

**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. [The applicant has now submitted an Arboricultural Impact Assessment and Method Statement from ACD Environmental, ref: PR121588aia-ams, 08/10/2018, inclusive of a Tree Protection Plan, ref: PR121588-03, which also highlights those trees proposed for pruning or removal.](#)
- 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. [BS5837 prescribes a degree of permissible RPA incursion, which has been exploited by the applicant. That said, the recent history of development on their east aspect and its likely association with the recorded physiological distress, and future growth potential/long-term contribution to the site and surrounding area – should become superior considerations. The broader site environs are characterised by the successful retention of oak trees during earlier phases of development and complementing this theme ought to be a primary factor informing any site layout.](#)
- 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. [Whilst a detailed 'No-dig' solution is proposed, the extent of incursion for T8 appears to exceed the recommended 20% limit of unsurfaced ground within the RPA, although no area calculations have been provided to support viability of such a plan.](#)
- 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. [The applicant proposes to remove T11 a category C tree. I would have no objection to that, so long as there is an adequate replacement tree planting scheme as part of a detailed landscaping plan. Indeed, substantial benefit could arise if this facilitated an alternative site access to be considered towards the NE corner of the plot, which would avoid interference with significant trees.](#)

[I am aware only of tree planting proposals within the site \(soft landscaping concept plan\) that utilise the small isolated parcels of land available by introducing non-native, relatively short-lived trees.](#)

## **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). It is disappointing that the design layout does not fully respect the significant trees around this plot. 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.
- If the applicant can provide a revised site layout which avoids all intrusion of Root Protection Areas, then I would be able to lend this scheme my support.

**Recommendations:**

- As it stands, I must lodge an OBJECTION to; the current layout which does not seek to avoid RPA incursion arboricultural information that is required; to ensure valuable trees are afforded the necessary level of protection and respect.
- As things stand, I must sustain my OBJECTION as the applicant has not sought to 'design out' conflict with significant trees overlapping the site, where opportunity is there to do so.

Mark Warwick

Tree Officer / Parks and Greenspace Team