

**Planning Officer:** Charlotte Easton

**Planning Application Ref:** EP/8/19/T

**Location:** 'Scorton' 9 Lime Tree Close, East Preston, BN16 1JA

**Description of works:** Crown reduction 2-3m and crown thin 20% to 1 No. maple tree

**Reasons given:** 1. Seasonal nuisance 2. Excessive influence over property

**Comments on Application:**

|                                            |                     |                    |                   |
|--------------------------------------------|---------------------|--------------------|-------------------|
| <b>Field maple / <i>Acer campestre</i></b> | Approx. height: 14m | Average spread: 5m | Age class: Mature |
|--------------------------------------------|---------------------|--------------------|-------------------|

- This tree appears to be outwardly healthy and stable with a relatively unmodified and attractive crown profile – a fine example of its type. It grows from a discreet strip of neglected land which abuts a shared garage compound and most notably overhangs the applicant's property. It is prominent when viewed from the public highway (footway and carriageway) and can be seen from numerous residential dwellings. As such, it has high public amenity value.
- The tree was unfortunately misidentified during the making of Tree Preservation Order (TPO/EP/4/74) although not so dissimilar as to raise doubt over it being the intended subject. This is reinforced by the original map associated with the Order and ground observations from site.

**Conclusions:**

- This tree requires careful management that respects its age and vulnerability to environmental changes and disease progression.
- The proposal to reduce both the height and lateral spread on all aspects (the correct interpretation of *crown reduction*) by 2-3metres respectively does not comply with 'British Standard (BS3998:2010) Tree work – Recommendations' and would be likely to result in harm to the health and vitality of the tree with large pruning wounds being formed as well as undermining its visual amenity value and impact in the landscape.
- *Crown reduction* and *crown thinning* work has not been justified on arboricultural grounds. In respect of the latter, such work rarely provides a benefit to the tree and often only a short-term increase in light levels. Furthermore, combining the two operations (and especially to the extent proposed) could drastically alter tree dynamics and natural defences against wind pressure. The sudden exposure of central crown areas to such winds can result in significant damage.

**Recommendations:**

- I recommend **REFUSAL** for this application.

Mark Warwick  
Tree Officer / Parks and Greenspace Team