

Item 5 PROW 23rd June 20/00067/TPO

Responses to Officer's report:

Please excuse typographical errors etc. This has been written in a rush – I was notified by SCC of the availability of the officer's report and the deadline for submissions on the same day this deadline expired.

Para 15. The background is incomplete.

i) No mention is made of application 19/00006/TPO for works at Marlhill Copse (see 12th March PROW documents) including the 'Marlhill Copse Large Tree Work Project'. This is a very significant oversight because the 3 Monterey pines were part of a cohort of trees that the airport wanted to cut down (reduce or fell 219 in all) to enable heavier planes to take off to the south. The airport (Mr. Steve Thurston) admitted at PROW on 12 March 2019 that its reasons were commercial (affidavits and a recording is available). The airport has also admitted that this was why it bought Marlhill copse in August 2018.

ii) Why is no mention of the planning permission given to the building of the 'infill' bungalows 13a and 14a Maryland Close when T119 and T120 (behind 13A) were already mature. The initial planning permission for 13A stipulates the protection of these trees and their overhanging branches during construction, so SCC was aware of potential future issues and should bear liability for them.

ii) Why is no reference made to the date the current occupants of houses near T124 (11 St. Helena Gardens) and T119 and T 120 (13A Maryland Close) moved in and the likely state of maturity of the trees at that time?

Para 16. The Table referred to in this letter of 18th is not included. **A significant oversight** as this mentions only removal of deadwood and broken limbs from T119, T120 and T124. There is no mention of felling for these trees.

Para 17. "At that stage the report had not identified the five trees the subject of the current application for felling." Wrong. The five trees are itemised in Appendix 2 of this report. T119, T120 and T124 as below. T162 & 163 are at page 6 of appendix 2.

Para 20. (see also para 39 & 40) The airport's tree survey dated 17th February is not included in the agenda pack. The panel needs to read Appendix 2 to this report, particularly page 4 in order to compare the observations and recommendations with those in the application. Why are the observations/assessment in both the 17th February and March 24th table the same yet the former recommends felling for T119 and T124 but not for T120, whereas the latter recommends felling for all three. Basically, there is one assessment but three different versions of the conclusions, ranging from 0/3 fells, 2/3 fells and 3/3 fells.

Tree ID	Species	Height (m)	Crown Spread Radius (m)	Condition/Description	Recommended Actions	Priority	Next Inspection
118	Lycamore	19	13	Forced growth, suppressed by adjacent trees	No work required	N/A	1 year
119	Larch	21	13	Very poor form, suppressed stem, severely bent, unsuitable for retention	Fell to ground level	1 year	N/A
120	Monterey pine	33	23	Adjacent to garden gate, gnarling roots, resin bleeding at SL, east side up to 5m AGL to main union. Very large scaffold stems major deadwood, unsuitable for retention. Low useful life expectancy.	Fell to ground level. Prior to felling undertake preliminary bot survey for potential bot roots	1 year	N/A
121	Monterey pine	28	20	Some broken & snapped limbs, deadwood throughout canopy & line to south over garden, stem ca dominant at SW & SE, very large scaffold stems. Slight swelling around root collar, low useful life expectancy.	Remove all deadwood over 25 millimetre in diameter and remove any broken or snapped branches	3 months	1 year
122	Scots pine	23	12	Stem swelling south side, heavily covered in ivy	Sever ivy, monitor structural condition.	1 year	1 year
123	Monterey pine	30	23	Multi stemmed from 11m very large scaffold stems, major deadwood, broken stubs, good physiological condition, poor structural condition, stem decay at 1.3m AGL. Low useful life expectancy.	Fell to ground level. Prior to felling undertake preliminary bot survey for potential bot roots	1 year	N/A
124	Monterey pine	30	24	Heavily bent to south, overhangs garden, ivy clad, multiple scaffold stems, moderate deadwood, good physiological condition. Low useful life expectancy.	Fell to create monopitch at 10 metre AGL. Prior to felling undertake preliminary bot survey for potential bot roots	1 year	2 years
125	Lycamore	10	10	Heavily suppressed by adjacent tree, epiphytic growth on stem.	No work required	N/A	1 year
126	Lycamore	24	8	Forced growth, poor form, unsuitable for retention	Fell to ground level subject to woodland management plan	1 year	N/A

Page 6 of 7

Paras 20/21 are in the wrong chronological order. Item 21 happened before 24 March because there is email correspondence from the tree officer on 19 March saying that the application had been referred by to the FC. However the FC said (24 March) that no such application was referred to them. The tree officer is aware of this contradiction, which should be referred to at this point in his report.

Para 28. The photos and video files are not included.

Para 31. "...could be as much as 160 years old". The February 17th report states that the trees are between 108 and 160 years old. Map and other evidence indicates the tree were planted ~1912. A companion Monterey felled (apparently illegally) when 13A Maryland Close was being finally built (reportedly 2000/2003) has exposed tree rings which suggest it was at most 90 years old when felled. Therefore the trees could have in excess of 50 years life left. Because 'high risk of failure' is here said to be determined by age, this risk of failure needs to be modified downwards.

Para 45. The concept of 'over mature' and the arguments that follow from it also need to be modified in light of the trees being younger than assumed.

Para 56. "High Risk" is not here or elsewhere quantified. Why has the QTRA (Quantified Tree Risk Assessment), for example, tool not been quoted?

Para 66. The main footpath can easily be diverted into subsidiary paths in the body of the Copse, which have existed since the 1930s/1940s and whose current existence testifies to usage since this time.

Para 103.

i) What evidence is there of any tree-related injury to users of the Copse over the last 40+ years?

- ii) What empirical evidence is there that users of the copse would not behave appropriately given warnings to 'enter at their own risk'.
- iii) Why has the value of each of these trees using CAVAT (Capital Asset Value of Amenity Trees) not been calculated?
- iv) Why has the carbon sequestration and flood-limiting value (additional to CAVAT) of each of these trees not been calculated (University of Southampton and SCC 2017)?

A full, thorough and independent expert assessment of the quantified objective balance between liability and benefits of these trees is required. PROW should defer its decision until this is available. This would incur no additional cost for the Council or airport – local residents have generously agreed to fund this.

Gareth Narbed
15.6.20