

Planning Officer: Miss Z Toppin

Planning Application Ref: LU/11/21/T

Location: Riverside Industrial Estate, Unit G and Unit H Bridge Road, Littlehampton, BN17 5DF

Description of works: Various works to 36no. sycamore trees and 9no. Scots pine trees

Reasons given: 1. Too close to buildings 2. Risk of damage to foundations

Comments on Application:

Mixed species group (in order of dominance): **Norway maple** / *Acer platanoides* – **Black pine** / *Pinus nigra* – **Sycamore** / *Acer pseudoplatanus* – **Whitebeam** / *Sorbus aria*

Age class: Early mature

- Outwardly this large group of trees appear to be in a generally fine physiological state (and assumed to be so in the absence of any information/evidence provided to the contrary).
- Despite the anomalies with description of tree species, the subjects of the application and intentions for those are obvious and clearly described in the accompanying report.
- I accept that some of those trees may not be ideally positioned and/or suppressed by others, requiring some future thinning (selected felling of individuals) for the betterment of the group. The group is a strategically important feature in the landscape and natural crown profiles should be preserved wherever possible. At this time, any existing or near-future building interference can be resolved through selective pruning of individual branches.
- Although proximity of tree roots to building foundations can be a concern, no evidence has been submitted that would implicate any tree in a damage event or suggest it has a foreseeable risk of doing so.

Conclusions:

- While it is acknowledged that it may not be reasonable to allow certain trees in the group to achieve their full growth potential; they are trees of public amenity value that can be satisfactorily managed without recourse to such extensive crown reduction work at this time.
- The trees are a significant feature in the local landscape and appear to be in adequately sound and healthy condition. The tree surgery proposed in the application would result in excessive reduction of their landscape impact and undue detriment to the visual amenities of the locality.

Recommendation:

- As it stands, I recommend **REFUSAL** for this application.
- **I would like the applicant to be invited to agree to a revised proposal for lesser works** (such as described below) as part of the current application so as not to incur further delay. Such work would go some way to addressing their concerns whilst preventing a diminution of the trees' landscape and public amenity value:
 - *Remove/reduce selected branches to achieve a maximum of 2metres clearance from buildings and fixtures.*

-
- If the applicant is prepared to re-submit in line with this advice, then I would be able to recommend APPROVAL subject to the following condition:

Condition to Be Applied to All Approved Works: -

- Part a) Where whole branches are to be removed and final cuts made close to the trunk or branch union they are to be made as shown in Figure 2 of BS3998:2010
- Part b) Where branches are to be shortened back the final cuts are to be made at the correct angle shown in BS3998:2010 and adjacent to a live bud or lateral.

Reasons: In the interests of the trees' continued health and vitality and to accord with current industry guidelines and sound arboricultural practice.

- See also the standard pruning guidance notes issued with the consent letter

Mark Warwick
Tree Officer / Parks and Greenspace Team

Figure 2 Positions of final cuts

