

REPORT UPDATE

Application No: AW/71/18/HH

Reason for the Update / Changes

Reason for Update/Changes:

FURTHER TREE OFFICER ADVICE

The Council's Tree Officer provided additional comment on the 30th July and this is summarised below:

- The Tree Officer had not previously considered the impact of the new gate pillars on the RPA of T5;
- Excavation to facilitate construction of the eastern pillar will occur within the amended RPA;
- Therefore, the Arboricultural Method Statement needs to refer to methodology and the inclusion of soil/root protection measure to limit the effects on tree health;
- There will be a risk of harmful soil contamination if as expected concrete is used to form an adequate footing for the pillar; and
- It is recommended that the following addition be sought to the Arboricultural Method Statement:

"The excavation for and construction of; footings for the eastern pillar (driveway access) within the RPA of T5, will be undertaken with care so as to avoid unnecessary damage to tree roots. Only hand-digging is permitted, and of sufficient depth and width so far as is necessary. Leachate from curing concrete can be toxic to tree roots therefore all pits are to be lined with impervious membrane before pouring concrete."

In response to this, the applicant submitted a revised Arboricultural Method Statement on the 31st July and this includes the additional paragraph. It is therefore necessary to amend condition 03 to refer to the Rev D Arboricultural Method Statement.

SUPPORTING PHOTOGRAPHS:

The applicant has provided a series of interior & exterior photographs to demonstrate (a) the existing appearance of the two single storey front extensions to be removed; and (b) how passionate the applicants are about Art Deco. These images can be viewed on the Council's website. It is not considered that the interior photographs are material to this determination.

NEW NPPF:

A new version of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) was published after this officer report was finalised. However, there is no need to change the report as a result of the changes to the previous NPPF.

ADDITIONAL LOCAL RESIDENT OBJECTIONS

Since the finalisation of the officer report on the 19th July, 4 additional objections have been received from raising the following points:

(1) Craigweil Private Estate Limited should not be allocated any weight in this determination as they do not take any professional advice before making comment;

- (2) Objections raised to the Arboricultural Method Statement and the impact of its requirements on the grass verge;
- (3) The verge will have a ramp on it - where are there other examples of this in Craigweil;
- (4) The submitted existing elevations do not correctly show the height of the existing hedge to the front. A photo is supplied to illustrate this point;
- (5) Removal of this hedge will have a drastic impact on the streetscene;
- (6) Unacceptable for the Conservation Officer to only provide verbal comments;
- (7) Replacement hedge is low in comparison to other properties in the streetscene;
- (8) Tree Officer is wrong that T11 (to be felled) makes no contribution to the character of the area;
- (9) The proposal does neither preserve or enhance the Conservation Area;
- (10) Objections within letter despatched on 26/07 do not appear in the officer report;
- (11) The width of the road surface within the property will be wider than Queensway thus making the verge appear as a central reservation;
- (12) Only reason for hedge to be removed is to facilitate two way traffic in/out of the site;
- (13) This should be refused as per AW/150/13 on grounds of excessive hard surfacing, new opening, loss of grass. The officers comment about there being no precedent from this decision due to the different frontage lengths is misdirected;
- (14) The number of trees in the hedge to be felled has not been clarified;
- (15) The Article 4 has not been considered and therefore the pre-application advice given in January 2018 was wrong;
- (16) An attachment to an email from the officer to the agent dated 23/04/18 is not provided on the website;
- (17) No details of Conservation Officer advice received at the time of the 23/04/18 email exchange;
- (18) No mention of removed trees in the application description;
- (19) The building is not an architectural gem waiting to be revealed to the world;
- (20) The submitted photos by the applicant are not material to the application and should not have been accepted; and
- (21) The revised Tree Plan has not been made available to the public and the tree officer was not re-consulted on this.

