Development Management – Delegated Officer Report **Date; 04/08/20**

Application Number	**AWDM/0866/20**
Address	**73 Downsway Shoreham-by-Sea West Sussex BN43 5GN**
Proposal	**Application for consent under Adur Tree Preservation Order No.13.53/2/00(SU) to fell and replace one Acer tree T26.**

Date of site visit: 03/08/20

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

Proposal, Site and Surroundings

The application refers to a medium sized Acer located near the centre of the front garden adjacent to the entrance driveway and pavement of Downsway. The tree is a prominent part of the street scene and makes a significant contribution to the character and visual amenities of the area.

Consent is sought to fell and replace the tree.

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

Consultations: None.

Representations: One representation recieved from nearby neighbour in support claiming the tree is inappropriate for the area, concerns regarding the roots of the tree lifting the driveway and also the loss of light to the property.

Relevant Planning History

2000: Adur Tree Preservation order Number No.13.53/2/00(SU) of 2000 confirmed on 15/01/2001.

Planning Assessment

The tree is medium sized mature growing in the front garden adjacent to the driveway and pavement. The tree is prominent to the area, and can be seen from many views.

The tree has several stems from near ground level. The two stems emerge with included bark from ground level that each divides at 0.75 metres and again at 2 metres. The main scaffold stems are ascending it a tight array and support many smaller laterals from 3 metres. The main crown is dense and wide spread with some lower hanging secondary branches.

The proposed works are to fell and replace the tree claiming a single root is causing damage to the driveway/entrance path. This damage is approximately 3 metres from the base of the tree along a slight incline towards the house. There are no surface roots or extended buttresses at the base of the tree. Also the tree has historically been severely pruned to the southern side directly adjacent to the pavement. The felling has been requested in response to damage to the nearby combined driveway

and entrance way. There are signs of movement to the northwest curb and along the block works toward the northeast. Presumably the works are required irrespective of the presence of the tree, which has occurred prior as the paving has been replaced since 2009. Therefore I consider that alternatives should be considered that would retain the tree. The claimed damaging root is approximately 3 metres up from the base of the tree, and unlikely to be a major or anchoring root, meaning with consultation could be removed or reduced.

Recommendation

Therefore it is recommended that the proposal is refused.

REFUSE for the reason(s):-

1. The Acer tree T1 is a prominent and established feature, which contributes positively to local character and landscape of the area, and its removal would be detrimental to these qualities. There is no arboricultural or other acceptable reason provided which would justify the loss of this tree. Having regard to the maturity and stature of the tree and its prominence within the street scene, it is considered that evidence and or other engineering solutions should be considered.

Is recommendation contrary to letter(s) of representation?
Yes. One representation from nearby neighbour claims the tree is inappropriate for the area, lifting the driveway and creating excessive shade. The tree is a Sycamore many of which can be found in the area and there are two on the same Tree Preservation Order. Sycamore trees can be allowed to become large tall trees, or restricted by selective pruning, as this tree has been since 2000. Although there is damage to the nearby paving, this may not be due to the tree and can be overcome by works other than felling. Also the tree has, in the past received various works to maintain its size and spread, such as crown lifting, thinning or reduction works, these works could be considered again if applied for.

Case Officer: JDS Date: 05/08/2020

Authorised by: PB Date: 5/8/20