

Janice Chapman

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 10 March 2014 14:01
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: FW: AW/32/14/T 17 Craigweil lane PO21 4AN Emailing: 2014-03-07 11.14.52-1

Dear Mr Smyth,

Please see response from Mr Harverson. Are you happy to accept an overall reduction in height by 3-4m.

Regards

Janice Chapman
Planner

From: Bernie Harverson [REDACTED]
Sent: 10 March 2014 13:09
To: Janice Chapman; Joe Russell-Wells
Cc: Richard Martin
Subject: RE: AW/32/14/T 17 Craigweil lane PO21 4AN Emailing: 2014-03-07 11.14.52-1

I am happy to mark up a photograph but this too can be very misleading depending on the angle that the photo has been taken and I suggest that the best course of action would be to grant approval on the basis of 3m to 4m and the proviso that I meet up with Mr Smyth and his tree surgeon on site before he starts work so that the tree surgeon can put tape around the branches at the points of intended severance?

This would also give the tree surgeon chance to probe the decay point whilst I am there just in case we have to agree to felling on safety grounds!! [see my notes].

Regards,

Bernie Harverson
3 Foxcombe Cottages
South Harting
West Sussex
GU31 5PL
[REDACTED]

From: Janice Chapman [REDACTED]
Sent: 10 March 2014 09:10
To: Joe Russell-Wells
Cc: Bernie Harverson [REDACTED]
Subject: FW: AW/32/14/T 17 Craigweil lane PO21 4AN Emailing: 2014-03-07 11.14.52-1

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 09 March 2014 18:56
To: Janice Chapman
Subject: AW/32/14/T 17 Craigweil lane PO21 4AN Emailing: 2014-03-07 11.14.52-1

Dear Ms Chapman,

Thank you for your visit on 6th March. I have contacted an arboriculturist but before instructing him to prepare a report, would it be possible for Mr Harverson to clarify either on a photograph, or by reference to it, exactly the point to which he is recommending that the two main branches (if I understand him correctly) should be reduced. Because of the height and angle, it is difficult to judge from the ground where his 3-4m would come to. I am happy to email him or speak to him direct if you would be happy with that.

I have taken a photograph and will either email it separately under the above reference or drop a hard copy in by hand.

I think that it is important that we are not misunderstanding each other, hence my suggestion that he marks, or describes his proposal by reference to, either my own or some other photograph.

I generally find that these things are best dealt with by reasoned compromise in order to avoid an appeal and to this end I would be happy to submit an amended application if agreement with Mr Harverson and yourself can be reached. From a visual point of view, it seems to me fairly clear where the reduction should be made but I suspect that this would mean reducing by 4-6m rather than the 3-4m currently proposed by Mr Harverson. If that is correct, the gap between us is not great.

Incidentally, I think there is a mistake in his report in the fourth bullet point where he says the whole of the west side of the tree has been lost – I believe he means 'east'.

Kind regards
Christopher Smyth

***** IMPORTANT NOTICE: This e-mail is intended exclusively for the addressee and may contain information that is confidential and/or privileged. If you are not the intended recipient (or authorised to receive it for the addressee), please notify the sender and delete the e-mail immediately; using, copying, or disclosing it to anyone else, is strictly prohibited and may be unlawful. Any views, opinions or options presented are solely those of the author and do not necessarily represent those of Arun District Council. The information in this e-mail may be subject to public disclosure under the Freedom of Information Act 2000, therefore we cannot guarantee that we will not provide the whole or part of this e-mail to a third party. The Council reserves the right to monitor e-mails in accordance with relevant legislation. Whilst outgoing e-mails are checked for viruses, we cannot guarantee this e-mail is virus-free or has not been intercepted or changed and we do not accept liability for any damage caused. Any reference to "e-mail" in this disclaimer includes any attachments. ***** <http://www.arun.gov.uk> : NLPG UPRN 100062237016 : DX 57406 Littlehampton

Janice Chapman

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 09 March 2014 19:03
To: Janice Chapman
Subject: AW/32/14/T 17 Craigweil Lane Aldwick Bognor Regis PO21 4AN
Attachments: 2014-03-07 11.14.52-1.jpg

Dear Mrs Chapman,

This is the photograph referred to in my earlier email which may be helpful to clarify what the consultant Mr Harverson is proposing. It is taken from an upstairs window looking due south.

Christopher Smyth



Janice Chapman

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 09 March 2014 18:56
To: Janice Chapman
Subject: AW/32/14/T 17 Craigweil lane PO21 4AN Emailing: 2014-03-07 11.14.52-1

Dear Ms Chapman,

Thank you for your visit on 6th March. I have contacted an arboriculturist but before instructing him to prepare a report, would it be possible for Mr Harverson to clarify either on a photograph, or by reference to it, exactly the point to which he is recommending that the two main branches (if I understand him correctly) should be reduced. Because of the height and angle, it is difficult to judge from the ground where his 3-4m would come to. I am happy to email him or speak to him direct if you would be happy with that.

I have taken a photograph and will either email it separately under the above reference or drop a hard copy in by hand.

I think that it is important that we are not misunderstanding each other, hence my suggestion that he marks, or describes his proposal by reference to, either my own or some other photograph.

I generally find that these things are best dealt with by reasoned compromise in order to avoid an appeal and to this end I would be happy to submit an amended application if agreement with Mr Harverson and yourself can be reached. From a visual point of view, it seems to me fairly clear where the reduction should be made but I suspect that this would mean reducing by 4-6m rather than the 3-4m currently proposed by Mr Harverson. If that is correct, the gap between us is not great.

Incidentally, I think there is a mistake in his report in the fourth bullet point where he says the whole of the west side of the tree has been lost – I believe he means 'east'.

Kind regards
Christopher Smyth

