

Planning Officer: Amber Willard

Planning Application Ref: AW/161/20/HH

Location: 34 Wakefield Way, Aldwick PO21 3RS

Description of works: Two storey side extension

Comments on Application:

- There is at least one significant tree (an off-site English oak) overlapping the above property and which enjoys statutory protection (Tree Preservation Order). This along with other trees could be adversely affected by this proposal. There is no supporting arboricultural information submitted with the application - a requirement of BS5837:2012. As such, were this application to now proceed, we will not have sufficient information to guarantee such trees would be adequately respected and protected.
- Before we can properly assess the viability of this proposal, the applicants would have to employ the services of an Arboricultural Consultant to carry out a tree survey exercise and then prepare an Arboricultural Implications Assessment (AIA) which must be inclusive of; a 'Tree Survey Schedule', a 'Root Protection Area (RPA) Schedule' and a 'Tree Constraints Plan' – with the trees accurately plotted on same.
- In the event that a RPA of any tree which is proposed for retention overlaps the development then BS5837:2012 requires that the Detailed Planning Application is accompanied by an Arboricultural Method Statement (AMS) and also most importantly a Tree Protection Plan – to both describe and illustrate the mitigation measures which are to be employed to ensure that the trees survive without detriment to their vigour and vitality and are given adequate protection both above and below ground.
- The one large, maturing English oak alongside the property is a major landscape component helping to define the verdant character of the area. This proposal presents a similar footprint to that submitted with previous application AW/246/19/PL (Refused) and which would intrude extensively into that tree's RPA.
- Should this application progress and the necessary arboricultural reports and plans be prepared, I would expect due consideration be given to the following:
The use of circular Root Protection Areas is typical and usually adequate but in truth is rarely an informative representation in the built environment. In this case it would be unlikely to reflect the area which contains sufficient roots and rooting volume to maintain the tree's viability. A polygon, which abandons the inclusion of carriageway/footway and captures enough of the existing garden and verges to be contingent with the area of pre-calculated circular RPA, would be a more realistic representation.

Conclusions:

- Although we are yet to have sight of the necessary arboricultural reports and plans to demonstrate that on and off-site trees have been properly considered, the likely impact on the most important of those from this proposal is likely to be severe. Whatever engineering/construction methods and above ground protection measures may ultimately be proposed, there is a risk that attaches during such incursion of root protection areas. This is especially significant where the tree in question is one of the most important locally.

Recommendations:

- I recommend **REFUSAL** for this scheme.

Mark Warwick
Tree Officer / Parks and Greenspace Team