From: [redacted]
Sent: 07 December 2017 15:24
To: [redacted]
Subject: Connaught Court; 17/01723/PREAPP

Hi [redacted]

Please consider the exchange below re: the impact on the protected trees as a consequence of providing adequate drainage. If you were to submit a planning application for your proposal it is unlikely to be approved.

[redacted]

From: [redacted]
Sent: 04 December 2017 10:27
To: [redacted]
Subject: RE: Connaught court; 17/01723/PREAPP

[redacted]n,
I have spoken to [redacted] and indeed it does.
Furthermore if they created a camber instead, the water draining off the sides of the driveway (rather than percolating through it) would not evenly redistribute under the road, therefore a change in soil conditions within the rooting zone would result. Also, one would expect a gravel drain either side of a cambered surface which would involve equally deep excavations, resulting in root severance.
[redacted]

From: [redacted]in
Sent: 04 December 2017 09:41
To: [redacted]
Subject: FW: Connaught court; 17/01723/PREAPP

Hi [redacted]

Thank you for your comments (attached) on this preapp for a new road and car park. [redacted]' comments are below. His solution appears to go against the construction method that would be needed to protect the trees. Does it?

Thank you

[redacted]

<< File: Connaught court 1701723preapp 27-11-17 EP.doc >>

From: [redacted]
Sent: 30 November 2017 15:56
To: [redacted]
Subject: RE: Connaught court; 17/01723/PREAPP

Borehole logs suggest the presence of sand and gravel at a depth of between 0.8-1.0m below ground level therefore this material should be subject to infiltration testing and the road/car park construction should be constructed to at least this depth and below the made ground level.

Regards, [redacted]

[redacted] | Senior Flood Risk Engineer
[redacted]

City of York Council | Flood Risk Management Team
Economy and Place Directorate | West Offices Station Rise | York YO1 6GA
www.york.gov.uk | facebook.com/cityofyork |@CityofYork

From: [redacted]
Sent: 30 November 2017 14:24
To: [redacted]
Subject: Connaught court; 17/01723/PREAPP

Hi [redacted]

Further to our conversation this afternoon, please can I have your comments on this preapp. Please note especially the site plan and the road construction report. Thank you.

[redacted]

[redacted] | Development Management Officer (Major and Commercial)
[redacted]

City of York Council | Development Management
Economy and Place Directorate | West Offices Station Rise | York YO1 6GA
www.york.gov.uk | facebook.com/cityofyork |@CityofYork

From: [redacted]
Sent: 30 November 2017 14:50
To: [redacted]
Subject: FW: Connaught court; 17/01723/PREAPP

Hi [redacted]

[redacted] and [redacted] have put together their comments (attached) on your pre-application enquiry. [redacted] will shortly be commenting on the drainage proposals.

Best wishes

[redacted]

From: [redacted]
Sent: 28 November 2017 16:43
To: [redacted]
Subject: RE: Connaught court; 17/01723/PREAPP

Hi [redacted],

[redacted] has covered this in her comments but just to reiterate – The raised bed is candidate Site of Importance for Nature Conservation, identified through a previous planning application on the site (05/00022/OUTM). At this time a number of species considered rare in Yorkshire were recorded.

Given that the site has since been disturbed by the replacement of the beech tree an updated survey should be undertaken and the results consulted with local experts (e.g. the Mid-Yorkshire Fungus Group). The majority of fungi species are most likely to be found in late summer or autumn.

Thanks
[redacted]

[redacted] | Countryside and Ecology Officer
[redacted]

From: [redacted]
Sent: 27 November 2017 19:01

To: [redacted]
Cc: [redacted]
Subject: Connaught court; 17/01723/PREAPP

[redacted],
Please see attached response to the above pre-app.
Let me know if you want to discuss the content, otherwise please forward to [redacted] at [redacted].


Connaught court 1701723preapp ...

[redacted] | Landscape architect
[redacted] [redacted]

City of York Council | Design Conservation & Sustainable Development, Economy & Place, West Offices, Station Rise, | York YO1 6GA
www.york.gov.uk

Please include the reference number in all planning corrsepondence

Internal Memo

Design, Conservation & Sustainable Development

Re: Connaught Court, St. Oswald's Road, Fulford
Ref: 17/01723/PREAPP
Date: 27th Nov' 2017 **File:** Connaught court 170preapp 27-11-17 EP
To: [redacted], Development management
From: [redacted], Landscape architect **Ext** : [redacted]
Cc: [redacted], Ecology & Countryside officer

Main reference doc.s:
Proposed Site Plan 20640-1503 Rev.E
By Nicholas Nairn Architects

Report QO/8789.T.1 Rev3
by Ryland Consultant Arborists

Report 15684-Y-RP-001-R1 dated 02 October 2017
by Mason Clark Associates

I am in receipt of the above documents, from which I ascertain the following.

