
FW: BR/76/26/T- 13 Normanton Avenue

From Silvie Steiningerova <Silvie.Steiningerova@arun.gov.uk>

Date Mon 08/06/2026 09:21

To Planning.Responses <Planning.Responses@arun.gov.uk>

 1 attachment (2 MB)

Report ref 2620.pdf;

Good morning,

Please can you upload the attached document to BR/76/26/T and re-consult the Tree Officer?

BR/76/26/T, Planning, Statement, 'Structural Engineers Report May 2026', Public, Redacted

Many thanks,

Silvie Steiningerova

Planning Officer, Planning Department

T: 01903 737702

E: silvie.steiningerova@arun.gov.uk

Arun District Council, Civic Centre, Maltravers Rd

Littlehampton, West Sussex, BN17 5LF

www.arun.gov.uk

My Usual Working hours are: 7:30- 17:00 Monday, 7:30 – 15:00 Tuesday, 7:30- 14:00 Wednesday to Friday

To register to receive notification of planning applications in your area please go to www1.arun.gov.uk/planning-application-finder



Our priorities...



Improving the wellbeing of Arun



Delivering the right homes in the right places



Supporting our environment to support us



Fulfilling Arun's economic potential



ARUN
DISTRICT COUNCIL

From: A Kha [REDACTED]
Sent: 04 June 2026 16:19

To: Silvie Steiningerova <Silvie.Steiningerova@arun.gov.uk>

Subject: Re: BR/76/26/T- 13 Normanton Avenue

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organisation. You should take extra care when clicking links or opening attachments - if you are unsure the content is safe contact the IT Helpdesk before clicking or opening.

Re: Application BR/76/26/T – Response to Refusal of Consent

Dear Silvie

Thanks for sending over the Tree Officer report, I respectfully challenge the recommendation to refuse consent for the removal of T1 (Oak) at 13 Normanton Avenue and request that the Council reconsider the application in light of the supporting professional evidence submitted. I have attached the Structural Engineer Report and Arbitration Report.

Whilst I acknowledge that T1 is a prominent landscape feature and has been assessed as a Category A tree, the decision appears to place substantial weight on its amenity value whilst giving insufficient consideration to the documented and ongoing damage being caused to the property.

The Council's report states that removal has not been justified because detailed evidence of structural damage has not been provided. However, the Structural Engineer's Report prepared by Michael J. Grant BSc CEng FStructE identifies numerous structural defects throughout the property, including cracking to external walls, internal walls, distortion around openings, cracking within the garage structure and damage to the roof caused by direct branch contact. The report further concludes that the oak tree represents a significant risk to the foundations where clay-bearing soils are present and that the observed garage cracking has probably been caused by tree root activity affecting the subsoil and foundations.

The engineer records that the oak tree has a trunk diameter of approximately 1.2 metres, a crown spread of approximately 20–21 metres and is situated only 1.7 metres from the dwelling. Given its exceptional size and proximity, it is difficult to dismiss the likelihood that the tree is exerting significant influence on both the structure and the ground conditions surrounding the property.

Importantly, the Arboricultural Report itself records that the tree is causing visible damage to the building. Appendix A notes that branches are significantly encroaching upon the building and are causing visible roof damage. The report also identifies fractured branches, extensive deadwood, overextension above the highway and historical changes to ground levels around the tree base. These observations demonstrate that the relationship between the tree and the property is already resulting in physical damage and ongoing management concerns.

Furthermore, the property is currently undergoing substantial refurbishment following a prolonged period of dereliction. Retaining a mature oak of this size within such close proximity to the dwelling presents an ongoing risk of further damage, increased maintenance costs and constraints on the long-term restoration and occupation of the property.

The Structural Engineer has specifically recommended the gradual removal of the oak over several years to minimise any potential risk of soil heave. This is not a proposal for immediate felling without consideration of the consequences; rather it is a carefully considered professional recommendation intended to balance structural protection with appropriate arboricultural management.

I therefore respectfully submit that there is credible professional evidence demonstrating:

- Existing physical damage to the roof and building fabric caused by the tree.
- Evidence of structural cracking and movement throughout the property.
- A significant risk of continued foundation-related movement due to the size and proximity of the tree.
- A professional recommendation from a Chartered Structural Engineer that the tree should be progressively removed.

In light of this evidence, I respectfully request that the Council reconsider its decision, or alternatively advise what additional investigations would be required to satisfactorily demonstrate the relationship between the tree and the structural damage already observed.

Yours faithfully,

Abdul Khail
Owner – 13 Normanton Avenue

Sent from my iPhone