

**Planning Officer:** Michael Eastham

**Planning Application Ref:** **FP/248/20/PL**

**Location:** **Land north of Felpham**

**Description of works:** **Revised details relevant to the sport pitch & changing facilities building (previously approved under Y/38/09/). This site also lies within the parish of Yapton & is in CIL Zone 4 (Zero Rated) as other development**

**Comments on Application:**

- I have considered this application by means of a desktop review, using the information and plans submitted as well as online resources. Previous consideration from site and familiarity with surrounding areas provides further insight to the proposal.
- The original tree survey provided on behalf of the applicant is now more than 2years old, generally regarded as a threshold beyond which any condition ratings and management recommendations may no longer be valid. Furthermore, such is the age of the reports (prepared 2007) that we cannot be confident the implications for existing tree stock have been properly considered.
- There are significant on and off-site trees, many of which enjoy statutory protection being subjects of TPO/FP/1/07. They could be adversely affected by these proposals. There is no up-to-date arboricultural information submitted with the application - a requirement of BS5837:2012. As such, were this application to now proceed, we will not have sufficient information to guarantee such trees would be adequately considered and protected.

General principle for layout design around trees

- Root Protection Area (RPA) – for a large, open site such as this we require a 2m buffer zone in addition to the calculated RPA - as promoted within our Supplementary Planning Documents: Arun District Public Open Space, Playing Pitches and Built Facilities (Appendix 9) and Arun Design Guide (E.02 Landscape Structures & Trees, p48). This is to ensure adequate room for any construction or other working alongside the RPA and account for any topographical margin of error during survey – thus removing the risk of any activity spilling over into the RPA and demanding a reduction in the Construction Exclusion Zone.

**Conclusions:**

- The principle of development as described is certainly achievable without undue detriment to retained on and off-site trees, although we are yet to have sight of the necessary arboricultural report and plans to demonstrate this has been properly considered.
- As it stands, I am unable to lend this scheme my support and so register an **OBJECTION**.

**Recommendation:**

1. The applicants will need to employ the services of an Arboricultural Consultant to carry out a tree survey exercise and then prepare an Arboricultural Impact Assessment (AIA) which must be inclusive of; a 'Tree Survey Schedule', a 'Root Protection Area (RPA) Schedule' and a 'Tree Constraints Plan' – with the trees accurately plotted on same.
2. In the event that a RPA of any tree which is proposed for retention overlaps the development then BS5837:2012 requires that the Detailed Planning Application is accompanied by an Arboricultural Method Statement (AMS) and also most importantly 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.

Mark Warwick  
Tree Officer / Parks and Greenspace Team