The comments are noted. The bulk of these points have already been considered within the officer report or by the consultees. However the following comments are made in respect of new points:

- (1) The comments of the Private Estate are considered to be a local resident representation with the same weight as other representations;
- (10) These objections were received after the report was finalised and are instead summarised above;
- (15) The Article 4 has been considered but only insofar as it removes permitted development rights and requires that planning permission be sought;
- (16) The attachment was a notice of service form taken from the Councils website;
- (17) There was no conversation with the Conservation Officer at this time;
- (20) We are required to upload anything submitted by an applicant in support of their proposal (or indeed anything submitted by third parties in connection with an application). It is then the role of the planning officer to determine whether the information submitted is material or not;
- (21) The Councils Tree Officer requested a further addition to the Arboricultural Method Statement and the applicants have provided a new version including this additional text (this is referred to elsewhere in this report update). The Arboricultural Method Statement was added to the website on the 3rd of August. The Tree Officer was informed of this but there was no reason for him to make further comment.

CORRECTION TO "OFFICERS COMMENTS ON REPS" SECTION OF THE REPORT:

A local resident had commented that a ramped access from the road would detract from the streetscene.

In response, the officer had stated: "(18) Noted however, there are other ramped or level accesses on local roads which are not considered to detract from the character of the streetscene;"

However, we are unable to give examples of other ramped accesses within the Craigweil Estate.

There are existing and proposed section drawings within the Tree Survey report which illustrate that there will be a slightly greater gradient on the slope between the site and the road.

Officers Comment:

The recommendation has been amended to amend condition 03 to refer to the Rev D Arboricultural Method Statement. This change is reflected by the attached amended replacement recommendation sheet.

Notes: Changes to recommendations, conditions and / or reasons for refusal will always be reflected in the recommendation section of the attached Officer's Report.

Recommendation Report for Planning Permission for Works or Extension to a Dwelling

REF NO: AW/71/18/HH

LOCATION: 36 Kingsway
Aldwick
PO21 4DH

PROPOSAL: Demolition of existing ground floor extensions to front of property, construction of a single storey rear extension & reworking of existing external hard & soft landscaping including new vehicular access onto Kingsway. This application affects the character & appearance of the Craigweil House Conservation Area.

SITE AND SURROUNDINGS

DESCRIPTION OF APPLICATION	The proposal consists of the following: (1) Removal of 2 x single storey front extensions; (2) Removal of the Leylandi hedge to the front of the property; (3) Reworking of existing front hard/soft landscaping including a replacement low front hedge; (4) Creation of a new vehicular access onto Kingsway; (5) Removal of the pedestrian gate on Queensway; and (6) New flat roofed rear kitchen extension (2.85m wide by 1.96m deep by 3.1m high); In addition to the front hedge to be removed, the application proposes to fell tree T11 (a Smooth Arizona Cypress) and also proposes works in respect of trees T5 (reinstating verge levels), T9 (removing major deadwood) and T13 (removing Ivy and major deadwood).
TOPOGRAPHY	Predominantly flat.

TREES	Several mature tree specimens to the boundary with Queensway and to the rear of the site. Most notable is a Horse Chestnut (ref T5) located close to the junction of Queensway and Kingsway. Also three young trees on the verge to the front. The T5 Horse Chestnut and a Monterey Cypress (T6) just to the south of it are both protected by TPO/AW/5/16.
BOUNDARY TREATMENT	Existing 3-4m high conifer hedge to the front and eastern side allowing no views in. Supplemented with close boarded fencing. Existing pedestrian/vehicular entrances have white rendered pillars.
SITE CHARACTERISTICS	Large corner plot with attractive, detached two storey property, set back from the road with driveway and detached garage to front and rear respectively. Large garden to rear and, in part to side. Driveway to front of garage and two existing pedestrian gates, one on the front and one on the side.
CHARACTER OF LOCALITY	Within the Craigweil House Conservation Area also designated as an Area of Special Character. Private residential estate comprising detached properties of various styles and designs, some of notable character.

