HORSHAM DISTRICT COUNCIL CONSULTATION

TO:	Horsham District Council – Planning Dept
LOCATION:	Bucks Cottage Tismans Common Rudgwick RH12 3BJ
DESCRIPTION:	Alterations to Boundary wall (Householder)
REFERENCE:	DC/24/1986
RECOMMENDATION:	Advice / More info
2nd set of comments in Red	Advice / More info

SUMMARY OF COMMENTS & RECOMMENDATION:

From my recent site visit and discussions with the applicant on site, it is apparent that a fair amount of roadside vegetation and trees would need to be removed for the new wall to be built as proposed. In this respect it is worth noting that there are several standing dead trees in this area, which will need to be removed regardless of the outcome of the application. However, more information is needed to make a to make a fair assessment of the tree-related / landscape impacts of the development proposal at the site.

MAIN COMMENTS:

My main observation with the proposal is how the new wall would be constructed where it needs to go behind the roadside Oak, which is very visible in the local street scene. If the wall were to be built using a standard trench footing, it would result in a high level of root severance that would be detrimental to the tree's health and structural stability, and likely result in the loss of the tree. One solution to address this would be to bridge this section of the wall, with a concrete lintel and then build the wall atop of the lintel.

To make a fair assessment of the tree-related impacts of the development proposal. Such as tree removals and how the retained trees will be successfully retained, and new planning proposals. Please request a BS 5837 compliant Tree Survey and Arboricultural Impact Assessment including appropriate tree protection measures. This information should be prepared by a person who has, through relevant education, training and experience, gained expertise in the field of trees in relation to construction.

The current BS5837 (2012) Trees in relation to design, demolition and construction—Recommendations provides full guidance on the survey information, tree protection plan, and impact assessment that should be provided with an application. Using the methodology set out in the BS should help ensure that development is suitably integrated with trees and that potential conflicts are avoided.

Regrettably, the additional tree information provided does not satisfactorily address the points I have previously raised with the development proposals at the site, and the impact on trees of high landscape value. Whereby, it is acknowledged that the document has identified that several poor-quality trees would need to be removed in this area for the new wall to be erected. However, when read in conjunction with the proposed site plan it is not clear exactly which trees are proposed to be removed and which ones are going to be retained, nor are their Root Protection Areas RPAs plotted; as such it is not possible to make a fair assessment of the tree related impacts of the development proposal form the submitted information.

In addition, there is no reference as to how they're going to get around the issue of building the wall in a manner where it is not going to significantly impact the roots of the roadside oak tree and its viability for long-term retention. The only mention of this issue in the tree report is –

"The Oak tree can be left due to its visual amenity taking care of the root system when building the wall to prevent any damage."

Without the submission of a detailed specification setting out how the wall will be built where it falls with the RPA of the oak tree in question i.e engineering solution such as bridging the RPA, it is not possible to make an informed assessment of the impacts of the development proposals at the site which if undertaken without regard to the oaks key rooting area, will result in harm to the tree, and significantly impact its viability for long term retention.

ANY RECOMMENDED CONDITIONS: None at this stage

NAME:	Andy Bush Arboricultural Officer
DEPARTMENT:	Strategic Planning Specialist Team
DATE:	08/04/2025