

[REDACTED]

From: Bernie Harverson [REDACTED]
Sent: 01 October 2017 17:53
To: Michael Eastham
Cc: Richard Martin; Joe Russell-Wells; Sue Howell
Subject: A/99/17/OUT - Land south of Water Lane, Angmering

Michael,
Please find attached my report on this development application along with the TEMPO forms for the TPO that is recommended.
By copy of this email I would ask Richard Martin if he would be so kind as to prepare the GIS plan that you will require.

Best regards,

Bernie Harverson
(Acting Tree Officer -Greenspace)



Virus-free. www.avg.com

Planning Officer: Michael Eastham

Planning Application: Seeking advice on an **OUTLINE** planning application for this site for 175 residential units

Reference: A/99/17/OUT

Location: Land south of Water Lane, Angmering

Comments:

- The applicants employed **the PJC Consultancy back in July 2016** to undertake a tree survey and then prepare an Arboricultural Impact Assessment PJC/3874/15-02 to support this Outline Application inclusive of Tree Constraints Plan 3874/16/A – Rev01. the Tree Survey data is comprehensive and accords with the requirements of BS5837:2012.
- They also commissioned **the PJC Consultancy back in July 2016** to prepare an Arboricultural Method Statement PJC/3874/15-03 & Tree Protection Plan 3874/16/A – Rev01.

Conclusions:

- The accuracy of the tree survey and root protection data submitted in support of this outline application is acceptable and I agree with the gradings allocated to trees & groups therein.
- However, despite there being an Illustrative Masterplan 1911/PO3 Rev E in existence in June 2016 the AMS report does not reference this document and is very generic in nature and furthermore the Tree Protection Plan is not acceptable because it has to be drawn onto the masterplan base so that I can assess the true impact that it will have on the retained trees – instead it is drawn onto the red line site boundary drawing.
- In my review of the Illustrative Masterplan 1911/PO3 Rev E I note that in Plot 175 it shows a large garden area and no access out onto Weavers Hill and yet the PJC AIA says that it will be necessary to remove the good young specimen Oak T37 – I cannot see the justification for this!
- Plot 171 & 172 place pressure on two young Lime trees in Grp 31 and whilst I note that they suggest the removal of one of these trees the other one is proposed for retention and this would be under immediate pressure to be 'pruned or felled' given that it is a young tree with significant growth potential for the future.
- Further to this the access drive and parking bays will overlap the RPA of another retained Lime in this group and yet this is not mentioned in the AMS report?

Recommendations:

- Whilst I find that the base tree survey data submitted in support of this outline application is acceptable the levels of tree retention are not acceptable and inaccurate and misleading information is supplied. Certain feature trees that should in my view be better respected and afforded room to grow will be under pressure to be 'Pruned or Felled' as a direct result of development proposals.
- This layout does not therefore fully comply with the requirements of BS5837 as it does not seek to retain the best trees and ensure that those that are to be retained are afforded due respect and appropriate levels of protection and room to grow into such that their ongoing health and vitality is not compromised and they can continue to enhance the landscape and amenity of this area.
- I therefore register an **OBJECTION** to the current proposals and propose that a TPO is made to afford better protection to the significant mature Oak T29 and also the young trees for the future Oak T37 and the five Limes in Grp 31.

Bernie Harverson

Consultant Arboriculturist

TREE EVALUATION METHOD FOR PRESERVATION ORDERS - TEMPO

SURVEY DATA SHEET & DECISION GUIDE

Date: 1st October 2017

Surveyor: B J Harverson (Acting Tree Officer-Greenspace)

Tree details

Tree/ Group No: **Group 1** (shown as Grp31 on the PJC tree survey)

Species: **5 x Common Limes** *Tilia x europaea*

Owner (if known): ? Location: **Land south of Water Lane, Angmering**

REFER TO GUIDANCE NOTE FOR ALL DEFINITIONS

Part 1: Amenity assessment

a) Condition & suitability for TPO; where trees in good or fair condition have poor form, deduct 1 point

- | | |
|--------------------------|-------------------------|
| 5) Good | Highly suitable |
| 3) Fair | Suitable |
| 1) Poor | Unlikely to be suitable |
| 0) Dead/dying/dangerous* | Unsuitable |

