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1.0 Introduction

1.1 This report summarises the work carried out to assess the potential impact of development within the Enterprise Bognor Regis Local Development Order area upon arboreal/tree assets. Reference is made to assessment carried out in January 2014. (Appendices 1 and 2). This original assessment considered the amenity value of the tree stock therein and adjacent to the LDO site. The assessment was based upon a tree evaluation method for preservation orders (TEMPO). The tree groups that have been assessed are shown on the map within Appendix 1. The outcome assessment is summarised in Section 2 below.

Arun Local Plan

1.2 The Arun Local Plan 2011 – 2031 Publication Version contains the spatial strategy and strategic land use policy for the Arun Local Plan Area (Arun District Council area, excluding land within the South Downs National Park). The Plan identifies several Strategic Employment Land Allocations (Policy EMP SP2) designed to help with economic growth in the Coast West Sussex sub-region. This policy identifies land branded as “Enterprise Bognor Regis” (EBR) and comprises four contiguous areas:

Area 1 – Salt Box 11.8 HA
Area 2 – Rowan Park 3.3 HA
Area 3- Oldlands Farm 23.8 HA
Area 4 – Former LEC airfield and adjoining land 30.5 HA

1.3 The Local Plan Policy EMP DM2 –Enterprise Bognor Regis sets out the development principles for this allocation. The supporting text to Policy EMP DM2 identifies an indicative timetable for development and land use classes with floorspace ranges for each area in the EBR allocation.

1.4. The specific Local Plan policy for the protection of trees is Policy ENV DM4.

1.5 The relevant Arun Local Plan (2003) saved policies are GEN 7 and GEN 28.

Local Development Order

1.6 The Council proposes to introduce a Local Development Order for Salt Box (Area 1), Rowan Park (Area 2) and parts of Oldlands Farm (Area 3). The land within Area 3, Oldlands Farm has a total area of 7.8 Ha. The “red line” boundary is shown below. It excludes land that benefits from a planning permission for 43,000 sq. metres of B use class development currently being constructed for Rolls Royce (Ref: BE/73/14/PL) and a parcel of land that is within the Environment Agency classification Flood Zone 3b (Functional Flood Plain). The former LEC Airfield and adjoining land is not included in the LDO “red line” boundary as development on this site requires significant infrastructure investment and further studies, notably measures to overcome significant environmental constraints.
2.0 Summary.

2.1 The arboreal/tree assessments have been prepared to assess the issues that may be affected by the LDO proposals was prepared in 2014. The reports have been prepared to include a wider area than the proposed “red line” boundary for the LDO. The wider area includes land towards Shripney Village and east of the railway line between Bognor Regis and Barnham.

2.2 Within, and immediately adjoining the “red line” boundary of the LDO the following has been identified:

- a linear belt of Myrobalan Plums (*Prunus cerasifera ‘Nigra’*) that provide an effective separation and screen between the existing industrial complex and the new areas for development – TPO not appropriate but would merit
• retention and protection........... (Detailed as Group A on the assessment map)

• **Sycamore (Acer)**; **Common Ash (Fraxinus)**; **Corsican Pine (Pinus)** and **Hawthorn (Crataegus)** – these trees form a Shelterbelt screen at the edges of Rowan Park and they abut the main arterial road leading into Bognor and thus have a high impact and significance. They are included as this area appears to have been shaded (for built development) on one of the (draft LDO) plans and may come up for grabs in the future – clearly if the site remains in Council ownership then there is no need for a TPO. (Detailed as Group F on the assessment map)

• **Willows (Salix)**; **Poplars (Populus)**; **Hawthorn (Crataegus)** & **Oak (Quercus)** - off site groupings at the edges of private gardens and wooded areas that have a significant impact in the landscape but are set back a little from the development site edge and should therefore not prove to be a constraint on same and there seems little point in applying a TPO because BS5837 consideration and protection measures will be sufficient at the detailed development stages of each plot.(Detailed as Group H on the assessment map)

2.3 In regard to protection of these assets the assessment report indicates:

“an Arboricultural Impact Assessment from the respective developers of each plot which identifies and surveys these trees in accordance with BS5837:2012 and calculates and shows their Root Protection Areas on a Tree Protection Plan and explains how they will be retained and protected and fenced off for the entire duration of the development process.”

2.4 The evidence has been taken account of to help define any mitigation and planning conditions required. These have been informed by consultation with the Council’s Tree Officer in November 2014. The relevant actions are detailed in Section 3: Conclusions.

