Development Management – Delegated Officer Report **Date; 29/03/19**

Application Number	**AWDM/0277/19**
Address	**21 Greenoaks Lancing West Sussex BN15 0HN**
Proposal	**Application for consent under Adur Tree Preservation Order No.162/2/57(L) to fell one Sycamore within Group G2.**

Date of site visit: 01/03/19

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

Proposal, Site and Surroundings

The application refers to a mature, long established Sycamore tree located near the centre of the eastern boundary of the front garden. The tree is a prominent part of the street scene and makes a 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 amenity value.

Consultations: Letter sent to Lancing Parish Council, who responded stating they had no objections.

Representations: None received.

Relevant Planning History

1957: Worthing Tree Preservation order Number 162/2/57(L) of 1957 made.

1998: Crown Lift By Removing Approx 4 Lowest Branches To No More Than 4M Above GRD Level And Crown Thin By Up To 30% Of Sycamore (Subject To Tpo 162/2/57/L)

2001: Crown Thinning (By 20%) Of Ginkgo Tree (Subject To T.P.O 162/2/57/L)

Planning Assessment

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

The tree has a single stem that is clear to 4 metres and extends to 5 metres, where it then divides into several smaller stems. The secondary stems each support many laterals, some of which are wider spread. The main crown is high dense and moderately wide spread with some slightly over extended laterals.

The proposed works are to fell and replace the tree. The reasons given for its removal are difficulties with entrance and exiting the property due to a phone pole on the north side of the driveway, and claims that the tree is progressively leaning toward the north,

The main concern would appear to be the restricted vehicular access to the property mostly due to the telegraph pole positioned to the north of the entrance driveway, which would have been installed after the TPO was confirmed. The application claims that the slight lean toward the north will reduce access further, I have seen no reason to assume this, other than secondary thickening, which given that the tree is already over eighty years old, significant increase in width seems unlikely.

Other reasons given are claims the tree is interfering with adjacent Ginkgo tree, excessive shading and interference with TV reception.

The Sycamore tree and adjacent Ginkgo, form group G1 of Adur Tree Preservation Order No.162/2/57(L) of 1957, as part of a cohesive pair, this is suggested on the original TPO plan that shows intertwined crowns. The issue of shading could be alleviated by tree works such as crown lifting thinning or reduction in radial spread. Also the two trees are located to the east of the dwelling, resulting in only limited intervals of shade. It is claimed that the property's TV reception is disrupted by the tree when in leaf, although this is not considered to be a viable consideration with TPO trees, it is noted that many aerials in the area are pointing Southwest (Isle of Wight Rowridge transmitting station).

Due to the age and amenity of the group of trees G1, it is recommended that the proposed felling of the Sycamore tree of group G1 be refused, and that works other than felling other are considered.

Recommendation

REFUSE for the reason(s):-

1. The two trees of group G1 are a prominent and established feature, which contribute positively to the local character and landscape of the area, and the removal of the Sycamore tree from the group would be detrimental to these qualities. Having regard to the maturity, stature and prominence within the street scene of the tree, there is no arboricultural or other acceptable reason provided which would justify its loss.

Is recommendation contrary to letter(s) of representation?

No

Case Officer: JDS Date: 02/04/2019

Authorised by: PB Date: 2/4/19