

Planning Officer: Mr S Davis

Planning Application Ref: P/70/19/RES

Location: Land North of Summer Lane, Pagham, PO21 4NG

Description of works: Approval of reserved matters following outline consent P/58/15/OUT for 90 No. dwellings. Also seeking to address the terms of planning conditions 6 (Phasing), 8 (ecology), 9 (Surface Water), 12 (Vehicular Access), 15 (Parking), 18 (Travel Plan), 20 (Landscape Management), 24 (Parking Control), 25 (Dwelling Parking) and 26 (Materials)

Comments on Application:

- The applicants have employed ARBORCALL to prepare an Arboricultural Impact Assessment for this project. No Tree Protection Plan or Arboricultural Method Statement has been provided as the intention is to remove all on-site trees to facilitate the same.
- The Tree Survey data is comprehensive and accords with the requirements of BS5837:2012, although I disagree with retention category ratings for the most significant of on-site trees (T03 and T05).
- The majority of proposed tree removals have either been approved already or are justified and acceptable.
- The current proposed layout assumes the removal of established oak trees which I assess as being of moderate value (Category B) in their current state and of potential landscape and high amenity value if adequately respected and protected from this point onwards. Their retention should be a major influence on any proposed site layout. They qualify and are suitable for, long-term preservation.
- As a general principle of design, careful consideration should be given to the intended land use beneath existing canopy of established trees and the potential for further growth (root and canopy expansion). With such a large and open site to work with I would expect a layout proposal to have placed great emphasis on utilising and enhancing the existing green infrastructure and eliminating future 'residential pressure to prune'.
- The oaks T03 and T05 should not be confined within the development, rather they should be visible from multiple aspects. I would expect the root protection area (RPA) plus a 2metre buffer zone to be an absolute minimum requirement for these neglected trees. Ideally, they should be incorporated into an area of open space and be so remote from any development such that they can project veteran status in the future without being irrevocably spoilt by risk mitigation pruning.

Conclusions:

- There would need to be a compelling argument in favour of any wholesale removal or incursion into the root protection area of mature trees, as this site clearly lends itself to a harmonious design that avoids any direct interference with such trees of current or potential landscape value. This becomes especially relevant where there are relatively few trees of such stature and quality, as is the case here.
- I find the extent of proposed tree loss unjustified and unacceptable. There is ample scope to revise the plot layout at the north-east corner of the site and successfully accommodate significant trees (oak T03 and T05) in long-term harmony with surrounding built form.

Recommendations:

- As it stands, I must register an **OBJECTION** to this proposal.
- A revised layout will need to be supported by an **Arboricultural Method Statement Report** inclusive of a **Tree Protection Plan** defining which trees are to be retained and which trees are to be removed and how they would propose to protect the retained trees and improve ground conditions so as to facilitate recovery and extension of their root systems.
- I follow up on a previous recommendation for the making of a Tree Preservation Order in respect of two pedunculate oak (referred to as **T03** and **T05** in the applicant's tree survey schedule) to preserve their place in the landscape and better inform a revised layout. I attach TEMPO forms and GIS plan for this purpose. Please advise both myself and the applicant on the outcome of this specific recommendation.

Mark Warwick
Tree Officer / Parks and Greenspace Team

Land West of Pagham Road, Pagham



Scale 1:1000 @ A4

© Arun District Council and Crown Copyright. All rights reserved. Licence No: 100018487, 2019

Production Date: 17 April 2019

ARUN-DISTRICT-COUNCIL-P/70/19/RES

www.arun.gov.uk

TREE EVALUATION METHOD FOR PRESERVATION ORDERS - TEMPO

SURVEY DATA SHEET & DECISION GUIDE

Date: 17th April 2019

Surveyor: Mark Warwick / Tree Officer, Parks and Greenspace Team

Tree details

Tree/Group No: T1

Species: Pedunculate oak / *Quercus robur*

Location: Land West of Pagham Road, Pagham

OS Map ref: E 489061

N 098618

Part 1: Amenities assessment

a) Condition & suitability for TPO; where trees in good or fair condition have poor form, deduct 1 point

- | | |
|--------------------------|-------------------------|
| 5) Good | Highly suitable |
| 3) Fair | Suitable |
| 1) Poor | Unlikely to be suitable |
| 0) Dead/dying/dangerous* | Unsuitable |

Score & Notes

3

* Relates to existing context and is intended to apply to severe irremediable defects only

b) Retention span (in years) & suitability for TPO

- | | |
|-----------|-----------------|
| 5) 100+ | Highly suitable |
| 4) 40-100 | Very suitable |
| 2) 20-40 | Suitable |
| 1) 10-20 | Just suitable |
| 0) <10* | Unsuitable |

