



HORSHAM DISTRICT COUNCIL CONSULTATION

TO:	Horsham District Council – Planning Dept
LOCATION:	Cherrytree Cottage, Pickhurst Lane, Pulborough
DESCRIPTION:	Erection of a self-build dwelling and detached garage with new vehicle access from Black Gate Lane and associated driveway/car parking
REFERENCE:	DC-26-1207
RECOMMENDATION:	Advice / Objection
SUMMARY OF COMMENTS & RECOMMENDATION:	
The garden extension area is defined by the original hedge and trees therein associated with the historic field system of the area. These primary landscape elements continue to make a significant contribution to the visual amenities of the rural landscape. The layout fails to conform with the minimum recommendations of the relevant design standard (BS5837:2012 Trees in relation to design, demolition and construction – Recommendations) for new engineering and habitable development near trees of landscape merit that would afford their longer term retention.	
MAIN COMMENTS:	
The application is accompanied by a tree survey that shows the positions, sizes and species of trees present within the bounding hedgerows. I disagree with some of the assignments of tree grading within the landscape context and the lack of recognition of the foreseeable rooting constraint posed by the adjacent engineered lane. The young planted oak (T2) proposed for removal to enable the access bridge over the ditch has suffered a large stem wound, likely from mechanised verge/hedge maintenance and is thus not viable for longer term retention. The oaks either side of the proposed access (T1 and T3) are both prominent within the lane side hedgerow and are worthy of longer term retention. The RPA's of the trees should be plotted to recognise that the engineered lane adjacent will not have a soil bulk density beneath it that is conducive to root growth. The invasive engineering required for the access bridge over the ditch and associated tie into the existing road profile would be entirely within the two oaks recommended minimum RPA's. A "no-dig drive" as proposed, that would safeguard the roots and key	

rooting areas of the trees in accordance with the relevant design standard, is not a viable option for the majority of the engineering and ditch culverting required to access the site from the Lane. I am unable to support new development that has a foreseeable impact on the future health of the adjacent trees of landscape merit unless there is an overriding justification for the development.

No details of services either to be connected from the road or provided internally to the site have been provided to enable fair assessment of the additional excavations required by the development in this respect. The submitted Tree Protection Plan fails to provide adequate protection for the minimum recommended RPA's of some of the bounding trees principally due to the design siting the detached garage partially within the RPA of another of the mature bounding oak trees (T7).

T13 is the largest oak tree within the historic field boundary hedgeline. It has a relatively symmetrical open grown form and is a good mature example of the species. The tree would dominate the rear amenity area off the dwelling and be a significant constraint on afternoon light to the property. The layout and orientation of development would foreseeably IME lead to future pressure to lop/fell the tree for light/a view.

The central group of young oaks, proposed for removal, were likely planted this century and have yet to achieve wider landscape significance.

If minded to support the application on other planning grounds, I recommend that re-design is considered to overcome the arboricultural shortcomings of the design.

ANY RECOMMENDED CONDITIONS:

Yes – if minded to approve – Standard conditions 3.7 Utilities, 3.8 Pre-commencement Tree Protection requirement and 3.8 Arboricultural Method Statement (AMS) (the submitted AMS document is a draft only at this stage of the planning process and will require updating at the least with exact details of the specialist engineering to be utilised – hence why there is no statutory requirement for an AMS for validation purposes although it may be a useful draft document in explaining possible approaches to safeguarding retained trees)

NAME:	ANDY CLOUT – ASST. ARBORICULTURAL OFFICER
DEPARTMENT:	STRATEGIC PLANNING - SPECIALISTS
DATE:	02/09/26