From: planning@adur-worthing.gov.uk <planning@adur-worthing.gov.uk>
Sent: 05 November 2024 14:51:56 UTC+00:00
To: "planning@adur-worthing.gov.uk" <planning@adur-worthing.gov.uk>
Subject: Comments for Planning Application AWDM/1202/24

Comments summary

Dear Sir/Madam,

Planning Application comments have been made. A summary of the comments is provided below.

Comments were submitted at 05/11/2024 2:51 PM from Ms Pamela Kelly.

Application Summary

Address:	Beechwood Court Tennyson Road Worthing West Sussex
Proposal:	Application for consent under Worthing Tree Preservation Order No.10 of 1997 to reduce radial spread to South by up to 2 metres, crown lift up to 3 to 6 metres,over Road and Footpath one Sycamore tree T2.
Case Officer:	Jeremy Sergeant

Click for further information

Customer Details

Name:	Ms Pamela Kelly
Address:	51 Richmond Road, Worthing, West Sussex BN11 4AF

Comments Details

Commenter Type:	Member of the Public
Stance:	Customer objects to the Planning Application
Reasons for comment:	- Loss of General Amenity - Other - Trees and Landscaping
Comments:	Dear Mr Sergeant, I may have just missed the deadline for comments, but see there do not appear to be any at all, very sad, so hope you will consider this. My objections to this application are 1. The amount of work proposed to this tree is excessive. By my

calculation the amount proposed for crown lifting of 3 up to 6 metres over the road and footpath is enormous. At 6 m it would mean almost the entire equivalent height of my two storey house being removed. The lower limit of 3m does not reassure me; it is still nearly 10 feet, so twice the height of a 5' person. Probably at minimum the whole storey of a building. The application says "to comply with highway regulations" and I have experience of talking to a tree surgeon who used that very argument to justify taking off more from a neighbour's tree than had been approved by your department in the past. I have not measured amounts on this tree itself but I see no sign of an obstruction to traffic due to this tree. There is no foliage knocked off by the large number of very large vehicles travelling along the western part of Richmond Road. I would know if there were because I cycle past the tree on a daily basis and because of the pot holes am forced to study the road ahead and am very familiar with the hasards on the road at that point. There is never any apparent tree debris on the road so nothing appears to hit it, despite the size of the Brakes food supplies lorries. If by any chance it is getting close to the size where a lorry might hit it then permission to remove up to 6m is certainly excessive. Looking at Google Streetview (dated April 2021) I can see that one lower branch might have become a potential problem but this is a shot when the leaves are off the tree and so it appears to me to be no more than the one bough. Therefore in terms of loss of general amenity, trees & landscaping, I believe this permission request is decidedly excessive because Richmond Road, in the adjacent conservation area, has already lost several pavement trees, to the detriment of the area itself which used to be an avenue of trees. This is a beautiful and healthy (according to the applicant himself) specimen which contributes to the visual amenity of the area itself as well as the adjacent conservation area. It helps to clean the air on a busy road (A259).
2. The public is slow to see the need for trees in order to mitigate the effects of climate change. Most agree that more trees need to be planted and in huge numbers, but do not necessarily feel or know the benefits of existing mature trees. Their localised cooling effect has been particularly noticeable during recent summer's hot spells, because this is an area of brick, concrete and tarmac. In addition they take up a lot of excess water and so should be considered as part of the strategy for reducing surface water which then contributes to sewage spills, and we know the local company, Southern Water, has already been fined for excessive sewage releases on many occasions.
3. In terms of "other" reasons to object, I am also personally aware that a lot of applications to do with trees are really because people object to the leaves in the autumn, but they hide this in the applications. It is not honest or ethical to do so, whatever the case here. In addition people object to loss of light, but we all have to balance this out against climate change (heatwaves, flooding and sewage in the sea and on the town's beaches) and the wider need for preserving our trees, even if we have north facing rooms. We

all need to cool our towns and maintain the dirt filter of the leaves, especially in busy and dirty areas, which Richmond Road has become. In this particular case I request that you consider a small amount of work on the radial spread on the south side if the branches are too close to windows, but I fear up to 2 m will result in more drastic action by a tree surgeon because I have seen it happen, opposite and behind my own house. Unfortunately Planning Enforcement is a bit too late by the time the tree has been decimated, as most people know. This problem is easily exploited. I would not like the tree to be damaged by a lorry as that could lead to a disease invading the tree, but I think this application is really excessive and from experience could be even worse when work is done.
My apologies for this late submission but cycling and watching the road led to me not seeing the notice in time. I saw it only when I walked past. Thank you for your consideration,
Pamela Kelly
51 Richmond Road

Kind regards