Score & Notes

3

**Relates to existing context and is intended to apply to severe irremediable defects only*

b) Retention span (in years) & suitability for TPO

- | | |
|-----------|-----------------|
| 5) 100+ | Highly suitable |
| 4) 40-100 | Very suitable |
| 2) 20-40 | Suitable |
| 1) 10-20 | Just suitable |
| 0) <10* | Unsuitable |

Score & Notes

4

**Includes trees which are an existing or near future nuisance, including those clearly outgrowing their context, or which are significantly negating the potential of other trees of better quality*

c) Relative public visibility & suitability for TPO

Consider realistic potential for future visibility with changed land use

- | | |
|---|---------------------|
| 5) Very large trees with some visibility, or prominent large trees | Highly suitable |
| 4) Large trees, or medium trees clearly visible to the public | Suitable |
| 3) Medium trees, or large trees with limited view only | Suitable |
| 2) Young, small, or medium/large trees visible only with difficulty | Barely suitable |
| 1) Trees not visible to the public, regardless of size | Probably unsuitable |

Score & Notes

3

d) Other factors

Trees must have accrued 7 or more points (with no zero score) to qualify

- | |
|---|
| 5) Principal components of arboricultural features, or veteran trees |
| 4) Tree groups, or members of groups important for their cohesion |
| 3) Trees with identifiable historic, commemorative or habitat importance |
| 2) Trees of particularly good form, especially if rare or unusual |
| 1) Trees with one of the above additional redeeming features (inc. those of indifferent form) |

Score & Notes

4

Part 2: Expediency assessment

Trees must have accrued 9 or more points to qualify

- | |
|-------------------------------|
| 5) Immediate threat to tree |
| 3) Foreseeable threat to tree |
| 2) Perceived threat to tree |
| 1) Precautionary only |

Score & Notes

3

Site is proposed for redevelopment

Part 3: Decision guide

- | | |
|-------|-----------------------|
| Any 0 | Do not apply TPO |
| 1-6 | TPO indefensible |
| 7-11 | Does not merit TPO |
| 12-15 | TPO defensible |
| 16+ | Definitely merits TPO |

Add Scores for Total:

17

Decision:

Definitely merits TPO

TREE EVALUATION METHOD FOR PRESERVATION ORDERS - TEMPO

SURVEY DATA SHEET & DECISION GUIDE

Date: 1st October 2017

Surveyor: B J Harverson (Acting Tree Officer-Greenspace)

Tree details

Tree/ Group No: T1 (shown as T29 on the PJC tree survey)

Species: Pedunculate Oak *Quercus robur*

Owner (if known): ? Location: Land south of Water Lane, Angmering

REFER TO GUIDANCE NOTE FOR ALL DEFINITIONS

Part 1: Amenity assessment

a) Condition & suitability for TPO; where trees in good or fair condition have poor form, deduct 1 point

- | | |
|--------------------------|-------------------------|
| 5) Good | Highly suitable |
| 3) Fair | Suitable |
| 1) Poor | Unlikely to be suitable |
| 0) Dead/dying/dangerous* | Unsuitable |

Score & Notes

5

*Relates to existing context and is intended to apply to severe irremediable defects only

b) Retention span (in years) & suitability for TPO

- | | |
|-----------|-----------------|
| 5) 100+ | Highly suitable |
| 4) 40-100 | Very suitable |
| 2) 20-40 | Suitable |
| 1) 10-20 | Just suitable |
| 0) <10* | Unsuitable |

Score & Notes

4

*Includes trees which are an existing or near future nuisance, including those clearly outgrowing their context, or which are significantly negating the potential of other trees of better quality

c) Relative public visibility & suitability for TPO

Consider realistic potential for future visibility with changed land use

- | | |
|---|---------------------|
| 5) Very large trees with some visibility, or prominent large trees | Highly suitable |
| 4) Large trees, or medium trees clearly visible to the public | Suitable |
| 3) Medium trees, or large trees with limited view only | Suitable |
| 2) Young, small, or medium/large trees visible only with difficulty | Barely suitable |
| 1) Trees not visible to the public, regardless of size | Probably unsuitable |

