

Planning Officer: Michael Eastham

Planning Application Ref: WA/99/18/DOC

Location: Land East of Tye Lane, Walberton, Arun

Description of works: Application for approval of details reserved by conditions imposed on planning reference WA/44/17/OUT relating to conditions 5, 9, **10**, 11, 12 13, 16, 17, 24, 25, 27, 28, 30, 32, 33, **36**, 41 and 43

Comments on Application:

- I undertook a whole site survey on July 11th 2019, making frequent reference to the approved **Tree Retention/Removal and Protection Plan, dwg. no. BHA_401_02, Revision E**. I have also undertaken a desktop review of the accompanying **Arboricultural Method Statement, ref.C2636**.
- I am satisfied with the position and structure of the fencing around retained trees exposed on all aspects within the site (oaks T28, T39, T40 and horse chestnut T38).
- Perimeter fencing is for the most part double-clamped and all is sat in block trays. This will not be acceptable for the 'construction phase' of the development and does not entirely meet the requirements of the approved plan/AMS.
- I list the following items which will require attention from the project arboriculturist:
 - Fencing has been installed well within the root protection area (RPA) of G9 – white willow.
 - Fencing appears to have been installed within the RPA of G13 – goat willow.
 - There is a gap (approximately 3 panel widths) in the perimeter fence at the north end of G15 (see photo fig.1).
 - Fencing has been installed well within the RPA of G19 – poplar species.
 - Fencing appears to have been installed within the RPA of G20 – Lombardy poplar.
 - There are no informative notices affixed to panels at regular intervals (Construction Exclusion Zone – Keep Out!).
 - Stabilising struts will need to be installed on perimeter fencing at regular intervals.

Conclusions:

- Significant groundworks are underway involving; archaeological trial trenches, excavation of construction areas and creation of large temporary soil bunds. On the whole this has been satisfactory and not obviously to the detriment of retained on/off-site trees.
- The fencing is currently 'fit for purpose' although it does not entirely meet the requirements of the approved plan/AMS and **must do so** before the construction phase of development gets underway.
- No damage to retained trees has been observed although that is likely to occur if construction gets underway before the above refinements have been made and 'signed off' by the project arboriculturist.

Recommendations:

- I recommend we await photographic evidence and written confirmation from the project arboriculturist, which demonstrates that the above list of items have been satisfactorily addressed – before discharging conditions 10 and 36.

Advisory:

- I would like to state that I have had regular and positive correspondence with the project arboriculturist and am confident that if their recommendations/instruction are strictly adhered to then we will see adequate respect and protection for retained on/off-site trees throughout the course of development. As it stands, I suspect there has been a

failure to follow the instruction given and in the required timescale, such that I am obliged to formalise my response to the current shortcomings in Tree Protection across the site. These are easily rectified and so once we have confirmation of the same, I expect to be able to promptly recommend 'signing off' on the aforementioned conditions.

Mark Warwick
Tree Officer / Parks and Greenspace Team



Fig.1 – Location of gap in perimeter fence, immediately north of tree group 15