RELEVANT SITE HISTORY

AW/144/16/HH	Replacement ground floor extension & new vehicular accesses to site. This application affects the Craigweil House Conservation Area.	Withdrawn 13-10-16
AW/104/06/	Erection of detached house and garage	Refused 30-08-06 Appeal: Dismissed 25-01-07
AW/2/02/	Details in pursuance of outline approval AW/187/98 for a new house and garage.	ApproveConditionally 07-08-02
AW/187/98/	Renewal of unimplemented outline planning permission AW/159/95 for detached house, double garage and driveway.	ApproveConditionally 19-01-99

Pre-application advice was given in respect of this proposal in January 2018 at which time it was concluded that "were an application for planning permission to be submitted then providing that the front pedestrian gate is retained and that the Councils Tree Officer has no objections with respect to impact on trees, then the proposal would likely be approved."

Prior to this, application AW/144/16/HH had been withdrawn following objection by the Councils Tree

Officer.

REPRESENTATIONS

REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED:

Aldwick Parish Council

"Members strongly objected to the application on the grounds that the proposed extension would not preserve or enhance a conservation area and because it would compromise the established spatial character and pattern on the street and because it would damage or destroy one or more trees protected by a tree preservation order in a conservation area. Members noted that the drive cuts across a verge and interrupts the spatial character of the road. Therefore Members agreed that the proposed application is in direct conflict with Policy Area 2, Policy Dev 19 (v) and Policy Gen 28 of the Arun District Local Plan 2003 and with the Parish Design Statement (p. 31) The Ass't Clerk agreed to inform the relevant Ward Member of the Committee's decision."

Eleven letters of objection (including from the Craigweil House and its Environs Conservation Area Association - CHECAA) raising the following issues:

- (1) Drawings incorrectly show tree/hedge heights;
- (2) Application does not advertise the felling of trees;
- (3) Flawed consultation with CAAC as it was not clear about the new driveway;
- (4) Insufficient details of the proposed gates and gate posts;
- (5) Insufficient detail in respect of trees;
- (6) New hedge will result in heavy soil & gutter pipes being visible in the streetscene;
- (7) In/out driveways in the Conservation Area unacceptable in principle;
- (8) New driveway will harm the Conservation Area and Area of Special Character;
- (9) History of refusals for in/out driveways e.g. AW/150/13 concerning 38 Kingsway);
- (10) Will lead to storage, parking & maintenance of racing cars within the site (the applicants are involved in motor racing) which would be out of character with the Conservation Area;
- (11) New access will lead to pedestrian safety issues given it is only 10m from the Queensway junction;
- (12) Most properties manage perfectly well with just one vehicle access;
- (13) The extension will not sympathetically relate to or be visually integrated with, the existing building in siting, design, form, scale and materials - and will make the house bigger & bulkier;
- (14) The Horse Chestnut must be afforded great protection;
- (15) No planning application has been made to hard surface the verge;
- (16) Proposal will not enhance the Conservation Area;
- (17) The loss of the 20+ trees in the hedge will harm the Conservation Area;
- (18) Ramped access across the verge will detract from the street scene;
- (19) Most cars reverse out of their driveways causing highway safety issues. This proposal will result in vehicles reversing out of two driveways and close to the junction with Queensway;
- (20) The boundary wall/gates will harm the T5 Chestnut tree; and
- (21) The gates will open outwards thus blocking access to the privately owned verge.

One letter of support on the grounds that the proposal will enable this to be a feature house on the estate by removing the unsightly/overgrown Leylandii hedge. Also, that although there is traffic on that short piece of Queensway, there is not traffic congestion and traffic should not be traveling quickly after all the speed limit on the estate is 20mph.

A representation from Craigweil Private Estate Limited stating that:

- Do not envisage the second proposed exit on to Kingsway to create a safety issue;
- A number of other houses in the estate have 'in-and-out' driveway layouts;
- 36 Kingsway boasts the second-longest verge frontage on the estate;
- The proposed layout is in keeping with the size and nature of the property, and its frontage on to Kingsway and Queensway;
- We give our approval for the construction of the new cross-over this proposal requires, as the re-allocation of the area currently occupied by the pedestrian paths mitigates the loss of verge; and
- The applicants should strictly adhere to the standard Tree Preservation perimeter regulations in respect of the T5 Horse Chestnut.

