

Planning Officer: Charlotte Easton

Planning Application Ref: **AW/305/18/T**

Location: **The Studio, Cypress Way, Aldwick PO21 4DF**

Description of works: **Crown reduction of 3m and crown lift of 3m to 1No. Beech tree. Crown reduction of 6m to 1No. Sycamore tree**

Reasons Given: T1 - Low-level obstruction, excessive shading T2 - Declining branches

Comments on Application:

Note: Tree numbers below (eg.T1) are for the sole purpose of interpreting my comments in respect of this application and have no relationship (intended or otherwise) with those referred to elsewhere, such as may be recorded on the original Tree Preservation Order.

T1 Beech / <i>Fagus sylvatica</i>	Height: Approx.13m	Average spread: 5m	Age class: Early mature
T2 Sycamore / <i>Acer pseudoplatanus</i>	Height: Approx.18m	Average spread: 5m	Age class: Mature

- Outwardly and from a distance both trees appear to be in a fine physiological state, with relatively unmodified and attractive crown profiles.
- The beech tree has asymmetric form and is visible from adjacent properties although limited from publicly accessible land. The sycamore tree is highly visible from adjacent properties and publicly accessible land.
- Both trees are a good distance from residential dwelling so as to present no obvious nuisance or blight.
- *Crown reduction* work as defined by the British Standard BS3998:2010 and generally understood within the arboricultural industry; involves reduction of both top-height and lateral branches on all aspects. On that basis, the applicant proposes a crown reduction of such an extent to both trees (T1 and T2) that would be damaging to their ongoing health and vitality. While I suspect the applicant is more concerned with achieving a height reduction that would nevertheless also be quite a dramatic loss of crown volume. No evidence has been provided that supports a need for such work.
- The *crown lifting* of 3m proposed for T1 seems reasonable, presumably to enhance enjoyment of the garden area beneath and as an isolated operation should not be detrimental to the tree's ongoing health and vitality.

Conclusions:

- Both trees are significant features in the local landscape and appear to be in adequately sound and healthy condition. The *crown reduction* works proposed in the application would result in excessive reduction of their landscape impact and undue detriment to the visual amenities of the locality.
- The *crown lifting* proposed to T1 is acceptable. Were the applicant to revise the (or submit a new) application with a request to '*Crown lift to 3metres on all aspects*', I would be able to lend that element of work my support.

Recommendations:

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

Mark Warwick

Tree Officer / Parks and Greenspace Team