

CONSULTEE RESPONSE (Council's Arboriculturist)

Date of inspection: 1 September 2022

Reference: BN/21/22/PL

Proposal: Demolition of existing care home and construction of 5 no. dwellings and garaging, with landscaping and associated works. This application affects the setting of a listed building and is in CIL Zone 2 and is CIL Liable as new dwellings

Location: The Hollies, 84 Barnham Road, Eastergate, PO22 0ES

Case Officer: Ms M Tomalova

Comments on application:

The applicants have employed Trevor Heaps Arboricultural Consultancy Ltd. to prepare an Arboricultural Impact Assessment, Method Statement & Tree Protection Plan for this project.

The Tree Survey data is comprehensive and accords with the requirements of BS5837:2012. I agree with the retention category ratings for on and off-site trees.

The following Tree Preservation Orders (TPO) affect the plot:

TPO/BN/1/98 – Beech (applicant ref. T4)

Eastergate No.1/70 – No trees protected at the time the Order was made remain on the plot.

Several trees on and adjacent the site are suitable candidates for a new TPO. Details at the foot of this report, for ease of reference - ash T8, hornbeam T15 and red oak T29.

The site and immediate environs host a healthy population of higher value (category A and B trees) which already provide substantial visual amenity to the surrounding area. It is pleasing to note that all are to be retained as part of this proposal and an ambitious suite of tree protection measures employed to ensure they are successfully retained and can flourish post-development.

Approval of the proposed drainage strategy (heavily reliant on infiltration through carriageway) appears critical to securing a low impact on retained trees - an alternative may demand tree removal/damage.

Foul water and other service-runs in and out of site have not been confirmed or shown in detail, so there remains a risk of root protection incursion at significant depth to satisfy those requirements.

Conclusions:

The principle of development as described is achievable without undue detriment to retained on-site trees, provided there is adequate site supervision at key stages by the project arboriculturist.

There is significant and potentially damaging work occurring within and in proximity to higher value trees. Proposals set out in AIA/MS, section 12, table 2 (including regular reporting to the LPA) are required if there is to be adequate oversight throughout this development.

We do not have 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.

Recommendations:

I recommend the above scheme for **APPROVAL**, subject to the following conditions being applied:

Condition 1

Before the site is occupied or any machinery is introduced to the site or demolition work or construction work or alterations to existing ground levels takes place, written confirmation is required from the Arboricultural Expert representing the site owner(s), confirming that all protective fencing and ground protection has been inspected and found to be 'Fit for Purpose' as required under British Standard 5837:2012 and been erected and positioned exactly as shown on the **Tree Protection Plan, dwg no. TH/A3/3023/PP**.

Reasons: To comply with BS5837:2012 and ensure the retention and maintenance of trees and vegetation which are an important feature of the area, in accordance with Policy D DM1 of the Arun Local Plan. It is considered necessary for this to be a pre-commencement condition as the protection and retention of trees goes to the heart of the planning permission.

Condition 2

Part a)

All activity at the site is to be carried out in strict accordance with: - **Arboricultural Impact Assessment, Method Statement & Tree Protection Plan**, ref. TH 3023, 8 March 2022

Part b)

If there is deemed to be a need for any Utility Service Route connections to bisect retained tree Root Protection Areas/Zones, then prior to their installation a Method Statement prepared by an Arboricultural Expert must be submitted that stipulates how this can be achieved without adverse impact on tree roots. Written approval and confirmation of acceptance of this Methodology must be issued before any works are commenced out on site.

Reasons: To comply with BS5837:2012 and to ensure that retained trees are afforded due respect and appropriate levels of protection such that their ongoing health and vitality is not compromised, and they can continue to enhance the landscape and amenity of the area.

TPO

I recommend the making of a Tree Preservation Order in respect of three individual trees, to better control their future management in the interest of public amenity. I attach TEMPO forms and a GIS plan for this purpose.

Mark Warwick

Tree Officer

Environment and Climate Change



The Hollies, 84 Barnham Road, Eastergate, PO22 0ES

© Arun District Council and Crown Copyright. All rights reserved. Licence No: 100018487, 2022

Production Date: 06 September 2022

Scale: 1:500 @ A3

www.arun.gov.uk



TREE EVALUATION METHOD FOR PRESERVATION ORDERS - TEMPO

SURVEY DATA SHEET & DECISION GUIDE

Date: 1st September 2022

Surveyor: Mark Warwick / Tree Officer, GreenspaceTeam

Tree details

Tree/Group No: T2

Species: Hornbeam / *Carpinus betulus*

Location: The Hollies, 84 Barnham Road, Eastergate, West Sussex, PO22 0ES

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

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 none 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

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:

16

Decision:

Definitely merits TPO

TREE EVALUATION METHOD FOR PRESERVATION ORDERS - TEMPO

SURVEY DATA SHEET & DECISION GUIDE

Date: 1st September 2022

Surveyor: Mark Warwick / Tree Officer, GreenspaceTeam

Tree details

Tree/Group No: T3

Species: Red oak / *Quercus rubra*

Location: Land west of The Hollies, 84 Barnham Road, Eastergate, West Sussex, PO22 0ES

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

4

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 none 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

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 September 2022

Surveyor: Mark Warwick / Tree Officer, GreenspaceTeam

Tree details

Tree/Group No: T1

Species: Ash / *Fraxinus excelsior*

Location: The Hollies, 84 Barnham Road, Eastergate, West Sussex, PO22 0ES

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 |

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

Score & Notes

5

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 |

* 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

Score & Notes

4

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

4

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 none 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

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