From: Planning@horsham.gov.uk
Sent: 06 March 2024 22:54
To: Planning
Subject: Comments for Planning Application DC/23/2142

Categories: Comments Received

Comments summary

Dear Sir/Madam,

Planning Application comments have been made. A summary of the comments is provided below.

Comments were submitted at 06/03/2024 10:54 PM.

Application Summary

Address:	Boreham House Church Street Rudgwick West Sussex RH12 3EF
Proposal:	Variation of Conditions 1,8,9,10, and 13 of previously approved application DC/22/2048 (Variation of condition 1 of previously approved application reference DC/22/1571 (Variation of condition 1 of previously approved application DC/22/0085 (Variation of Condition 1 (plans) and Removal of Condition 4 (finished floor levels), 5 (materials), 6 (water use), and 7 (landscaping) of previously approved application DC/19/1229 (Erection of 2.No two storey detached dwellings with associated parking and garage, landscaping and creation of hard standing) to allow for design alterations to Unit 2) to allow for the phasing of the overall scheme) to allow for minor design changes to Unit 1.) Variation sought in respect of air source heat pump, water drainage details, finished floor levels, engineering layout, and arboricultural details including tree protection plan.
Case Officer:	Robert Hermitage

Click for further information

Customer Details

Address:	Wisteria Cottage Highcroft Drive Rudgwick

Comments Details

Commenter Type:	Neighbour
Stance:	Customer objects to the Planning Application
Reasons for comment:	- Design - Overdevelopment - Trees and Landscaping
Comments:	Tree T11 with the TPO In the planning application it has been requested to be crown raised to a height of 5.5 meters.

Having measured this from the driveway of Boreham House we have found that this is not achievable without the removal of a substantial primary limb. On a tree of this significant age it is not acceptable to remove such a primary bough and will have a catastrophic effect on the health or even life of this protected Oak. Removal of the secondary limb on this primary only gives a clearance of 5 meters when measured at the edge of the north side of the driveway. To achieve a 5.5 clearance the primary limb will be in the way. We are not confident that having taken the secondary limb off to achieve the 5m clearance that the contractors will not 'accidentally' knock into the main primary limb and damage the tree.

On a second note for this poor tree, we are not happy for all the digging in the RPA of the tree to enable the services for this development. The tree officer is also concerned that all the open trench digging for the services will likely to be detrimental to the overall condition of this tree. Surely there are other areas for this service trench to be dug to join up with the services on the roadside. I think this has been planned as the easiest and cheapest place for the service trenching without a thought for this TPO'd tree. What is the point of a tree having a TPO if planning simply ignores it.

Tree T13, T12 and T29

We object to the digging of traditional foundations within the RPA of T13, T12 and our own tree T29. This digging would have a detrimental effect on the trees which is confirmed by the tree officers report. In a few years' time the trees would then have to be felled or severely cut back and not be the tree corridor that they are at present and that is meant to be so important. If the piles used for the garage of unit 2 are going to be 'sheathed to make sure no concrete seeps into the root system for the garage', how would the concrete foundations of the house and surrounding area be sheathed to protect the RPA? Why is it that it is OK for concrete foundations to be used for the house and surrounding area now? We know of no foundations in such a clay soil area to be as shallow as 650mm indeed they are often at least 1.5m or more. Why was it not OK last time but it being asked for again? The tree officer even says that this could affect a high degree of damage for the surrounding trees, one of which is our own T29 which is not even on the plans for the 2019 and 2022! T29 is a large oak tree with roots in the RPA. How is it that we can accept plans that are totally inaccurate or was it just omitted for convenience? If the house and garage are built, how are we to make sure that the plans are adhered to when they are so inaccurate.

Apparently, Unit 2 has now been moved nearer Boreham House, but nowhere does it tell us by how much. The plans for this whole development have been totally inaccurate from the very start and have given rise to this whole debacle and this gives us no confidence that the plans are correct now and that the builders will actually build Unit 2 in the right place. We are told there is to be an arboriculturist monitoring the sensitive digging in the RPA but we feel doubtful this will actually happen. We don't trust this statement and we don't trust this planning process in the least.

We repeat again, when we bought Wisteria Cottage we knew that there was planning permission (2019) for two houses in the garden of Boreham House and having researched it as much as we could we were happy that the development would not impact the house and garden at Wisteria Cottage and on that basis, we went ahead and purchased the house. Since that time, there have been numerous alterations to these plans and we have since discovered the inaccurate mapping of the trees T29 (missing) and the fictional huge gap between T13 and T14 (enough to contain a garage building) on the original plans. We feel we have been duped. We would suggest that the planning returns back to the original plans we saw in 2019 - a smaller footprint further away from the RPA's of the trees (even if the tree plans were totally inaccurate) thus we object to these plans.

Kind regards