

## Catherine Cardin

---

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 02 March 2026 13:20  
**To:** Catherine Cardin  
**Cc:** Colin Sewell-Rutter; Joyce Sewell-Rutter  
**Subject:** DM/25/3209: COTTAGE HOMES, CHURCH PLATT, CUCKFIELD

**Follow Up Flag:** Follow up  
**Flag Status:** Flagged

Dear Catherine

### **DM/25/3209: COTTAGE HOMES, CHURCH PLATT, CUCKFIELD Supplementary Objection by Mr & Mrs Sewell-Rutter, The Old Clergy House, Church Platt**

Since the objection lodged with you on 13 January by Mr & Mrs Sewell-Rutter the applicants have submitted an Arboricultural Impact Assessment (10 February), the MSDC Assistant Tree Officer has made a submission (27 February) and very significant submissions have also been made by the MSDC Conservation Officer (6 February) and Historic England (26 February). In our capacity as professional advisers to Mr & Mrs Sewell-Rutter we make further representations on their behalf on these new submissions.

#### **Trees and Hedges**

We presume the RPA of H1 is the solid blue polygonal outline. The report states that this hedge is assessed from site measurements (as it was omitted from the topographic survey) but that presented suggests that aerial photography of the canopy rather than fieldwork may have been relied upon instead (no approach was made to Mr and Mrs Sewell-Rutter for access). As a result the RPA has been positioned centrally in the canopy extrapolated from the photography. This methodology overlooks the heavy pruning evident on Cottage Homes' side as approved under DM/20/4031 'T1 - Yew. Reduce the overhanging branches by 3 meters back to the boundary with Old Clergy House. Same Elder and other leafing behind Summer House' and which was repeated thereafter. This when combined with the methodology employed, has had the effect of incorrectly positioning the hedge centreline and therefore misrepresenting the RPA.

We submit also that the RPA is also positioned without any eccentricity which is likely to exist as a result of the retaining wall located on the Old Clergy House's side of the boundary fence which I showed you during your site visit. This was last renewed in the mid-1990s and it is reasonable to contend will have biased rooting closer towards Cottage Homes where no obstruction exists. Acknowledgement and consideration of this should be made in the AIA.

For clarity, we confirm that the hedge centreline is located consistently 0.6m to the west of the timber fence. Accordingly this puts the foundation zone of the proposed extension within the RPA of H1 before any offset impact of the existing retaining wall is accounted for.

Given that H1 is relied upon by the applicant for visual screening from proposed first floor windows, in considering the application the LPA should be satisfied that the proposed extension will not result in damage to or loss of this hedge and its constituent trees. At present, this is inadequately addressed in the submitted report, which we submit has led to the assistant tree officer's own representation being misinformed.

Although of relevance to Mason's Cottage rather than The Old Clergy House, the AIA stipulates that tree work on land outside of the applicant's control is required in order to facilitate safe access the site, but the application particulars refer only to pedestrian access from the west gates.

This we submit reinforces Mr & Mrs Sewell-Rutter's objection to the application, most particularly (in regard to trees) in respect to the proposed southern extension containing two further dwellings.

#### **MSDC Conservation Officer comments**

We are reassured by and endorse the Conservation Officer's comments in respect of the proposal which echo our observations on the submission scheme as previously submitted.

Of particular importance but not mentioned specifically in her representation is the addition of the new windows on the west elevation of the proposal which appear to be absent in the pre-app excerpt included within her advice. These windows we contend are unnecessarily large and by virtue of their size and position represent an unneighbourly form of development which eliminates neighbouring privacy amenity.

Thank you for giving due consideration to these observations and objections in your deliberations.

Kind regards

Jonathan

Jonathan Sewell-Rutter  
BSc(Hons) BArch PGDip ARB RIBA  
Chartered Architect & Director

---

**Dwell Architecture & Design Limited**

**Telephone:** 01444 831800 | [www.dwellarchitecture.com](http://www.dwellarchitecture.com)

The Old Post Office, Lewes Road, Scaynes Hill, West Sussex, RH17 7PG



Dwell Architecture & Design Limited. Registered in England and Wales 04156076