

From: Simon Davis
Sent: 02 December 2019 17:14
To: Mark Warwick <Mark.Warwick@arun.gov.uk>
Subject: FW: Inglenook P/58/19/PL

Hi Mark,

At the request of WSCC Highways (see comments attached – top of page 2), the applicants are proposing to remove two conifers from the access road (see annotation on the plan). These are also shown on the photo. They state in the email below that the trees are Category C. Can you confirm whether this is ok with you? I could do with knowing by the 10th December so that I can get this included in the Committee report.

Kind Regards

Simon J Davis MRTPI | Principal Planning Officer, Planning Department, Directorate of Place, Arun District Council |
Location: Planning, First Floor, Arun Civic Centre, Maltravers Road, Littlehampton, BN17 5LF
Internal: 37874 | External: +44 (0) 1903 737874 | E-mail: simon.davis@arun.gov.uk
Please note that I typically work from home on Thursdays when I am unreachable on my work phone

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



Save the environment - think before you print.

From: Richard Dollamore | Whaleback [REDACTED]
Sent: 02 December 2019 14:57
To: Simon Davis <Simon.Davis@arun.gov.uk>
[REDACTED]
Subject: RE: Inglenook P/58/19/PL

Dear Simon

Attached is a photo of the corner in question. The dead branches laid to make a kind of fence can be removed. The conifer tree can also be removed to leave the two sweet chestnuts free-standing. If we propose to remove the conifers, would it be sufficient for this to be identified with a new annotation on the site plan? The tree report identifies them as C Category trees and we cannot see a reason for retaining them.

Best wishes

Richard

From: Richard Dollamore | Whaleback [REDACTED]
Sent: 28 November 2019 15:16
To: 'Simon Davis' <Simon.Davis@arun.gov.uk>; 'Gareth Giles | Whaleback' [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
Subject: RE: Inglenook P/58/19/PL

Dear Simon

Thank you for your message confirming that you consider the alternative pedestrian path to be a positive change.

With regards to your questions, we can confirm that the understorey vegetation around the trees will be removed and any side shoots or whippy growth coming from the sweet chestnuts kept trimmed to maximise visibility. There is a mixed Leyland and Lawson cypress hedge that extends to this corner; it is not very attractive and not locally characteristic. If your tree officer is in agreement, a section of this could be removed from the corner area to further improve visibility.

With regards to the securing of the alternative pedestrian path through the pub grounds, it is proposed for the path to be gated and, outside of opening hours, to be accessible only by those with the key code/pin. Codes will be made available to staff of the Inglenook and residents of the proposed development, who will be able to let visitors know the pin as necessary. Security will also be ensured through CCTV covering the hotel grounds. This route may be made available for the permanent use of residents through an appropriate condition. In relation to the red line boundary, would it be acceptable to amend this so that it also encloses the revised pedestrian access? This would enable a condition with regards to the provision of pedestrian access through the hotel grounds to be conditionable.

The pavement on the shared drive may also be surfaced in bonded gravel but will be distinguishable from the main carriageway through 3 courses of brick pavers or a dished clay channel. There is also potential for the pavement area to be surfaced in clay paviors but this would need to be considered further at detailed design stage. The line of the pavement area is indicated on the drawing. As the detail of this has not yet been agreed we would be pleased if it could be agreed by condition.

Kind Regards

Richard

Richard Dollamore

WHALEBACK