Score & Notes

2

*Includes trees which are an existing or near future nuisance, including those clearly outgrowing their context, or which are significantly negating the potential of other trees of better quality

c) Relative public visibility & suitability for TPO

Consider realistic potential for future visibility with changed land use

- | | |
|---|---------------------|
| 5) Very large trees with some visibility, or prominent large trees | Highly suitable |
| 4) Large trees, or medium trees clearly visible to the public | Suitable |
| 3) Medium trees, or large trees with limited view only | Suitable |
| 2) Young, small, or medium/large trees visible only with difficulty | Barely suitable |
| 1) Trees not visible to the public, regardless of size | Probably unsuitable |

Score & Notes

4

d) Other factors

Trees must have accrued 7 or more points (with no zero score) to qualify

- | |
|--|
| 5) Principal components of arboricultural features, or veteran trees |
| 4) Tree groups, or members of groups important for their cohesion |
| 3) Trees with identifiable historic, commemorative or habitat importance |
| 2) Trees of particularly good form, especially if rare or unusual |
| 1) Trees with none of the above additional redeeming features (inc. those of indifferent form) |

Score & Notes

1

Part 2: Expediency assessment

Trees must have accrued 9 or more points to qualify

- | |
|-------------------------------|
| 5) Immediate threat to tree |
| 3) Foreseeable threat to tree |
| 2) Perceived threat to tree |
| 1) Precautionary only |

Score & Notes

5

Part 3: Decision guide

- | | |
|-------|-----------------------|
| Any 0 | Do not apply TPO |
| 1-6 | TPO indefensible |
| 7-11 | Does not merit TPO |
| 12-15 | TPO defensible |
| 16+ | Definitely merits TPO |

Add Scores for Total:

15

Decision:

TPO defensible

TREE EVALUATION METHOD FOR PRESERVATION ORDERS - TEMPO

SURVEY DATA SHEET & DECISION GUIDE

Date: 17th April 2019

Surveyor: Mark Warwick / Tree Officer, Parks and Greenspace Team

Tree details

Tree/Group No: T2

Species: Pedunculate oak / *Quercus robur*

Location: Land West of Pagham Road, Pagham

OS Map ref: E 489058

N 098602

Part 1: Amenities assessment

a) Condition & suitability for TPO; where trees in good or fair condition have poor form, deduct 1 point

- | | |
|--------------------------|-------------------------|
| 5) Good | Highly suitable |
| 3) Fair | Suitable |
| 1) Poor | Unlikely to be suitable |
| 0) Dead/dying/dangerous* | Unsuitable |

Score & Notes

3

* Relates to existing context and is intended to apply to severe irremediable defects only

b) Retention span (in years) & suitability for TPO

- | | |
|-----------|-----------------|
| 5) 100+ | Highly suitable |
| 4) 40-100 | Very suitable |
| 2) 20-40 | Suitable |
| 1) 10-20 | Just suitable |
| 0) <10* | Unsuitable |

Score & Notes

4

* Includes trees which are an existing or near future nuisance, including those clearly outgrowing their context, or which are significantly negating the potential of other trees of better quality

c) Relative public visibility & suitability for TPO

Consider realistic potential for future visibility with changed land use

- | | |
|---|---------------------|
| 5) Very large trees with some visibility, or prominent large trees | Highly suitable |
| 4) Large trees, or medium trees clearly visible to the public | Suitable |
| 3) Medium trees, or large trees with limited view only | Suitable |
| 2) Young, small, or medium/large trees visible only with difficulty | Barely suitable |
| 1) Trees not visible to the public, regardless of size | Probably unsuitable |

Score & Notes

3

d) Other factors

Trees must have accrued 7 or more points (with no zero score) to qualify

- | |
|--|
| 5) Principal components of arboricultural features, or veteran trees |
| 4) Tree groups, or members of groups important for their cohesion |
| 3) Trees with identifiable historic, commemorative or habitat importance |
| 2) Trees of particularly good form, especially if rare or unusual |
| 1) Trees with none of the above additional redeeming features (inc. those of indifferent form) |

Score & Notes

1

Part 2: Expediency assessment

Trees must have accrued 9 or more points to qualify

- | |
|-------------------------------|
| 5) Immediate threat to tree |
| 3) Foreseeable threat to tree |
| 2) Perceived threat to tree |
| 1) Precautionary only |

Score & Notes

5

Part 3: Decision guide

- | | |
|-------|-----------------------|
| Any 0 | Do not apply TPO |
| 1-6 | TPO indefensible |
| 7-11 | Does not merit TPO |
| 12-15 | TPO defensible |
| 16+ | Definitely merits TPO |

Add Scores for Total:

16

Decision:

Definitely merits TPO