



Agenda Update Sheet

Planning Committee

Date: 26th September 2019

ITEM 6

Application DM/19/1742

Appendix A: Updated List of Plans

Plan Type	Reference	Version	Submitted Date
Location Plan			08.05.2019
Location Plan			08.05.2019
Location Plan			08.05.2019
Block Plan			09.07.2019
Proposed Elevations	19138 SHT1	A	08.05.2019
Proposed Elevations	A 006		25.07.2019
Proposed Elevations	A 008		14.08.2019
Proposed Elevations	A 007		14.08.2019

Appendix B:

Include the below consultee response:

Ecologist (15/07/2019)

Such netting should be heavy enough to avoid bat and bird entanglement, being of much thicker gauge and visibility than the fine mist nets required to catch them for scientific study. Clearly such a large barrier could potentially cause problems on important commuting routes but given the heavy built up surroundings and relatively poor habitat represented by the playing field, I have no biodiversity policy objections to raise in this case.

ITEM 7

Application DM/19/2671

Pg 73 – MSDC Tree Officer – Additional comments received.

I have reviewed the AMS for the above application and can confirm that a number of the issues I raised on my previous comments have been addressed.
See below my previous comments and current comments in shown in red:

I visited the above site on 30 August and have the following comments:

- It is not clear from the plans I have seen whether T2 - Category A Hornbeam is to be removed. The habit of a hornbeam with branches growing wide and low would make it difficult to crown lift or cut back to accommodate the development. I cannot therefore envisage that it is possible to retain this tree in its current state prior to or during construction. In addition, if T2 were to be retained there would be future pressure to prune or fell this tree. *It has been confirmed T2 is to be removed - This is not ideal as it is a Category A tree.*
- The development would result in the loss of four category B trees comprising of two beech (T7, T8), one English oak (T9), one other hornbeam (T10), and the possibility of one category A hornbeam (T2) (above). Removal of moderate/ high quality native trees (Category B or above) is a significant loss and not recommended. If the loss is unavoidable replacement should be on a minimum one for one basis as close to the original position as possible. *One further tree is being removed than was originally*

outlined on the AIA, resulting in the total loss of one Category A tree and five Category B trees. Replacement of these trees needs to be addressed.

- The area as a 'whole' is of high amenity value, being visible from the street and surrounding recreation areas, and clearly is of great value as wildlife habitat. Nothing further to add here, the area of trees in my opinion remains of high amenity value.
- As with T2, there will inevitably be future pressure on all the retained trees. There needs to be allowance and space for future growth and maintenance, alongside consideration to shading, direct damage and seasonal nuisance from the trees. This issue still remains, although the AMS has given some consideration to this point particularly with reference to leaves and gutters.
- T1 - a large oak sits at the entrance to the development and may come under future pressure due to visibility constraints. I believe that this is not necessarily an issue.
- There are incursions into the RPA of T4, T14 and T15. The impact and protection measures for these trees should be addressed in an Arboricultural Method Statement (AMS). The impact of incursions into the RPA of retained trees (ie T3, T12, T13, T14, and T15) and the protection measures have been satisfactorily addressed in the AMS.

My Comment below still stands:

Consequently I would object to the development based purely on arboricultural grounds; however it is a matter for the planning officer to balance the impact of the loss of the trees with the benefits to the community.

Pg 92 – Appendix A Recommended Conditions

Addition conditions to state the following;

The scheme shall only be constructed in accordance with the details contained within the Arboricultural Method Statement by SFF Tree Consultancy received on the 25th September 2019 unless first agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To ensure suitable tree protection is present during construction and to accord with Policy DP37 of the Mid Sussex Local Plan.

Prior to the use of the building hereby permitted commencing, details of the proposed guttering system, having regard to the information contained within the submitted Arboricultural Method Statement by SFF Tree Consultancy received on the 25th September 2019, shall be submitted to and approved in writing with the Local Planning Authority. Thereafter, the building shall not be brought in to use until such time as the approved details are implemented on site and shall thereafter be retained as such.

Reason: To help mitigate the pressure from retained trees and to accord with Policy DP37 of the Mid Sussex Local Plan 2014-2031.

This page is intentionally left blank