

Planning Officer: Miss Z Toppin

Planning Application Ref: WA/48/21/TC

Location: Walberton House, The Street, Walberton, BN18 0PJ

Description of works: Removal of 1no. ash (T1) because of ash dieback

Comments on Application:

Ash / *Fraxinus excelsior* Height: 10-15m, Radial spread: 5-10m, Age class: Early mature

- I visited this location on 25th June 2021, to determine the aforementioned Town & Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) s211 Notice.
- My inspection was limited but from a distance (roadside and from gated entrance) this tree appears to be outwardly healthy and stable with a relatively unmodified and attractive crown profile. (See photos at foot or report). It is a valuable constituent of the mature high canopy that collectively make an important contribution to the character of the surrounding area.
- The applicant is seeking to remove the tree on the grounds that it is diseased and likely to become hazardous. I did not observe any obvious symptoms of *Chalara* infection (ash dieback) - on the contrary, the tree appears to be in good condition. That is not to say the tree is not infected, but in the absence of clear evidence of significant disease we should proceed on the basis that it is healthy and may remain so.
- I did not see any large lesions on the scaffold limb framework, although a recently formed 'hazard beam' (longitudinal split) had opened on an east-tending limb low in the crown. Deadwood content did not appear obviously problematic or indicative of disease.
- The Forestry Commission currently maintain the view that '*some ash trees may have genetic tolerance to ash dieback*' (June 2021). As such, there ought not to be a presumption ash will develop significant disease. Source: [Managing ash dieback in England - GOV.UK \(www.gov.uk\)](https://www.gov.uk/guidance/managing-ash-dieback-in-england)

Conclusions:

- It has not been satisfactorily demonstrated that this tree is or likely to become hazardous in the near future, as a consequence of *Chalara* (ash dieback) infection.
- The tree is an attractive feature in the local street-scene, contributes positively to the character of the area and appears to be in adequately sound and healthy condition.

Recommendation:

- I recommend the making of a Tree Preservation Order to preserve its place in the landscape and better control its future management. I attach a TEMPO form and GIS plan for this purpose.

Mark Warwick
Tree Officer / Parks and Greenspace Team



Fig.1. – T1 ash behind boundary wall, from driveway to Walberton House.



Fig.2. – T1 ash (left of frame) from The Street.

Arun District Council Maps



Walberton House, The Street, Walberton, W. Sussex, BN18 0PJ
Scale 1:625 @ A4
© Arun District Council and Crown Copyright. All rights reserved. Licence No: 100018487, 2021
Production Date: 29 June 2021

TREE EVALUATION METHOD FOR PRESERVATION ORDERS - TEMPO

SURVEY DATA SHEET & DECISION GUIDE

Date: 29th June 2021

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

Tree details

Tree/Group No: T1

Species: Common ash / *Fraxinus excelsior*

Location: Walberton House, The Street, Walberton, W. Sussex, BN18 0PJ

OS Map ref: E 497313 N 105808

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

5

* 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

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 – Sect. 211 notice (felling proposed)

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