

Planning Officer: Ms M Tomalova

Planning Application Ref: BN/66/19/PL

Location: Land off Canal Mews Barnham PO22 0DP

Description of works: Erection of 3 No dwellings

Comments on Application:

- The applicants have employed Lizard Landscape Design Limited to prepare an Arboricultural Impact Assessment & Method Statement along with a Tree Retention Protection Plan for this project.
- The Tree Survey data is comprehensive and accords with the requirements of BS5837:2012. I am in agreement with the retention category ratings for trees and hedgerow recorded therein.
- The current proposed layout is going to impact heavily on the only significant tree (T04 – oak), both above and below ground. Although achievable in principle by adopting the tree protection measures proposed; there is nonetheless a risk that attaches during such incursion of root protection areas. This is especially significant where the tree in question is so prominent, of current high public amenity value, long-term potential and has endured recent ground disturbance/amelioration on remaining aspects.
- Plot 1 is going to experience a high level of seasonal nuisance from the presence of (T04 – oak), which will increase if the tree remains healthy and achieves its current potential.

Conclusions:

- The principle of development here is acceptable in arboricultural terms, although there is insufficient appreciation for and consideration of T04's long-term amenity potential and impact on the occupiers of plot 1.
- It seems to me that a determination to provide 3 units will put this tree under excessive pressure and compromise its long-term health and vitality. If the plot layout can be reconfigured or unit quantity reduced so as to leave the nominal root protection area of T04 inviolate – only then would I be able to lend the scheme my support.

Recommendations:

- As it stands, I am unable to lend this scheme my support and so register an **OBJECTION**.
- I recommend the making of a Tree Preservation Order in respect of **T04** to preserve its place in the landscape and hopefully better inform a revised layout. I attach a TEMPO form and GIS plan for this purpose.

Mark Warwick
Tree Officer / Parks and Greenspace Team

TREE EVALUATION METHOD FOR PRESERVATION ORDERS - TEMPO

SURVEY DATA SHEET & DECISION GUIDE

Date: 16th December 2019

Surveyor: Mark Warwick / Tree Officer, Parks and Greenspace Team

Tree details

Tree/Group No: T1

Species: Pedunculate oak / *Quercus robur*

Location: Land off Canal Mews, Barnham, West Sussex, PO22 0DP

OS Map ref: E 496322

N 104484

Part 1: Amenities 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

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

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:

16

Decision:

Definitely merits TPO

Land off Canal Mews, Barnham, PO22 0DP

