Recommendation Report for Works to Tree(s) on trees subject to a Tree Preservation Order (

REF NO: **AW/219/15/T**

LOCATION: 14 Gossamer Lane
Aldwick

PROPOSAL: Reduce canopy spread of 1No. Oak by 4m, reduce canopy spread of 1No. Oak by 3m & fell 1No. Larch tree

SITE AND SURROUNDINGS

DESCRIPTION OF APPLICATION	As above
SITE AREA	1400m2.
RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT DENSITY	N/A
TOPOGRAPHY	Predominantly flat
TREES	Various, including the trees forming part of the application.
BOUNDARY TREATMENT	1.8m close boarded fence.
SITE CHARACTERISTICS	Two storey detached property, built on a back land site behind original dwelling.
CHARACTER OF LOCALITY	Suburban residential, mainly two storey detached dwellings with front and rear gardens.

RELEVANT SITE HISTORY

None relevant.

REPRESENTATIONS

Representations received:
Aldwick Parish Council
No objection.
Comments on Representations received:
Comments noted.

CONSULTATIONS

Arboriculturist
Consultations responses received:
Arborist

The trees cited in this application are located in the front garden of 14 Gossamer Lane.

· For T1, the applicant has applied to reduce the crown by 4 meters. From the site inspection it

is clear that the lowest branches are elongated, and are likely to become overbearing. A reduction to the lower branches is likely to reduce the chance of failure occurring. The applicants request to reduce the crown by 4 meters.

· For T2, the applicant has applied to reduce the crown by 3 meters. From the site inspection it is clear that T2 has an irregular open crown. The applicants request to reduce by 3 meters is excessive.

· For T3, the applicant has applied to fell to ground level. T3 was assessed for a TPO order, and was found not to have the attributes to warrant a TPO order.

Recommendation:
· I would object to the proposed reductions to T1 - T2 as they are excessive, and is likely to have negative impact on the atheistical value and longevity of both T1 - T2. In my opinion a smaller reduction would be more suitable.

· I would however have no objection to the following reductions;

-For T1, a reduction of no more than 3 meters to the single lowest east spanning limb, a reduction of no more than 3 meters to the 2 lowest south spanning limb, and no more than a 3 meters reductions to the two western spanning limbs.

-For T2, a reduction of no more than 1.5 meters to the whole eastern spread, and a reduction of no more than 2.5 meters to the western spread.

· I would have no objection to the felling T3, does not have the attributes to warrant a TPO order.

Comments on Consultation responses:

Comments noted.

POLICY CONTEXT

Classification:

Adopted Local Plan
Class C Road
Tree Preservation Order
No Public Sewer

DEVELOPMENT PLAN POLICIES

Arun District Local Plan 2003:

PLANNING POLICY GUIDANCE

POLICY COMMENTARY

The above policies are general and, other than online Planning Policy Guidance under references ID 36-090-20140306 and ID 36-091-20140306, are not specific to trees.

DEVELOPMENT PLAN AND/OR LEGISLATIVE BACKGROUND

Section 198 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 states:
"If it appears to a Local Planning authority that it is expedient in the interest of amenity to make provision for the preservation of trees.... they may for that purpose make an order"

OTHER MATERIAL CONSIDERATIONS

It is considered that there are no other material considerations to warrant a decision otherwise than in accordance with the Development Plan and/or legislative background.

CONCLUSIONS

The Council's Arborist has objected to the crown reductions to the two Oak trees as this would be excessive and harm the visual appearance of the trees in the street scene and potentially their health and lifespan.

It is considered that a 3m crown reduction and 1.5m crown reduction respectively would be acceptable. However, attempts were made to contact the agent to amend the proposal but no response was received to agree to this as such refusal is recommended.

The Larch tree is not subject to a TPO and is not considered worthy of being given a TPO. As such this tree may be felled. An informative will be added to the decision to make the applicant aware of this.

Therefore the application is recommended for refusal on the grounds that the crown reductions to the oak trees would be excessive and detrimental to visual amenity and the health of the trees.

RECOMMENDATION

REFUSE

1 The two Oak trees provide a significant contribution to the character of the area and the proposed works, in the absence of sufficient arboricultural justification, would be detrimental to the health of the trees and the visual amenities of the locality.

2 INFORMATIVE: The owner should be aware that the Larch tree is not covered by a TPO (Tree Preservation Order) nor is it considered to have the attributes to warrant an order. As such it may be felled without consent.