

A Whitehead Associates Ltd

Arboricultural Consultants

Unit 5, Fisher Green, Ripon,
North Yorkshire. HG4 1NL

Tel: 01765 692480

Fax: 01765 690935

E. Mail: awhitehead@tree-consultant.com



Our Ref: 5658

31/08/05

Fulford Friends

Dear Friends,

**RE: Proposed Indicative Site Layout for Connaught Court
Development Plan McNeil Beechey O'Neill Chartered Architects
December '04 Scheme Ref: CCDP/P11**

1. Introduction

- 1.1 Further to your instructions to review the revised plan for the development at Connaught Court, I have the pleasure in enclosing my findings.
- 1.2 In accordance with our instructions I visited the site on 18/08/05 and took salient measurements of the tree stocks using an MDL laser range finder.
- 1.3 The revised plan has resolved a number of tree issues. However there still remains a long list of areas where the development conflicts with the site trees and is not in accordance with BS5837.

2. Scheme Review

- 2.1 The scheme is reviewed in the order of a clockwise walk entering the site on Main Street by the huge veteran beech 275 and walking round to the exit on St Oswald's Road.
- 2.2 There are three general points I raise before discussing individual tree issues:
 - In my original report I requested a tree survey in accordance with BS5837. Despite the size of this scheme, a BS5837 survey has not been made available but the new drawing (December '04 CCDP/P11) does give the proposed line for protective fencing for each group of trees. However, the line of the protective fencing has not been plotted in accordance with BS5837 and bends in and out of the protective zones whenever it is convenient to do so. For example, Chestnut 258, where the fence line has been brought 1m within the BS protective radius in order to accommodate the Health Centre car park turning head.
 - The drawing protocol for the increase in tree canopies over time has been selectively rather than universally applied. For example, 294 and 296 the 25 year canopies have been omitted because they would be inside the building plan. I would also like to see these crown spreads in tabulated format as some of the predictions are very conservative.

2.3 **Beech 275**



Beech 275 is the magnificent veteran beech at the front of the site. Its crown measurements are greater than shown. The true crown dimensions are North 14m, South 13m, East 11m and West 14m. A check triangulation plot using the top northern corner and the northern bus shelter corner as reference points concurred with the plot of the bole on plan.

The western crown dimension on plan is shown as 12m. If the crown is increased to its true dimensions the crown oversails the new bowling green by 1m. The crown oversail and the shade from the whole tree will conflict with bowls play by creating a black hole in one corner of the pitch.

The current pitch is featured on the right and has no shade spots.



There is an additional problem, the 1.5m wide tarmac path, which encompasses the current pitch has been omitted from the drawing. If the path is added to the current proposed position of the bowling green, the outside edge of the path is 8.5m from the bole of beech 275 which is 5.5m on the inside edge of the crown.

2.4 **Lime 271**

The bowling green path would necessitate felling lime 271 because it is on the edge of the proposed bowling green. The path also passes under the crowns of trees 277 and 278 and very close to the boles of the same.

2.5 **Bowling Green Conclusion**

In plain English the bowling green does not fit as shown on plan and will compromise 6 trees. The long-term collateral risk to beech 275 is greater than it would appear because

York City Council will be deluged with applications to prune the tree from the Bowling Club so that the tree does not compromise the playing standards of the green.

In regard to the green it would be appropriate for the applicant to supply the plan of the shadows cast by the respective trees to demonstrate that the green is playable.

2.6 Walnut 250 and Lime 251

The crowns of these two trees have been flattened on plan where in reality they actually meet.

The footpath is shown as 2m wide and yet in brackets it is detailed as being the route of emergency link if required. If the link path is also going to be an emergency link, it will need to be at least 3m wide and up to Highway specification because fire engines weigh 18 tons.



The construction of a Highway specification road underneath the crowns of these two mature trees will cause extensive root damage.

2.7 Acers 252 and 254 and Chestnut 258

The crowns of these three trees oversail either car parking bays or the Health Centre parking turning head.

2.8 Lime 287 and Chestnut 288

The footpath passes underneath the crowns of these two trees and the outside kerb almost touches the bole of 288.

2.9



2.10 The set of three photographs above depict the land in front of trees 236, 237 and 240 and show the high level of gradient change across this piece of land. In order to construct properties 1-10 in this area of the site there will need to be considerable cut and fill.

The drawing shows that the access road passes underneath the crowns of trees 235, 236 and 240. However the scale of cut in order to install a level road will greatly extend the construction area over and above the kerb lines as shown. The construction of a road underneath the canopy of TPO'd trees is not normally acceptable. I have considerable reservations as to whether this plan can be constructed without inflicting considerable damage to the tree stocks. Considering the scale of level changes within this area it would be reasonable to request a topographic plan to show that it is practical to build what is being proposed.

2.11 **Pear 294**
Pear 294 is too close to the building.

2.12 **Pear 296**
The footpath stops on the outside of the pear tree's crown forcing the pedestrians onto the road at the entrance to the site. This design does not appear appropriate in regard to Health and Safety of the residents and visitors to Connaught Court. Though the detail saves footpath construction damage to the pear I would like to see an opinion from the Highways Authority that they would accept this detail.

2.14 **Silver Birch 298**

The footpath not only passes underneath the crown but the kerb is only circa 500mm from the bole.

2.15 **Sycamore 314 and Ash 315**

A new footpath is proposed within 1m of the bole of these two trees.

2.16 **Ash 312 and Sycamore 317**

New buildings are proposed within 1m of the crown of these two trees. This means that foliage will extend to within the length of a man's arm from the building. This is not realistic.

Yours faithfully,

Tony Whitehead

A Whitehead Dip Arb. (RFS) F. Arbor A., MICFor
Arboricultural Association Registered Tree Consultant and Chartered Forester