

Planning Officer: Amber Willard

Planning Application Ref: LY/18/17/T

Location : Arunbrook House, The Causeway, Arundel

Description of works: 2m lateral spread reduction and 3m crown lifting to 1 No Oak and 1 No Sycamore
4m crown lifting to 1 No Sycamore & 3 No Beech
15% thinning to 1 No Oak and 2 No Sycamore & 3 No Beech

Applicants Reasons To improve light percolation to the rear garden.

Comments On Application:

Mixed Oak/Sycamore & Beech Height = 12m to 14m Avge spread = 5m Age = Early Mature

- The **Oak T2** is a free standing tree of reasonable form albeit with an issue of low overhang to the south side of the neighbours roof.
- The **Sycamores T3 & T5** and **Beech T6/7/8** form a linear belt of trees with merged crowns (although the removal of **T4 Lime** – see 17/17/T – will leave **Sycamore T3** as a free standing tree).

Conclusions:

- The proposal is to leave the height untouched but to raise the ground clearance to the lowest branches to between 3m to 4m to allow light in under the crowns. I would support this approach as crown lifting will improve matters without adversely impacting on these trees amenity value in the landscape (whereas height reduction would be much more drastic and detrimental to same).
- The proposal is also to thin the crowns of all of the trees by 15% which equates to the removal of 1 in every 6 branches – I would object to any thinning of the **Oak tree T2** because it already has an open crown and thinning it would be detrimental and undermine its amenity value and appearance in the landscape. As far as the other trees are concerned I think thinning will be counterproductive for the **Sycamores** because they are so vigorous that they will utilise the increased light within the crowns and produce a dense growth spurt to quickly replace the lost branches. As for the **Beech** these tend to respond more slowly to this work but letting the wind inside the crowns could prove counterproductive in future. However, this is not a heavy thin and provided that it does not remove any large diameter branches I would not resist this work on this occasion.
- The proposal is also to reduce the lateral spread (NOT HEIGHT) of the **Oak T2** and **Sycamore T3** by up to 2m.
- I would object to this work on the **Oak T2** as it is excessive and would undermine its visual appearance and create large diameter wounds prone to fungal infection and thus be contrary to BS3998 recommendations. It would be better in my view to go for a lesser pruning of laterals to the north, east and west by up to a maximum of 1m but permit the 2m reduction on the south side because it is weighted more heavily in this direction and the low branches touch the roof of the neighbours house.
- I am less concerned for the **Sycamore T3** as it is a tree of lesser importance and landscape significance but it has been suppressed to the north side by the presence of **T4 Lime** and thus a variable degree of pruning of between 1m to 1.5m would be more suited to re-training the shape and form of this tree into a more balanced canopy at this juncture.

Recommendations:

- I recommend **APPROVAL** for the following works:-
T2 Oak – Raise canopy to achieve a 3m ground clearance to the lowest branches.
T3 Sycamore – Thin canopy by 15% removing branches up to a maximum diameter of 50mm in the process.
Raise canopy to achieve a 3m ground clearance to the lowest branches.

T5 Sycamore - Thin canopy by 15% removing branches up to a maximum diameter of 50mm in the process.

Raise canopy to achieve a 4m ground clearance to the lowest branches

T6 Beech – Thin canopy by 15% removing branches up to a maximum diameter of 50mm in the process.

Raise canopy to achieve a 4m ground clearance to the lowest branches.

T7 Beech – Thin canopy by 15% removing branches up to a maximum diameter of 50mm in the process.

Raise canopy to achieve a 4m ground clearance to the lowest branches.

T8 Beech – Thin canopy by 15% removing branches up to a maximum diameter of 50mm in the process.

Raise canopy to achieve a 4m ground clearance to the lowest branches.

- I recommend **REFUSAL** for the following works:-

T2 Oak – Reduce radial spread by up to 2m all around crown.

T3 Sycamore - Reduce radial spread by up to 2m all around crown.

ADVISORY:

I advise that the applicant re-submits seeking the following works:-

T2 Oak – Reduce radial spread to the south side ONLY by a maximum of 2m.

Reduce radial spread to north, east and west sides by a maximum of 1m.

T3 Sycamore - Reduce radial spread by a variable amount of 1m to 1.5m maximum to achieve a more balanced appearance to the crown.

The following Conditions should be applied to all approvals:-

- 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
- 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.*

Bernie Harverson

Consultant Arboriculturist