

Planning Officer: Michael Eastham

Planning Application Ref: A/76/20/PL

Location: Land at Dappers Lane, Angmering

Description of works: 84 No. dwellings, public open space, play areas, associated infrastructure & landscaping. This application affects a Right of Way.

Comments on Application:

- I have considered this application by means of a desktop review, using the information and plans submitted as well as online resources.
- The applicants have employed Barrell Tree Consultancy to prepare an Arboricultural Constraints and Opportunities Assessment for this project. The supporting Tree Survey data is comprehensive and accords with the requirements of BS5837:2012. This is a high-quality and first stage report in support of a pre-/outline application.
- The original tree survey provided on behalf of the applicant is now more than 2 years old, generally regarded as a threshold beyond which any condition ratings and management recommendations may no longer be valid. That said, it remains possible to consider the general implications for existing tree stock.
- We have yet to see a site layout with trees (root protection areas and existing crown spread such as provided on the Tree Constraints Plan) accurately imposed over the same, such that we cannot confidently assess how they relate to this proposal. The submitted planning layout (dwg.no. A77-PL-01, Rev A, Nov.'19) appears broadly supportable but with the following item of obvious concern:
 - Plot numbers 67-72 are in close proximity to tall, off-site poplar trees. Those tree types have an inherent tendency to form extensive root systems and heavily influence ground conditions, are vulnerable to limb/branch breakage during severe weather events and have relatively low decay resistance. From the Tree Survey provided, it is reasonable to conclude these examples retain high growth potential. Although undoubtedly of landscape value and so can add value to the development (especially if not obscured by built form), they need to be given far more space to flourish and be in harmony with such a change in land use. I expect most occupiers of those plots would perceive significant threat from such trees and limit their enjoyment of rear gardens. I propose those plots be abandoned and units assimilated elsewhere in the scheme, giving the majority of that space over to soft landscape provision although not at the expense of other important buffer zones/open space which currently provide connectivity with the surrounding area. Of special interest is the protected woodland to the north of the site and the 'green corridors' that flow out from that – which must be maintained.
- With so few trees within the site, there need not be any conflict between trees and construction. Those off-site trees around the perimeter could bring a mature outlook to much of the development and easily be afforded sufficient room to allow future growth without constraint.
- There does not appear to be an approved surface water drainage (and foul water sewer) strategy for the site. This fundamental element of the design ought to be addressed to our satisfaction in association with layout proposals, so that we are not subsequently held hostage to flood mitigation measures which could then impact heavily on retained trees/landscape plans/open space provision.
- Service-runs in and out of site have not been shown and so there is potential for root protection area incursion to satisfy those requirements.
- For a detailed application such as this, I would also expect to see a Tree Protection Plan and Arboricultural Method Statement, that both describes and illustrates 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.

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.
- The current layout is broadly supportable in arboricultural terms although there is a significant area of concern around plots 67-72 that needs to be revisited before I can support it.

Recommendations:

1. 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.
2. As it stands, I am unable to lend this scheme my support and so register an **OBJECTION**, although expect that to be easily overcome with a slight but important amendment to the layout and with the ongoing support of their project arboriculturist.

Mark Warwick
Tree Officer / Parks and Greenspace Team