



# Memo.

**Date:** 29<sup>th</sup> July 2011

**To:** Sarah Smith

**Cc:** -

**From:** Oliver Waring

**Subject:** N6/2010/3120/DC3 – Redevelopment of site to provide a wet play area, adventure play areas, an educational play area, high ropes attraction, changing huts, education room, cafe and toilet facilities. Alterations to Stanborough Road and car park on site

---

An assessment has been made of the impact of the above proposed development on trees on or near the proposed site.

The following documents were used in the assessment:

- Appendix 9:Tree Survey Stanborough Park Planning Application rev a1: updated July 2011 within the Cracknell Landscape Architecture Planning information.
- Arboricultural Survey and Planning Integration Report at Stanborough Park (north), Welwyn Garden City, Hertfordshire by Quaife Woodlands(ref. AR/2376a/ap) dated 6<sup>th</sup> December 2010.
- Cracknell Landscape Architecture Planning Tree Plan Sheet 1 (project no 5108, drg no TP001 rev 04|)
- Cracknell Landscape Architecture Planning Tree Plan Sheet 2 (project no 5108, drg TP-002 rev 04).

A site visit was also carried out on 28<sup>th</sup> July 2011.

The proposed development is at the site of the old swimming complex at the northern section of Stanborough Park , Welwyn Garden City.

An assessment of the trees in and around the proposed development site has been carried out by Quaipe Woodlands and detailed in their report following the guidance set out in BS 5837: 2005 Trees in relation to construction- Recommendations. In general the categorisation of the trees given within the report is agreed with.

The report has recommended removal of 70 trees however not all these are to facilitate the development. Section 2.1.2 Tree Works of Appendix 9 of the planning application appendices states, 'only 21 small trees have been indentified for removal as part of the development process.' This is not entirely true, two limes (tree nos 257 and 258),an oak (tree no 485) and a Pagoda tree (tree no 487) would need to be removed to facilitate the entrance widening are all 13m or taller. There is also further confusion over trees to be removed on the two Tree Sheet Plans. These do show some of the trees for removal, however there are areas where tree are show for retention but proposed planting is shown on top or very near these trees.

Having assessed the trees most indicated for removal are of low quality or limited amenity value. The main exceptions are the limes and an oak near the entrance that need to be removed to widen the entrance, which have significant amenity value. It is understood that the removal of these trees is a safety requirement and necessary. In light of the above significant replacement planting would be required around the entrance to compensate for the removal of these trees.

Clarification of which trees will be removed /retained will be needed prior any on site activity.

Those trees being retained will need protecting during the construction process. The report carried out by Quaipe Woodlands gives details of Root Protection Areas (RPA) and details of protective fencing and a plan indicating the proposed location of the fencing. The specification for the fencing is sufficient. The indicative location on the plan supplied in the Appendix of the arb report shows that some of the fencing falls within the RPA due to the location of existing or proposed footways, roads or buildings. The report does give details of special construction methods that can be used within the RPA of trees but does

not indicate specifically where they would be used. Further details regarding the use and locations of protection measures (both fencing and ground protection) and special construction methods would be needed prior to any on site activity.

Location of site huts, machinery and material storage has not been supplied. In addition details of any underground services particularly those going through any RPAs has not been supplied. This above information would need to be supplied prior to any on site activity.

Should the application be approved on site supervision at key stages of the development by a qualified Arboriculturist would be required. A report from any site visit made by the Arboriculturist with any recommendation or works required would be submitted to the Council to ensure that Tree Protection measures are adhered to.

Tree planting is mentioned within the report but a landscaping plan has not been supplied. A detailed planting scheme will need to be submitted for approval prior to any on site

## **CONCLUSION**

In general there is no objection to the proposed development on tree or landscape grounds. However the information supplied is a little confusing. Clarification of the existing information supplied and more information will be required prior to any development.

It is recommended that the following is request as conditions should the application be approved:

- An Arboricultural Method Statement (AMS) and Tree Protection Plan (TPP) in accordance with BS:5837;2005 section 7 which should include the following.
  1. A plan clearly indicating trees for removal and retention
  2. Precise location for tree protection,
  3. Details of special construction methods and the areas where these are to be applied.

4. Details of site huts, machinery and material storage.
5. Details of site parking
6. Details of services both existing and proposed.
7. Details of any on site supervision.

Also a detailed landscape scheme will need to be provided to include:

- Details of species, size and planting densities
- Planting method specification
- Details of after care and replacements if needed.

I trust the above clear. Please let me know if you need any classification.