

Planning Officer: Mr D Easton

Planning Application Ref: Y/127/21/RES

Location: Land at Bilsham Road, Yapton

Description of works: Approval of reserved matters (appearance, landscaping, layout and scale) following the grant of Y/91/17/OUT for 250 No dwellings with associated parking, road/footway/cycleway provision, open space, landscaping, surface water attenuation & ancillary works (resubmission following Y/152/20/RES). this site is not CIL Liable as in Yapton Strategic Site

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. Previous consideration from site and familiarity with surrounding areas provides further insight to the proposal.
- There are significant trees and hedgerow across the site, many of which enjoy statutory protection (Tree Preservation Order). They could be adversely affected by these proposals. There is no supporting arboricultural information submitted with the application - a requirement of BS5837:2012. As such, were this application to now proceed, we will not have sufficient information to guarantee such trees would be adequately considered and protected.
- Until such time as we have plans showing detailed layout overlaid with accurate tree data (root and crown spread shown), it is not possible to adequately understand what the relationship between built form and green infrastructure is likely to be.
- Sites of this size and generally open nature but with established landscape features (trees and hedgerow), should be subject to the higher-level development principles, as promoted in our Supplementary Planning Documents. Those give instruction for avoiding Root Protection Area (RPA) incursion and providing further insurance with the use of 2metre buffer zones. **Arun District Public Open Space, Playing Pitches and Built Facilities** (Appendix 9) and **Arun Design Guide** (E.02 Landscape Structures & Trees, p48) - [Supplementary Planning Documents \(SPDs\) and other guidance | Arun District Council](#).
- There must be an overriding justification for RPA incursion, not a presumption (often mistakenly) that BS5837:2012 – Trees in relation to Design, Demolition and Construction promotes activity in the RPA. It does not. It presents a range of options to consider, where such incursion is unavoidable or where no reasonable alternative exists.
- I must await the necessary arboricultural reports and plans before commenting in detail on layout proposals, but it is already clear from Proposed Site Layout Full Site (dwg. 19284.P201) that a large, veteran oak (N of plots 93-95) will be heavily impacted by footway creation, drain reconstruction or enhancement and change of land use (to rear garden) – all within the nominal RPA. Such a tree ought to be considered for a 15metre RPA to ensure it remains viable for long-term retention and retains high ecological value (avoiding risk mitigation pruning). This was highlighted at /OUT stage and discussed with the applicant's project arboriculturist at that time (2018), so it is disappointing not to see that being observed at this stage.
- There does not appear to be an approved surface water drainage strategy for the site. This fundamental element of the design ought to be addressed to our satisfaction in association with layout proposals, so that we are not subsequently held hostage to flood mitigation measures which could then impact heavily on retained trees/landscape plans/open space provision.
- I draw attention to the nominal root protection areas (RPA) of retained trees and their growth potential as obvious constraints to the siting of any SUDS (e.g. attenuation pond) or introduction of subterranean utility apparatus. The provision of appropriate buffer/easement around such features

must also take into account that growth potential (roots), to limit the risk of damage occurring during future maintenance of the same, from compaction/contamination of the soil structure.

- Any improvements to existing or creation of new watercourses within the RPA of preserved trees to be fully considered, details provided in advance and to our satisfaction. Where there is a significant risk of damage to those trees arising from such operations, then an alternative strategy should be proposed.

Conclusions:

- Whilst I anticipate amendments to the layout being required (in addition to the obvious conflict with a veteran oak mentioned above) the majority of development as described is certainly achievable without undue detriment to retained on and off-site trees. That said, we are yet to have sight of the necessary arboricultural report and plans to demonstrate this has been properly considered.
- Any areas of conflict between retained trees of higher value should be 'designed out' within a revised layout that upholds the higher-level development principles promoted within our Supplementary Planning Documents: Arun Design Guide and Arun District Public Open Space, Playing Pitches and Built Facilities.
- As it stands, I am unable to lend this scheme my support and so register an **OBJECTION**.

Recommendations:

1. The applicants will need to employ the services of an Arboricultural Consultant to carry out a tree survey exercise and then prepare an Arboricultural Impact Assessment (AIA) which must be inclusive of; a 'Tree Survey Schedule', a 'Root Protection Area (RPA) Schedule' and a 'Tree Constraints Plan' – with the trees accurately plotted on same.
2. In the event that a RPA of any tree which is proposed for retention overlaps the development then BS5837:2012 requires that the Detailed Planning Application is accompanied by an Arboricultural Method Statement (AMS) and most importantly a Tree Protection Plan – to both describe and illustrate the mitigation measures which are to be employed to ensure that the trees survive without detriment to their vigour and vitality and are given adequate protection both above and below ground.

Mark Warwick
Tree Officer / Parks and Greenspace Team