COMMENTS ON REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED:

The Parish Council comments are noted and the issues raised will be discussed in the Conclusions section.

The following comments are offered in respect to the objections:

- (1) The trees & hedges can be accurately considered from a site visit or from photographs;
- (2) The application supporting statements clearly reference the felling of trees and hedges;
- (3) The application plans clearly show the proposed new vehicular access and CAAC would have access to these plans. CAAC raised no objection to the application;
- (4) Noted. A condition will be imposed to control the details of the gates;
- (5) Noted. This is considered to have been resolved through the intervention of the Councils Arboriculturist and the submission of further supporting information;
- (6) Such features are visible on most houses and it is not considered that these detract from the appearance of the building;
- (7) All applications should be considered on their own merits. There is no adopted development plan policy that states that in/out driveways are unacceptable in principle;
- (8) This will be considered within this report's conclusions;
- (9) An in/out driveway was refused in respect of 38 Kingsway (AW/150/13) and dismissed on appeal (APP/C3810/D/13/2207441). In respect of that site there was a Conservation Officer objection and further, the frontage, at 22m is some 13m shorter than that for the application site. On this basis, it is considered appropriate to appraise this proposal without reference to that previous decision;
- (10) There is no evidence of this within the application submission, only from the objectors. There would be nothing stopping anyone on the estate, in planning terms, from parking racing cars on their drives.
- (11) Noted however, cars travelling along this estate do so at low speeds and drivers are aware of pedestrians who often share the road surface. It is not considered that the proposal would result in a severe impact on highway safety;
- (12) Noted;
- (13) This will be considered within this report's conclusions;
- (14) This tree has warranted special attention from the Councils Arboriculturist and as such will be afforded the necessary level of protection; and
- (15) This forms part of this planning application and the drawings/plans clearly show the area of verge to be hard surfaced.
- (16) It is considered that the act of removing the existing hedge will enhance the conservation by better revealing the existing attractive building;
- (17) See (16);
- (18) Noted however, there are other ramped or level accesses on local roads which are not considered to detract from the character of the streetscene;
- (19) It is considered likely that with an in/out driveway, residents will be more likely to turn around within the site and exit in a forward gear. However, cars travelling along this estate do so at low speeds and

drivers are aware of pedestrians who often share the road surface. It is not considered that the proposal would result in a severe impact on highway safety;

(20) The proposal has been subject to a comprehensive assessment by the Councils Arboriculturist who has following receipt of amendments, raised no objection; and

(21) Land ownership is not a material planning consideration.

The letter of support and the representation from Craigweil Private Estate Limited are both noted.

CONSULTATIONS

Conservation Officer

Arboriculturist

Arboriculturist

CONSULTATION RESPONSES RECEIVED:

ADC ARBORICULTURIST - Initially raised an objection on the grounds of a failure to make allowance for the likely impeded root development on the east aspect of T5 and the impact of the proposed new driveway on the root system of T5. Following a site meeting and the receipt of further documents, the Arboriculturist has stated that subject to the inclusion of two planning conditions, that the objection can be lifted.

ADC CONSERVATION OFFICER - verbal advice received raising no objection and requesting that a condition be applied to seek approval of the driveway surfacing materials. Written advice was also received in respect of the pre-application enquiry and stated that the pedestrian gate on the site frontage (northern elevation) is an original feature and should be retained. However, that a new vehicular access will be acceptable provided that matching materials are used. There was no concern raised to either the demolition or extension aspects.

CONSERVATION AREA ADVISORY COMMITTEE - "No objection"

COMMENTS ON CONSULTATION RESPONSES:

Comments noted. The conditions recommended by the Arboriculturist and Conservation Officer are included within the list of conditions.

POLICY CONTEXT

Designations applicable to site:

Within the Built Up Area Boundary;

Craigweil House Conservation Area;

No Public Sewer;

Article 4 Direction (preventing the enclosure of verge areas and the hard surfacing of front gardens);

TPO/AW/5/16;

TPO/AW/1/02; and

BOGNOR NO.2 TPO.

