

70 Cobden Avenue Southampton SO18 1FT

Notes on arboricultural aspects of planning application 16/00888/FUL:

Redevelopment of the site. Demolition of the existing building and erection of 7 x dwellings (2 x 4-bed, 3 x 3-bed, 2 x 2-bed flats) with associated access, parking and landscaping (resubmission of 16/00083/FUL)

Prepared by Dr Martin Dobson

BSc (Hons) Biol, DPhil, FArborA, MEWI, Registered Consultant of the Arboricultural Association

1. I have been instructed by David Jerram to prepare notes in relation to arboricultural aspects of application ref. 16/00888/FUL at 70 Cobden Avenue to demolish the existing building and create seven new dwellings.
2. The application was initially submitted under reference 16/00083/FUL and was supported by a tree report from Eco Urban dated 24 February 2016. The application was refused on 3 March 2016. The comments of Southampton City Council's Tree Officer are shown at Appendix 1 and the principal reason for refusal is shown below: the overhang of tree branches into the amenity space of plots 6 – 7 and 3 was regarded as unacceptable.

The amenity space shown to serve the proposed development is not considered to be fit for its intended purpose as useable external space to serve the prospective residents. In particular, the proximity of the canopy of protected trees to the private garden spaces serving plots 6-7 and 3 would result in excessive shading to the detriment of the usability of the garden space. The proposal would, therefore, introduce additional and unreasonable pressure for the cutting back and/or removal of overhanging branches of these trees to the detriment of the character and amenities of the area. As such, the proposal would be contrary to saved policies SDP1(i), SDP7, SDP12, H7 of the Local Plan Review (March 2015 amended) and policy CS13 of the Core Strategy (March 2015 amended) as supported by paragraph 2.3.14, section 4.4 and paragraphs 4.8.7 to 4.8.8 of the Residential Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (September 2006).

3. The current application is supported by an Arboricultural Implications Assessment and Method Statement prepared by Eco Urban and dated 13 April 2016.
4. The proposed plan for the first, rejected, application is shown at Appendix 2 and the proposed plan for the current application is shown at Appendix 3. The main difference between the first and current proposals are that the dwelling at Plot 3 has been reduced in size and the garage has been moved forward away from T11. The garage for Plot 4 has been moved and for Plot 5 omitted. Plot 5 has been enlarged and is now 5/6 and Plot 7 has been reduced in size. It is assumed that these changes have been made in response to the Tree Officer's comments.



5. The points that I would raise in relation to the application are as follows:
- (i) The submitted arboricultural report contains no tree constraints plan showing the existing site with canopy spreads, root protection areas (RPA) and BS5837 categorisation. The submitted plan which shows the proposals (Appendix 3) does not have RPAs shown for trees in G21 which may encroach into Plots 5 and 6. Nor are they shown for G26 which may encroach into Plot 7, and indeed for a number of other Category C trees.
 - (ii) Canopy spreads of trees are not shown clearly on the submitted development plan and therefore the extent of overshadowing cannot be assessed accurately. Overshadowing was the principal reason for refusal of the first application. For example, Alder T33 has a diameter crown spread of 10 m NESW and that is not reflected on the drawings. Such a large canopy to the south east of Plot 7 will cause significant shading and potentially future pressure for felling or pruning. The crown spreads of oaks T11 and T12 are not even shown in the tree table, but given that concerns were raised regarding shading onto Plot 3 by them this should be corrected so that the council have sufficient information with which to make an informed decision. I am surprised that T11 and T12 which are large mature oaks have been assessed as category B trees. No explanation has been given as to why they are not high quality category A trees. The same applies to T33 alder and T38 oak.
 - (iii) Section 5.2.2 of BS5837: 2012 advises that the tree constraints plan should include an indication of potential direct obstruction of sunlight. This is usually illustrated by an arc equal to the tree's height from due north west to due east, indicating the shadow pattern. No arcs have been included in the applicant's submissions and therefore they have not demonstrated that there will be acceptable light in proposed amenity spaces. The shading impacts of trees in G21 and G26, due south of Plots 5/6 and 7 have not been considered.
 - (iv) The site appears to be very 'cramped' with plots being squeezed between trees in an uncomfortable juxtaposition. This will create additional pressure on trees in the long term.
 - (v) A significant number of category C trees are to be removed from the site. The tree report asserts that 12 category C trees and 2 groups are to be removed. But the submitted plan appears to show the removal of 32 trees or groups of trees. Whilst these may be lower value trees the overall effect is to weaken the area of 'pocket woodland'.
 - (vi) I have seen no landscape proposals which would mitigate the losses of trees.

APPENDIX 1

Tree officer comments on application ref. 16/00083/FUL

Trees & Open Spaces

Comment Date: Fri 19 Feb 2016

There are two tree preservation orders that are within the curtilage of 70 Cobden Avenue. These are The Southampton (70 Cobden Avenue) Tree Preservation Order 2013 and The Southampton (Cobden Avenue-Thorold Road Area) Tree Preservation Order 1955, and as such are a material consideration to this application.

