

F/24/98399 - 6 SEDGWICK ROAD, BISHOPSTOKE

11/12/2024

Hi Clare

Arboricultural Documents

Arboricultural report reference IH/Land R/o 6&8 Sedgwick Road, SO50 6FB/sur/imp/7217

Tree protection plan reference 7217TP

Comments

At pre-app, we provided the following comments:

The area around the tree appears to be shown as new hardstanding, which would be a point of objection at full planning because it could cause impacts on the rooting system of the tree.

Further, it is probably that the southern unit would be within the root protection area of the tree resulting in impacts.

Finally, the position of the southern unit in relation to the tree would likely result in a dominance issue, which would also be a point of objection.

Regarding the driveway. having assessed the information supplied for this full planning application, the following points can be made:

- The RPA has not been modified to take into account the hard surfacing to the south. The garden of the application property is, therefore, currently likely to provide a greater rooting volume than the tree protection plan suggests.
- Further, the unsealed nature of the garden further increases its significance for water percolation and gaseous exchange, as well as nutrient availability.
- Regardless, the hard surfacing is being laid over a significant proportion of the RPA. While it is accepted that engineered solutions may be applicable – as stated in the report – these solutions are not without impact. The area being covered is greater than we are comfortable with, even before we consider the elevated importance of the garden for the root system.
- Finally, the report has not demonstrated that engineered solutions can be achieved on this specific site.

Other issues that we highlighted at pre-app are still valid: the proposed dwellings are within the RPA – which may be significantly larger than that shown in the tree protection plan – and both units would be dominated and shaded by the tree, which lies to the south.

Therefore, as it stands, we cannot support this application. The applicant has not suitably demonstrated that the proposal would not impact the arboricultural features of the site. The proposal is, therefore contrary to policy DM1 and information contained within the Trees and Development SPD.