

Douglas, Sarah

From: Stringer, Chris
Sent: 07 December 2022 11:39
To: Sharpe, Summer
Subject: F/22/94046 - 49 BISHOPSTOKE ROAD, BISHOPSTOKE

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Categories: Consultees

Hi Summer,

F/22/94046 - 49 BISHOPSTOKE ROAD, BISHOPSTOKE

Apologies for the delay in commenting on this: as I mentioned, the request went missing!

The site has a significant linear tree feature on the western boundary, adjacent to the river. These trees are subject to a Tree Preservation Order. They provide high levels of visual amenity and are critical in the landscape of the Itchen.

The first point of note is the extensive arboricultural work proposed to the trees. A critical example is to T13 because the proposed dwelling would be situated within its RPA. The arboricultural consultant has identified *Ganoderma* fungal fruiting bodies on the main stem, but has not quantified the extent of strength loss. The resultant proposed pruning would be considered extreme in the absence of any data. A 6m reduction in height and up to 5m lateral reduction (depending on the side of the canopy) would remove large amount of photosynthetic area and leave a significant total pruning wound area. This would impact on both the longevity of the tree and its short-term amenity value.

As the proposed mitigation for the encroachment into the RPA of T13 – or lack of it – depends on the pruning, we would not be supportive of the proposal as it currently stands because the report does not demonstrate the need for the extensive pruning work. The encroachment into the RPA of T13 is significant and is contrary to Policy DM1 and the information and guidance in both the Trees and Development SPD and BS5837:2012. The report has not suitably demonstrated that the proposal can be constructed without significant harm to T13.

The focus on T13 should not negate the fact that there are other trees that should be considered a constraint. For example, the ability to upgrade the existing driveway will have to be demonstrated – we recognise the use of cellular confinement can work in situations like this, but it will have to be evidenced for this site, specifically. Further, as per the Highways Officer's comments, we have concerns regarding any amended plans coming forward increasing the driveway area.

Finally, we would also have concerns for post-occupancy dominance and shading from the tree feature. The trees would be in close proximity to the dwelling, dominate the site and shade a significant proportion of any recreational space. It would be a dereliction of our duty to allow obvious post-development pressures to be borne from these proposals.

We raise an arboricultural objection to the proposal. For the reasons stated above, the proposal is contrary to DM1 and the information and guidance provided in the Trees and Development SPD.

Kind regards,

Chris.

Chris Stringer
Tree Consultant
Countryside and Trees
Ext.: 8257