The current design puts all of the properties outside of the indicated root protection area, although there has not been a scaled plan that shows the extent of the RPA in relation to the properties, therefore clarity will be required to show the areas marked on the EcoUrban tree protection plan, as included within the arboricultural implications and method statement (Ref 14598 -AIA 3, dated 15 January 2016) are a true representation of the RPA.

There will be a requirement to install ground protection around the rear of plot 6&7, where access will be required to enable the building of the two units. A specification of ground protection has been supplied in the arboricultural report in s5.1.3, but gives vague specifications. It would appear that the specification relates to BS5837 2012 s6.2.3.3 (a) which would be only for pedestrian movements. This is acceptable ground protection for pedestrian use and I would ask that the tree protection fencing be placed on the extent of the RPA until such a time that the construction of units 6&7 commences. The tree protection plan shows that the ground protection will be 2m in width, which is approximate width of the scaffolding required for construction. Therefore once this is erected, there will be no opportunity of damage occurring from vehicles which will require the lighter specification of ground protection.

The hard landscaping that is shown to be to the rear of plot 6&7 is in the RPA of T38 and T29 and should be installed with the roots of the trees in mind, therefore there is to be minimal excavation in this area and compaction is to be avoided. I would therefore ask for further details over installation of this area be provided.

No services runs have been identified on any site plan. These are all to be located outside of the root protection area and will be required to be identified on a site plan.

A retaining wall is shown around trees T23, T27 & T28 which is outside of the suggested RPA, therefore should not have a negative impact to the trees. I would, however mention that there is to be no adjustment of soil levels within the RPA of these trees, and that is the same for all retained trees on site.

I do have a concern that some of the properties will be in shade from the neighbouring trees, especially plots 6&7 and that this may lead to future pressure to have the trees heavily pruned or felled, I would therefore ask if this has been given due consideration and the design layout been orientated to provide the maximum natural light penetration achievable.

My further concern is over the loss of boundary vegetation. I fully understand that by removing trees and large shrubs, it will aid with natural light penetration, but it will also open up the view to the houses below. Due to the topography of the land, the new houses will sit high above which may result in loss of privacy. I therefore would ask that additional planting of small to medium sized trees be planted in these voids on the southern boundary.

In respect to the planting design (ACD Landscape proposal, drawing No SOU19933-11) I am not in support with the suggested tree species. The trees that border Cobden Avenue are to be of a larger and longer living species, rather than the Prunus Hillieri Spire, as suggested.

I am happy with Prunus Hillieri spire that are shown to be to the North of the parking bays for plot 6&7, as these will cast minimal shade to the adjacent garden but will provide screening. As these are to be adjacent to a hard surface, the installation of a root barrier should be used to prevent future damage.

The trees that are shown to the rear of plot 5 are shown to be Sorbus and Betula. I do not support the planting of the Sorbus as these are not long lived species. I would also ask that Betula pendula 'Tristis' be planted rather than the standard silver birch as these will have a better form. Alternatively Betula utilis jacquemontii could be planted as these have more interesting bark.

I would question if there is additional space to plant further trees along the western edge of the land behind plot 4&5.

I am happy with the choice of Amelanchier to the rear of plot 2, but would ask for an additional Amelanchier to be planted in the grassed area to the side of plot 4&5

There is some further information required with regards to service runs, method statements and specification for ground protection and fencing location, along with the adjustments to the landscape plan, that require attention before I could fully support this application.

Gary Claydon-Bone
City Tree Officer.

APPENDIX 2.

Tree protection plan from application 16/00083/FUL



	<p>ECO 4 - TREE PROTECTION AT 70 COBDEN AVENUE, SOUTHAMPTON</p>	<p>SCALE: 1:200 @ A1</p>	<p>COMPOSITE PLAN: LAND SURVEY IN GREY SUPERIMPOSED OVER PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT</p>
<p>T1 XXX BS Category B: Trees of moderate quality</p> <p>T1 XXX BS Category C: Trees of low quality</p>	<p> Tree protective barriers with construction exclusion zone</p> <p> Area outside barriers requiring ground protection</p> <p> Tree/hedge removals</p>		<p>This drawing was originally produced in colour, therefore any subsequent monochrome photocopies may not show appropriate levels of detail and should not be relied upon for the purposes of dealing with site tree issues</p>

APPENDIX 3.

Tree protection plan from application 16/00888/FUL



	<p>ECO 5 - TREE PROTECTION AT 70 COBDEN AVENUE, SOUTHAMPTON</p>	<p>SCALE: 1:200 @ A1</p>	<p>COMPOSITE PLAN: PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT IN BLUE AND SUPERIMPOSED OVER LAND SURVEY</p>
<p>T1 xxx BS Category B: Trees of moderate quality</p> <p>T1 xxx BS Category C: Trees of low quality</p>	<p>--- Tree protective barriers with construction exclusion zone</p> <p>▨ Area outside barriers requiring ground protection</p> <p>○ Tree/hedge removals</p>		<p>This drawing was originally produced in colour, therefore any subsequent monochrome photocopies may not show appropriate levels of detail and should not be relied upon for the purposes of dealing with site tree issues</p>