

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 (3) **Current Comments in red typeface**

Location: Land south of Water Lane, `

- 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.
- **The current Tree Protection Plan has now been drawn onto a version of the Masterplan but unfortunately the one they have chosen to use is not up to date and the revisions to the layout are not shown on it so I cannot accept this for assessment. I also question the validity of preparing a very detailed Tree Protection Plan for an outline application – inappropriate in my view as it should only come in to accompany a detailed layout at a later date.**
- 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!
- **We are now on Illustrative Masterplan 1911/PO3 Rev E and Plot 175 now has a huge dwelling on it which directly threatens the future of T37 Oak (which I have recommended for a TPO) – I am not happy with this juxtaposition.**
- 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.
- **Nothing has changed with the new layout and these two trees (recommended for TPO) remain under pressure and I am not happy with this juxtaposition.**
- 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?
- **Having discussed this matter with a representative of PJC it was agreed that at this juncture they only supply an AIA report & Tree Constraints Plan and that an AMS & TP Plan should accompany the detailed layout at a later date.**
- **I am pleased to see that with the amended submission 1911 PO3 and AIA 4656/17-02 R2 6th Nov17 the masterplan now allows sufficient room for all of the TPO'd trees to be retained without intrusion into their RPA's thus complying with BS5837:2012.**
- **However, whilst T37 Oak seems to have space to grow into - the Limes in G31 are still very close to the dwellings and whilst they are positioned to the north side and shading will be less of an issue they cannot achieve their full growth potential at this location otherwise they will dominate the Plots and gardens – thus we will be under pressure from day one to allow them to prune them back when new owners move in (as is happening all the time with the new development just completed that borders onto the Golf Club at Felpham).**

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.
- All of the above comments still apply and if anything the current layout Rev G is worse and I sustain my **OBJECTION** and would not recommend this to go through under the proviso of Conditions until I am satisfied that the layout can be made to work with the existing tree content.
- Whilst I will not withdraw my **OBJECTION** because of the 'pressure to prune or fell' I will reluctantly let this one go through to the Condition stage rather than hold up its progress and will look to them to come back in at that detailed stage with a layout that better respects the future growth and well being of the TPO'd Lime trees. Or alternatively as these are young trees they could show them being removed and replacement semi-mature trees planted at alternative locations where the new trees can grow to their full potential (perhaps the north west corner behind T37 + other natural spaces).

Bernie Harverson

Consultant Arboriculturist