

**Planning Officer:** Lynnyrd Wolfe

**Planning Application Ref:** R/8/20/T

**Location:** 2 Botany Close, Rustington, BN16 2BH

**Description of works:** Crown reduction to 1no. golden *Macrocarpa* tree (T1) to height 12m and spread 14m. Crown reduction to 2no. *Macrocarpa* trees (T2 & T3) to height 12m and overall spread 12m

**Reasons Given:** T1 - To maintain at a reasonable size T2 & T3 – Reduce weight following recent exposure to prevailing winds (recent loss of companion tree)

**Comments on Application:**

|                                                          |                     |                    |                        |
|----------------------------------------------------------|---------------------|--------------------|------------------------|
| <b>T1 Monterey cypress / <i>Cupressus macrocarpa</i></b> | Approx. height: 18m | Average spread: 8m | Age class: Over-mature |
| <b>T2 Monterey cypress / <i>Cupressus macrocarpa</i></b> | Approx. height: 20m | Average spread: 6m | Age class: Mature      |
| <b>T3 Monterey cypress / <i>Cupressus macrocarpa</i></b> | Approx. height: 15m | Average spread: 6m | Age class: Mature      |

- **T1** – A large tree with a relatively unmodified crown. Despite being in such close proximity to a neighbouring dwelling, it has been retained in harmony with the same and presents an attractive profile. Outwardly it appears to be in a fine physiological state and structurally sound.
- **T2** – A tall tree that has been particularly exposed to prevailing south-westerly winds following the recent loss of a larger companion tree (4 Botany Close). Predictably, some of the exposed foliage has been wind-scorched ‘browned off’ – otherwise it appears to be in a fine physiological state. A degree of recovery is likely but that will be slow and incomplete. Nonetheless, the tree retains enough visual amenity to justify its retention in current form. It does not appear to have sustained any significant structural damage as a consequence of the February storms.
- **T3** – A lesser but nonetheless visually significant tree which positively contributes to the character of the area. Appears to be in a fair physiological state but slightly suppressed by its neighbour (T2) leading to asymmetric form.
- Collectively they are highly visible from numerous properties and estate access roads.

**Conclusions:**

- These trees require careful management that respects their age and vulnerability to environmental changes and disease progression.
- All three trees are distinct in character but remain visually important at this part of the estate. Unusually no evidence of widespread infection from *Seiridium* Canker; a fungal infection typically associated with aged examples of this tree type and which can be disfiguring and ultimately fatal. Their overall condition both physiologically and structurally appears generally fine, despite the recent winter storms and environmental changes affecting T2 & to lesser extent T3. I am therefore unable to concur with the reasons stated as being sufficient to justify the ‘crown reduction’ work proposed.
- The removal/reduction of branches from T1 to achieve greater clearance of the neighbouring dwelling is entirely reasonable although the work specification needs to be clarified.

**Recommendations:**

- As it stands, I recommend **REFUSAL** for this application.

**Advisory:**

- I would like to see the applicant submit a revised work specification such as detailed below, which removes the crown reduction elements and clarifies/expands the property clearance work associated with T1.

T1 only

- Remove 3 lowest branches arising from main stem/bole and with a diameter no greater than 100mm.
- Reduce/remove any other branches as necessary to achieve no more than 2metres clearance from the adjacent dwelling (4 Botany Close).

- 
- 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 Approved Work: -**

- 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

