



ARBORICULTURAL PLANNING CONSULTANTS

THE OLD POST OFFICE
DORKING ROAD
TADWORTH
SURREY KT20 5SA

Tel.: (01737) 813058
E-mail: sja@sjatrees.co.uk

Directors: Simon R. M. Jones Dip. Arb. (RFS), FArborA., RCArborA. (Managing)
Frank P. S. Spooner BSc (Hons), MArborA, TechCert (ArborA), RCArborA. (Operations)

Horsham District Council Planning Department
Albery House
Springfield Road
Horsham
RH12 2GB

19th August 2026

SJA Ref: 25319

Ref. DC/26/0640- Cedar Cottage Sandygate Lane Lower Beeding

1. I write in response to comments made by the case officer in respect of the arboricultural implications of the above-mentioned planning application. The officer's comments were as follows:

“Removal of plots 7 & 13

- *concern is raised regarding the proximity of the plot and the existing treeline, which is likely to result in a poor relationship and shading concerns. This places the trees at considerable risk of future lopping or felling pressure, which would further erode the site's landscape character and amenity value. Please amend.*
- *as per earlier comments on Plot 7 - within the RPA of 'notable' T19, which benefits from a TPO. While recognised that the current buffer zone is larger than the BS minimum requirements, the removal of this parcel will allow for the delivery of a more meaningful open space that can deliver on the amenity typology as per the requirements of Horsham District Council's Open Space, Sports & Recreation Review 2021 (OSSR)”*

The purpose of this response is to address the arboricultural concerns raised in relation to plots 7 and 13 and to confirm why, on arboricultural grounds, the revised layout can be supported without the removal of either plot.

2. In respect to plot no. 13, the dwelling is outside of the shadow patterns of the retained trees (nos. 22-26) along the west site boundary. The trees along the boundary will provide afternoon shade for the parking bays and along the western side of the garden; however, these spaces will benefit from morning and mid-day sun until the sun drops beyond the canopies of the trees. I would add that in the context of a

warming climate, that the shading will have significant benefits for the local microclimate of the dwelling, helping to relieve the heat gain on the garden and property.

3. In terms of the relationship to the tree canopies, there is 3m clearance between the western elevation and the closest tree canopy, which is sufficient clearance for construction and to accommodate future canopy growth. The oaks (the largest canopied trees along the boundary) are capable of achieving crown spreads between 20 to 25m (10 to 12.5m radius from trunk). The dwelling is outside of the range of the future canopy growth of these except in relation to oak no. 24.

4. The dwelling is 11m from the trunk of the closest oak (no. 24), so in the future it is possible that the canopy will need to be managed to accommodate the future growth of the canopy. Mature oaks are relatively slow growing so average canopy growths will likely range between 200mm to 400mm annually, so it would take between 7.5 to 15 years for the canopy to span the gap to the dwelling. The extent of pruning necessary will be minimal to mitigate the risk of direct contact with a 1 to 2m reduction of the east canopy, there after the cycle of pruning would be required every 5 to 10 years; which is entirely reasonable and there is no indication that the specimen will not tolerate this pruning.

5. A review of the garden space (c230m²) highlights that 35% is covered by canopy, which gives a significant area (150m²) uncovered, which highlights that the garden space is not in a poor relationship with the retained canopies. Considering the future canopy growth, the smaller canopies associated with the false acacia and trees within G8 could reasonably be pruned along the property line to maintain a vegetative boundary, none of these trees contribute to the site's landscape character and pruning them back to the property line would have no material impact on amenity. As discussed above, the mature oak no. 24 will grow but at relatively slow pace such that the garden will always benefit from a significant area of uncovered garden space.

6. The proposed pruning set out in the tree protection plan (crown lift east canopy from 2m to 3.5m) coupled with the pruning regime set out above, would also alleviate the concerns and ensure a positive relationship between the property and the tree.

7. As such, our assessment concludes that the dwellings and its garden is designed to ensure a positive relationship between the property and the retained trees. I would add that the consultee comments in relation to this plot from Andy Bush have been addressed in the revised layout by relocating the dwelling 3m outside of the canopy extent of the tree, the orientation of the dwelling altered as recommended and avoiding any incursions into the RPA of oak no. 24.

8. In relation to plot no. 7, although the comment refers to notable oak no. 19, the substantive issue appears to concern open space provision rather than arboricultural impact, which falls outside the scope of this arboricultural response. The arboricultural implications associated with plot no. 7 have been addressed in our submitted report, and Andy Bush concluded that, subject to appropriate post-development measures, there was no arboricultural objection to either the road or the plot.

Yours sincerely

SJAtrees

Simon Jones Associates Limited