



HORSHAM DISTRICT COUNCIL CONSULTATION

TO:	Horsham District Council – Planning Dept
LOCATION:	The Hyde Rusper Road Ifield West Sussex
DESCRIPTION:	Outline Application for redevelopment of the site to provide up to 7 dwellings, infrastructure, ancillary parking and landscaping with all matters reserved except access
REFERENCE:	DC/26/0207
RECOMMENDATION:	Advice / More info
SUMMARY OF COMMENTS & RECOMMENDATION:	
While the trees on site have been surveyed and an Arboricultural Survey and a Tree Constraints Plan has been provided, and the way in which the trees have been recorded within the survey does accord with the principles set within BS5837: 2012. However, unfortunately, the level of detail within the Survey is insufficient to make a proper assessment of the potential tree-related impacts of the development proposals at the site. Whereby, due to the extent of tree coverage at the site, coupled with the housing density in a relatively compact space, it would have been beneficial if the tree survey had been supported by Arboricultural Impact Assessment (AIA), that makes reference to the number of trees proposed to be removed to facilitate the scheme, identifies any sensitive works within the root protection areas of trees to be retained for example. The AIA should also be supported by to Arboricultural Method Statement (AMS); and Tree Protection Plan (TPP). These documents should be prepared in full accordance with BS 5837:2012 and provide sufficient detail to enable an informed assessment of the proposals, regarding the tree related impacts of the scheme. To appropriately assess the proposed development's impact on existing trees, please request Arboricultural Impact Assessment (AIA), Arboricultural Method Statement (AMS); and a detailed Tree Protection Plan (TPP) with any underground utilities such as fresh and foul water clearly plotted on the plan.	
MAIN COMMENTS:	
From what information is available, it is evident, that the development proposals seek to remove the G9 the group of mature Leyland cypress, (<i>Cupressus x leylandii</i>). These were likely planted to screen the existing dwelling at the site from the wider urban area to the east, which they do very well. The trees in G9 by virtue of their location, scale and orientation, do represent a significant landscape feature, mostly because of their high visibility when viewed from within the	

public domain. Although, it is acknowledged that in pure Arboricultural terms the overall quality of trees in G9, when assessed as individual specimens is modest. However, when assess as a group they do contribute to the visual character and amenities of the area, and their removal would be noticeable.

The retention of the trees T10 - Lime, T11 - Oak, T12 - Sycamore, T13 - Norway maple, T14 - Purple leaved sycamore, and T15 - Norway maple, along the eastern boundary and within the rear gardens of Units 4-6, would limit levels of natural light to the rear garden areas of these units, particularly during morning periods, with additional overshadowing arising in the afternoon due to the proximity and position of the proposed dwellings. This relationship is unsustainable for the long-term and would giving rise to a likely and foreseeable pressure from future occupiers for excessive pruning or removal.

It noted that the Root Protection Area (RPA) for Tree T5 a Hornbeam, as advised on the proposed site plan, places a substantial proportion of the RPA is shown within the existing pond, which is not representative of the tree's functional rooting environment. Whereby, no significant rooting would have occurred beneath the pond, suggesting that the majority of the tree's roots would instead extend beneath the proposed access road and toward Unit 4. When assessed on this basis, the development incursion as set out in proposed site plan strongly implies the works in the RPA likely to exceed the 20% threshold advised within **BS 5837:2012**, and the submitted information does not allow for an accurate assessment of this impact.

In addition, insufficient detail has been provided to demonstrate how the proposed access road serving Unit 1 could be constructed without causing harm to the mature oak trees located to the south-east. The absence of detailed construction methodology and tree protection measures prevents an informed arboricultural assessment of this part of the proposals.

Overall, the proposal in its current form dose not demonstrate that the development can be delivered without harm to retained trees at the site, or that a sustainable long-term relationship between trees and the new dwellings can be achieved. Which brings the proposal into conflict with Policy 33 of the HDNPF 2015, which seeks the successful retention of key landscape features, such as trees and hedges.

ANY RECOMMENDED CONDITIONS: None at this stage.

NAME:	Andy Bush Arboricultural officer (Planning)
DEPARTMENT:	STRATEGIC PLANNING - SPECIALISTS
DATE:	21/04/26