

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]








[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Arun District Council, Civic Centre, Maltravers Rd
Littlehampton, West Sussex, BN17 5LF
www.arun.gov.uk

To register to receive notification of planning applications in your area please go to
<https://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	 Our core foundations	 
---	--	--	--	---	--

Connect with us: [Facebook](#) | [X](#) | [Instagram](#)

From: Breezie Allwright <Breezie.Allwright@arun.gov.uk>
Sent: 30 January 2026 08:40
To: Planning.Responses <Planning.Responses@arun.gov.uk>
Subject: Fw: Objection to FP/167/25/HH

Rep letter

Breezie Allwright
Planner Degree Apprentice, Planning Department
T: 01903737889
E: Breezie.allwright@Arun.gov.uk

Please note my working days are Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday and Friday.

Arun District Council, Civic Centre, Maltravers Rd
Littlehampton, West Sussex, BN17 5LF

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



Our priorities...



From: Masha White [REDACTED]
Sent: 29 January 2026 13:03
To: Planning <Planning@arun.gov.uk>
Subject: Objection to FP/167/25/HH

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.

29.01.2026

Dear Ms Clewley

We wish to object strenuously to this application which abuts our whole boundary with this proposed dwelling.

Application No. FP/167/25/HH 7 Lindsey Court, Felpham

We wish to object to the above proposal on the following grounds :-

1. The proposed new build is an overdevelopment of a modest size plot, which has already been subject to several extensions. It is proposed as a self contained standalone annex as it would be outside permitted development if it were attached.

2. We are particularly concerned that the proposed building would be right on our boundary. There is no provision for access to the rear or side of the property for regular maintenance. Under the terms of the 1990 Town and Country planning Act, for buildings up to 2.5 meters in height a space of 0.3 to 1.0 meters is usually considered practical and if the building is within 2 meters of a boundary its maximum height must not exceed 2.5 meters. If the building is taller, up to 4 meters it must be positioned at least 2 meters from the boundary. The plan submitted does not specify dimensions, but given the fact that it would have a pitched roof we believe it would be more than 4 meters high.
3. When “Site 6” was being developed to the rear of our garden we were told that no new building could take place within 25 meters of established TPO trees. The new build is well within 25 meters of our TPO tree and those in the applicant’s garden. The canopy from these mature Oak trees would overhang the new build.
4. Siting the new build against our boundary means that given the pitched roof our garden would collect fall out from the trees in the form of the regular acorn and leaf dropping. We already have a huge amount of such deposits and do not want more from next door. Every few years (Most Years) Oak trees are subject to exceptional falls of acorns. Autumn 2025 was such a year. We had to collect and remove over 300 kilos of Acorns from our garden and the applicant had at least a similar amount, it therefore seems unreasonable that we should collect even more via the roof of the new build.
5. The applicant’s Tree Survey makes assumptions as to the root spread of our tree, but it can be up to 3 times the spread of the canopy and we are concerned about the effect of the construction of foundations of what is described by your Tree Officer as a very important tree. The applicant’s Tree Surveyor, never visited the site of our tree and described it, T5, as a single stemmed Oak, whereas in fact it has a double stem and a much greater canopy and corresponding root system than described.
6. The Tree survey is very detailed in its conditions before and during the build for the protection of the trees. If permission is granted, this will need to be carefully monitored as the applicant has shown a blatant disregard for the regulations covering the TPO trees in the last year with 2 visits from the Enforcement officer and Arun DC Arboriculturist.
7. We were informed after the previous application that a special technique could be used to protect the tree roots to build on a type of raft with a crawl space under the building. Such a system if utilised would of course further increase the height of the building by 0.5 to 1.0 meters.
8. We are also concerned about extra noise and disturbance with another dwelling right on our boundary.

9. Finally we are concerned that the new build might be sold off as a separate dwelling requiring its own access and even potentially be further extended and possibly incorporate a second storey.

For all of the above reasons we would ask that the application be refused.

Yours sincerely

Glyn and Masha White

19 Whitelands,

Felpham

PO22 8JG

A solid black rectangular box used to redact the signature of Glyn and Masha White.

Masha White