PXC

Julie Grieves

From: Peter Cleveland
Sent: 18 October 2012 09:13
To: Planning.Responses
Subject: FW: A/82/12
Attachments: A8212 ANGMERING.doc

Please could the attached be acknowledged as a consultation from Ian B

Thanks
Peter

-----Original Message-----
From: Ian Brewster
Sent: 17 October 2012 15:05
To: Peter Cleveland
Cc: Joe Russell-Wells
Subject: RE: A/82/12

Hi Peter,

Please find attached my consultation on the development plan.

Regards

Ian

-----Original Message-----
From: Peter Cleveland
Sent: 15 October 2012 16:18
To: Ian Brewster
Subject: RE: A/82/12

By the end of this week would be helpful.

Thanks
Peter

-----Original Message-----
From: Ian Brewster
Sent: 15 October 2012 16:12
To: Peter Cleveland
Subject: RE: A/82/12

Hi Peter,

How long have I got to respond?

Ian

-----Original Message-----
From: Peter Cleveland
Sent: 15 October 2012 15:59

To: Ian Brewster
Subject: RE: A/82/12

Hi Ian

Thanks for the comments please could you amend/confirm what property you are referring to the in your first sentence below.

Also what is the concern with groups G4 and G5?

I think I understand what you are referring to but please could you clarify as there are a lot of interested parties to this application.

Thanks
Peter

-----Original Message-----
From: Ian Brewster
Sent: 12 October 2012 17:45
To: Peter Cleveland
Cc: Joe Russell-Wells
Subject: A/82/12

Peter,

My concerns are with the inadequate distances provided between the proposed property and the existing tree cover where the development places an indirect adverse impact upon them.

The central area proposed for open space will feature three English Oak T21,T 22 and T23 measuring heights of between 12-17m. The linear design allows for new houses with their restricted gardens to be within the shadow and falling distance of the trees.

Other areas of concern are for the Groups, G4 and G5 with tall Poplar trees at 17m height along the southern boundary and those trees and scrub acting as a screen along the eastern boundary.

Future residents would place more emphasis on the utility that a limited garden area can provide. The above proposal provides for restricted garden space and presents a nuisance concern to those future residents in the form of shade and leaf fall. The perception of danger may also exist due to the close proximity and height of existing trees. These and other aspects of concern have been documented within the BS5837 (2012), Section 5.3.

Provision to allow adequate space between trees and property to prevent future concerns should be a main consideration with this development and where a minimum distance equivalent to the mature falling heights of existing and future plantings is recommended.

In its present form and in accordance with the above concerns I would therefore object to the above planning proposal.

Ian

ARUN DISTRICT COUNCIL

Date: 19 October 2012

ADC PARKS & GREENSPACE ARBORICULTURE CONSULTATION

FROM: Ian Brewster TO: Peter Cleveland

PLANNING APPLICATION: A/82/12

ADDRESS: Land adjacent to Roundstane Lane, Angmering, West Sussex

BRIEF DESCRIPTION: David Wilson Homes, property development

INSPECTION DATE: 15th October 2012

Objection	X	No Objection		Suggested Conditions	
Comment	X	Recommendation	X	Abate a Nuisance	
Tree Replacement		**Dead/Dangerous**		CA & Amenity Value	

Comments:

1. It is recommended that trees identified by the tree consultant categorised as A and B are retained in their natural form throughout the duration of their expected life. These have been identified as;

   a) 12 x Individual trees (3 evergreen Maritime Pine),
   b) 6 x Groups (3 evergreen Lawson Cypress)
   c) 1 x Woodland (including evergreen Maritime Pine)

2. These trees are regarded as good features and provide high visual amenity hence their categorisation. It does not include the C categorised trees.

3. Adequate space should be provided to allow their the long-term physical retention and future maintenance. The presence of large species is advantageous as amongst other benefits they contribute towards climate change resilience. Successful integration of large species trees requires careful consideration before the planning application can be agreed.

4. According to Mitchell's 'A field guide to Trees' and Barcham's nursery catalogue, the majority of trees both within and located near to the periphery of the development site have not reached their mature height. Trees identified within the site have been listed below showing mature heights with some exceeding 20m(+).

