



HORSHAM DISTRICT COUNCIL CONSULTATION

TO:	Horsham District Council – Planning Dept
LOCATION:	Land Adjacent To 1 Woodcot, New Road, Billingshurst
DESCRIPTION:	Erection of a chalet style self-build dwelling with associated access from New Road and driveway/car parking
REFERENCE:	DC-26-1138
RECOMMENDATION:	Advice
SUMMARY OF COMMENTS & RECOMMENDATION:	
The direct arboricultural impacts of tree and hedgerow loss could be mitigated by replacement planting of indigenous species in keeping with the local rural landscape setting which could be controlled by condition in the short term. The mature roadside oak tree would dominate the rear amenity space and potentially be under future pressure for lopping/felling in the future.	
MAIN COMMENTS:	
The application is accompanied by a tree survey and arboricultural impact assessment (AIA) that considers the proposed extent of tree and hedgerow loss to be acceptable. I do not concur that the trees to be removed all have a safe useful life expectancy of less than 10 years. The quantum of proposed development requires removal of a section of young roadside hedgerow trees, retention and bulking up/re-instatement of a section of the lane side hedgerow and the removal of a belt of aged formerly coppiced Field maples and other surrounding trees and replacement with a 1.8m high new boundary hedge to the North. Due to the elevated boundary bank the Field maples are set upon, some levels alterations would be required. The extent of tree loss would have a short term detrimental impact on the rural character of the locality subject to control of mitigation planting. The principal individual tree of merit is the roadside oak tree (T2 of submitted survey). I consider the tree to be of fair form and condition and to make a positive contribution to the landscape character of the area. The tree has a minimum recommended root protection area (RPA) that should be plotted and off-set to account for the rooting constraint posed by the adjacent engineered	

highway and services within it. The AIA does not do this and thus incorrectly implies that the tree is rooting beneath and beyond the road.

The RPA of the tree would encompass most of the remaining soft ground area to the rear of the proposed build footprint and thus all hard landscaping and associated latter pd desires (no hardstanding indicated on submissions in rear amenity area despite patio doors) have the potential to harm the trees current key rooting environment.

The trees height and branch spread would dominate the relatively small rear amenity space and foreseeably be under significant future pressure for lopping/felling in the future due to the constrained nature of the site and foreseeable associated recreational use/desires.

The space proposed to be barriered off from development process in the draft tree protection plan is not IME either sufficient or realistic bearing in mind the highway constraints on the site, the size of the build proposed or the logistics of a development of the footprint proposed. The draft TPP/AMS would therefore require amendment if planning considerations have significantly altered since the last application for similar development at the site (DC/16/1415).

ANY RECOMMENDED CONDITIONS:

Yes, if minded to approve –

standard pre-commencement conditions 3.9 - Arboricultural Method Statement required

and condition to control all hard and soft landscaping – standard condition 5.4 subject to Landscape Team agreement

NAME:	ANDY CLOUT – ASST. ARBORICULTURAL OFFICER
DEPARTMENT:	STRATEGIC PLANNING - SPECIALISTS
DATE:	19/08/26