From: **Chris Partridge** <chris.partridge@adur-worthing.gov.uk>
Date: Fri, 9 Oct 2026 at 10:44
Subject: AWDM/0593/26 - Land South Of Lyne House 20 Links Road
To: Louise Prew <louise.prew@adur-worthing.gov.uk>

Hi Louise,

Apologies for the delay in getting my comments back to in regard to AWDM/0593/26, please see below:

Site: Land south of Lyne House, 20 Links Road, Worthing
Document reviewed: Arboricultural Impact Assessment & Method Statement, Arbortrack Systems Ltd, ref. *jwmb/rpt2/lynehouse/AIAAMS*, dated 6 May 2022.

Tree Officer Comments

I have reviewed the submitted Arboricultural Impact Assessment and Method Statement (AIA/AMS) prepared by Arbortrack Systems Ltd.

The assessment is based upon a tree survey undertaken on 18 November 2021, with the AIA/AMS subsequently dated 6 May 2022. The report identifies a number of trees within and adjacent to the site, including trees subject to Tree Preservation Order No. 23 of 1990.

The proposed development would necessitate the removal of trees T5, part G6, T7-T10, part G11, G14, T18, T19, T22, T33 and G34. These are principally assessed within the submitted survey as Category C trees, with T10 assessed as Category U. I would not raise an objection solely to the removal of these lower-quality trees, subject to suitable replacement planting being secured as part of an appropriate landscaping scheme.

Of greater arboricultural significance are the retained Category B trees and the off-site trees whose RPAs potentially interact with the development. In particular, attention is drawn to G12, a group of mature off-site Leyland cypress, where the proposed driveway passes through the calculated RPA. The AIA recognises this conflict and proposes use of a specialist RootBridge construction system.

Whilst the principle of a specialist low-impact/no-dig construction within the RPA may be acceptable, the submitted AIA does not, in my view, contain sufficient site-specific construction information to allow this element simply to be left to the contractor. The report itself states that details of the RootBridge construction are to be agreed through discharge of condition. If planning permission is granted, I therefore recommend that a detailed, site-specific arboricultural construction method for this section of driveway is secured prior to commencement. This should include existing and proposed levels, the precise extent of the specialist construction, foundation/ground-screw locations where applicable, installation

methodology, final surfacing, edge restraint, drainage arrangements, means of preventing excavation within the RPA and arboricultural supervision requirements.

The report also identifies hardstanding within the RPA of T32, a mature Category B copper beech, although this is stated to amount to less than 5% of the RPA and is considered by the consultant to represent a very low impact. T32 is identified as TPO protected and has a calculated 13.4 m RPA. Appropriate tree protection and control of construction activity in this area will therefore be important.

I also note an apparent inconsistency within the AIA that should be clarified. The summary table at section 4.1 refers to specialist "No Dig" construction for T15 and G12, and Appendix E provides a no-dig cellular confinement specification. However, section 3.7.1 specifically discusses only the RootBridge treatment in relation to G12, and section 4.1 does not clearly identify T15 within the "Trees Affected" column for the hardstanding item. The applicant's arboricultural consultant should therefore clarify exactly where no-dig construction is required in relation to T15 and ensure this is unambiguously identified on an updated Tree Protection Plan/AMS.

A further concern is the age of the underlying tree survey. The survey was undertaken in November 2021 and therefore, as at October 2026, is approaching five years old. Given the time elapsed, the condition, dimensions and management history of the trees may have changed. I recommend that the applicant be required to provide an updated arboricultural survey/site verification by a suitably qualified arboriculturist, confirming that the tree data, categorisation, RPAs and conclusions of the AIA remain valid and identifying any changes which have occurred since the original inspection.

Tree Protection and Arboricultural Supervision

The submitted Tree Protection Plan provides for protective fencing and ground protection. The AMS requires the tree protection barriers to be installed prior to construction and retained for the duration of the works. It also provides for ground protection within potentially affected RPAs. These principles are supported.

However, the submitted monitoring arrangements are relatively open-ended. The report states that the designated arboriculturist will attend on a basis to be agreed with the client and Local Planning Authority "when/if appropriate or required". Given the construction proposed within RPAs, I consider that specific arboricultural supervision hold points should be secured rather than supervision being optional.

These should include, as a minimum:

1. A pre-commencement inspection following installation of tree protection fencing and ground protection.
2. Arboricultural supervision of the installation of specialist/no-dig construction within the RPA of G12 and any equivalent works affecting T15.

3. Supervision of any unexpected excavation, service installation or other works required within an RPA.
4. A completion inspection prior to or following removal of tree protection measures, as appropriate.

The AMS states that new service runs should avoid RPAs where possible but provides generic measures where incursion proves unavoidable. I would prefer this matter to be resolved at design stage rather than through a generic provision. The final drainage and utility layout should therefore demonstrate that services avoid retained-tree RPAs wherever practicable. Any unavoidable incursion should first be agreed with the LPA and supported by an arboricultural method statement.

Recommendation

Subject to the above matters being satisfactorily addressed, I would not raise an objection in principle on arboricultural grounds.

I recommend that, prior to determination where practicable, the applicant provides:

- an updated arboricultural inspection/survey confirming that the November 2021 tree data and AIA conclusions remain current;
- clarification of the treatment proposed within the RPA of T15 and corresponding amendments to the Tree Protection Plan/AMS where necessary; and
- confirmation that the proposed layout, including drainage/services, remains consistent with the tree protection constraints identified within the AIA.

If the Case Officer is otherwise minded to approve the application, conditions should secure:

1. Updated/final Arboricultural Method Statement and Tree Protection Plan
No development, including site clearance other than agreed arboricultural works, shall commence until a final Arboricultural Method Statement and Tree Protection Plan have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

2. Tree protection
All approved protective fencing and ground protection shall be installed before commencement and retained in accordance with the approved arboricultural documents for the duration of construction. No storage, excavation, level changes, fires, mixing of materials, movement of plant or other construction activity shall take place within protected areas except where expressly approved.

3. Specialist construction within RPAs
Prior to construction of any driveway, parking area or other hard surface within the RPA of a retained tree, detailed site-specific construction information shall be submitted and approved, including existing/proposed levels, construction depth, supporting

structure/foundations, surfacing, edging, drainage and installation methodology. The approved works shall be undertaken under arboricultural supervision.

4. Arboricultural supervision
The agreed arboricultural supervision programme and hold points shall be implemented, with written records/site photographs retained and provided to the Local Planning Authority upon request.

5. Services
No services or drainage shall be installed within the RPA of a retained tree unless specifically shown within the approved plans or subsequently agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority together with an appropriate arboricultural method statement.

6. Replacement planting/landscaping
A suitable landscaping scheme should secure replacement tree planting to mitigate the proposed removals, with species and locations selected to provide meaningful long-term canopy and amenity value.

Overall Arboricultural Position

No objection in principle, subject to updated arboricultural information/clarification and robust conditions.

The principal issues requiring control are the age of the 2021 survey, protection of the retained TPO and Category B tree stock, the driveway construction within the RPA of off-site G12, clarification of the treatment around T15, and ensuring that arboricultural supervision is expressly required rather than discretionary.

Kind regards,

Chris