DEVELOPMENT PLAN POLICES

DDM1 D DM1 Aspects of form and design quality

DDM4 D DM4 Extensions&alter to exist builds(res and non-res)

ENVDM4	ENV DM4 Protection of trees
HERSP1	HER SP1 The Historic Environment
HERDM3	HER DM3 Conservation Areas
SDSP2	SD SP2 Built-up Area Boundary
TSP1	T SP1 Transport and Development

PLANNING POLICY GUIDANCE:

NPPF	National Planning Policy Framework
NPPG	National Planning Practice Guidance

SUPPLEMENTARY POLICY GUIDANCE:

SPD2	Conservation Areas
SPD2A	Craigweil House, Aldwick, Conservation Area Statement
SPD10	Aldwick Parish Design Statement

POLICY COMMENTARY

The Development Plan consists of the Arun District Local Plan 2011-31, West Sussex County Council's Waste and Minerals Plans and Made Neighbourhood Development Plans.

The Neighbourhood Development Plan

Where applicable, Neighbourhood Development Plan's (more commonly known as a neighbourhood plan or NDP), once made by Arun District Council, will form part of the statutory local development plan for the relevant designated neighbourhood area.

Made Plans in Arun District Council's Local Planning Authority Area are: Aldingbourne; Angmering; Arundel; Barnham & Eastergate; Bersted; Bognor Regis; Clymping; East Preston; Felpham; Ferring; Kingston; Littlehampton; Rustington; Walberton; Yapton.

Aldwick have not developed a Neighbourhood Development Plan but has published a Design Guide.

DEVELOPMENT PLAN AND/OR LEGISLATIVE BACKGROUND

Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 states:-

"If regard is to be had to the development plan for the purpose of any determination to be made under the planning Acts the determination must be made in accordance with the plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise."

The proposal is considered to comply with relevant Development Plan policies in that it would have no materially adverse effect on the visual amenities of the locality or the residential amenities of the adjoining properties, nor would it have an adverse impact upon the established character of the surrounding area.

OTHER MATERIAL CONSIDERATIONS

It is considered that there are no other material considerations to warrant a decision otherwise than in accordance with the Development Plan and/or legislative background.

CONCLUSIONS

PRINCIPLE:

The site is within the built up area boundary where development is acceptable in principle subject to normal development control criteria being satisfied such as design, visual & residential amenity and parking provision.

IMPACT ON THE CHARACTER OF THE AREA:

The Parish Council consider that the extension will not preserve or enhance the Conservation Area and will compromise the established spatial character and pattern of the street. Also that the harm to trees will affect the Conservation Area and that the new access will interrupt the spatial character of the road. Local residents also raise concerns over the new access and the extension to the house.

Arun Local Plan policy HER DM3 states that:

"In order to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Conservation Area, planning permission or relevant consent will normally be granted for proposals within or affecting the setting of a Conservation Area, provided that:

(b) Alterations or additions to existing buildings are sensitively designed, constructed of appropriate materials and are sympathetic in scale, form and detailing and retain or emphasise the features and qualities of the existing buildings, townscape or streetscape in the area;

(d) Unsympathetic features are removed and missing features are restored or reinstated;

(e) It retains historically significant boundaries, important open spaces and other elements of the area's established pattern of development, character and historic value, including gardens, roadside banks and verges;"

The Policy also states that demolition will only be acceptable if the structure to be demolished makes no material contribution to the special character or appearance of the area.

The description of this section of Kingsway given in both the Craigweil House Conservation Area Statement and the Aldwick Parish Design Statement (APDS) is as follows:

"The character of Kingsway changes slightly at the curve in the road; the grass verges widen creating a sense of spaciousness. Boundary treatment of the properties varies; there is a variety of brick boundary walls, fences and some properties have open frontages. Younger planting is visible on the verges and miniature trees are present."

