reserved. Licence number 100022432

Site Location Plan

Scale 1:1250



URBAN ARCHITECTURE
Malcolm Stevens BA (Hons) Arch Tech Email : malcstevens@urban-architecture.co.uk Mobile : 07815 109494

Project 24 KINGSWAY CHANDLERS
CHANDLERS FORD
EASTLEIGH SO53 1EN

Project No P22005

Date MAR 2022 Scale 1:1250/200

Drawing Title SITE LOCATION & BLOCK
PLAN LAYOUTS

Drawing No P01

Client MR & MRS P EVANS

Revision

This drawing is copyright of the Architectural Designer & must not be reproduced without express permission