

Dear Sir/Madam,

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

Comments were submitted at 02/03/2026 3:05 PM from Miss Carole Whitcomb.

Application Summary

Address: 28 Parkfield Road Worthing West Sussex BN13 1EL

Proposal: Application for consent under Worthing Tree Preservation Order No.8 of 2004 to crown lift up to 8 metres one Ash tree of group G6 and reduce to allow clearance to building of up to 3 metres one Lawson Cypress tree of group G6.|cr|

Case Officer: Jeremy Sergeant

[Click for further information](#)

Customer Details

Name: Miss Carole Whitcomb

Email:

Address: 26A Parkfield Road Worthing West Sussex

Comments Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer made comments in support of the Planning Application

Reasons for comment: - Other

Comments: I am fully supportive of the request for works to be undertaken as highlighted in the Planning Application AWD/100/26. However I wish the below matters to also be addressed within this same Planning Application to protect the health and safety of myself (26A), and my loss of light together with the same in regard to my neighbours at 24 & 26 Parkfield Road and for the protection of structural damage to our properties.

The Planning Application simply states "cut back to give 3m clearance to the block of flats, to improve light into the flats and prevent damage to the building". I am making the assumption this relates to St Andrews Gardens, Church Road. However it neglects to mention any works to be undertaken to the east side where branches significantly overhang my property (26A) causing a danger to health, "nuisance" and loss of light and sunlight to my property and garden and also to my neighbours at 24 and 26 Parkfield Road.

The completed current Planning Application, excluding the Ash tree, simply states "Conifers (G1)" which are in the TPO G6 group It does not mention a Lawson

Cypress which is what appears as part of the title on the Council's letter I received. It also neglects to specify what works are intended to be undertaken to each of the 5 "conifers" included within G6 on a tree by tree basis.

In 2020 Worthing Borough Councils Planning Services Manager published his "Rejection Report" (31.07.20 - ref AWDM/0864/20) to a planning application, to undertake works to the same group of 7 TPO G6 trees. In its report, at that time the Council stated that any future requests should set out the intended works for each individual tree/species and this does not appear to be the case in the latest application. The Rejection Report also outlined constructive guidance for the TPO G6 tree owners for the alleviation of "nuisances" to others and their property e.g. crown reduction and crown thinning and attention to low hanging and wide spreading branches

Within the "Rejection Report" (31.07.20 - ref AWDM/0864/20) to the planning application made in 2020, the Council stated that these G6 trees were "immatures" trees. As such they have had over 5 years more growth since that inspection was undertaken, continuing to grow in height and branch width and continuing to cause "nuisance" to myself and my property.

The "current" Planning Application does not mention the felling of 1 Deodar tree which the Council has previously identified as dead (31.07.20 - ref AWDM/0864/20). I am concerned that if this tree is still present it would be dangerous in its current state.

I am also concerned that the current planning application does not take account of the purple beech tree (TPO T17) which is progressively substantially overhanging my property and that of my neighbour at 26 Parkfield Road causing a "nuisance" to our homes and cars. This T17 tree continues to develop a significant unbalanced crown and upper trunk over my property, causing the tree to lean in a north east direction "fall path" directly over my entire property. In the event of the tree falling under pressure from its exposure to strong prevailing south west winds, the fall would undoubtedly impact and demolish my home 26A - (first floor flat), further causing structural damage to the properties of 26 and 24, all of which are included within the same building structure. In particular my concern is the continued risk to life/health and safety, in the event that this tree should fall.
