[redacted]

From: Richard Temple
Sent: 24 May 2017 15:49
To: Planning.Responses
Subject: FW: CHECAA OBJECTION to AW/123/17/T - 54 Kingsway - Fell 3 Bay Laurel trees - 21-5-2017
Importance: High

From: [redacted]
Sent: 24 May 2017 15:06
To: Planning; Richard Temple; Bernie Harverson
Subject: CHECAA OBJECTION to AW-123-17-T - 54 Kingsway - Fell 3 Bay Laurel trees - 21-5-2017
Importance: High

Dear Sir

Please receive CHECAA's objection to application AW/123/17/T for the consideration of the Decision Maker and posting on the website.

Thanks and regards,

Richard Ostler, Chairman, CHECAA

CHECAA

Craigweil House and its Environs Conservation Area Association

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

AW-123-17-T – 54 Kingsway – Fell 3 Bay Laurel trees – 21-5-2017

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

BY EMAIL

21 May 2017

Dear Sir,

OBJECTION to AW/123/17/T – Felling of 7 Bay Laurel trees within the setting of the Craigweil House Conservation Area.

Although the applicant states that his property is outside the bounds of the Craigweil House Conservation Area it is, in fact, next door to the CA and shares a boundary (N/S) with No. 52 Kingsway which is within the designated CA. **CHECAA contends that anything occurring at No. 54 does, therefore, have the potential of influencing – for good or ill – the setting of the Conservation Area which is equally protected under the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990. Trees are a major consideration within that designation for the Craigweil House was 'carved out' of a forest and the creators of the estate regarded their maintenance as fundamental to preserving the design and verdant ambience of the area.**

This property was never within the bounds of the original Craigweil House and was, therefore and for that reason alone, excluded, from the designation. CHECAA, an Association of over 200 members feels it right to make comment for all around – looking into No.54 and those looking out from No. 54 see the CA.

The applicant, at paragraph 7, describes the three trees as being 'small'. He then goes on to say that they take up so much water that 'they make it difficult for other plants to survive'. Common sense suggests that it is one or the other – not both – but, whatever the situation, we are in an era of climate change and increasing temperatures and we have suffered a drought throughout the winter, spring and still it persists into the summer. The applicant is not alone in having dry ground and felling a couple of trees in the back garden will not result in lush growth and water, as he can see throughout the estate.

The applicant is a Director of the Estate Company and knows the importance of trees and, in such a position, one would expect that he would also, of necessity, appreciate the importance to the environment of the retention of forest trees. Furthermore, he has been here long enough to know that flooding exists in Kingsway during persistent rain and that trees serve an invaluable purpose in taken up some of it. **They are of great utility value.**

CHECAA sees the amenity value of the two Bay Laurel trees at the rear as significant for they provide privacy to properties all around and if they were to be removed then, reciprocally, houses in The Drive and Kingsway would be overlooking each other's gardens and houses.

The verdant **evergreen feature** would disappear and all, we say, would be the poorer. They may be younger trees but they were there when the applicant bought and are of considerable height and age and there is no suggestion that they are dead, dying or dangerous – nor that they suffer any form of disease or incapacity.

Indeed, the trees to the rear are of great public amenity value and a joy to see from Kingsway as a pedestrian and must similarly be so to residents across the road who, if they were removed, would be left looking at more houses. And the verge and road outside this applicant site ARE within the Conservation Area.

Tree stock at Craigweil has been decimated in recent years and it is becoming necessary to protect younger trees to secure some form of continuity before the whole CA is de-forested and the concept of Auty and Du Cros is destroyed.

CHECAA accepts that the tree to the front could, depending upon one's taste, have been better chosen but it is evergreen, can be trimmed and shaped, grows well by the sea and is a handsome specimen in good health. We can see no reason to destroy a handsome tree. They may be relatively young trees but, if they are not protected by Tree Preservation Orders now, when they are clearly – by this application – at risk, de-forestation prevails. .

CHECAA asks that the Consultant Arboriculturalist be asked to inspect these trees and report and that the Decision Maker please acts upon his widely respected opinion. We ask that these trees – particularly to the rear - be protected by TPO's.

Yours faithfully

Richard D. Ostler
Chairman