   Silver Birch 20m, Norway Maple 20m+, Maritime Pine 20m+, Common Oak 20m+, Beech 20m+, Lawson Cypress 20m+, Hybrid Black Poplar 20m+, Hawthorn 20m.

5. Property built within a falling distance of a mature tree would be a concern to its owners in its various forms such as honeydew drip, branch drop, fruit, leaf, shade, indirect nuisance and perceived threat of failure in strong winds, particularly for exposed trees. The tree consultant mentions these as concerns in Section 5.3 of the tree report which features in the British Standard BS5837 (2012) Section 5.2. The lack of solar, TV and WiFi signal may affect a person's Human Rights restricting the use of Photovoltaic and heat collectors, satellite and internet reception.

6. The shade aspect can be demonstrated by plotting a segment, with a radius from the centre of the stem equal to the mature height of the tree, drawing a line from due north-west to due east, to show the shadow pattern a tree would ca throughout the main part of the day. Property built within shade of trees places an adverse impact upon the homeowner reducing the functionality of a minimal garden space for recreation.

7. In accordance with BS5837 (2012) 5.3 due allowance and space for future tree growth and maintenance requirements should be provided to maximize a successful tree retention.

8. Shading of open spaces such as gardens and sitting areas should be designed to meet the normal requirement for direct sunlight at least for part of the day. Otherwise pressure would be placed upon the tree owner and if TPOd the Council to allow consent for tree work towards a prolonged distortive pruning regime, adversely affecting a tree's natural form and reducing its useful life expectancy.

Recommendation:

9. The High Hedge legislation would be applicable where the owners of G4 Conifer screen places proposed property in deep shade. Lawson Cypress grow beyond a height of 20m. They are currently 16m and the new property is located 10m from the line of their main stems. The future maintenance of this line would place an unnecessary burden upon the tree owner/s and needs to be addressed with a practical way forward submitted to the Planning Authority.

10. The new property fronts facing towards the east are built within close proximity to English Oak trees numbered T21, T22, T23. The trees should be placed at a minimum distance of their ultimate average height of 20m to reduce impact of shade and nuisance (and as described above). This gap increase should be in addition to the proposed open space and will increase its recreational diversify that would predominantly be in shade.

11. The 10m distance of the evergreen Maritime Pines T14, T15 and T16 as key components of W1 to the proposed property will place an unnecessary burden upon the householder and restrict the reasonable use of their rear gardens. It is recommended that sufficient garden space is provided by providing a minimum distance from the woodland and tree edge to a minimum of 20m from the north west boundary.

12. G9 contain a single linear group of intermingled Silver Birch categorised as B and regarded as visually important. These trees have the potential to grow to heights of 20m. Their light shade bearing crowns may impact upon those properties proposed to be built at a distance of 15m. A 'secondary street' is to provide and access route between the trees and property and consideration towards root protection is necessary to avoid damaging these short lived and sensitive to ground change species.

13. It is important to retain a healthy green buffer to minimise the visual impact and reduction of noise from the fast flowing main highway A280. The buffer contains two main groups G12 and G6. Within these groups are located A and B categorised trees and with the remaining buffer provides good visual amenity and a green corridor important for wildlife. The width from the proposed property is insufficient and would have an impact upon the buffer and householders. It is recommended that the buffer should be at least 20m from the nearest property/rear garden boundary. This would allow for growing space of large trees and proposed planting without impinging upon property owners. The buffer should not be fragmented as part of a garden, but allowed to remain continuous with the odd breach by cycle ways/footpaths. – Deadfe knee raid along canopy

Conclusion:

14. Generally the site lacks mature trees throughout its core. The main central features are with the three Oak trees and to a lesser degree G7 with interspersed Holly. These areas need to be enhanced in character by providing new planting and gapping up. A planting proposal should be submitted with this provision in mind.

15. Once the above issues have been addressed the Arboricultural Implications Assessment needs to be revised and re-submitted to the Planning Department for assessment where conditions should be drawn from its content and become applicable.

16. The new development proposal should maintain the current distances from trees where they do not currently impact upon them.

17. As it stands the Development Plan will impact upon the current and future existence of good trees within and to the immediate periphery of the site and should be refuse consent.

Yours sincerely

Ian Brewster
Arboriculturist