

Planning Officer: Simon Davis

Planning Application Ref: BR/229/17/PL (Prev BR/200/16/PL Withdrawn)

Location : Land rear of 41 to 47 Pevensey Road, Bognor Regis

Description of works: Construction of 4 No dwellings with access and parking arrangements.

This has now been amended to show 3 No dwellings.

Comments On Application:

- Following on from my adverse comments on the previous scheme it was withdrawn and has now been re-designed and re-submitted for consideration.
- There are trees both on and off this site of value which has been recognised by ADC in the making of a TPO to cover T2; T12; T13 and T20 (numbering taken from the PJC tree survey and are not the actual TPO ref No's.) I would find it very difficult to justify adding to this listing of trees even though I appreciate that for the neighbours the general tree cover in these gardens has separation and screening value.
- As to the Tree Constraints report this has on this occasion been prepared by PJC Consultancy and this accords with BS5837 requirements and I agree that the gradings and assessment of tree quality is a fair representation. The RPA's have also been increased for the off-site trees to better reflect the true situation even though they have also had to estimate the diameters of T11 & T12 without access to the adjacent garden.
- PJC have provided both a Tree Constraints Assessment/Plan and a Method Statement & Tree Protection Plan in accordance with BS5837 requirements where trees are impacted by development proposals.
- The primary change to the layout as far as I can see is that Plot 4 has been moved outside of the RPA for trees 11 & 12 and the parking has been relocated along the eastern boundary in front of these two tree and within their RPA.
- All of the bullet points made under the Comments heading in my previous assessment have therefore been addressed with this new layout and further data submitted as requested and yet I still have reservations over the layout.
- The primary changes with this plan are :-
 1. To reduce the number of units and re-orientate them to face directly southwest in each instance.
 2. To move Plot 2 a little further back from the tree content in the rear gardens and along the rear boundary line.
 3. To move Plot 1 a little closer to the tree content in the rear gardens and along the rear boundary line.
 4. To replace the 5 parking bays with two parking bays and one garage block – with the garage block outside of RPA's for off-site TPO'd trees.

Conclusions:

- The building on Plot 4 although further away will still be shaded by off-site trees in the garden of No 39 (primarily TPO trees T11/12 & T2) so there will still be pressure to prune or fell that would be difficult to resist on application to prune back from the garden by the new owners of Plot 4. This is now Plot 3 BUT my comments regarding shading and pressure to prune or fell have not altered.
- On re-assessment of Plot 1 I also note that it has a very narrow garden and about 50% of this will be directly shaded by trees 19 & 20 both of which are not yet fully grown so the problem can only intensify year on year and once again these will be under pressure from the new occupants for pruning or felling which will be difficult to resist. Only T20 is TPO'd here so T19 could be removed without reference to the local authority and we would have difficulty in resisting an application to prune T20. This situation would be eased considerably if we were looking at three dwellings and not four here – this would also allow the parking to be re-designed to be totally outside of the RPA's of trees T11 & T12. Plot 1 now benefits from a larger garden area but has in the process crept closer to the trees and looks out directly at them - so my comments regarding shading and pressure to prune or fell have not altered.

- Whilst I accept that there is provision within BS5837 to mitigate the effects of the car parking within the RPA's of T11 & T12 I would much rather see them design this out of the scheme rather than 'make it fit' by mitigation. I am also not convinced that the levels would allow the proposed 'No Dig' situation to be applied here and would wish to see east /west cross section drawings submitted to prove that this can really work. **These comments still apply.**

Recommendation:

- Even with the amendments to layout that have improved matters I still have concerns over intense shading of gardens and also the viability of applying a 'No Dig' situation adjacent to Trees 11 & 12 for the parking bays. **These overview comments still apply.**
- I therefore **OBJECT** to this scheme as it still represents a situation where pressure to 'Prune or Fell' valued trees in the landscape is inevitable. **I still OBJECT to the scheme for the reasons that pressure to 'Prune or Fell' valued trees in the landscape is inevitable.**

Bernie Harverson

Consultant Arboriculturist