All of the trees are subject to TPO CYC 158, including the Beech tree in the centre of the courtyard within the pre-app site.

The proposed driveway passes between an over-mature Sweet chestnut and a Red Horse Chestnut. This is aligned so as to be approximately equidistant between the tree trunks. It then skirts alongside a Hawthorn and two Norway Maples as it turns into the courtyard at a slightly lower level.

The tree most at risk as a result of the proposed development is Sweet chestnut T1, located close to the proposed entrance through the existing gateway off Fulford Park. Not only is the entrance to the site within the rooting zone of the tree, the proposed drive wraps around over 50% of the circumference of the Sweet chestnut.

The recommended root protection area (RPA) for the Sweet chestnut (T1) is 707m^2. There are no significant restrictions on the rooting zone of the tree as it stands within a grassed area, though there will be some competition from neighbouring trees. The proposed driveway would take up an area of approximately 45m length x 3.5m width = 157.5m^2. This is approximately 22% of the RPA of the Sweet chestnut.

The RPA for the Horse chestnut (T2) is 547m^2.
The proposed driveway would take up an area of approximately 25m length x 3.5m width = 87.5m^2. This is approximately 16% of the RPA of the Horse chestnut.

Both trees currently have a retention life span of over 40 years.

Creating a driveway with a no-dig construction over an area of up to 20% of the recommended root protection area, is sometimes acceptable depending on the age, condition, and species of the tree, and the ground conditions.

The ground conditions in this instance appear to be suitable for a ‘no-dig’ construction using the proposed Cellweb TRP system, which apparently is also likely to be suitable for soakaway discharge to the ground below.
Such construction allows the passage of water and oxygen to the soils below, and protects the ground from compaction, thereby maintaining existing conditions as far as possible. However there would still be a degree of compaction and a slight reduction in gaseous exchange both as a result of the construction and also with the passage of time, due to regular vehicular use; furthermore the joints and interstices may clog up, but it may be possible to clear these under suitable maintenance.

The high value of the trees, and their old age, is a limiting factor. The Sweet chestnut is an over-mature tree. The Red Horse chestnut is a mature tree. Although they are in ‘fair’ condition (not ‘good’), trees of such age have a reduced vitality and are less able to react and compensate for any potential root loss and/or alterations to ground conditions.

(The Cellweb Fact sheet includes a table stating the ‘tolerance to oxygen deficiency’ in a number of species; but this does not include Sweet chestnut or Horse chestnut, which would be interesting to know.)

Then there is also a risk posed by workmanship, which does not always meet the standards of the theory or specification.

Overall, the soil conditions and proposed construction product is suited to constructing a drive across some of the root protection area of a tree. However there are still residual impacts and risks. The proposed driveway takes up a considerable area of the RPA of both chestnuts. Given the age and high value of the trees, and the extent of driveway over the rooting zones and the risk to these two trees, the proposed development would not be favourable on arboricultural grounds alone.

The encroachment into the rooting zone of Norway Maple (T103) is probably acceptable, provided there are no introduced level changes, in order to drop down into the car park, which would result in the earthworks extending any significant distance beyond the alignment of the drive within the RPA of Norway maple (T103).
The impact on Norway maple (T102) should be negligible.
The driveway passes over the RPA of Hawthorn (T100), which is not in good condition, so this should not hinder development, but it would be worth considering planting a future replacement.

There is an existing temporary access created using grass reinforcement. Some compaction and disturbance of soil structure has occurred. Other comments aside, it might be better to use this initial alignment rather than extend the area of disturbance.

The Beech tree (T104) in the middle of the courtyard is a replacement for a former mature Beech that was felled approximately 12 years ago because it had reached the end of its safe useful life. The amenity value of the replacement tree and the former tree is/was limited by the presence of the buildings around it, however the

Beech tree adds to the general tree cover and amenity of Connaught court. This young tree is nicely established, so it would be a shame to lose it.

As I mentioned on site, an important relationship between the former Beech tree and the soil, by way of the range of funghi, was noted when the former mature Beech was still standing. I have checked with [redacted] - the central, low, raised area was recorded as a candidate SINC site due to its funghi interest, although this may have changed in the intervening years since the removal of the mature Beech.

The loss of the replacement Beech results in the loss of perpetual canopy cover.

There is space to re-plant with large-species, stand-alone trees within the grassed area between the bungalows and Main Street.

This pre-app should be considered in the context of other planning consents within the Connaught Court complex and incremental loss to the green infrastructure.

The car park would be screened from Main Street, but it would be contained within the conservation area, and have a detrimental impact on the setting of the bungalows which sit within the garden on the periphery of the main building.

I assume there would be no additional lighting along the drive.