3.0 Conclusions

3.1 The trees identified in the assessment are largely in belts on the boundaries. The assessment suggests that it could be appropriate for any particularly important tree belts to be identified for retention and that can be reflected in the parameters plan for the LDO., and for all other trees/shrubs, a tree survey is required by condition prior to development. For, example, to also require replacement of removed trees elsewhere within the site.

3.2 Therefore, to identify any protected tree belts on the parameters plan, and then include appropriate conditions requiring tree survey and protection details. The value of significant trees and vegetation will also need to reflect their role as set out in other evidence reports, notably habitat and ecology, landscape and visual effects.

3.3 The LDO parameters plan and planning conditions for development within the LDO should ensure that:
• Where Significant Trees are identified for retention they will be sufficiently protected to ensure that they survive development activity without their long term life expectancy being compromised.

• Prior Development Notification must be supported by an Arboricultural Impact Assessment completed in accordance with the broad principles of tree protection set out in BS 5837 Trees in relation to design, demolition and construction – Recommendations (2012). This must calculate and show for Significant Trees to be retained Root Protection Areas on a Tree Protection Plan and describe protective measures to be implemented during development operations.

• Significant trees and vegetation shall be retained/protected in a manner to be agreed with the Local Planning Authority (LPA) before the development commences for the duration of the development and shall not be damaged, destroyed, uprooted, felled, lopped or topped during that period without the previous written consent of the Local Planning Authority.

• Any trees removed without such consent or dying or being seriously damaged or becoming seriously diseased during the period shall be replaced in the following planting season with trees of such size and species as may be agreed with the LPA.

0678.bjh.let

18th January 2014

Mr D Pilkington
Major Projects Officer – Arun DC
Economic & Cultural Department
2nd Floor Arun Civic Centre
Maitravers Road
Littlehampton
BN17 5LF

Dear Mr Pilkington,

**Trees at BNRR, Shripney – TPO Assessment**

Thank you for your instructions on this project.

Acting as stand in Tree Officer for the Council I have now visited the sites outlined in red on the illustrated plan that you kindly provided and assessed the amenity value of the tree stock therein or adjacent to it. Please note that on your instructions I have excluded the LEC Airfield site.

Please find attached pdf’s of the annotated plan and TEMPO form for the trees I assess as of high amenity value and worthy of a Tree Preservation Order. There are other trees of value and note around the periphery of the farm fields and on adjacent land that I have made a note of and which it would be good to see retained but which do not require specific Tree Preservation Order protection. It would be sufficient in my view to require an Arboricultural Impact Assessment from the respective developers of each plot which identifies and surveys these trees in accordance with BS5837:2012 and calculates and shows their Root Protection Areas on a Tree Protection Plan and explains how they will be retained and protected and fenced off for the entire duration of the development process.

a – a linear belt of **Myrobalan Plums** (*Prunus cerasifera ‘Nigra’*) that provide an effective separation and screen between the existing industrial complex and the new areas for development – TPO not appropriate but would merit retention and protection as outlined above.

b – a linear belt of **Hawthorns** (*Crataegus monogyna*) at the edge of the field and adjacent to the drainage ditches and abutting the railway line that provide an effective separation and screen between the railway line and the new development area – TPO not appropriate but would merit retention and protection as outlined above.

c, d & group e – all mature **Pedunculate Oaks** (*Quercus robur*) trees of high amenity value that can readily be seen from a point of public access and have a significant impact in the wider landscape – all have been **TEMP0** assessed and calculated to merit a **TPC**.
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f – Sycamore (*Acer*); Common Ash (*Fraxinus*); Corsican Pine (*Pinus*) and Hawthorn (*Crataegus*) – these trees form a Shelterbelt screen at the edges of Rowan Park [which I believe is Council owned?] – and they abut the main arterial road leading into Bognor and thus have a high impact and significance – they are included as this area appears to have been shaded on one of the plans and may come up for grabs in the future – clearly if the site remains in Council ownership then there is no need for a TPO.

g & h – Willows (*Salix*); Ioplaris (*Populus*); Hawthorn (*Crataegus*) & Oak (*Quercus*) - off site groupings at the edges of private gardens and wooded areas that have a significant impact in the landscape but are set back; little from the development site edge and should therefore not prove to be a constraint on same and there seems little point in applying a TPO because BS5837 consideration and protection measures will be sufficient at the detailed development stages of each plot.

I trust that this is sufficient for your requirements but if you have any further queries then please do not hesitate to make contact.

