



ARBORICULTURAL TECHNICAL NOTE

DATE:	04 May 2020	CONFIDENTIALITY:	Public
SUBJECT:	CAV Testbed Phase 1 & 2 Design Changes		
PROJECT:	Midland Future Mobility CAV Testbed	AUTHOR:	Callum Throw
CHECKED:	Neil Davies	APPROVED:	Kevin Roeton

The WSP Arboriculture & Forester team, acting as advising consultants for arboricultural matters on the *Transport for West Midlands: MIDLAND FUTURE MOBILITY (MFM) CAV TESTBED* Phase 1 and 2, were made aware of the intention to submit a batch of new planning applications due to Distribution Network Operator (DNO) design changes to that previously submitted by WSP.

This Technical Note has subsequently been prepared to review arboricultural matters following the changes made to the design of eight sites; three sites in Phase 1 (referenced as Sites 14, 17 and 32) and five sites forming Phase 2 (referenced as Sites 75, 79, 82, 85 and 89).

Separate Detailed Arboricultural Reports have been previously prepared to address the arboricultural implications of each Site forming both Phase 1 and Phase 2. For reference, these reports are titled as follows;

- Phase 1: 70054251_ITS_RP_091 Arboriculture Constraints Report 002 20200211
- Phase 2: 70054251_ENV_RP_114 ARBORICULTURE CONSTRAINTS REPORT 20200113

The Arboriculture Constraints Report submitted for Phase 1 does not include any details on Sites 14, 17 and 32. Following a desk-based RAG Assessment, the Sites were excluded from further arboricultural assessment on the basis that there would be no impact to trees from the Proposed Scheme in these locations. This position still stands irrespective of design changes and no further arboricultural comment shall be made on these three sites.

Of the five Sites subject to design changes within Phase 2, Sites 75, 79 and 89 were omitted from arboricultural assessment following the same desk-based RAG Assessment conducted for Phase 1. Again, this position still stands irrespective of design changes and no further arboricultural comment shall be made on these three sites.

For Sites 82 and 85, in brief, the following arboricultural features and impacts were identified within the Arboriculture Constraints Report (70054251_ENV_RP_114 ARBORICULTURE CONSTRAINTS REPORT 20200113) submitted to the local authority.

Site 82

Overall one high quality individual tree (tree T6), two moderate quality trees (trees T4 and T5) and a single hedge (H3) were recorded within influencing distance of the Proposed Site. T6 is a mature Beech *Fagus sylvatica* subject to a Tree Preservation Order (TPO Ref. *Coventry City Council, Kenilworth Road No.4 TPO-2004, Kenilworth Road and Kenilworth Road No.7 TPO-2015, Kenilworth Road*).

The Arboriculture Constraints Report identified that there would be a need to carry out pruning works to several trees to facilitate the operational capacity of the proposed CCTV camera; requiring an 80m visibility splay to function.



ARBORICULTURAL TECHNICAL NOTE

DATE:	04 May 2020	CONFIDENTIALITY:	Public
SUBJECT:	CAV Testbed Phase 1 & 2 Design Changes		
PROJECT:	Midland Future Mobility CAV Testbed	AUTHOR:	Callum Throw
CHECKED:	Neil Davies	APPROVED:	Kevin Roeton

Following a review of the design changes proposed at Site 82 to that previously assessed and referenced in the report, it has been concluded that no additional impact would occur and recommendations for pruning, as previously specified, would still be necessary.

Subsequently, following an on-site meeting on 8th March 2020 with Robert Penlington (Coventry City Council, Tree Preservation Officer) these recommendations were considered acceptable and within a follow up email correspondence (Subject: Site 052 A4053 Ringway St Johns & Phase 2 tree sites. 4th March 2020) Robert Penlington raised no objection.

Site 85

Two tree groups (G1, G2) and a single hedgerow (H2) were identified and assessed at Proposed Site 085. Of prevalence, group G2 comprised three sycamore trees of a semi-mature age which were in a poor physiological and structural condition and offered limited long-term value and irrespective of any future development, should be removed in the interests of public safety.

The Arboriculture Constraints Report concluded that no direct impacts shall be placed upon these trees as a result of the original scheme design and that group G2 (category U) should be removed in the interests of public safety; the removal of the three sycamore trees indirectly facilitating the scheme. Upon review of the latest design changes, this assessment remains in that no significant arboricultural impacts beyond those originally assessed shall exist. Our recommendation to remove those trees forming G2 is still of relevance.

N.B. Both sites are wholly within a conservation area referenced as Kenilworth Road Conservation Area [DCT30].

We trust that the review and information provided covers any arboricultural matters which may be raised. If you have any questions or require further clarification or additional information, please do not hesitate to contact us.

Yours faithfully,

Callum Throw *ND Arb, AMIEnvSc, TechArborA*
Principal Consultant - Arboriculture & Forestry

CTT