Score & Notes

5

d) Other factors

Trees must have accrued 7 or more points (with no zero score) to qualify

- | |
|---|
| 5) Principal components of arboricultural features, or veteran trees |
| 4) Tree groups, or members of groups important for their cohesion |
| 3) Trees with identifiable historic, commemorative or habitat importance |
| 2) Trees of particularly good form, especially if rare or unusual |
| 1) Trees with one of the above additional redeeming features (inc. those of indifferent form) |

Score & Notes

1

Part 2: Expediency assessment

Trees must have accrued 9 or more points to qualify

- | |
|-------------------------------|
| 5) Immediate threat to tree |
| 3) Foreseeable threat to tree |
| 2) Perceived threat to tree |
| 1) Precautionary only |

Score & Notes

3

Site is proposed for redevelopment

Part 3: Decision guide

- | | |
|-------|-----------------------|
| Any 0 | Do not apply TPO |
| 1-6 | TPO indefensible |
| 7-11 | Does not merit TPO |
| 12-15 | TPO defensible |
| 16+ | Definitely merits TPO |

Add Scores for Total:

18

Decision:

Definitely merits TPO

TREE EVALUATION METHOD FOR PRESERVATION ORDERS - TEMPO

SURVEY DATA SHEET & DECISION GUIDE

Date: 1st October 2017

Surveyor: B J Harverson (Acting Tree Officer-Greenspace)

Tree details

Tree/ Group No: T2 (shown as T37 on the PJC tree survey)

Species: Pedunculate Oak *Quercus robur*

Owner (if known): ? Location: Land south of Water Lane, Angmering

REFER TO GUIDANCE NOTE FOR ALL DEFINITIONS

Part 1: Amenity assessment

a) Condition & suitability for TPO; where trees in good or fair condition have poor form, deduct 1 point

- | | |
|--------------------------|-------------------------|
| 5) Good | Highly suitable |
| 3) Fair | Suitable |
| 1) Poor | Unlikely to be suitable |
| 0) Dead/dying/dangerous* | Unsuitable |

Score & Notes

5

*Relates to existing context and is intended to apply to severe irremediable defects only

b) Retention span (in years) & suitability for TPO

- | | |
|-----------|-----------------|
| 5) 100+ | Highly suitable |
| 4) 40-100 | Very suitable |
| 2) 20-40 | Suitable |
| 1) 10-20 | Just suitable |
| 0) <10* | Unsuitable |

Score & Notes

5

*Includes trees which are an existing or near future nuisance, including those clearly outgrowing their context, or which are significantly negating the potential of other trees of better quality

c) Relative public visibility & suitability for TPO

Consider realistic potential for future visibility with changed land use

- | | |
|---|---------------------|
| 5) Very large trees with some visibility, or prominent large trees | Highly suitable |
| 4) Large trees, or medium trees clearly visible to the public | Suitable |
| 3) Medium trees, or large trees with limited view only | Suitable |
| 2) Young, small, or medium/large trees visible only with difficulty | Barely suitable |
| 1) Trees not visible to the public, regardless of size | Probably unsuitable |

Score & Notes

3

d) Other factors

Trees must have accrued 7 or more points (with no zero score) to qualify

- | |
|---|
| 5) Principal components of arboricultural features, or veteran trees |
| 4) Tree groups, or members of groups important for their cohesion |
| 3) Trees with identifiable historic, commemorative or habitat importance |
| 2) Trees of particularly good form, especially if rare or unusual |
| 1) Trees with one of the above additional redeeming features (inc. those of indifferent form) |

Score & Notes

1

Part 2: Expediency assessment

Trees must have accrued 9 or more points to qualify

- | |
|-------------------------------|
| 5) Immediate threat to tree |
| 3) Foreseeable threat to tree |
| 2) Perceived threat to tree |
| 1) Precautionary only |

Score & Notes

3

Site is proposed for redevelopment

Part 3: Decision guide

- | | |
|-------|-----------------------|
| Any 0 | Do not apply TPO |
| 1-6 | TPO indefensible |
| 7-11 | Does not merit TPO |
| 12-15 | TPO defensible |
| 16+ | Definitely merits TPO |

Add Scores for Total:

17

Decision:

Definitely merits TPO