



## HORSHAM DISTRICT COUNCIL CONSULTATION

|                                       |                                                                                                                                                   |
|---------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <b>TO:</b>                            | Horsham District Council – Planning Dept                                                                                                          |
| <b>LOCATION:</b>                      | Cedar Cottage Sandygate Lane Lower Beeding                                                                                                        |
| <b>DESCRIPTION:</b>                   | Demolition of existing dwelling and erection of 24no. dwellings including the creation of a new access from Sandygate Lane with associated works. |
| <b>REFERENCE:</b>                     | DC/26/0640                                                                                                                                        |
| <b>RECOMMENDATION:</b>                | Advice / Modification                                                                                                                             |
| <b>2<sup>nd</sup> response in Red</b> | <b>Advice / Modification</b>                                                                                                                      |

### SUMMARY OF COMMENTS & RECOMMENDATION:

The application is supported by an Arboricultural Impact Assessment, Method Statement and Tree Protection Plan. From the submitted information, and onsite observations it suggests that the development seeks to retain all trees of high landscape and arboricultural merit and limiting impacts to lower quality Category C specimens.

Except for some minor suggested layout amendments, the scheme is broadly acceptable from an arboricultural perspective; subject requested amendments, strict implementation of tree protection measures, arboricultural supervision and delivery of replacement planting.

Subject to the above matters being satisfactorily addressed, the scheme is otherwise broadly acceptable from an arboricultural perspective.

**The amended submission has addressed a number of the previous arboricultural points raised previously, which is positive, although some matters remain outstanding.**

### MAIN COMMENTS:

#### Trees Proposed for Removal

A total of 16 individual trees, three groups and one hedge are proposed for removal to facilitate the development; these are:

- **T2** – Sweet gum
- **T3** – Evergreen magnolia
- **T7** – Common walnut
- **T21** – Common walnut

- **T43–T45** – Himalayan birch (grouped individuals)
- **T46–T47** – Silver birch
- **T48** – Blue cedar
- **T49** – Variegated holly
- **T50** – Variegated sycamore
- **T52** – Purple maple
- **T53** – Goat willow
- **T54** – Common walnut
- **G2, G3, and G15** – Groups of mixed, small ornamental trees
- **H1** – Mixed species hedge

All of the above trees have been classified as Category C specimens of low arboricultural quality, limited landscape value, or short-term retention potential. Only one mature tree (T7 – walnut) is proposed for removal, No Category A or B trees, are proposed to be removed.

Due to the position of most of the site being set back from the principal areas of public activity within the vicinity, Sandgate Lane to the north the majority of the proposed tree removals are not readily visible from the wider public domain. It's accepted the loss of that hedge and small trees towards the front of the existing dwelling would in the first instance be noticeable, however, these losses could in my opinion be readily mitigated against through an appropriate landscape scheme. As such, the trees identified for removal are not considered to be of wider landscape significance, nor do they represent specimens of any rare or exceptional merit in terms of their species, size, condition or form.

#### **Facilitation Pruning / Tree Surgery**

Surgery works are proposed to two trees shown for retention:

- T1 (Cherry laurel): crown reduction to boundary
- T24 (English oak): crown reduction and crown lift

The works are required to achieve construction clearance and future growth tolerance without over-intervention. The extent of pruning is relatively minor, BS3998 compliant, and will not negatively impact the subject trees or result in any wider amenity impacts.

#### **Root Protection Area (RPA) and site layout Observations**

The following retained trees will experience partial incursions within their identified Root Protection Areas (RPAs) because of the proposed development:

T1 (Cherry laurel) – 6.1% (Proposed foundations)  
 T8 (Lawson cypress) – 2.7% (Proposed parking bays)  
 T13 (Lawson cypress) – 8.4% (Proposed parking bays)  
 T14 (Lawson cypress) – 5.2% (Proposed parking bays)  
 T15 (Lawson cypress) – 2.7% (Proposed parking bays)  
 T17 (Lawson cypress) – 2.8% (Proposed parking bays)  
 T19 (English oak) – 6.0% (Proposed road and foundations)  
 T24 (English oak) – 0.5% (Proposed foundations) 6.4% (Proposed parking bay)  
 T26 (English oak) – 12.8% (Proposed hard surfacing)  
 T34 (Coast redwood) – 0.2% (Proposed foundations)

T42 (English oak – TPO) – 0.04% (Proposed foundations)

T51 (Sycamore) – 0.9% (Proposed road)

Whilst the extent of the individual incursions is below the 20% threshold as advised within BS5837:2012, the Standard is clear that the default position is to avoid development within RPAs wherever possible. The scheme as proposed appears to rely primarily on mitigation and limited encroachment rather than providing clear overriding justification for why development within RPAs is unavoidable.

