

Mr T Dixon
5 Bramley Gardens
Bognor Regis
West Sussex
PO22 9SP

Mrs Nicola Moore
Arun District Council
Arun Civic Centre
Maltravers Road
West Sussex
BN17 5LF

Nicola.moore@arun.gov.uk

13th October 2020

RE: BE/98/20/TC – Liseve Lodge 84 North Bersted Street

Dear Ms Moore,

Firstly, I'd like to note that Arun Council have a responsibility to ensure such planning notifications are adequately displayed in the community, on this occasion visibility of this notification was not adequate and future precautions should be made to ensure the community have an opportunity to review such notifications.

I write to object current plans under reference BE/98/20/TC my reasons for objecting are as follows:

- Sufficient information is not available to understand the condition of the trees T1 & T2 and adequate information on why they are unsafe and should be removed is missing from the current reports available
- Removal of trees T1 & T2 could make future planning applications more likely to be approved. (Note: previous plans on this site have recently been rejected)
- Removal of these tree's is contrary to the Bersted planning document '**Bersted Neighbourhood plans 2014-2029**'
- Removal of these tree's significantly risks wildlife
- A second opinion of tree condition should be obtained by a council nominated party

Insufficient information:

The current plan documentation on the Arun website does not give sufficient information on why trees T1 & T2 should be fell. I could understand a reduction in height to promote future growth and ensure the tree's foundations remain well.

I would also suggest a second opinion from a tree surgery to ascertain the best course of action for tree health.

Plans do not align with Bersted's planning document 'Bersted Neighbourhood plans 2014-2019':

Bersted Neighbourhood plans - Page 13 - Sections 2.3.4 & Section 3.0

This document clearly outlines the plans for Bersted and I believe this proposal is contrary to these plans, the plans clearly note the area's aim is to have mature hedging, mature trees, large garden and fields, wildlife, flint walls all of which make a positive contribution to the area, none of which these plans complement. Two fell two beautiful trees is a direct contrary to the plans.

Wildlife risk

It would be important to re-review a previous ecological assessment carried out on the site which clearly outlined a beautiful array of wildlife which include protected species, and note poignant parts of the report for your conveyance.

Preliminary Ecological Assessment

Badgers:

Page 5 - Section 2.3 - This report mentions that signs of Badgers were recorded but does not specify in the report what the recordings are. I would therefore suggest further assessment of badgers is taken as it would be clear to me that the site is the perfect setting for badgers.

Bats:

Page 18 - Table 1 - Clearly suggests that the potential for bats to roost is high in 'T1, T2 & T3' I can also confirm that I often see bats during the evening.

Page 19 - clearly shows that 5 species of bats are known within the area within 1km.

Great Crested Newts:

Page 20 - Section 3.7 clearly mentions the site being an ideal spot for Great Crested Newts within flowerbeds and railway sleepers the report also mentions a notable sighting of the GCN's within the pond noted as Pond 1 within the report.

Birds:

I'd implore you to come and stand within my garden to witness the breath-taking sound and visual sight of the wildlife which would be endangered by this proposal.

Future plans:

It is my belief that the felling of these trees will make way for future planning applications as the grounds these trees fall in are within the area of a previous housing proposal. Approval of this application may be a way to gain approval for housing in the future.

Proper consideration should be given to ensure this proposal does not make way for future proposals.

Yours Sincerely

Mr T Dixon