

## CONSULTEE RESPONSE (Arun District Council - Arboriculturist)

Date of report: 8<sup>th</sup> May 2026

Reference: BN/33/26/PL

Proposal: Construction of 2 No C2 (residential institution) dwellings and associated works (resubmission following BN/125/25/PL). This application may affect the setting of a listed building and is in CIL Zone 2 and is CIL Liab as new dwellings.

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

Case Officer: Amber Willard

---

### BACKGROUND

I have considered this application by means of a desktop review, using the information and plans submitted as well as online resources. Previous consideration from site and familiarity with surrounding area provide further insight to the proposal.

The preceding application was refused solely on grounds of inadequate surface water drainage scheme. The block plan layout remains the same as does the arboricultural implications. The same arboricultural report and plans submitted with both applications.

### TREE SURVEY INFORMATION / HIGHER VALUE TREES ON SITE

The applicants have employed Owen Allpress, Independent Arboricultural Consultant, to prepare an Arboricultural Impact Assessment & Method Statement along with a Tree Protection Plan for this project.

To visualise the arboricultural implications of this proposal, I have considered the following plans: Drainage Strategy, dwg. no. 101 Rev P3 and Tree Protection Plan, dwg. no. 2733-02-P1.

There are two trees of existing or potentially high amenity value, given references T1 & T8 and retention category rating B (BS5837:2012). No structural defect or physiological impairment was recorded against T8 in the Tree Survey Schedule, so is reasonable to assume the tree is in good condition. Whilst mature it could possess high growth potential, thus increasing its visibility and amenity offer to the surrounding area. The category B rating may be in dispute (as all other qualifying factors being met), such trees of high quality with an estimated remaining life expectancy of at least 40years would normally be assigned the highest A rating. Seemingly the only reason for such a downgrade is the species' current

vulnerability to disease (*Hymenoschyphus fraxinea*), as there is no mention in the report to justify it. Perhaps therefore is only a point of interest, but individual ash of this age class, apparent good health and form, correspondingly high growth potential and recognised amenity value, ought to be a significant constraint and provided with sufficient room to not only survive the construction phase of a scheme, but importantly to flourish post-development and be in harmony with surroundings. It is worth bearing in mind that were the ash to be removed for any reason, we would likely seek a replacement nearby, to sustain the verdant backdrop when viewed from established residential areas.

## LAYOUT PROPOSAL – AREAS OF CONFLICT

The location of attenuation tanks at the rear of both plots abuts the root protection area (RPA) of T8 Ash, which fails to recognise its growth potential and puts that structure at risk of conflict. Our drainage engineer could be best placed to consider the integrity of such a structure against the direct physical pressure and exploitative capacity of an expanding tree root system.

The rear garden of plot 1 is burdened with the bulk of required attenuation feature, again abutting the RPA and potentially limiting exploitation of that space.

The proximity of proposed dwelling at plot 2 to the existing crown of T8 could easily be perceived as nuisance or hazard forming, also with shade cast across the property for much of the day and set to increase if growth potential is reached.

The extent of RPA overlapping usable garden space of plot 2 requires a restriction be placed on permitted development rights (PDR) to outside of its perimeter, to preserve the soil structure and prevent harm occurring from excavation, compaction or contamination.

## SERVICES

Service-runs in and out of site have not been revealed to the project's arboricultural consultant, so no detail is contained within his report. As such there is potential for root protection area incursion, to satisfy those requirements. Is it assumed that utility (gas, electric, mains water) apparatus can be located and routed away from the RPA of retained trees and connect with those existing.

More detail is required around those elements of the proposal and how they might impact retained trees and hedgerow.

## DRAINAGE

There is currently no approved surface water drainage (and foul water sewer) strategy for the site. My understanding is that the only viable scheme is to connect to existing off-site apparatus, contingent on gaining the necessary permissions from landowners and satisfying utility providers. Should this not be viable and alternative methods reconsidered, I draw attention to the nominal root protection areas (RPA) of retained trees and their growth potential as obvious constraints to the siting of any SuDS feature, soakaway or introduction of subterranean utility apparatus. The provision of appropriate buffer/easement around such features must also take into account that growth potential (roots), to limit the risk of damage occurring during future maintenance of the same, from compaction/contamination of the soil structure.

## CONCLUSIONS

The above areas of conflict should be 'designed out' and a more sympathetic layout proposed to better accommodate T8 ash, the subject of a tree preservation order.

Our drainage engineer may need to consider the lifespan/integrity of the attenuation tank feature given the high growth potential and future presence of mature tree(s) in the rear garden of plot 2.

With the proposed change of land use, it is necessary to restrict permitted development rights within plot 2, to prevent building works impacting the root system of a protected tree.

## RECOMMENDATION

As it stands I am unable to lend this scheme my support. Whilst I believe it may be compliant with policy and standards relating to trees and development, it is unsympathetic and fails to exploit the amenity potential of a protected tree and so register an OBJECTION. This could be overcome if there is willingness to revise plot layout so that T8 can achieve its full potential and persist as a valuable asset to any development, rather than be partially obscured and potentially blight the property (plot 2) and invite future applications for hard pruning.

If the application is to be approved despite my objection, please advise accordingly and I will forward a set of conditions to be included in the decision notice.

Mark Warwick  
Principal Tree Officer  
Environment and Climate Change

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]



Arun District Council, Civic Centre, Maltravers Rd, Littlehampton, West Sussex, BN17 5LF  
[www.arun.gov.uk](http://www.arun.gov.uk)

**To register to receive notification of planning applications in your area please go to**  
<https://www1.arun.gov.uk/planning-application-finder>



---

**From:** Mark Warwick [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 08 May 2026 14:57  
**To:** Planning.Responses <Planning.Responses@arun.gov.uk>  
**Cc:** Amber Willard <Amber.Willard@arun.gov.uk>  
**Subject:** BN/33/26/PL

Please find attached my report for your consideration.

Regards,

Mark Warwick  
Principal Tree Officer, Environment and Climate Change

Arun District Council, Civic Centre, Maltravers Rd  
Littlehampton, West Sussex, BN17 5LF  
[www.arun.gov.uk](http://www.arun.gov.uk)