

**Planning Officer:** Ms Myer

**Planning Application Ref:** R/102/20/PL

**Location:** Land North of Springfield House, Cross Road, Rustington, BN16 2ST

**Description of works:** 1No. detached 5-bedroom house with attached single storey double garage & carport

**Comments on Application:**

- I have considered this application by means of a desktop review, using the information and plans submitted as well as online resources.
- The applicants have employed Lizard Landscape Design Ltd to prepare an Arboricultural Impact Assessment & Method Statement (AIA/MS) along with a Tree Retention and Protection Plan (TRPP) for this project. The Tree Survey data is comprehensive and accords with the requirements of BS5837:2012.
- There are significant on and off-site trees, many of which enjoy statutory protection (Tree Preservation Order). While most are to be retained, they could be adversely affected by these proposals due to the extent of construction occurring within their nominal root protection areas and pruning to facilitate access by construction traffic into the site.
- Although tolerable in theory, I am uncomfortable with this level of intrusion into the nominal root protection area of established trees. The combined extent of ground protection and no-dig construction areas, as shown on the TRPP plan is symptomatic of that intrusion. Whilst they propose recognised engineering solutions for working in close proximity to retained trees, it must be noted that element is very ambitious and carries a high risk of accidental damage.
- The relationship between existing ground levels and adjacent areas of 'no-dig construction' has not been shown on any cross-section drawing. The viability of this critical element of the development proposal should be revealed via civil engineering exercise, so we can be sure affected trees will not suffer damage and that finished ground levels in a broader context will be acceptable.

**Conclusions:**

- The principle of development as described is theoretically achievable being within tolerable limits of disturbance of retained trees although I find the building footprint to be unnecessarily intrusive. I would suggest a revision of the footprint, 90deg. anti-clockwise and tending more towards the south boundary as being more sympathetic.
- The current proposed layout is going to negatively impact on significant trees, particularly (T07 and TG04) both above and below ground. Although achievable in principle by adopting the tree protection measures proposed; there is nonetheless a risk that attaches during such incursion of root protection areas. This is especially significant where the trees in question are visually important and the subject of preservation orders.
- Trees of lesser quality and landscape value are (and will inevitably have) to be sacrificed to provide the only logical access onto the plot. This is reasonable and of itself would not incur undue detriment to the visual amenity of surrounding area.
- **I must register an Objection** to this scheme as it unnecessarily threatens to diminish the visual amenity and reduce life expectancy of, trees made the subject of Preservation Order.

**Recommendations:**

- I note that a similar scheme (R/91/17/PL) was permitted. As such, if you are minded to recommend the above scheme for APPROVAL, the following conditions should be applied:
1. Before the site is occupied or any machinery is introduced to the site or demolition work or construction work or alterations to existing ground levels takes place a **PRE-COMMENCEMENT Site Meeting** is to take place between the

Planning Authority's Tree Officer and the Arboricultural Expert representing the site owner(s) – at this meeting all protective fencing and ground protection measures will be inspected to verify they are 'Fit for Purpose' as required under British Standard 5837:2012 and have been erected and positioned exactly as shown on the **Tree Retention and Protection Plan, LLD1935-ARB-DWG-002 Rev 00, 27.05.2020.**

- A schedule of Site Monitoring/Supervision visits and Reporting Procedures prepared by an Arboricultural Expert will be required and their extent will be agreed on at the site meeting to the satisfaction of the Planning Authority's Tree Officer.

**Reasons:** To comply with BS5837 and to ensure that retained trees are afforded due respect and appropriate levels of protection such that their ongoing health and vitality is not compromised, and they can continue to enhance the landscape and amenity of the area.

2. All activity at the site is to be carried out in strict accordance with: - **Arboricultural Impact Assessment and Method Statement, LLD1935 Rev 01, 01.06.2020.**

- If there is deemed to be a need for any Utility Service Route connections to bisect retained tree Root Protection Areas/Zones, then prior to their installation a Method Statement prepared by an Arboricultural Expert must be submitted that stipulates how this can be achieved without adverse impact on tree roots. Written approval and confirmation of acceptance of this Methodology must be issued before any works are commenced out on site.

**Reasons:** To comply with BS5837 and to ensure that retained trees are afforded due respect and appropriate levels of protection such that their ongoing health and vitality is not compromised, and they can continue to enhance the landscape and amenity of the area.

3. Any tree pruning considered essential to enable the agreed development must meet the requirements of BS3998:2010  
Tree work – Recommendations:

- 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 interest of continued health and vitality of trees and to accord with current industry guidelines and sound arboricultural practice.

Mark Warwick  
Tree Officer / Parks and Greenspace Team