

Bronte Welham

From: Amanda Scholes on behalf of Planning.Responses
Sent: 31 March 2017 12:56
To: Planning Scanning
Subject: FW: Land adj No2 North Bersted St
Attachments: Land adjacent to 2 North Bersted St RevC.docx

Importance: High

From: Simon Davis
Sent: 31 March 2017 12:21
To: Planning.Responses
Subject: FW: Land adj No2 North Bersted St
Importance: High

Please upload this email and the attachment as Application Correspondence. I don't need a copy.

Kind Regards

Simon J Davis MRTPI | Principal Planning Officer, Planning Department, Arun District Council |
Location: 1st Floor, Arun Civic Centre, Maitravers Road, Littlehampton, BN17 5LF

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



Save the environment - think before you print.

Sent: 31 March 2017 11:23

To: Simon Davis

Subject: FW: Land adj No2 North Bersted St
Importance: High

Simon,

Thank you for sending us Dr Ian Wightman's comments this morning.

In response to his comments we would note as follows;

- The proposed dwelling has been set back by circa 1m from back of footpath.
- We would be very happy to put forward alternative elevational treatments to North Bersted Street. The reason we have not done so previously was because of concerns over possible overlooking, which does not appear to be an issue.

With regards the issue of the trees, my clients wish to make it perfectly clear, that they are not looking to carry out any works to the trees adjacent & apologise if the Landscape Architect has given that impression. Please find attached our response to this item, for your consideration.

Our clients wish to stress that they are happy to work with yourselves to come up with an agreeable solution to all & would be happy to have a meeting with you, if that were felt to be in any way beneficial.

We look forward to your response.

Regards

David Seaman
The Seaman Partnership Ltd
Unit 2 Martins Barn
Birdham Road
Chichester
West Sussex, PO20 7BX


This email and any files transmitted with it contains confidential information intended solely for the use of the individual or company to whom it is addressed. If you have received this email in error (ie you are not the named addressee) you should not disseminate, distribute or copy this e-mail. Please notify the sender. All reasonable precautions have been taken to ensure that this e-mail is free from any virus, however, the recipient should verify this to be the case. At TSP we appreciate all comments received from clients, take pride in providing an excellent service and place value on our ability to correct error. Should you wish to comment on any aspect of the service that I personally, or TSP as a whole, have given you please do so in confidence through my e-mail address.

Land adjacent to 2 North Bersted St. Bognor Regis.

Further arguments demonstrating acceptable proposals in relation to the existing off site trees.

The self-seeded sycamores in question are located beyond the site boundary, are not quality trees and are not protected by TPOs. The applicants could, tomorrow if they wished, trim all overhanging branches back to the boundary line entirely legally. Therefore, to refuse planning permission on the grounds that, in the future someone may wish to do something that is entirely legal and does not require planning permission is clearly not a valid reason for a refusal and the applicants have indicated that they would appeal if this was a reason given for such a refusal. The fact that they don't carry out such trimming now demonstrates that they are as keen as others for the trees to remain.

If, in the future, anyone based at the application site did wish to have the trees felled, the fact that they are not in control of the applicant means that such pressure can have no effect. The church, whose land they are located on, have already indicated that they wish the trees to remain.

The supplementary picture of the south east edge of the as site posted on the planning portal (enc below) demonstrates how the low eaves building proposed can be constructed without trimming the trees. The proposed building overlaps the furthest extent of the canopy of one tree by about 1M but, as can be seen from the photograph, the tree in question has a base some 750mm above the FFL of the proposed building and has a tall and ragged canopy. The eaves of the proposed building will easily fit below the plastic bag shown caught in the canopy meaning that no trimming will be required.

The planning issues have to be judged on the situation as it is presented now. The applicants have demonstrated that a perfectly acceptable property, complete with south facing garden can be constructed without "Pressure to fell or prune the off-site trees" now or in the future. Planning guidance does not require gardens to be in full sun or to be so remote from existing trees that gutter protection is not required.