Regard should also be had to policy D DM4 (Extensions and Alterations) which requires that:

"(a) the extension or alteration sympathetically relates to and is visually integrated with, the existing building in siting, massing, design, form, scale and materials;

(b) the extension or alteration is visually subservient to the main building and provide a high standard of amenity;

(c) the extension or alteration does not have an adverse overshadowing, overlooking or overbearing effect on neighbouring properties;

(e) the extension or alteration does not compromise the established spatial character and pattern of the

place but is instead a positive addition."

It is considered that the extension is acceptable as it is very small in size/scale, subservient to the host building, will be in matching materials and will only have very limited visibility in the streetscene. The proposal also involves the removal of two existing front flat roofed single storey extensions. These are considered to be unsympathetic additions to the building which make no material contribution to the special character & appearance of the area.

The demolition of these together with the removal of the front hedge (and replacement hedging) will better reveal the attractiveness of the building to the streetscene and in turn enhance the character of the Conservation Area in accordance with policy HER DM3 and the APDS. It is considered that the loss of the hedge would open up of the property to views from outside would make a positive contribution to the character of the area.

It is not considered that the pedestrian gate to be removed from the Queensway frontage will be harmful. It is acknowledged that there are concerns with the addition of a second vehicular gate and that a similar proposal was refused and appeal dismissed on a property nearby. However, this property has a much longer frontage onto Kingsway and is considered better able to absorb the new entrance without resulting in overdevelopment of the verge. Furthermore, that previous application attracted an objection from the Conservation Officer whilst this one does not. Indeed, the Conservation Officer raises no objection to any part of the proposal.

It is therefore considered that the proposal complies with policies HER DM3 and D DM4 of the Arun Local Plan 2011-2031 - and with the additional supplementary planning guidance documents.

OTHER MATTERS:

It is not considered that any part of the scheme affects the amenity of neighbouring residential properties. It is also not considered that the new access will result in harm to pedestrian or vehicle safety given the low speed of vehicles using the estate and the visibility afforded by the wide verges.

The Councils Arboriculturist has now confirmed that there is no objection to the removal of T11 or the front hedge and is also satisfied with the works to T5, T9 & T13. The proposed tree protection scheme is considered to be appropriate and conditions will be imposed to ensure that this is followed (and will be subject to checking on site by the Arboriculturist).

SUMMARY:

The Parish Council and local resident objections have been carefully assessed but it is not considered that any part of the proposed scheme will result in a materially adverse impact on the character & Appearance of the Conservation Area on notable/protected trees or on the safety of the local roads. The Council's Conservation and Tree Officers are supportive of the proposals and as such, it is recommended that planning permission be granted subject to the following conditions.

HUMAN RIGHTS ACT

The Council in making a decision should be aware of and take into account any implications that may arise from the Human Rights Act 1998. Under the Act, it is unlawful for a public authority such as Arun District Council to act in a manner, which is incompatible with the European Convention on Human Rights.

Consideration has been specifically given to Article 8 (right to respect private and family life) and Article 1

of the First Protocol (protection of property). It is not considered that the recommendation for approval of the grant of permission in this case interferes unreasonably with any local residents' right to respect for their private and family life and home, except insofar as it is necessary to protect the rights and freedoms of others (in this case, the rights of the applicant). The Council is also permitted to control the use of property in accordance with the general interest and the recommendation for approval is considered to be a proportionate response to the submitted application based on the considerations set out in this report.

DUTY UNDER THE EQUALITIES ACT 2010

Duty under the Equalities Act 2010

In assessing this proposal the following impacts have been identified upon those people with the following protected characteristics (age, disability, gender reassignment, marriage and civil partnership, pregnancy and maternity, race, religion or belief, sex or sexual orientation).

The proposal would have a neutral impact on the protected characteristics.

RECOMMENDATION

APPROVE CONDITIONALLY

- 1 The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of 3 years from the date of this permission.

Reason: To comply with Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended).