Yours sincerely,

Bernie Harreran

Arboricultural Consultant
a = Myrobolan Plums - slow 

b = Willows/Poplars/Rowans but a few Oaks as well 

c = Lilac for h
### TREE EVALUATION METHOD FOR PRESERVATION ORDERS - TEMPO

**Survey Data Sheet & Decision Guide**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date: 16/01/14</th>
<th>Surveyor: B.J. Harverson</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tree details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TPO Ref (if applicable):</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owner (if known):</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location: In back of edge of field</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Species: Redwood oak</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**REPEAT GUIDANCE NOTE FOR ALL DEFINITIONS**

#### Part 1: Amenity Assessment

a) Condition & suitability for TPO; where trees in good or fair condition have poor form, deduct 1 point

- 5) Good
- 4) Fair
- 3) Poor
- 2) Dead/dying/dangerous

*Relates to existing context and is intended to apply to trees irremediable defects only.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score &amp; Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

b) Retention Span (in Years) & suitability for TPO

- 5) 100+ Highly suitable
- 4) 40-100 Very suitable
- 3) 20-40 Suitable
- 2) <20 Just suitable
- 1) <10* Unsuitable

*Includes trees which are an existing or near future risk, including those dead or outgrowing their context, or which are significantly negating the potential of other trees of better quality.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score &amp; Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

c) Relative Public Visibility & Suitability for TPO

Consider realistic potential for future visibility with change in land use

- 5) Very large trees with some visibility, prominent large trees
- 4) Large trees or medium trees clearly visible to the public
- 3) Medium trees, or large trees with limited visibility only
- 2) Young, small, or medium/large trees visible only with difficulty

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score &amp; Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

d) Other Factors

Trees must have scored 7 or more points (with no zero score to qualify)

- 5) Principal components of arboricultural features, or veteran trees
- 4) Trees group, or members of groups important for her cohesion
- 3) Trees of identifiable historic, commemorative or habitat importance
- 2) Trees of particularly good form, especially if rare or unusual
- 1) Trees with none of the above additional redeeming features (i.e. those of indifferent form)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score &amp; Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Part 2: Expediency Assessment**

Trees must have scored 9 or more points to qualify

- 5) Immediate threat to tree
- 4) Foreseeable threat to tree
- 3) Precautionary only

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score &amp; Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Part 3: Decision Guide**

Any 0
1-6 TPO indefensible
7-11 Does not merit TPO
12-15 TPO defensible
16+ Definitely merits TPO

**Add Scores for Total:** 15

**Decision:** TPO is indefensible
TREE EVALUATION METHOD FOR PRESERVATION ORDERS - TEMPO

SURVEY DATE: SHEET & DECISION GUIDE

Date: 16/01/14  Surveyor: B.J. MARVENSON

Tree details
TPO Ref (if applicable):  Tree/Group: Pedunculate Oak Species: Quercus robur
Owner (if known):  Location: in a farm field

REFER TO GUIDANCE NOTE FOR ALL DEFINITIONS

Part 1: Amenity assessment
da) Condition & suitability for TPO; where trees in good or fair condition have poor form, deduct 1 point

5) Good  Highly suitable
3) Fair  Suitable
1) Poor  Unlikely to be suitable
0) Dead/dying/dangerous*  Unsuitable

*Relates to existing context and is intended to apply to severe irreparable defects only

b) Retention span (in years) & suitability for TPO

5) 100+  Highly suitable
4) 40-100  Very suitable
2) 20-40  Suitable
1) 10 -20  Just suitable
0) <10  Unsuitable

*Includes trees which are an existing or near future nuisance, including those clearly outgrowing their context, or which are significantly negating the potential of other trees of better quality

Score & Notes

0

Part 1: Relative public visibility & suitability for TPO

Consider quality, potential for future visibility with change in land use

5) Very large trees with some visibility, or prominent large trees
4) Large trees, or medium trees clearly visible to the public
3) Medium trees, or large trees with limited view only
2) Young, small, or medium-size trees visible only with difficulty
1) Trees not visible to the public, regardless of size

Score & Notes

5

Part 1: Other factors

Trees must have accrued 7 or more points (with no zero score to qualify

5) Principal components of arboricultural features, or veteran trees
4) Tree groups, or members of groups important for their cohesion
3) Trees with identifiable historic, commemorative or aesthetic importance
2) Trees of particularly good form, especially if rare or unusual
1) Trees with some of the above additional redeeming features (inc. those of indifferent form)

