

Janice Chapman

From: Richard Ostler [REDACTED]
Sent: 20 June 2011 21:52
To: Planning
Cc: Janice Chapman; Ian Brewster; Martyn White
Subject: Emailing: AW-123-11-TC - 34 The Drive - Trees - OBJECTION
Attachments: AW-123-11-TC - 34 The Drive - Trees.doc

Dear Sir

I attach an objection to this planning application on behalf of the Craigweil House and its Environs Conservation Area Association and ask that it, please, be taken into consideration in determining this application.

Yours faithfully

Richard D. Ostler, Chairman, CHECAA.

The message is ready to be sent with the following file or link attachments:
AW-123-11-TC - 34 The Drive - Trees

Note: To protect against computer viruses, e-mail programs may prevent sending or receiving certain types of file attachments. Check your e-mail security settings to determine how attachments are handled.

CHECAA
Craigweil House and its
Environs Conservation Area
Association

'Preserving our Regal, Historic and Architectural Heritage for Future Generations'

AW-123-11-TC – 34 The Drive - Trees

Head of Planning Services
Arun District Council
Maltravers Road
Littlehampton
BN17 5LF

16 June 2011

Dear Sir

OBJECTION – AW/123/11/TC – Tree surgery, 34 The Drive,
Craigweil House Conservation Area

The Planning Applications Scrutiny Committee of CHECAA has examined the documentation of this application and is concerned for the welfare of the trees subject which, of course, we are unable to examine for they are on private land and cannot be identified from the roadway except that they are part of a Group of trees of significant public amenity value in the Conservation Area where there is a dearth of trees west of the white gate in The Drive due to extensive felling and bungalow building in the 1980's. These trees greatly enhance the Conservation Area.

We are doubtful that the extensive lopping and topping described can be justified upon grounds of 'assymetry'(sic!) or that 40% can be justified in most situations, particularly upon the grounds stated of 'reduce excessive shading and improve structure balance of Holm Oaks. The symmetry of trees is of nature's making and, we feel, should be left undisturbed for it is the character of the tree that should not be destroyed except for sound arboricultural reasons.

These trees are of considerable age – well over 50-60 years and should be treated delicately to prevent harming them and in the interests of good husbandry.

Through lack of information we have no alternative but to object to these works but we ask that the Principal Arboriculturalist, please, be asked to inspect and report upon all the trees which are declared as being subject to the protection of TPO BR/2/1958 but may well also be protected by a recent TPO resulting from the recent survey by Colin Bashford and Partners.

Please record our objection.

Yours faithfully

Richard D. Ostler
Chairman

CC Case Officer; Principal Arboriculturalist and Conservation Officer.