



Horsham
District
Council

HORSHAM DISTRICT COUNCIL CONSULTATION

TO:	Horsham District Council – Planning Dept
LOCATION:	Haynes Littleworth Lane Partridge Green
DESCRIPTION:	Erection of detached two-storey dwelling and creation of new vehicle access and driveway from Littleworth Lane.
REFERENCE:	DC/25/1531
RECOMMENDATION:	Advice / Modification
SUMMARY OF COMMENTS & RECOMMENDATION:	
The supporting arboricultural documents provide a fair assessment of the tree stock at the site and set out how the retained trees would be protected during the construction phase of the development, if approved. They are largely compatible with BS 5837:2012. However, observations are made regarding the risk of future resident pressure arising from the proximity of the new dwelling to retained large trees, particularly the two Oaks, T7 and T9.	

MAIN COMMENTS:

Site Layout Observations

No trees on the site are subject to statutory controls, such as a Tree Preservation Order, nor is the site located within a Conservation Area.

The limited spatial separation between trees T7 and T9 (both Oaks) is noted. The position of T9, immediately north of the new dwelling, is likely to create foreseeable post-development conflicts. This includes potential concerns from future residents about falling tree detritus (such as acorns during a mast year), as well as leaf drop, bird excreta, and perceived safety issues associated with crown encroachment toward the northern flank wall of the dwelling. There is a credible risk of future resident pressure for inappropriate pruning or removal of T9.

If built as proposed, T9 will never reach its full potential as a landscape and visual amenity feature. Consideration should therefore be given to increasing the separation distance between T9 and the new dwelling. This could reasonably be achieved by shifting the building 3 m to the south. It is noted that the ARB report recommends crown lifting T9 to improve light, which, in my opinion, indicates that the relationship between the tree and the dwelling would be constrained enough to cause post-development issues.

The tree-to-building relationship with T7 is better than that with T9. However, given its location on the eastern boundary, T7 will at certain times of day (morning) restrict natural light entering the eastern section of the garden and likely the eastern part of the dwelling, including the patio area shown on the TPP.

Tree Removals

The scheme proposes the removal of the following trees and hedges:

- **H1** – Category C hedge (front boundary – new access)
- **G1** – Category C mixed Elm & Wild Plum group (driveway footprint)
- **T2** – Category C Pear (driveway footprint)
- **H3** – Category C Photinia hedge (driveway footprint)
- **T6** – Category B Sweet Gum (house footprint)
- **T13** – Category U Oak (decline, decay, Ganoderma; fell recommended)

The loss of **T6** (Category B) is regrettable. The justification provided is based on the building footprint positioning. However, given the tree's position set back from Littleworth Lane to the west, its loss could be compensated through appropriate mitigation planting, preferably near the new access.

The removal of **T13** (Category U) is acceptable due to its limited merit and poor condition and is acceptable and will not have any wider landscape impact.

All other vegetation proposed for removal is low quality (Category C), these removals will not result in any significant wider landscape harm, subject to appropriate mitigation planting.

Root Protection Area (RPA) Observations & Tree Protection Measures

The report states that the proposed dwelling and associated hard surfacing remain outside the RPAs of retained trees. A review of the TPP, and on site observations supports this assessment and this is satisfactory.

Where the new access drive intersects the RPAs of boundary hedges (H2 and H4), a 150 mm Cellweb no-dig system is proposed. This is compliant with BS 5837 and acceptable in this instance.

The TPP shows Tree Protection Fencing located outside RPAs, defining Construction Exclusion Zones (CEZs). The specification provided (Appendix 5-6) is appropriate.

Service routing—such as fresh and foul water—has not been defined at this stage. Any future routing must avoid RPAs or follow NJUG 4 trenchless methodology where avoidance is not possible.

ANY RECOMMENDED CONDITIONS: None at this stage

NAME:	Andy Bush Arboricultural Officer
DEPARTMENT:	Strategic Planning (Specialist Team)
DATE:	11/11/25