Score & Notes

1

Part 2: Expediency assessment

Trees must have accrued 9 or more points to qualify

5) Immediate threat to tree
3) Foreseeable threat to tree
2) Perceived threat to tree
1) Precautionary only

Score & Notes

3

Part 3: Decision guide

Any 0  Do not apply TPO
1-6  TPO indefensible
7-11  Does not merit TPO
12-15  TPO defensible
16+  Definitely merits TPO

Add Scores for Total: 18

Decision: Definitely merits a TPO
# TREE EVALUATION METHOD FOR PRESERVATION ORDERS - TEMPO

**SURVEY DATA SHEET & DECISION GUIDE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date: 16/01/14</th>
<th>Surveyor: B. J. HUGHESON</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

## Tree details
- **TPO Ref (if applicable):**
- **Group No.:**
- **Location:**
- **Species:**
- **Quercus robur**

**F的重大 note for all definitions**

### Part 1: Amenity assessment
**a) Condition & suitability for TPO:** where trees in good or fair condition have poor form, deduct 1 point

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score &amp; Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Part 2: Retention span (in years) & suitability for TPO

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score &amp; Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Part 3: Relative public visibility & suitability for TPO
**Consider realistic potential for future visibility with changed land use**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score &amp; Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Part 4: Other factors
**Trees must have accrued 7 or more points (with no zero score) to qualify**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score &amp; Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Part 2: Expediency assessment
**Trees must have accrued 9 or more points to qualify**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score &amp; Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Part 3: Decision guide

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Add Scores for Total:</th>
<th>Decision:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Definitely merits a TPO</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* *Includes trees which are an existing or near future nuisance, including those clearly outgrowing their context, or which are significantly negating the potential of other trees of better quality.*
# TREE EVALUATION METHOD FOR PRESERVATION ORDERS - TEMPO

## SURVEY DATA SHEET & DECISION GUIDE

**Date:** 16/01/14  
**Surveyor:** B.J. MARVERON

### Tree details
- **Group No.:**  1  
- **Location:** Field  
- **Species:** **Cassia fistula**  
- **Owner (if known):**  
- **Ref (if applicable):**  

REERTO GUIDANCE NOTE FOR ALL DEFINITIONS

### Part 1: Amenity Assessment

**a)** Condition & suitability for IPO: where trees in good or fair condition have poor form, deduct 1 point

| 5) Good | Highly suitable | Score & Notes: 3 |
| 4) Fair | Suitable        |
| 3) Poor | Unlikely to be suitable |
| 2) Dead/dying/dangerous* | Unsuitable |

*Relates to existing context and is intended to apply to severe/remediable defects only

### Part 2: Retention Span (in years) & Suitability for IPO

| 5) 100+ | Highly suitable | Score & Notes: 5 |
| 4) 40-100 | Very suitable |
| 3) 20-40 | Suitable |
| 2) 10-20 | Just suitable |
| 1) <10 | Unsuitable |

*Includes trees which are an existing or near future nuisance, including those **dying**; outgrowing their cones, or which are significantly negating the potential of other trees of better quality

### Part 3: Relative Public Visibility & Suitability for IPO

**c)** Consider realistic potential for future visibility with changed land use

| 5) Very large trees with some visibility, or prominent large trees | Highly suitable | Score & Notes: 4 |
| 4) Large trees, or medium trees clearly visible to the public |
| 3) Medium trees, or large trees with limited view only |
| 2) Young, small, or medium/large trees visible only with difficulty |
| 1) Trees not visible to the public, regardless of size |

**d)** Other factors

Trees must have accrued 7 or more points (with no zero score) to qualify

| 5) Principal components of arboricultural features, or veteran trees | Highly suitable |
| 4) Tree groups, or members of groups important for their cohesion |
| 3) Trees with identifiable historic, commemorative or habitat importance |
| 2) Trees of particularly good form, especially if rare or unusual |
| 1) Trees with none of the above additional redeeming features (incl. those of indifferent form) |

### Part 4: Expelegancy Assessment

Trees must have accrued 9 or more points to qualify

| 5) Immediate threat to tree |
| 4) Foreseeable threat to tree |
| 3) Perceived threat to tree |
| 2) Precautionary only |

### Part 5: Decision Guide

| 0 | Do not apply TPO |
| 1-6 | TPO indefensible |
| 7-11 | Does not merit TPO |
| 12-15 | TPO defensible |
| 16+ | Definitely merits TPO |

Add Scores for Total: 17  
**Decision:** Definitely merits a TPO