

Planning Officer: Simon Davis

Planning Application Ref: FP/180/17/PL (4) Current comments in green typeface

Location : 84 Flansham Lane, Felpham

Description of works: Demolition of 1 No dwelling and erection of 2 No dwellings

Applicants Reasons n/a

Comments On Application:

- In the grass verge outside this property there are two Norway Maples (one Purple one Green) which are sound and healthy and make a significant contribution in the landscape. No TPO is advised because they are assumed to be Council owned highway trees (if they are not then a TPO should be made).
- There is potential for these trees to be damaged at both the Demolition and Construction phases of this project if proper advice is not obtained from an Arboricultural expert and an AMS report & Tree Protection Plan obtained detailing how these two trees will be retained and fully respected and protected for the duration of site works.

Conclusions:

- The applicant has currently submitted no Arb information to support the planning application therefore there is insufficient information for me to be able determine it at this juncture with any confidence that the trees will be safely retained and respected and protected.
- The applicants have now submitted a combined AIA & AMS report with a Tree Constraints Plan but no Tree Protection Plan prepared by David Meagher Environment Consultants. The Tree Survey/RPA Schedule conforms to BS5837 requirements and is sound and I agree with the data and gradings with the exception of the life expectancy of these trees which I place at over 40 years.
- Sadly the report offers two alternative options for management of these trees – one for retaining them and one for removing and replanting. They will have to re-submit opting for one or the other. For guidance on this matter I am seeking a TPO for these trees so would wish to see them retained as part of any new layout.
- Their report says that ‘ The survey reveals that the trees either above or below ground will not interfere with site works to demolish the existing bungalow and erect two new single storey dwellings.’ I fundamentally disagree with these conclusions since their survey data and constraints plan show both a canopy overhang of the existing building as well as a significant overlap of the RPA of the existing building. What I wanted to see was how they would demolish the building carefully pulling it in on its own foot[print away from the trees and then once they have exposed bare earth erect protective fencing at the full distances specified in their schedules or lay ground protection etc etc – this is not advocated in their AMS so I cannot accept it.
- The applicants have now supplied a revised AMS report and TP Plan which reads well apart from one paragraph which will need to be amended regarding machinery access within the RPA.

Recommendations:

- I raise an **OBJECTION** to this application on the grounds that insufficient information has been submitted.
- The applicants will need to employ the services of an Arboricultural Consultant to carry out a tree survey exercise and then prepare an Arboricultural Assessment to support this Planning Application inclusive of a Tree Survey Schedule a Root Protection Area Schedule and a Tree Constraints Plan with the trees accurately plotted on same.
- As the RPA's will overlap the development BS5837:2012 requires that the Application is accompanied by an Arboricultural Method Statement Report including a Tree Protection Plan – to both describe and illustrate the mitigation measures which are to be employed to ensure that the trees survive without detriment to their vigour and vitality and are given adequate protection both above and below ground.

- At the present time they still have not submitted any of the Arboricultural information that has been requested and without this I have no confidence that this project can be achieved without significantly damaging these trees so I cannot let this go with the info being submitted to comply with a planning condition.
 - I now recommend a TPO is made to protect these trees – see attached TEMPO forms.
 - I am not satisfied with the AMS report as it is vague and not detailed enough with respect to protection measures to ensure that these two trees survive the demolition and construction process so I sustain my OBJECTION and stand by my recommendation that these two trees be TPO'd.
 - I am certain that this site can be developed with these trees in situ but I will need to see a supporting and detailed AMS report and Tree Protection Plan before I am prepared to recommend it for approval.
 - At Page 17 under the heading of Machinery it states that 'Machinery must be operated inside the root protection area.' This is not acceptable and it should read 'Machinery must NOT be operated inside the root protection area.'
 - I now recommend APPROVAL for this scheme based on the latest revised submissions and subject to the amendment of the Machinery paragraph on Page 17 and the application of the following standard Conditions :-
1. All demolition & construction works are to be carried out in strict accordance with :- **Arboricultural Method Statement Report Ref: AIA&MS Version 2 Nov17 and Tree Protection Plan ref: DJM TP/243/FL November 2017.**
 2. Prior to any demolition or construction works taking place or the introduction of machinery and plant to the site the following issues must be resolved to the complete satisfaction of Arun District Council :-
 - A **PRE-COMMENCEMENT Site Meeting** is to take place between the Arun DC Tree Officer and the Arboricultural Consultant representing the site owners – at this meeting all protective fencing will be inspected along with ground protection measures – they will be assessed to verify that they are 'Fit for Purpose' as required under British Standard 5837:2012 and have been erected and positioned exactly as shown on the **Tree Protection Plan - DJM TP/243/FL November 2017.**
 - The schedule of Site Monitoring/Supervision visits and Reporting Procedures prepared by an Arboricultural Expert will be required and reports are to be submitted as per the schedule included within the AMS report.
 - **IF** there is deemed to be a need for any Utility Service Route connections to bisect retained tree Root Protection Areas/Zones then prior to their installation a Method Statement prepared by an Arboricultural Expert must be submitted that stipulates how this can be achieved without adverse impact on tree roots. Written approval and confirmation of acceptance of this Methodology must be issued before any works are commenced out on site.

REASONS :

To comply with BS5837 and to ensure that retained trees are afforded due respect and appropriate levels of protection such that their ongoing health and vitality is not compromised and they can continue to enhance the landscape and amenity of the area.

Bernie Harverson

Consultant Arboriculturist