[redacted]

From: [redacted]
Sent: 19 December 2024 16:48
To: Planning
Subject: Planning applications DC/24/1800 and DC/24/1802

[redacted] [redacted]

For the attention of: Andrew Bush

I submitted objections to planning applications DC/24/1800 (relating to No.4 Lansdown Close) and DC/24/1802 (relating to No.5 Lansdown Close) for the felling of four protected oak trees in Lansdown Close and wish to add further comment for consideration accompanied by photographs.

The photographs attached to the aforementioned applications were for identification purposes only but did not show the context of their location either in the Close or as seen from the surrounding vicinity.

Oak trees used to be called 'the Sussex weed' they were so prolific but this is no longer the case and it is essential to retain those trees which remain. Being an indigenous species they are complete ecosystems in their own right as they maintain a wide variety of wildlife, flora and fauna. Since the mid 1980's I have witnessed the loss of five oaks in the locality, four of which have been felled and one, in Earls Meadow, has died in the last 12 months.

In regard to the alleged damage it seems only the extension at No.4 is affected, not the main original structure, and there is only one paper submitted headed 'discussion' suggesting the trees and vegetation are the cause but since it appears to be the concluding page of a fuller report it begs the question what was said on the other pages?. This page also concludes with the proviso and I quote 'Recommended works may be subject to change upon receipt of additional information.' So even the authors do not appear 100% certain of the cause. Could a contributory factor be the fully tarmaced frontage to both Nos.3 and 4 preventing rainwater being absorbed?

However, without the full report to consider we don't know. None of the photographs submitted show evidence of the damage. Neither has the Applicant submitted reports from a Building Surveyor, Structural Engineer or even a builder's quote for any necessary remedial works so it is not established with any confidence what may be the cause or the extent of the damage. Nor does the Applicant say if there is any recent sign of damage. If the tree roots are proved to be the problem could other options be considered before felling the trees such as removal of the roots or the installation of a root barrier?

In conclusion I believe applications DC/24/1800 and DC/24/1802 are supported by inadequate and insufficient evidence to justify the felling of the four protected trees and should be declined accordingly.

Yours faithfully,
[redacted] 7 Lansdown Close, Horsham

[redacted]





