

Recommendation Report for Works to Tree(s) on trees subject to a Tree Preservation Order (**REF NO:** BR/94/15/T**LOCATION:** 10 Arnhem Road
Bognor Regis**PROPOSAL:** Fell 2 No. Sycamore trees**SITE AND SURROUNDINGS**

DESCRIPTION OF APPLICATION	As above.
SITE AREA	N/A
RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT DENSITY (NET)	N/A
TOPOGRAPHY	Predominantly flat
TREES	None of any significance affected by the proposed development.
BOUNDARY TREATMENT	Dwarf boundary wall to front and sides, close boarded fencing to rear.
SITE CHARACTERISTICS	Two storey detached property with rendered walls painted white with a brown tiled roof.
CHARACTER OF LOCALITY	Residential comprising a mixture of terraced and semi-detached properties, flats to west of site.

RELEVANT SITE HISTORY

BR/89/04/T	Fell 2 No. Sycamore trees (Acer Pseudoplatimus)	Refused 23-04-2004
BR/366/05/T	Surgery to two Sycamore Trees - raise crowns to a height of 3m, reduce crowns by 25% and thin by 20%	ApproveConditionally 23-11-2005

REPRESENTATIONS**Representations received:**

Bognor Regis Town Council

No objection

Subject to the approval of the ADC Arboriculturist, it is recommended, if approved, that no work should be carried out if any birds or bats are nesting.

Comments on Representations received:

Parish Council comments noted

If approved, an informative will be placed on any approval regarding nesting birds and bats.

CONSULTATIONS

Arboriculturist

Consultations responses received:

Tree Officer

T1 Species: Sycamore *Acer pseudoplatanus* Height: 15 meters Average Branch Spread: 4.5 meters Crown Condition: fair Form: fair Age Class: mature

T2 Species: Sycamore *Acer pseudoplatanus* Height: 15 meters Average Branch Spread: 4.5 meters Crown Condition: fair Form: fair Age Class: mature

The trees cited in this application are situated in the front garden of 10 Arnhem Road. Both trees are therefore highly visible to public from the main highway outside.

Both trees cited in this application are covered by active TPO orders.

The applicant has applied to fell the trees highlighted in this application. The applicant has stated that the reasoning for the felling of these trees are due to 'overgrown, weak branches hitting house, roots near main sewage system, lifting pavement and wall'. I would contest these points. From the site inspection both trees were showing no signs of pathogenic presence, no major areas of decay and/or no major deadwood present. There is some evidence of epicormic growth, which does indicate a level of stress present on both individuals. This given level of stress it's not a large enough factor to allow the felling of T1 and T2.

The applicant has failed to address any potential mitigation that could be used to retain both T1 and T2. This would include addressing any conflict between the limbs of T1 and T2, and the surrounding structures. Mitigation techniques can also be used to address any potential lifting of the surrounding paving.

I would object to the proposed operation as the applicant has failed to address any mitigation that could be used to retain both T1 and T2. The applicant has also failed to produce any sound arboricultural justification for the felling of T1 and T2.

Comments on Consultation responses:

Tree Officer comments noted

POLICY CONTEXT

Designation applicable to site:

Built Up Area Boundary

Tree Preservation Order BR/3/93

Public Sewer On Site

DEVELOPMENT PLAN POLICIES

[Arun District Local Plan 2003:](#)

PLANNING POLICY 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 Sycamore trees are the subject of Tree Preservation Order BR/3/93.

The Sycamore trees are sited in the front garden adjacent to the dwarf boundary wall fronting Westloats Lane and are readily visible within the street scene being of significant public visual amenity value. The application seeks to fell the trees as the applicant is concerned regarding the health of the trees and branches which are overhanging the house and telephone lines. He is also concerned that the roots may be affecting the drainage system and lifting the pavement.

A previous application BR/89/04/T for the felling of the trees was refused on the 23rd April 2004 as it was considered that the trees make a significant contribution to the character of the area and no arboricultural justification had been submitted for the felling.

No detailed report has been submitted with the application regarding the health of the trees or mitigation techniques. The Council's Tree Officer has inspected the trees and has raised an objection to the felling. He has stated that there appears to be no signs of decay or major deadwood present but there appears to be some evidence of epicormic growth present in the trees which indicates a level of stress. However, given this level of stress it is not of a significant level to allow the felling of the trees.

Taking this into account it is therefore recommended that the application be refused.

RECOMMENDATION

REFUSE

- 1 The Sycamore trees make a significant contribution to the character of the area and therefore in the absence of any arboricultural justification the loss of the trees would be detrimental to the visual amenities of the locality.