- 2 The development hereby approved shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans:

C0019-P001 Location Plan Rev B;
 C0019-P004 Proposed Site Plan Rev I;
 C0019-P111 "Proposed Ground Floor Plan" Rev E;
 C0019-P112 "Proposed First Floor Plan" Rev B;
 C0019-P211 "Proposed South Elevation" Rev B;
 C0019-P212 "Proposed West Elevation" Rev B;
 C0019-P213 "Proposed North Elevation" Rev B;
 C0019-P214 "Proposed East Elevation" Rev B;
 C0019-P215 "Proposed North Elevation - Context" Rev G;
 C0019-P216 "Proposed East Elevation - Context" Rev C;
 C0019-P218 "Proposed Section through drive"; and
 C0019-SK028 "3D Model - Proposed" Rev B.

Reason: For the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of amenity and the environment in accordance with policy D DM1 of the Arun District Local Plan 2011-2031.

- 3 All construction works are to be carried out in strict accordance with the Tree Survey; Arboricultural Impact Assessment; and Arboricultural Method Statement Report all prepared by the Landscape Partnership (REV D - 03/08/18) including the Tree Protection Plan dwg.no. AIA/AMS drawing no.602 - Rev B. and Cellweb Section - Tree Root Protection dwg no. GS-CW-BP-75.

Reason: To comply with BS5837 and the National Planning Policy Framework to ensure that

retained trees are afforded due respect and appropriate levels of protection such that their ongoing health and vitality are not compromised so they can continue to enhance the landscape and amenity of the area. This is required to be a pre-commencement condition because it is necessary to ensure that the trees are protected prior to commencing any building works.

- 4 Prior to any construction works taking place or the introduction of any machinery and plant to the site, the following issues must be resolved to our satisfaction:-

A Pre-Commencement Site Meeting is to take place between the Arun District Council Tree Officer and the Arboricultural Expert representing the site owners - at this meeting all protective fencing will be inspected along with ground protection measures - they will be assessed to verify that they are 'Fit for Purpose' as required under British Standard 5837 and have been erected and positioned exactly as shown on the Tree Protection Plan ref: AIA/AMS drawing no.602 - Rev B.

A schedule of Site Monitoring/Supervision visits and Reporting Procedures prepared by an Arboricultural Expert will be required and their extent will be agreed on at the site meeting to the satisfaction of the Arun District Council Tree Officer.

Reason: To comply with BS5837 and the National Planning Policy Framework to ensure that retained trees are afforded due respect and appropriate levels of protection such that their ongoing health and vitality are not compromised so they can continue to enhance the landscape and amenity of the area. This is required to be a pre-commencement condition because it is necessary to ensure that the trees are protected prior to commencing any building works.

- 5 No development in respect of the new driveway/new hard surfacing shall take place unless and until a schedule of materials and finishes to be used for the new proposed hard surfacing/driveway have been submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority and the materials so approved shall be used in the construction of the new hard surfacing/driveway.

Reason: To enable the Local Planning Authority to control the development in detail in the interests of amenity and the character and appearance of the Conservation Area in accordance with policies D DM1 & HER DM3 of the Arun District Local Plan 2011-2031.

- 6 The materials and finishes of the external walls of the extension hereby permitted shall match in colour and texture those of the existing building.

Reason: In the interests of amenity in accordance with policies D DM1 & HER DM3 of the Arun District Local Plan 2011-2031.

- 7 The materials and finishes of the new gates and gate posts shall match in colour, style and texture with those of the existing vehicle & pedestrian gates on the Kingsway frontage.

Reason: In the interests of amenity in accordance with policies D DM1 & HER DM3 of the Arun District Local Plan 2011-2031.

- 8 INFORMATIVE: Statement pursuant to Article 35 of the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure)(England) Order 2015. The Local Planning Authority has acted positively and proactively in determining this application by identifying matters of concern within the application (as originally submitted) and negotiating, with the Applicant, acceptable amendments to the proposal to address those concerns. As a result, the Local Planning Authority has been able to grant planning permission for an acceptable proposal, in

accordance with the presumption in favour of sustainable development, as set out within the National Planning Policy Framework.