Development Management – Delegated Officer Report **Date; 30/06/21**

Application Number	**AWDM/0798/21**
Address	**Elder Cottage Ropewalk Shoreham-by-Sea West Sussex BN43 5WW**
Proposal	**Application for consent under Adur Tree Preservation Order No.162/2/76 (SU) of 1976 to reduce radial spread to previous points, (up to 2 metres) and crown lift / remove epicormic growth up to 6 - 7 metres three Sycamore trees T1, T3 and T4.**

Date of site visit: 29/06/21

Neighbours checked: Y
Additional neighbour notifications: N
Site notice: (wider publicity / conservation area): N

Proposal, Site and Surroundings

The application refers to three Sycamore trees in the front garden of the limited access road of Rope Walk. The trees are part of an established group, which are part of the street scene and make a contribution to the character and visual amenities of the Shoreham Conservation Area.

Consent is sought to reduce radial spread to previous points and crown lift / remove epicormic growth up to 6 - 7 metres three Sycamore trees T1, T3 and T4.

The reasons for the works are primarily in the interests of safety, light issues and amenity value.

Consultations: None.

Representations: None received.

Relevant Planning History

1976: Adur Tree Preservation order Number 162/2/76 (SU) of 1976 confirmed on 10/08/76.

1994: Pruning of 4 Sycamore Trees T.P.O 162/2/76 (SU)

2001: Felling Of Multi-Stemmed Sycamore and Crown-Thinning, Raising & Shaping Of 3 Other Sycamores T.P.O 162/2/76 (SU)

2005: Crown Thinning And Reduction By 40% Sycamore Trees Subject To TPO Ref 162/2/76(Su) Application Refused.

2016: Application for consent under Adur Tree Preservation Order No.162/2/76 (SU) of 1976 to reduce radial spread by up to 2 metres, crown thin by up to 10% and crown lift up to 6 - 7 metres three Sycamore trees T1, T3 and T4.

Planning Assessment
The trees are three tall matures growing along the western boundary of the front garden adjacent to the roadway of Rope Walk. The trees are all twin stemmed from ground level to 0.5 metres, with mostly clear stems. The crowns break from 6 to 7 metres with lower branches being mostly epicormics.

The trees are;

Sycamore T1 (north)
This tree is twin stemmed from ground level with the two mostly clear stems both dividing at 5 to 5.5 metres, with the most significant limbs emerging at 6 to 7 metres. The main crown is dense and compact.

Sycamore T3 (central)
The Sycamore tree T3 is the next inline from the North, with the original Sycamore T2 being lost prior to the order being made in 1976. T3 is single stemmed to 0.5 metres, with both stems remaining entire to the top of the slightly more open high crown. This tree has some more significant out grown epicormics growth from 2 metres.

Sycamore T4 (South)
The tree at the south end of the group, this Sycamore is twin stemmed from 0.5 metres, with each stem dividing again at 6 metres forming a slightly wider spreading dense crown. The main stems have several areas of large re-growth from 2 to 6 metres.

The proposed works are to reduce radial spread to previous points, (up to 2 metres) and crown lift / remove epicormic growth up to 6 - 7 metres three Sycamore trees T1, T3 and T4. The works are to contain the spread of the trees, re-establish their high crowns and reduce weight and sail effect.

These works in my opinion would be relatively minor in relation to the overall size, spread and crown form of the trees and would not significantly or adversely affect their appearance, amenity value, or contribution to the character of the area.

Recommendation

Grant Consent, subject to the following Conditions:

1 The proposed works, hereby permitted, shall be restricted to;

i Reduction in radial spread of 0.5 to 2 metres, 2 metres only on the longest most extended laterals.

ii Crown lifting of up to 6 to 7 metres.

iii Removal of epicormic growth.

only unless otherwise agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority and carried out within two years from the date of consent and in accordance with the British Standard BS 3998: 2010 Tree Work.

Reason: *In the interest of visual amenity.*

Is recommendation contrary to letter(s) of representation?

No

Case Officer: JDS Date: 30/06/2021

Authorised by: PB Date: 30/6/21