

Daun Johnson

From: Charlotte Burrows on behalf of Planning.Responses
Sent: 14 March 2012 11:36
To: Daun Johnson
Subject: FW: 24 KINGSWAY po21 4dh - AW 48 12 T - APPLICATION TO LOP TREES
Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Red
Attachments: 24kingswaytrees.zip

Charlotte Burrows | Technical Support Unit Assistant, Planning and Building Control, Arun District Council | Location:
First Floor, Civic Centre, Maltravers Road, Littlehampton, BN17 5LF
Internal: 37459 | External: +44 (0) 1903 737711 | E-mail: Charlotte.Burrows@arun.gov.uk

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



Save the environment - think before you print.

From: stockdale37@aol.com [REDACTED]
Sent: 13 March 2012 19:10
To: Planning.Responses
Subject: 24 KINGSWAY po21 4dh - AW 48 12 T - APPLICATION TO LOP TREES

Following our telephone conversation of 12th March I have attached a map as requested to show :-

24 kingsway in relation to its surrounding houses

the area at the back of the house where the 14 Lleylandi trees are situated that we would like to lop 10-15 ft to provide better lighting to ourselves and neighbours.

I trust that this is satisfactory to proceed with the application

any further questions please do not hesitate to contact me. 07801309824

Please note I did not receive the original request for some reason, so please advise on next steps.

regards
richard styles

Janice Chapman

From: Janice Chapman

Sent: 02 April 2012 11:08

To: [REDACTED]

Subject: AW/48/12/TC - Lop by a minimum of 3m 14 no. Lleylandi trees at The White House, 24 Kingsway, Aldwick

Dear Mr Styles,

I am the case officer dealing with your notification to carry out works to trees within the Conservation Area.

Please can you confirm the number of Lleylandi trees to be lopped as the notification under Section 7 states 15 but the submitted plan states 14.

Regards

Janice Chapman
Planner

Janice Chapman

From: Janice Chapman
Sent: 27 March 2012 11:24
To: 'I JEFFERIES'
Subject: RE: AW/48/12/T -- 24 Kingsway

Dear Mr Jeffries,

I have been in contact with Mr Brewster regarding the application. He will be visiting the site sometime this week and will ascertain whether the trees are covered by TPO/2/58 and the number involved and whether the works are acceptable.

If the trees are not old enough to be covered by TPO/2/58 then the application will be amended and changed to a notification with the suffix TC.

Regards

Janice Chapman
 Planner

From: I JEFFERIES [REDACTED]
Sent: 21 March 2012 [REDACTED]
To: Janice Chapman
Cc: Ian Brewster
Subject: Fw: AW/48/12/T -- 24 Kingsway

Mrs Chapman

Further to my previous email, I notice in the Application papers the word 'lopping' is used to describe what is asked for.

My understanding of lopping would be the taking out of branches in the similar way as the word 'topping'.

I believe both 'lopping and topping' are not practices supported by professional arboriculturists and are therefore inappropriate in this case.

I note there is no supporting Report from an arboriculturist in this Application.

Taking out the tops of mature trees in the way suggested here I believe puts them at serious risk of destruction. I am sure Arun's Arboriculturist will suggest any corrective action appropriate to the circumstances here.

Ian Jefferies

----- Forwarded Message -----

From: I JEFFERIES [REDACTED]
To: "Janice.Chapman@arun.gov.uk" <Janice.Chapman@arun.gov.uk>
Cc: IanBrewster <ian.brewster@arun.gov.uk>
Sent: Wednesday, 21 March 2012, 15:20
Subject: AW/48/12/T -- 24 Kingsway

Dear Mrs Chapman

I am finding this application a complete nonsense at the moment.

Firstly, in Section 7 of the Application it says "lopping of minimum 10ft of 15 tall conifers.....", then in on the 'plan it states " 14 Lleylandi trees....". So which is it please???

Secondly, there are hatched areas on the plan that appear to have no relevance to the Application. I believe the plan/drawing is a simple copy of a plan that related to AW317/11 Brus Lodge, where hatchings were to do with the development/exchange of neighbouring land as part of that 'deal'. The plan has the same developers logo (HJ Concepts) and indeed the same name heading of Mr D.T.Colley of Brus Lodge.

Such duplication of plans/maps is at the least confusing if not misleading. A plan should contain only that detail pertinent to a particular application.

Janice Chapman

From: I JEFFERIES [REDACTED]
Sent: 21 March 2012 17:43
To: Janice Chapman
Cc: Ian Brewster
Subject: Fw: AW/48/12/T -- 24 Kingsway

Mrs Chapman

Further to my previous email, I notice in the Application papers the word 'lopping' is used to describe what is asked for.

My understanding of lopping would be the taking out of branches in the similar way as the word 'topping'.

I believe both 'lopping and topping' are not practices supported by professional arboriculturists and are therefore inappropriate in this case.

I note there is no supporting Report from an arboriculturist in this Application.

Taking out the tops of mature trees in the way suggested here I believe puts them at serious risk of destruction. I am sure Arun's Arboriculturist will suggest any corrective action appropriate to the circumstances here.

Ian Jefferies

----- Forwarded Message -----

From: I JEFFERIES [REDACTED]
To: "Janice.Chapman [REDACTED]@arun.gov.uk"<[REDACTED]@arun.gov.uk>
Cc: IanBrewster <ian.brewster@arun.gov.uk>
Sent: Wednesday, 21 March 2012, 15:20
Subject: AW/48/12/T -- 24 Kingsway

Dear Mrs Chapman

I am finding this application a complete nonsense at the moment.

Firstly, in Section 7 of the Application it says "lopping of minimum 10ft of 15 tall conifers.....", then in on the 'plan it states " 14 Lleylandi trees....". So which is it please???

Secondly, there are hatched areas on the plan that appear to have no relevance to the Application. I believe the plan/drawing is a simple copy of a plan that related to AW317/11 Brus Lodge, where hatchings were to do with the development/exchange of neighbouring land as part of that 'deal'. The plan has the same developers logo (HJ Concepts) and indeed the same name heading of Mr D.T.Colley of Brus Lodge.

Such duplication of plans/maps is at the least confusing if not misleading. A plan should contain only that detail pertinent to a particular application.

In my view it is pure laziness on the part of the Applicant and should be addressed by replacing the submitted plan with a more accurate set of details - 14 or 15 trees and a proper plan/drawing.

Kind regards

Ian Jefferies