

Sandra Edwards

From: Amanda Scholes on behalf of Planning.Responses
Sent: 24 October 2017 09:06
To: Planning Scanning
Subject: FW: AW/155/17/PL---Brus Lodge, 28 Kingsway, Craigweil---OBJECTION
Attachments: 28Kingsway(BrusLodge)SA-AW-155-17-2.doc

From: Sue Bowley **On Behalf Of** Planning
Sent: 23 October 2017 17:20
To: Planning.Responses
Subject: FW: AW/155/17/PL---Brus Lodge, 28 Kingsway, Craigweil---OBJECTION

Sue Bowley | PA to Director of Place, Arun District Council | Location: First Floor, Arun Civic Centre, Maltravers Road, Littlehampton, BN17 5LF

Internal: 37533 | External: +44 (0) 1903 737533 | E-mail: Sue.Bowley@arun.gov.uk

Visit Arun's web site at www.arun.gov.uk



Save the environment - think before you print.

From: I JEFFERIES [REDACTED]
Sent: 23 October 2017 17:06
To: Planning
Subject: AW/155/17/PL---Brus Lodge, 28 Kingsway, Craigweil---OBJECTION

Dear Sirs

Regarding Planning Application AW/155/17/PL for Brus Lodge, 28 Kingsway, Craigweil.
Please find attached a **Letter of OBJECTION** to this application of several grounds, for publication of the District's website.

Yours faithfully
Ian Jefferies

Tel:
Mobile:
Email:

Saffron Lodge, 46 Kingsway
Craigweil, Bognor Regis
West Sussex, PO21 4DN

Tuesday, 24 October 2017

Head of Planning Services
Arun District Council
Arun Civic Centre
Maltravers Road, LITTLEHAMPTON
West Sussex
BN17 5LF

BY EMAIL-No Hard copy sent.

Dear Sir

Having studied the recent submissions by the Applicant's Agent, amending the details of the front garden and front boundary treatments, I wish to OBJECT as follows.

(a) The quoted T 01 from the previous and present tree schedule of tree works remains in the Application, even though the tree is owned by a third party, who also own the verge and that is the Craigweil Private Estate Limited (CPEL). It also sits away from the NE boundary of the plot and has no influence upon the Application site.

(b) The schedule is totally confusing in that under 'Status' it is to be 'Retained' but under the Recommendations column states "Tree should be dismantled to near ground level taking care not to damage neighbouring trees." This tree must be retained and protected as required by BS 5837:2012 from before starting any of the works to after completion if the Application is Approved.

(c) The revised plan retains the placing of an additional pedestrian gate to the northern boundary in the centre of the plot. The verge grass belongs to CPEL, not the Applicant. Pedestrian traffic, occupiers, visitors, paperboys, postmen/women, delivery drivers etc, etc will be destroying the continuity of the grassed verge, the principal characteristic of the Craigweil House Conservation Area (CHCA). There is no proposal for a prepared pathway across the verge. Previously, CPEL have stated to ADC that they will not permit such a crossing. So, the 'new gate' will open directly onto other's private land without permission.

(d) The newly 'skewed' position of the house in an anti-clockwise direction put its frontal appearance very oddly relating to the Brus Lodge placement parallel to the roadway.

(e) This setting back into the plot is an attempt to lessen the effect of traffic weights over the TPO RPA's of the trees to be retained, TPO'd or not, I see no evidence in these latest submissions to deal effectively with those RPA's. I believe them still to be at high risk.

(f) In the original submissions, SH 02, a Mixed-Species Shrub Group, the Status was quoted as 'Retain Bay Tree Remove all other shrubs beneath.' The new SH 02 says 'Retain Pittosporum Tree. Partial Remove other shrubs.' Yet, in the Recommendations column, it says 'Retain strip of vegetation at the site frontage....' I submit that there remains a deal of confusion as to what will be removed and what will be retained and as a 'building site' within a few days of commencement, all the greenery to the north boundary in particular will be in serious danger of removal/destruction.

(g) From the drawing LLD856/02 Revision 03, the green line depicting the placement of Protective Fencing makes muddled thinking I believe. There are two clearly defined squares of green lines to

the north of the site, centrally and to the east. HOWEVER, there is then a green line around the east and west boundaries, broken by the strip behind the western shrubbery to be removed. Where this green line negotiates the NW corner of the site, it then crosses the verge outside the land owned by CPEL. This then leaves almost the complete 'roadway/entrance area where site vehicles and equipment will be traversing, open to heavy damage and incorporating the RPA's of trees etc.

It is my contention therefore, that still we have no comprehensive plan to protect those protected trees from the risks of damage and destruction. These trees must be protected if the Application is granted but the general risk to trees is so great that only a REFUSAL will protect them.

(h) Finally, the recent amended details include PL26 - TSP 481 revision b, East and North Elevation drawings. I note that the North Elevation has reintroduced the roof-lights that were removed from the original drawings, following objections from the Conservation Consultant in her report of 5th July 2017. This is either a silly mistake or a deliberate ploy to reintroduce an element by stealth. Whichever is the case, such windows remain unacceptable to the C&D Officer.

On these grounds I again ask for the REFUSAL of this Application.

Yours faithfully,

Ian Jefferies