

ADC PARKS & GREENSPACE ARBORICULTURE

FROM: Dafydd Lloyd

TO: David Eastern

PLANNING APPLICATION: LU/361/14/TC

ADDRESS: Westfield Court Norfolk Road Littlehampton BN17 5AQ

BRIEF DESCRIPTION: Reduce 1 No Macrocarpa tree by 3m in height & shorten sides by 1-2m, reduce 1 No Sycamore by 3 m in height & shorten sides by 2m

INSPECTION DATE: 08/12/2014

RECOMMENDATION:

Objection ☐

No Objection ☒

Split Decision ☐

Comment ☒

Recommendation ☐

Suggested Conditions ☐

Tree Replacement ☐

Dead/Dangerous ☐

CA & Amenity Value ☐

T1 Species: Monterey Cypress *Cupressus macrocarpa* **Height:** 13 meters
Average Crown Spread: 5 meters **Crown Condition:** fair **Form:** fair **Age Class:** semi mature

T2 Species: Sycamore *Acer pseudoplatanus* **Height:** 14 meters **Average Crown Spread:** 4 meters **Crown Condition:** fair **Form:** fair **Age Class:** semi mature

T3 Species: Sycamore *Acer pseudoplatanus* **Height:** 12 meters **Average Crown Spread:** 3 meters **Crown Condition:** fair **Form:** fair **Age Class:** semi mature

Comments:

- The outlined trees are situated on a site with an apartment complex, with **T1** and **T2** on the north boundary, and **T3** on the southern boundary. The surrounding landscape has a fair mix of mainly small to medium sized trees.
- The outlined trees are not TPO'ed but are in a conservation area. this report will test the outlined trees suitability for an TPO order.
- **T1** has evidently had lateral reductions on the southern side (to allow vehicle access to the driveway. Also this tree has evidently had height reduction/s, which would directly correlate to the pruning activities applied for on this application. This tree does not have much aesthetic value, as the pruning has had adverse effects on the form and retention span on said tree. This tree scored an 8 on the TEMPO form – Not suitable for TPO.

- **T2** has also been pruned along the southern sides to allow vehicle access to the driveway. Again this has negatively impacted this tree, as the form has been adulterated to suit vehicle access. This application has also requested pruning back to the established pruning points of said tree. This tree scored a 9 TEMPO on the form – Not suitable for TPO.
- **T3** has also had reduction/s historically. Unlike **T1** and **T2**, **T3** has not been pruned to allow vehicle access, so the pruning is better and the form of said tree has not effected as much as **T1** and **T2**. This tree is visible from the highway however it does not have the presence and/or the aesthetic value to warrant a TPO order. Again the application has applied to reduced back to these previous pruning points. This tree scored a 9 TEMPO on the form – Not suitable for TPO.

Recommendation:

- As all cited trees (T1 to T3) are not suitable for TPO orders at this point in time. **I would therefore have no objection to the proposed pruning operations.**

Dafydd Lloyd
Arun District Council
Tree Officer