#### **Trees T13–T17 (Off-site trees Lawson Cypress Group)**

The proposed incursions associated with T13 (8.4%), T14 (5.2%), T15 (2.7%) and T17 (2.8%) relate to the formation of parking bays and are noted to fall within areas of existing heavily compacted ground associated with the established access track. In these locations, rooting potential is likely to be already constrained by the existing land use. As such, whilst development within RPAs should generally be avoided, it is acknowledged that the extent of encroachment in these instances is relatively minor and that the proposed construction methodologies, including manual excavation and no-dig solutions, are appropriate. On this basis, these limited incursions are acceptable in principle and are unlikely to result in significant additional harm to the existing rooting environment or the long-term viability of the affected trees.

#### **Tree T19 (Off-site tree English Oak – TPO Protected)**

T19 is a prominent, good-quality specimen but does not meet the criteria for ancient or veteran status; its classification as “notable” is considered appropriate. It’s precautionary 21m RPA exceeds the BS5837:2012 standard maximum of 15m; this approach is welcome and implies that the constraint posed by this tree on the scheme has been appropriately considered at the design stage, which is positive.

Whilst development falls within this extended 21m RPA, the proposed road alignment and Plot 7 falls outside the standard 15m RPA afforded to trees under the BS and this arrangement is therefore acceptable in principle. However, additional post-development safeguarding measures are recommended. Such as, including retention of existing ground levels and post-development protection of the undeveloped RPA, for example through knee-rail or post-and-rail fencing, to limit future access and compaction with the area covered by the RPA of T19.

Only outstanding matter relates to post-development protection of the undeveloped RPA through knee-rail or post-and-rail fencing, and to establish a clear barrier between the curtilage of plot 7 and the RPA of T19.

#### **Trees T24 & T26 (Off-site trees English Oaks) – Relationship with Plot 13**

The incursions associated with T24 (6.4% for parking and 0.5% for foundations) and T26 (12.8% for hard surfacing) are noted as being below the generally accepted 20% threshold. However, there are longer-term relationship considerations, particularly as T24 requires facilitation pruning and parking is proposed directly beneath the canopy. This arrangement will give rise to post-development pressures, including the potential for further pruning and conflicts arising from leaf fall and general tree-related debris affecting vehicle use.

The amendments to the position of Plot 13 are welcome and address the previous comments relating to T24; this is positive.

In addition, the road and access arrangement associated with T26 represent a more substantive encroachment into its RPA. It is considered that this relationship could be improved through minor design amendments, such as a slight westward shift of Plots 12 and 13 and a modest adjustment to building orientation. This would increase separation from T24, reduce reliance on ongoing tree management, and limit hard surfacing within the RPA of T26. While this may marginally reduce soft planting areas, this is considered acceptable when balanced against the long-term retention and function of these trees.

Concerns not address in full.

#### **Tree T34 (Off-site trees Coast Redwood)**

The proposed incursion into T34 amounts to approximately 0.2% of the total RPA and is therefore negligible in arboricultural terms. However, it is noted that sufficient space appears to be available within the layout to avoid this encroachment entirely through minor design refinement, such as relocating Plots 16 and 17 approximately 1.5m to the north. This would also help with the future residents perception of the tree given that it is not yet reached its ultimate height which could raise future occupier concerns beef tree safety and natural light penetration within the area below which could likely be improved by way of some crown lifting works, however, as the tree falls outside the site's boundary without the owner's permission this would not be a viable option.

The amendments to the position of the pots to the north of T34 are welcome, and it would appear that the trees RPA is now free form any built form; this is positive.

Furthermore, the majority of T34's RPA falls within the curtilage of Plots 15, 16 and 17, and as such there is potential for future domestic post-development pressure within this area. In this regard, it would be reasonable to consider the removal of certain permitted development rights for these plots to reduce the risk of post-development encroachment that could adversely affect the tree.

