HORSHAM DISTRICT COUNCIL CONSULTATION

TO:	Horsham District Council – Planning Dept
LOCATION:	Halnaker 4 Standing Close Southwater
DESCRIPTION:	Demolition of existing single storey rear extension and erection of a single storey rear extension.
REFERENCE:	DC/24/1320
RECOMMENDATION:	Advice / More info

SUMMARY OF COMMENTS & RECOMMENDATION:

The application has been supported Arboricultural Survey which refers to the off-site trees to the east, and their involvement or contribution to a structural defect at the property (Subsidence). However, the Arb report has not assessed what the impacts of the development proposal at the site may have on these trees, which make a positive contribution to the visual amenity of the area, and have a good level of landscape value, albeit localised.

MAIN COMMENTS:

To the east of the proposed extension, are a line of old field boundary trees, that were retained when the new estate at Roman Lane was built. Within the line, there are 5 trees, all oaks. The distance between the trees and what would be the eastern flank wall of the new extension ranges between 7 and 8m.

The supporting Arb report, in the Appendices section (page 15) has a plan that shows the extent of the Root Protection Area (RPA) of the trees in question. From the plan, it is evident that in palaces the RPAs extended right up to the back of the old extension. This suggests that the 1m extension to the overall building footprint will result in new development occurring within the RPA of the off-site oaks.

Paragraph 5.3.1 of the current industry standard **BS 5837 Trees in relation to Design, demolition and Construction Recommendations (2012)** states –

5**.3.1 The default position should be that structures (see 3.10) are located outside the RPAs of trees to be retained. However, where there is an overriding justification for construction within the RPA, technical solutions might be available that prevent damage to the tree(s) (see Clause 7). If operations within the RPA are proposed, the project arboriculturist should: a) demonstrate that the tree(s) can remain viable and that the area lost to encroachment can be compensated for elsewhere, contiguous with its RPA; b) propose a series of mitigation measures to improve the soil environment that is used by the tree for growth. - 3.10 structure manufactured object, such as a building, carriageway, path, wall, service run, and built or excavated earthwork.**

The BS also states that where development within the RPA is unavoidable the extent of the proposed development should not exceed 20% of the total RPA of the affected tree 7.4.2 Design recommendations - 7**.4.2.3 states that - New permanent hard surfacing should not exceed 20% of any existing unsurfaced ground within the RPA.**

From the information I have available, it does appear that the total abound of new development within the RPA of the off-site trees is less than 20% and falls within the acceptable limits. However, given the circumstances that have led to this application, a key consideration as to the suitability of the development with regards to trees is how the new extension will be founded to the ground, firstly to ensure that the building is protected against a repeat of the current situation, and secondly to limit the impact on the adjacent trees. In this regard, I note that the use of a pile and beam foundation system has been proposed; please request the full details of the foundation system which is proposed, such as the location and depth of the excavations, and how the works that fall within the RPA will be completed in a way that meets with the requirements of the current industry standard **BS 5837 Trees in relation to Design, Demolition and Construction Recommendations (2012).**

ANY RECOMMENDED CONDITIONS:N/A

NAME:	Andy Bush Arboricultural Officer
DEPARTMENT:	Strategic Planning (Specialist team)
DATE:	18/11/2024