

Planning Officer: Raymond Cole

Planning Application Ref: BN/57/19/RES (amended)

Location: Land East of Fontwell Avenue, Fontwell Avenue, Fontwell, BN18 0SB

Description of works: Approval of reserved matters for 3785sqm of light industrial floorspace (Class B1 (b)/(c)) following the grant of WA/22/15/OUT

Comments on Application:

- I have considered this application by means of a desktop review, using the information and plans submitted as well as online resources. My earlier comments (and regrettably my recommendations also) remain valid to this amended application. Where I have made additional comments they are in bold type.
- The applicants have employed Beechdown Arboriculture Ltd to undertake a preliminary assessment. The brief summary of their site meeting does little to advance our understanding of the likely impact from this development on any trees and hedgerow; a fact acknowledged by the arboricultural consultant who offers to provide their client with a more detailed assessment of their proposal once further information has been made available to him.
- There are significant on and off-site trees, many worthy of retention and some of which enjoy statutory protection. They could be adversely affected by these proposals. There is **insufficient** arboricultural information submitted with the application – **so it fails to meet** the requirements of BS5837:2012 – Trees in relation to Design, Demolition and Construction. As such, were this application to now proceed, we will not have sufficient information to guarantee such trees would be adequately respected and protected.
- At the very least, for such an application we must have sight of a detailed tree survey with those accurately plotted on a topographical map and with the proposed site layout imposed – so we can understand the relationship between green infrastructure and built form, and identify any significant constraints to development.
- Reference is made within the Landscape Management Plan to an Arboricultural (Impact) Assessment, assumed to be that prepared by FPCR Environment and Design Ltd, March 2015 in support of WA/22/15/OUT. The tree survey undertaken June 2014 provided on behalf of the applicant is more than 2years old, generally regarded as a threshold beyond which any condition ratings and management recommendations may no longer be valid. The survey will need to be updated so that we can better understand the recent history of tree management across the site, current value of existing green assets (trees and hedgerow) and likely impact of this proposal.
- There does not appear to be an approved surface water drainage 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. 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 (e.g. attenuation pond) **and their easement** or introduction of subterranean utility apparatus.
- Where established trees are growing close to carriageway or other substantive construction; a circular RPA may not be a satisfactory representation of the required area containing sufficient roots and rooting volume to maintain a tree's vitality. A revised polygon (of the same area) which abandons the inclusion of much of the carriageway or other feature and captures much more of the open farmland would be acceptable.

Conclusions:

- The principle of development as described is certainly achievable without undue detriment to retained on and off-site trees, although we are yet to have sight of the necessary arboricultural report and plans to demonstrate this has been adequately considered.

Recommendations:

1. The applicants will need to employ the services of an Arboricultural Consultant to carry out a tree survey exercise and then prepare an Arboricultural Impact Assessment (AIA) which must be inclusive of; a 'Tree Survey Schedule', a 'Root Protection Area (RPA) Schedule' and a 'Tree Constraints Plan' – with the trees accurately plotted on same.
 2. In the event that a RPA of any tree which is proposed for retention overlaps the development then BS5837:2012 requires that the Detailed Planning Application is accompanied by an Arboricultural Method Statement (AMS) and also most importantly a Tree Protection Plan – to both describe and illustrate the mitigation measures which are to be employed to ensure that the trees survive without detriment to their vigour and vitality and are given adequate protection both above and below ground.
- As it stands, I am unable to lend this scheme my support and so register an **OBJECTION**.

Mark Warwick

Tree Officer / Parks and Greenspace Team