A Considerable percentage of the T34's RPA is sited with the rear garden arear of the nearby plots as such the removal of certain permitted development rights for these plots is still considered to be prudent.

#### **Tree T51 (Sycamore)**

The incursion into T51 (0.9%), associated with the proposed road alignment, is considered to be within acceptable limits, having regard to both the relatively small extent of impact and the wider site layout constraints. Given the scale of the encroachment and the nature of the proposed works, this element of the scheme is not considered likely to result in significant adverse effects on the tree's rooting environment and therefore does not raise material arboricultural concern.

#### **Site Layout & Light Considerations**

The overall site layout indicates that trees and vegetation to the southern boundary are likely to reduce natural light levels within the rear gardens of Plots 14, 15, 16 and 17 during the morning period. In addition, the orientation and built form of the proposed dwellings are likely to further limit light availability in the afternoon.

It is acknowledged that the trees to the south of Plots 14, 15, 16 and 17 are located off-site and are predominantly broadleaf species, which may allow increased light penetration during winter months; however, during the summer, when garden use is greatest this

arrangement is likely to generate pruning requests with the aim of increasing summer light penetration into the rear garden areas.

BS5837:2012 seeks to achieve a sustainable and harmonious relationship between trees and development, thereby minimising pressure for future intervention. Given the southern position of the retained tree belt, including the coast redwood, some shading of the proposed dwellings and gardens is at certain times of the day will be inevitable.

The AIR notes that any future management pressures could, if necessary, be managed through the making of a Tree Preservation Order and suggests that the resulting shade impacts would be limited, with a degree of seasonal shading potentially welcomed by future occupiers during warmer periods. Whilst these points are acknowledged and may have some merit, it remains the case that shading of parts of the proposed dwellings and amenity areas is a foreseeable consequence of the relationship proposed. The suggestion that the trees could become protected by way of a TPO, does somewhat imply that there is the capacity post development pruning pressure to occur.

**ANY RECOMMENDED CONDITIONS:** If minded recommending for approval without the above concerns addressed in full, please attach the following conditions.

**Pre-Commencement Condition:** Notwithstanding previously submitted information, no development shall commence, including demolition pursuant to the permission granted, ground clearance, or bringing equipment, machinery, or materials onto the site, until the tree protection fencing has been erected in the position as indicated in Tree Protection Plan Drawing No: SJA TPP 25319-041b dated July 2026. Once in place, the person(s) responsible for supervising the works must meet the Arboricultural Officer of the Local Planning Authority, on-site, so the Arboricultural Officer can supervise that the condition attached to planning permission is fully complied with.

**Reason:** As this matter is fundamental to ensure the successful and satisfactory protection of important trees on the site in accordance with Policy 33 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015)

**Regulatory Condition:** All works shall be executed in full accordance with the submitted Arboricultural Implications Report/Outline Arboricultural Method Statement - Arboricultural Implications Report Proposed re-development at Cedar Cottage Sandygate Lane Lower Beeding West Sussex  
July 2026 Ref. SJA Ref. SJA air 25319

**Reason:** To ensure the successful and satisfactory protection of important trees, shrubs and hedges on the site in accordance with Policies 30 and 33 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015)

**Regulatory Condition:** Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (and/or any Order revoking and/or reenacting that Order) no development falling within Classes E and F of Part 1 of Schedule 2 of the order shall be erected, constructed or placed within the curtilage(s) of dwellings / plots 5, 6, 7, 13, 16 & 17 of the development hereby permitted as shown on Tree Protection Plan Drawing No: SJA TPP 25319-041b, without express planning consent from the Local Planning Authority first being obtained.

**Reason:** To ensure the successful and satisfactory protection of important off-site trees and their rooting environment in the interests of visual amenity, in accordance with Policy 33 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015)

|                    |                                             |
|--------------------|---------------------------------------------|
| <b>NAME:</b>       | Andy Bush Arboricultural officer (Planning) |
| <b>DEPARTMENT:</b> | STRATEGIC PLANNING - SPECIALISTS            |
| <b>DATE:</b>       | 12/06/26 2nd response 04/09/26              |