Development Management – Delegated Officer Report **Date; 27/03/14**

Application Number **AWDM/0177/14**

Site Address: **28 Church Lane Southwick BN42 4GB**

Proposal: **Section 211 Notice under the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 to remove one Beech and one Sycamore tree, Reduce one Hazel tree by up to 3 metres, Reduce radial spread by up to 2 metres on selected branches on Holm Oak, Macrocarpa, and Ash trees, and reduce radial spread by up to 4 metres on one Willow tree in the Southwick Conservation Area.**

Date of site visit: 13/03/14

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

Proposal, Site and Surroundings

The application refers to 7 trees in the grounds of 28 Church Lane Southwick. The trees are all on land to the east of a shared driveway for numbers 28 and 30, which runs between Southwick Rectory and 26 Church Lane.

The trees are;

Tree	Location	Consent is sought to
T1 = Beech	Adjacent to flint boundary wall in Southeast corner.	Fell
T2 = Sycamore	Adjacent to flint boundary wall in Southeast corner.	Fell
T3 = Holm Oak	Centre of Southern section of area	Reduce large limb on east side by up to 2 metres
T4 = Macrocarpa	Centre of Southern section of area	Reduce two large limbs on east side each by up to 2 metres
T5 = Ash	Slightly back from flint wall to the south	Remove three lowest branches over road and clear street lamp by up to 2 metres
T6 = Willow	North end of driveway	Reduce radial spread by up to 4 metres
T7 = Hazel	East side close to fencing	Reduce height by up to 3 metres

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

Consultations: None

Representations: Comments received from the Adur District Conservation Advisory Group stating that the trees are "*an important feature & the Group members feel that considerable care should be taken to enhance this rural vista within this old area of Southwick*". The group itemised what its members felt should be encouraged, which are;

Hazel - should be reduced by 2 metres only – Having inspected the tree a three metre reduction does not seem to be unreasonable

Beech – it is agreed this tree should be moderately reshaped not felled

Sycamore - same comments apply – In both cases these trees would not comply with the Councils guidance on preserving trees, therefore if not made subject of a TPO no other conditions can be enforced. However it is considered that the removal of the poor specimen trees will make the Ash tree T5 more visible.

Willow – this tree is of a too small size for the proposed work – **refuse –** The reduction in radial spread would be 4 metres in total rather than 4 metres all around, which it is felt would be standard maintenance.

The group suggested that they would refer to the opinion of the Councils Arboricultural Officer to asses the proposed works to trees T3 T4 and T5.

Relevant Planning History

1976: Southwick Conservation Area designated in June 1976 and included three distinct and separate areas: Manor House, The Green and Church Lane.

Planning Assessment

The trees are medium sized trees growing in

Tree	Description/condition
T1 = Beech	Small to medium sized tree, growing very close to the flint boundary wall. The tree is intertwined with T2, and has distorted growth with few up right branches. The tree has been cut back several times to reduce from the footpath.
T2 = Sycamore	As with T1 this tree is severely restricted by its proximity to the wall and the Beech tree. Many branches are crossed and rubbing, and there are several lost or reduced stems at ground level. Due to the restricted growth and poor form neither tree T1 or T2 would be considered suitable for a TPO, therefore permission to fell is recommended.
T3 = Holm Oak	Good specimen tree growing a reasonable distance from each boundary. The tree is around 14 metres tall and very prominent tree to the area. The works requested to reduce one eastside limb by up to 2 metres, is to alleviate overhang into neighbour's garden and will not affect the form of the tree.
T4 = Macrocarpa	This tree is around 14 metres tall, and although a reasonably good tree, there is damage to the central leader, which has not successfully re-grown. The proposed works are to reduce the two most extended branches to the East side by up to 2 metres, which will not affect the form of the tree, or its contribution to the area
T5 = Ash	Medium sized tree that was previously twin stemmed. The remaining stem is around 11 metres tall and has good form and is unaffected by the adjoining stump ended stem. Some works are required to clear the street light to the south and works are proposed to reduce the east side by up to 2 metres to reshape the tree and reduce overhang into garden. These works will enhance the trees amenity value, as will the removal of trees T1 and T2 which will allow more space for T5 and make it more visible from the public highway.
T6 = Willow	Tall stand alone tree at the northern end of the site. The tree is around 15 metres tall and can be seen from many views. The proposed works are to reduce the radial spread of the crown by a total of 4 metres, making a

	reduction of up to 2 metres on each compass point of the crown.
T7 = Hazel	Although included as a tree the Hazel T7 has previously been "coppiced" to ground level, resulting in a mass of small stems which reach a height of up to 9 metres. The proposed works are to continue the same management of the tree to a less drastic extent, by reducing the crown height by up to 3 metres.

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 their contribution to the character of the Southwick Conservation Area.

Recommendation

Grant Consent, subject to the following Conditions:

1. Proposed works, hereby permitted, shall be restricted to those specified in the application, only, unless otherwise agreed in writing with the LPA, 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?

Yes, one letter from the Adur District Conservation Advisory Group, which proposed the retaining of trees T1 and T2.

Case Officer: JDS Date: 27/03/2014

Authorised by: PD Date: 27.3.14