

Hi Kate,

The Trees team have been re-consulted on the above application following a response sent by the project arboriculturist to my queries in respect of the access road pinch point.

The response is somewhat confusing as it does not directly answer the points raised.

1. The specification of road submitted **is not to an adoptable standard**. I recommend that you get WSCC to confirm if you are minded to approve.
2. The section drawing and proposed method of construction **does not accord with the BS5837 design standard**. Steel road edgings as shown to a depth of circa 250mm will sever all roots at this upper level within the soil horizon and act as a constraint on future rooting within the oak trees minimum recommended root protection areas (RPA's). The reference to "Abweb" and submission of generic "Geoweb" information is not synchronised. The 100mm depth of web shown is highly unlikely IME to be adequate for purpose. An engineered design for both construction purpose (reference is made to a sacrificial web layer in this respect -no detail of depth or acceptability of approach with submitted "Geoweb" information is made) and latter finished surface, should be prepared by an engineer with knowledge of the existing soil bearing characteristics.

I would imagine existing/proposed levels and ground quality may not enable a 'no-dig' web formation to be laid over it and provide a suitable access road for 20 tonne plus vehicle movements as the development requires. The applicant should be given the opportunity to respond on this point as it is fundamental to understanding the foreseeable impact of the access road on the adjacent protected oak trees to the North.

3. Extent of RPA incursion for the road **is within the maximum recommendation of the design standard**.
4. A single trench utility line outside tree RPA's **would be acceptable in principle**.

Additional comment is made on the acceptability of tree/amenity area relationships, presumably in response to my pre-app comments? I disagree in respect of the future resident pressures that the relationships of the new rear gardens to trees creates. IME this would unlikely be a strong reason for refusal in isolation, however it could be a contributory one if there are other concerns in respect of quantum of development or design/layout.

Regards

Andy

**Andrew Clout**

Assistant Arboricultural Officer (Tues and Weds only)  
Specialists Team - Strategic Planning



---

**Horsham District Council, Albery House, Springfield Road, Horsham, West Sussex RH12 2GB**

Telephone: 01403 215100 (calls may be recorded) [www.horsham.gov.uk](http://www.horsham.gov.uk) Chief Executive: Jane Eaton