

[REDACTED]

From: Mark Warwick <Mark.Warwick@arun.gov.uk>
Sent: 11 December 2019 16:11
To: Amber Willard <Amber.Willard@arun.gov.uk>
Cc: Planning.Responses <Planning.Responses@arun.gov.uk>
Subject: AW/250/19/HH

Hi Amber

Please find attached my report, updated following the submission of arboricultural reports and plans - for your consideration.

Regards,

Mark

Mark Warwick | Tree Officer, Greenspace, Arun District Council | Location: Bognor Regis Town Hall, Clarence Road, Bognor Regis, West
Sussex, PO21 1LD

[REDACTED]

Visit Arun's web site at www.arun.gov.uk



Save the environment - think before you print.

Planning Officer: Amber Willard

Planning Application Ref: AW/250/19/HH

Location: 19 Kingsway, Aldwick, PO21 4DQ

Description of works: **Extension to driveway to front & widening driveway gate. This application affects the character & appearance of the Craigweil House Conservation Area**

Comments on Application:

- There are significant on and off-site trees, which by virtue of their size enjoy statutory protection from their position in Conservation Area. They could be adversely affected by these proposals. 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.
- The applicants have employed **Nicholas Jones Consultants Limited** to prepare an Arboricultural Assessment & Method Statement along with a Tree Protection Plan for this project. The Tree Survey data is comprehensive and accords with the requirements of BS5837:2012. I agree with the retention category ratings for on and off-site trees.
- There is a sketch plan (illustrative only) and insufficient engineering detail in support of this proposal; to be able to determine the full extent of its impact on trees, both above and below ground level. One can only assume the existing driveway width (between the garage and garden/verge interface) is to be retained as it is. Whilst welcome, we must understand how the existing construction is to be demolished, the new installation applied, and the type of materials to be used. There is also the gate-widening, installation of border sleepers and preparation of shrub borders/planting within the nominal root protection area (RPA) of significant trees to consider. All these items should be properly addressed within a detailed arboricultural report and to our satisfaction. Most of these items have been addressed in respect of their potential impact on trees, although outstanding is detailed description of how and what type (treated timber?) of sleepers are to be installed and ground preparation for shrub borders within the RPA of retained trees. These can be addressed to our satisfaction at the pre-commencement site meeting.

Conclusions:

- The principle of development as described is certainly achievable without undue detriment to retained on and off-site trees, although we are yet to have sight of the necessary arboricultural report and plans to demonstrate this has been properly considered. We now have sight of the necessary arboricultural report and plans, which I accept in their entirety and should be approved as part of any decision in favour of this development.
- The extent of RPA incursion as shown on the tree protection plan is within acceptable tolerances and given the probable impact on retained trees, does not require the use of a 'no-dig' engineering solution for the driveway construction. The tree protection plan identifies where the construction exclusion zones are to be positioned. Although I have not had sight of the method of demolition, I will be satisfied with the project arboriculturist's supervision at that key stage of development and submission of monitoring records with accompanying photographic evidence to demonstrate full compliance with their own report.
- The tree protection plan shows a driveway width of 3.5m which I understand exceeds that which has been subsequently proposed. Clearly a narrower driveway construction of stated 2.5m will provide an opportunity for less RPA incursion and I would expect that to be reflected in the final position of protective fencing, to be assessed at pre-commencement site meeting.
- As it stands, I am unable to lend this scheme my support and so register an OBJECTION.

Recommendations:

1. The applicants will need to employ the services of an Arboricultural Consultant to carry out a tree survey exercise and then prepare an Arboricultural Impact 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.
2. 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.

• I recommend the above scheme for **APPROVAL**, subject to the following conditions being applied:

1. Before the site is occupied or any machinery is introduced to the site or demolition work or construction work or alterations to existing ground levels takes place a **PRE-COMMENCEMENT Site Meeting** is to take place between the Planning Authority's Tree Officer and the Arboricultural Expert representing the site owner(s) or site manager – at this meeting all protective fencing will be inspected to verify it is 'Fit for Purpose' as required under British Standard 5837:2012 and have been erected and positioned exactly as shown on the **Tree Protection Plan, drg. no. NJCL 576 B, 08.11.2019**.
- 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 Planning Authority's Tree Officer.

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.

2. All activity at the site is to be carried out in strict accordance with: - **Arboricultural Assessment and Method Statement, ref. NJCL 576, 8th November 2019**.
- 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.

3. Any tree pruning considered essential to enable the agreed development must meet the requirements of BS3998:2010 Tree work – Recommendations:
- Where whole branches are to be removed and final cuts made close to the trunk or branch union they are to be made as shown in Figure 2 of BS3998:2010
- Where branches are to be shortened back the final cuts are to be made at the correct angle shown in BS3998:2010 and adjacent to a live bud or lateral.

Reasons: In the interest of continued health and vitality of trees and to accord with current industry guidelines and sound arboricultural practice.

Mark Warwick
Tree Officer / Parks and Greenspace Team