

Planning Officer: Simon Davis

Planning Application Ref: AW/259/18/PL

Location: 10 Barrack Lane, Aldwick, PO21 4BZ

Description of works: 1 No. dwelling

Comments on Application:

- The applicant has employed Ramsey & Co Landscape Architecture to submit an Arboricultural Impact Assessment and Method Statement inclusive of Tree Survey Schedule and a separate Tree Protection Drawing, dwg.no. RCo 241 / 02, Rev.01.
- The Tree Survey data is comprehensive and accords with the requirements of BS5837:2012.
- The vast majority of quality trees are to be retained. Notable losses would be T16 eucalyptus and part of TG19 himalayan birch, although they are of limited visual importance and ought not to be a constraint to any approved development.
- Having studied the above report and plans, I am broadly satisfied with the approach but have identified two areas of concern which I would like clarification on/amendments to, for me to be able to lend the scheme my support.
 1. This relates to T03 silver birch, a TPO tree. RPA incursion of <20% is proposed on the southern aspect. Within this area of incursion, provision is made for a *manual excavation area* within the new building footprint although I see little value in doing so as any roots encountered would have to be severed at that stage of development. Although mention is made of mini-pile type footings in the RPA I wonder if this is a generic comment and not site specific, as it would seem impractical to undertake for such a relatively small part of the overall footprint. If I have assumed correctly, then a traditional trench excavation foundation will be employed. There is an opportunity to implement ground protection between the protective fencing and building footprint, not yet shown on the drawing. [Ground protection as required has now been annotated on a revised Tree Protection Drawing. The extent of RPA incursion affecting T03 is unfortunate but within acceptable limits, in this instance. The proposed foundation design \(AIA chapter 4.7\) should reduce the negative impact on tree health/vitality.](#)
 2. There is not enough detail in the specification for the *No-dig solution*, which is especially important in this instance as it is proposed to be in place prior to any demolition/construction and must therefore have load bearing capability sufficient to support construction traffic. I have not seen any detail in relation to materials/timing of installation for the hard wearing surface, which must be permeable. [Although only a typical representation and not specified exactly, the example No-dig construction, ref.RCo241/03 incorporating a 200mm cellular confinement system ought to be adequate. It also provides detail of a permeable hard wearing surface. The timing of installation had in fact already been set out in Chapter 4.0 of the AIA, para.4.1.2, which confirms the No-dig driveway will be installed prior to commencement of demolition and construction activities on the site.](#)

Conclusions:

- In the absence of being able to locate the dwelling further south and therefore outside the RPA of T03; ground protection measures must be put in place at the same time as installation of tree protection fencing. This ground protection would exist across the RPA between fencing and building footprint as currently shown on the aforementioned drawing – which will need to be revised to show the same. [Resolved \(see above comments\).](#)
- I would like written confirmation from the engineer providing the cellular confinement system (*No-dig solution*) that it will have sufficient load bearing capability to endure the entire phase of development and retain sufficient integrity so as to accept a permeable hard wearing surface (as yet unspecified). [Not provided but further detail has been submitted in the form of a typical representation of construction drawing and which will form part of the following conditions.](#)

Recommendations:

I can now recommend **APPROVAL** subject to the following conditions being applied:

- All activity at the site is to be carried out in strict accordance with: - Ramsey & Co Landscape Architecture, **Arboricultural Impact Assessment and Method Statement, Dated 3rd September 2018 Revision: 01**
- 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 (but after agreed vegetation clearance) a **PRE-COMMENCEMENT Site Meeting** is to take place between the Arun DC Tree Officer and the Arboricultural Expert representing the site owners – at this meeting all protective fencing and ground protection measures will be inspected to verify 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 Drawing, Dwg.no. RCo 241 / 02, Rev.02, dated 24th April 2018.**
- The No-dig construction must be as described and shown in the drawing **No Dig Construction: Typical Section, dwg.no. RCo241/03, Rev.01, dated 22-01-19.** Any significant deviation from this specification, especially with regard to the depth and manufacturer of the cellular confinement system must be submitted for prior approval by this authority.
- 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.

- 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