**Recommendation Report for Works to Tree(s) on trees subject to a Tree Preservation Order (**

**REF NO:** **FP/89/14/T**

**LOCATION:** The Mead
7 Rife Way
Felpham

**PROPOSAL:** Fell 1 no. large Blue Atlas Cedar Tree and replace with 1 no. Silver Birch

## SITE AND SURROUNDINGS

| | |
|---|---|
| DESCRIPTION OF APPLICATION | As above. |
| SITE AREA | Approximately 582 square metres. |
| TOPOGRAPHY | Predominantly flat. |
| TREES | There are no other significant trees to the front of the site. |
| BOUNDARY TREATMENT | Approximately 1.5 metre high timber fencing to the front and side boundaries. |
| SITE CHARACTERISTICS | The site is occupied by a detached two-storey dwelling that is set back from the road. The cedar tree which is the subject of this application is positioned to the front of the dwelling. |
| CHARACTER OF LOCALITY | The site is located on a residential road that is characterised by an informal arrangement of dwellings of a mixture of designs and scales, all of which are set back from the road to some extent. Mature trees and landscaping help to generate a verdant character and appearance to the surrounding area. |

## RELEVANT SITE HISTORY

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| FP/61/91/T | Lightly prune, remove deadwood and stubs, prune to balance canopy 1 no. Blue Atlas Cedar subject of TPO/5/BR | ApproveConditionally<br>01-07-1991 |
| FP/106/00/T | Lop, reduce and shape the tree | ApproveConditionally<br>11-08-2000 |
| FP/40/01/T | Fell one Cedrus Atlantica Glauca tree | Refused<br>18-04-2001 *Appealed*<br>**Appeal: Dismissed 02 10 2001** |

## REPRESENTATIONS

**Representations received:**

Felpham Parish Council

Objection: There is no proven reason for felling the tree. It may be top-heavy but the base of the tree is healthy.

**Comments on Representations received:**

Noted.

## CONSULTATIONS

Arboriculturist

**Consultations responses received:**

This is a fine specimen of the species and contributes significantly to the amenity of this area being highly visible from a public perspective.

I am not convinced by the arguments and evidence submitted to date that this tree is causing damage to the building. Without such evidence I would find no justification for the removal of the tree.

I Object to the removal of this tree on the grounds that there is insufficient evidence submitted to reach a conclusion that the tree is causing damage to the property and therefore its removal is the only option available to the owner.

**Comments on Consultation responses:**

Noted.

## POLICY CONTEXT

Tree Preservation Order

### DEVELOPMENT PLAN POLICIES

Arun District Local Plan 2003:

### PLANNING POLICY GUIDANCE

NPPF National Planning Policy Framework

## POLICY COMMENTARY

The above policies are general and, other than online Planning Policy Guidance under References ID 36-090-20140306 and ID 36-091-20140306, are not specific to trees.

## DEVELOPMENT PLAN AND/OR LEGISLATIVE BACKGROUND

Section 198 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 states:
"If it appears to a Local Planning authority that it is expedient in the interest of amenity to make provision for the preservation of trees.... they may for that purpose make an order"

The works to the trees are to be judged having regard to amenity

## OTHER MATERIAL CONSIDERATIONS

It is considered that there are no other material considerations to warrant a decision otherwise than in accordance with the Development Plan and/or legislative background.

## CONCLUSIONS

The cedar tree is a prominent feature within the street scene and provides an important contribution towards the overall verdant character and appearance of the surrounding area. It is therefore considered that its loss would have a detrimental impact upon visual amenities. The Council's arboriculturalist does not believe there is sufficient evidence to justify the removal of the tree.

It is therefore recommended that the application is refused for the following reason.

## RECOMMENDATION

**REFUSE**

1 The Blue Atlas Cedar Tree is a significant feature in the local landscape and the proposed felling, in the absence of any arboricultural justification, would result in the unnecessary loss which would be to the detriment of the character and appearance of the surrounding area.