

From: Simon Davis <Simon.Davis@arun.gov.uk>
Sent: 25 June 2020 17:28
To: Planning.Responses <Planning.Responses@arun.gov.uk>
Subject: FW: AL/27/20/PL - Hook Lane, Aldingbourne

Final Tree Officer consultation response

From: Mark Warwick <Mark.Warwick@arun.gov.uk>
Sent: 25 June 2020 17:09
To: Simon Davis <Simon.Davis@arun.gov.uk>
Subject: RE: AL/27/20/PL - Hook Lane, Aldingbourne

Hi Simon

Thank you for forwarding your latest correspondence with Kerry Simmons for my attention. Although of interest, there is no substantive additional information to which I could submit a reply that would further support your consideration of this application.

I therefore have no further comment to make and stand by my report of May 22nd and additional comments of June 16th.

Regards,

Mark

Mark Warwick
Tree Officer, Greenspace Team

T: 01903 737974
E: mark.warwick@arun.gov.uk

Arun District Council, Civic Centre, Mailtravers Rd, Littlehampton, West Sussex, BN17 5LF
www.arun.gov.uk





From: Simon Davis <Simon.Davis@arun.gov.uk>
Sent: 25 June 2020 16:44
To: Mark Warwick <Mark.Warwick@arun.gov.uk>
Subject: FW: AL/27/20/PL - Hook Lane, Aldingbourne

From: Kerry Simmons [REDACTED]
Sent: 25 June 2020 14:33
To: Simon Davis <Simon.Davis@arun.gov.uk>
Subject: AL/27/20/PL - Hook Lane, Aldingbourne

Simon,

Thank you for forwarding Mark Warwick's response to our additional information and clarification in relation to impact on trees. We are disappointed with Mark's assessment of the scheme's potential impact on trees when we have gone to great lengths to address the objections previously raised. We understand that Mark is solely interested in the retention and protection of individual trees as well as the site's amenity value and we believe we have demonstrated that the current layout has overcome the 'in principle' objection regarding the previous application. We therefore find Mark's continued objection and resistance to be unreasonable and driven by ideals, rather than a balanced understanding of the moderate quality of the trees and the benefits of providing 9 additional new homes. The fact of the matter is that the application provides technical evidence from Lizard Landscape that the trees worthy of retention can be adequately protected in line with the required British Standards, indeed Mark doesn't actually dispute this, he is simply seeking greater measures than required by British Standards. Please see below our final comments in response to this matter:

1. To suggest that trees contained within a residential curtilage are less likely to face pruning pressures than trees on communal land protected by a planning condition is not reasonably the case, and contradicts previous comments made with reference to the previous scheme.
2. The Ecological Enhancement Plan can be conditioned, and any landscaping proposals can follow by way of condition in the usual manner. The principles are clear, and it is therefore unnecessary for this level of detail to be required at this stage.
3. The TPO'd tree can be added to the drainage plan if considered necessary. However it is clearly not impacted by the proposals and its root protection zone will be protected as there is no requirement for an digging near or around it. Due to its position within the garden area of plot 8. The applicant would also accept a standard condition requiring fencing around the tree during construction to be in accordance with the current recommendations within the British Standard BS5837:2012 'Trees in relation to design, demolition and construction -Recommendations' as shown on the proposed tree protection plan, and if required, a site meeting with a representative from the Local Planning Authority to inspect and approve the protective fencing in writing.
4. We would also remind officers' that the delivery of housing sites across Arun District is even more pressing the Council's housing land supply now shows just a 2.8 years housing supply. We would repeat therefore that this significant and declining land supply shortfall means that the presumption in favour of sustainable development is engaged even more strongly for the application and following paragraph 11 of the NPPF, in the absence of any other policy conflict it should be approved without further delay.

For all these reasons we consider that it would be appropriate for the Council to be able to justify recommending approval of this scheme and would request that the application is referred to the Council's Planning Committee for determination.

I look forward to hearing from you once you have taken the above information into consideration.

Kind regards,

Kerry

Kerry Simmons MA MRTPI
Partner



Planning & Architecture

RIBA  RTPI

PLANNING

15 West Pallant, Chichester, West Sussex, PO19 1TB

www.ss-p.co.uk