

[REDACTED]

From: Mark Warwick
Sent: 03 October 2018 13:16
To: Simon Davis
Cc: Planning.Responses
Subject: FP/171/18/PL

Simon

Please find attached my comments/observations for your consideration.

Regards,

Mark

Mark Warwick | Tree Officer, Greenspace, [Arun District Council](#) | Location: Bognor Regis Town Hall, Clarence Road, Bognor Regis, West
Sussex. PO21 1LD

Visit Arun's web site at www.arun.gov.uk



Save the environment - think before you print.

Planning Officer: Simon Davis

Planning Application Ref: FP/171/18/PL

Location: Land at Stanhorn Grove, Felpham

Description of works: Erection of 18 No. dwellings, creation of new access, landscaping & associated works

Comments on Application:

- The applicant has employed ACD Environmental to provide a preliminary Tree Report (Tree survey and constraint advice), ref.PR121588tr, 03/01/2018. I broadly concur with the tree schedule information and retention category ratings. The report contains a strong set of recommendations to their client which I endorse. Specifically, they have identified the need for a more detailed AIA which I would expect to be inclusive of a Tree Removal and Retentions Plan and importantly a Tree Protection Plan and specific Arboricultural Method Statement.
- All trees of significance are growing beyond the perimeter of the proposed development site, but there is extensive crown overhang, subsequent shading and overlapping root protection areas (RPA). The oak trees (subject of a Tree Preservation Order) with one exception (T10) have been recorded as suitable for retention. They are of high public amenity and landscape value. These have most likely been previously subject to development-related stress and so should be afforded special consideration and full protection as part of any new development (as proposed) on their west and south aspects.
- The latest site layout proposes significant RPA incursion from the construction of driveway/parking areas and main estate access road from the east and/or does not allow for future growth - in respect of oak trees T7, T8 and T11.
- There is a large quantity of trees that as a group are ecologically noteworthy across the site interior, although individually they are of low to moderate quality and ought not to be a complicating factor in any design. That said, their removal should be compensated for with a detailed landscape plan inclusive of trees that ultimately will be of sufficient stature and longevity so as to complement the established local tree character and provide long-term value to any development. I defer to Sue Howell / Leisure and Landscape Officer on this element.

Conclusions:

- At this stage of the process and for a development proposal on this scale, I would expect us to now be in receipt of the 'full set' of arboricultural reports and plans in support of the application. I require sight of a Tree Removal and Retention Plan, Tree Protection Plan. Where any part of the development (including installation of utility apparatus) overlaps or abuts a root protection area then a detailed Arboricultural Method Statement must be submitted, that describes and illustrates the mitigation measures which are to be employed to ensure that the trees survive without detriment to their vigour and vitality.
- 'Pressure to prune' trees along the east boundary from future residents of plot number 1 should be anticipated, putting at risk the public amenity value they currently provide. A revised layout should be sought that better accommodates existing trees of significant value (T1, T3 and T7).
- Tree constraints are mostly confined to the site perimeter, therefore it is reasonable to expect the final design to fully respect, accommodate and be in harmony with all Category B and C boundary trees.

Recommendations:

- As it stands, I must lodge an OBJECTION to; the current layout which does not seek/and insufficient arboricultural information that is required; to ensure valuable trees are afforded the necessary level of protection and respect.

Mark Warwick

Tree Officer / Parks and Greenspace Team