
From: Andrew.Clout
Sent: 19 April 2023 17:21
To: Nicola.Pettifer
Cc: Trees
Subject: DC/23/0406 - Land parcel at Park Lane Ashington with proposed access from Church Lane

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Hi Nicola,

Further to your consultation request to the Trees team in respect of the application for the demolition of the existing buildings and erection of 180 dwellings, sports pavilion, sport pitches and allotments; with associated access, landscaping, open space and infrastructure at the above site, I make the following observations and recommendations:

The landscape of the site includes a number of mature trees in the copses and hedgerows bounding the site and forming the historic field layout delineations. There are also a few additional individual specimens of note that likewise make a positive contribution to landscape character and would enhance any re-development of the land.

The majority of mature trees and landscape features are shown for retention.

The application submissions include a tree survey and AIA produced by Ian Keen Consultants. The way in which the information is submitted makes accurate assessment of how many development/tree rooting incursions occur and how far the minimum recommendations of the relevant standard (BS5837:2012 Trees in relation to design, demolition and construction – Recommendations) are transgressed, quite difficult to objectively assess.

It is however clear that a number of the mature tree features have engineering required within their minimum recommended root protection areas (RPA's). This includes those around the Western field edge where there is an "indicatively drawn" MUGGA (which presumably requires external lighting and drainage to be installed around the perimeter) and in a number of other pinch points, some of which are referred to in the AIA and others not.

Whilst specialist above ground engineering may be feasible in some of the instances of transgression, the tree rooting constraints on the access road cannot be engineered to an adoptable highway standard and this is foreseeably a stumbling block for the whole development. Raising the road level as proposed may also have an impact on the setting of the adjacent churchyard wall. Provision of services would not be possible from Church Lane without a trenchless method of installation, due to the rooting constraint posed by the dominant churchyard oak tree.

If on balance minded to approve the scheme, I recommend that further detail of the exact MUGGA position and all required excavations within and beyond the footprint that transgress minimum RPA's of retained trees are requested.

Please also request specific engineering intentions and details (as opposed to typical detail provided) of above ground construction specifications, edging and surfacing and all utility connections into RPA's of trees in all areas that fail to comply with the minimum recommendations of the design standard. This information would thus enable a fair assessment of their viability at this key stage of deliberations.

Thanks and regards

Andy

Andrew Clout

Assistant Arboricultural Officer

Telephone: 01403 215515

Email: Trees@horsham.gov.uk



**Horsham
District
Council**

Horsham District Council, Parkside, Chart Way, Horsham, West Sussex RH12 1RL

Telephone: 01403 215100 (calls may be recorded) www.horsham.gov.uk Chief Executive: Jane Eaton