

Planning Officer:

Anita Gardner

Planning Application Ref: AB/60/17/PL [3] – all current comments added in blue typeface (prev in red for AB/130/16/PL).

Location: Land to rear of 74 & 76 Canada Road, Arundel

Description of works: Erection of 1 No 3 bed dwelling & new garage and parking and crossover

Comments On Application:

- The applicants have employed ACD Environmental Consultancy to carry out a tree survey and then prepare an Arboricultural Impact Assessment & Method Statement Report inclusive of Tree Constraints Plan and Tree Protection Plan. This accords with the requirements of BS5837:2012.
- I have a number of issues with this report:- As they have not colour coded their changes and omissions I have stuck with the para references of my original report.
- At 2.1 – first bullet point – it states the diameter to be 7410mm which I believe to be a typo and it should be 741mm which would tie in with the 9m radial RPA that they are quoting. This has now been corrected.
- At 2.1 – third bullet point – it states that this tree *has over 20 years life expectancy* – this is an Oak and will live in excess of 100 years more at this location. No change noted and they are sticking with their original comments so we agree to differ here.
- My previous inspection of this tree was during the winter when it was not in leaf – now that it is in leaf it is clear to me that the tree has problems as the lower two thirds of the crown are healthy and vigorous but the top third is in decline with significant dieback noted. This would alter my opinion of its likely life expectancy and assessment of the demands made on its root system for water and nutrients to sustain the crown.
- At 2.2 – It states that *the existing garage is a constraint to root growth and it is anticipated that there will be very little, if any root development beneath it* – I fundamentally disagree with this statement as this is an Oak and as such will have a deep rooted root system that will not be hindered by a shallow footing of a garage – the roots will be found under the garage and well out into the garden beyond it. Furthermore it goes on to say that *once the garage has been removed works in that area can proceed with traditional methods* – No they cannot as there will be roots to cater for and mitigation measures and non-standard building methods will need to be employed with Porous 'No Dig' foundations used. This has now been amended to advocate arb expert supervised works and remediation/amelioration works (full details provided at Section 11 of report). This also includes the driveway removal. These works are now deemed acceptable subject to Arb Expert monitoring and supervision.
- At 3.1.3) it states that there will need to be a *Pre Start Meeting with the project arboriculturist* – this will need to be expanded to include the necessary presence of the Arun DC Tree Officer. Has been amended to include ADC Tree Officer.
- At 4.3 & 4.4 there is the assumption that a so called '*Tool Box*' *chat will be sufficient* – it will not - and in any event the supervising arboricultural consultant will need to be there to take photographs and submit these with a written report in order to obtain the written approval of the Arun DC Tree Officer on this matter. Has still not grasped the fact that it is for the applicants Arb Expert to submit all that is needed by way of photo's and written text to prove that works were carried out in strict accordance with the Method Statement and that it is not for the ADC Tree Officer to do this!
- At 7.2 it seems to suggest that 'access facilitation pruning' is deemed as acceptable – this will not be looked upon favourably even if the tree is not currently protected by a TPO. The specification has now been reduced to 2.5m crown lifting work which is deemed acceptable.
- At 9.2 It states that '*No details of Site Storage, parking, welfare unit location etc are available at the time of writing*' – On a site as small and tight to work on as this we would not let this be subject to a later Condition of Planning when it may be too late to get it right and we would be under pressure to then relent and let it all happen within the RPA – these details will be needed at the application stage. Reference has now been made to this at 8.1 of new report with an area shown on the Tree Protection Plan – which is satisfactory.

Given the trees overall condition and the amendments that have been made to the AMS report and Tree Protection Plan I **WITHDRAW MY OBJECTION** to this application provided that it can have the following Conditions applied:-

1. All demolition & construction works are to be carried out in strict accordance with :-

Arboricultural Method Statement Report Ref: ACD Environmental – PR117371tr- Rev E – 27.03.17.

and Tree Protection Plan ref: ACD Environmental – P117371-03D – 1:100@A2.

2. Prior to any demolition or construction works taking place or the introduction of machinery and plant to the site the following issues must be resolved to the complete satisfaction of Arun District Council :-
 - A PRE-COMMENCEMENT Site Meeting is to take place between the Arun DC Tree Officer and the Arboricultural Consultant representing the site owners – at this meeting all protective fencing will be inspected along with ground protection measures – they will be assessed to verify that they are 'Fit for Purpose' as required under British Standard 5837:2012 and have been erected and positioned exactly as shown on the Tree Protection Plan Appendix A – Rev B. Feb2017.
 - A schedule of Site Monitoring/Supervision visits and Reporting Procedures prepared by an Arboricultural Expert will be required and their extent will be agreed on at the site meeting to the satisfaction of the Arun DC Tree Officer.
 - IF there is deemed to be a need for any Utility Service Route connections to bisect retained tree Root Protection Areas/Zones then prior to their installation a Method Statement prepared by an Arboricultural Expert must be submitted that stipulates how this can be achieved without adverse impact on tree roots. Written approval and confirmation of acceptance of this Methodology must be issued before any works are commenced out on site.

REASONS :

To comply with BS5837 and to ensure that retained trees are afforded due respect and appropriate levels of protection such that their ongoing health and vitality is not compromised and they can continue to enhance the landscape and amenity of the area.

Bernie Harverson

Consultant Arboriculturist