

Planning Officer: Amber Willard

Planning Application Ref: AW/321/17/T

Location: 88 Westminster Drive, Aldwick

Description of works: Front Garden - T1 - Fell multi-stem Maple (*Acer campestre*)
Back Garden - T2, T4, T5, T6 - Oak (*Quercus robur*) *Fuligo septica* at base of tree, remove minor dead wood throughout tree.
Back Garden - T3 - Maple (*Acer campestre*) 3m overhang from boundary cut back by 1.5m from neighbouring property.

Reasons Given: T1 – Tree has decay/defect and presents a risk to public footpath users.
T2, T4, T5, T6 – Careful management.
T3 – Abatement of nuisance affecting neighbouring property.

Comments on Application:

T1 - Field maple	<i>Acer campestre</i>	Height: 3m	Ave. Spread: 2m	Age class: Mature
T2, T4, T5, T6 - Oak	<i>Quercus robur</i>	Ave. Height: 15m	Ave. Spread: 6m	Age class: Early-mature
T3 - Field maple	<i>Acer campestre</i>	Height: 5.5m	Ave. Spread: 2m	Age class: Semi-mature

- (T1) - Dominant stem has a complex crown-break at 2m ht. which has recently undergone partial failure – shedding a relatively large scaffold limb and revealing significant decay. Remaining intact scaffold limbs have been truncated to compensate this. An irregular open cavity near ground level suggests a loss of structural integrity in the main stem. This tree occupies a small distal part of private verge extant from the enclosed garden and largely given over to ornamental shrubs, beneath the spreading crown of a maturing pedunculate oak (T2).
- The immediately adjacent smaller stem has a pronounced kink in its main stem at 2m ht. and is of moderate-poor form. Its asymmetric crown profile is a result of long-standing suppression by neighbouring trees, with no realistic chance of recovering an attractive shape.
- (T2, T4, T5, T6) - The local planning authority's consent is not required for the removal of dead branches from a tree subject to an Order.
- (T3) – This tree has been heavily suppressed on its East and West aspects; as a consequence it has erratic form with no realistic chance of recovering an attractive shape. It is visible only with difficulty and provides very little amenity value.

Conclusions:

- (T1) – This tree now possesses poor form and has a number of significant structural defects that make it unviable for safe long-term retention. Its location next to a confluence of public footways and classified road necessitates its removal. The lesser subsidiary stem (neighbouring tree of same type?) left in isolation would not provide noteworthy amenity, having poor aesthetic value. For practical purposes, both trees can be regarded as forming T1.
- (T2, T4, T5, T6) – No consent is required for the work proposed.
- (T3) – There is no reason to object to the work proposed (despite it significantly reducing the crown volume) as the loss of this tree would not have a detrimental effect on the overall tree- amenity locally.

Recommendations:

- I recommend **CONSENT** is granted for this application.

Mark Warwick

Tree Officer / Parks and Greenspace Team