

Recommendation Report for Works to Tree(s) on trees subject to a Tree Preservation Order (

REF NO: BR/180/15/T

LOCATION: 10 East Dean
Bersted Street
Bognor Regis

PROPOSAL: Reduce 1No. Holm Oak by 4 metres

SITE AND SURROUNDINGS

DESCRIPTION OF APPLICATION	As above.
TOPOGRAPHY	Predominantly flat.
TREES	The tree is one of a group of mature trees and is the closest to accommodation.
BOUNDARY TREATMENT	Mix of walls and fencing.
SITE CHARACTERISTICS	Care accommodation - largely single storey. The tree is one of a line of trees on the south east boundary and overhangs the roof of single storey living accommodation. The tree is mature and substantial. It and the others are clearly visible from the surrounding area.
CHARACTER OF LOCALITY	Predominantly residential.

RELEVANT SITE HISTORY

BR/144/51/F	Outline application of residential development	Refused 21-11-1963
BR/996/72	Retain cottage for warden and common rooms erect 13 flatlets for elderly	ApproveConditionally 30-01-1973

None.

REPRESENTATIONS

Representations received:

Bognor Regis Town Council

No objection subject to approval of ADC Arboriculturist. It is recommended, if approved, that no work should be carried out if any birds or bats are nesting.

No representations have been received from nearby occupiers.

Comments on Representations received:

None.

CONSULTATIONS

Arboriculturist

Consultations responses received:

The Councils Tree Officer Objects and comments:

T1 Species: Holm Oak Quercus ilex Height: 15m Average Branch Spread: 5.5m Crown Condition: fair to good Form: fair to good Age Class: mature

Comments:

- The tree cited in this application is located in the front area of 10 East Dean.
- From the site inspection it is quite evident that T1 has had historic reduction/s. These reductions currently have 3.5m regrowth from the established pruning points.
- The applicants request to reduce T1 by 4m would surpass the established pruning points.

Recommendation:

- I would object to the proposed operation of a reduction of 4m to T1, as it would surpass the established pruning points.
- I would have no objection to the reduction operation of no more than 3.5 meters only, ensuring the pruning operation does not surpass the established pruning points.

Comments on Consultation responses:

The Tree Officer comments have been raised with the agent by phone and by email. No response has been received and the application has not been revised.

POLICY CONTEXT

Within Built Up Area
Tree Preservation Order

DEVELOPMENT PLAN POLICIES

[Arun District Local Plan 2003:](#)

PLANNING POLICY GUIDANCE

NPPF
NPPG

National Planning Policy Framework
National Planning Practice Guidance

POLICY COMMENTARY

The above policies are general and, other than online Planning Policy Guidance under references ID 36-090-20140306 and ID 36-091-20140306, are not specific to trees.

DEVELOPMENT PLAN AND/OR LEGISLATIVE BACKGROUND

Section 198 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 states:

"If it appears to a Local Planning authority that it is expedient in the interest of amenity to make provision for the preservation of trees.... they may for that purpose make an order"

The works to the trees are to be judged having regard to amenity

OTHER MATERIAL CONSIDERATIONS

It is considered that there are no other material considerations to warrant a decision otherwise than in accordance with the Development Plan and/or legislative background.

CONCLUSIONS

The agent was contacted regarding the need to revise the application. No response has been received. The application therefore remains unacceptable. Refusal is recommended.

RECOMMENDATION

REFUSE

- 1 The reduction by 4m exceeds the established 3.5m pruning points for the tree and as such the reduction is excessive and unnecessary and not consistent with good practice and tree husbandry.
- 2 INFORMATIVE: The application should be revised to propose a reduction of no more than 3.5m (established pruning points) in order to be acceptable.

The agent has not responded to telephone and email messages requesting revision of the application and refusal is therefore unavoidable.