

Additional Representation

An additional representation has been received stating:

*“I have been helping a close neighbour and relative with their concerns on this matter. There is considerable disappointment that the Conservation Officers report does not address the application effectively and appears not to recognise the garage is built in a location not agreed with the previous Conservation Officers negotiations.*

*There is considerable disappointment that the Conservation Officers report does not address the application effectively and appears not to recognise the garage is built in a location not agreed with the previous Conservation Officers negotiations.*

*It is my view that this report is wholly inadequate and I wonder whether a more purposeful opinion and consideration should be made. I did raise this with the case officer at the time but without success.*

*What is at stake here is the Hartlip Conservation Area and I am not sure that SBC have reasonably fulfilled the obligation to protect the areas status.*

*Furthermore the Tree Officers report is equally unconvincing, especially as conventional strip trenches were used and NOT mini piling as should have been. Notwithstanding that the garage is built in the wrong location.”*

Applicant Response

The applicant has responded to dispute the claim that the strip foundations were used. The applicant has stated that the foundations of the garage were provided in accordance with the tree root protection specification and has provided photographs of the foundations.

