

Report of:	Meeting	Date	Item No.
Mark Billington Corporate Director Environment	Planning Committee	1 st March 2023	

Wyre Council Tree Preservation Order No 13 of 2022: Land at former Moy Veterinarian Surgery, Chapel Lane, Out Rawcliffe, PR3 6TB

1. Purpose of report

- 1.1** To consider the objection to the making of Wyre Council Tree Preservation Order No 13 of 2022: Land at former Moy Veterinarian Surgery, Chapel Lane, Out Rawcliffe, PR3 6TB

2. Outcomes

- 2.1** To determine whether or not to confirm the Wyre Council Tree Preservation Order No 13 of 2022: Land at former Moy Veterinarian Surgery, Chapel Lane, Out Rawcliffe, PR3 6TB
- 2.2** An effective tree preservation order makes it an offence to do any works to the protected trees without first gaining consent from the Local Planning Authority unless such works are covered by an exemption within the Town and Country Planning (Tree Preservation) (England) Regulations 2012.

3. Recommendation

- 3.1** That the Wyre Council Tree Preservation Order No 13 of 2022: Land at former Moy Veterinarian Surgery, Chapel Lane, Out Rawcliffe, PR3 6TB be confirmed without modification for the reasons set out in this report.

4. Legislative background to the TPO

- 4.1** Section 198 of The Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) empowers Local Planning Authorities to protect trees or woodlands in their area in the interests of amenity by making tree preservation orders. Following the introduction of **The Town and Country Planning (Tree Preservation) (England) Regulations 2012**, The Local Planning

Authority is required to confirm a tree preservation order within six months of the issue date if it is to continue to have effect after that period. When an objection is received, a decision on confirmation is usually referred to the Planning Committee.

- 4.2** Tree preservation orders are usually made because it is considered expedient in the interests of amenity to protect the trees from felling or pruning. Authorities can also consider other sources of risks to trees with significant amenity value. For example, changes in property ownership and intentions to fell trees are not always known in advance, so it may sometimes be appropriate to proactively make an order as a precaution.
- 4.3** Amenity is not defined in law but the government's advice is that authorities need to exercise judgement when deciding whether it is within their powers to make an Order. Orders should be used to protect selected trees and woodlands if their removal would have a significant negative impact on the local environment and its enjoyment by the public. Before authorities make or confirm an Order they should be able to show that protection would bring a reasonable degree of public benefit in the present or future (GOV.UK, 2014).
- 4.4** Therefore the following criteria should be taken into account when assessing the amenity value of trees:
- **Visibility:** *the extent to which the trees or woodlands can be seen by the general public will inform the LPA's assessment of whether its impact on the local environment is significant. The trees, or at least part of them, should normally be visible from a public place, such as a road or footpath, or accessible by the public.*
 - **Individual, collective and wider impact:** *public visibility alone will not be sufficient to warrant an Order. The authority is advised to also assess the particular importance of an individual tree, of groups of trees or of woodlands by reference to it of their characteristics including:*
 - *Size and form;*
 - *Future potential as amenity;*
 - *Rarity or historic value;*
 - *Contribution to, and relationship with, the landscape; and*
 - *Contribution to the character or appearance of a conservation area.*
 - **Other factors:** *where relevant to an assessment of the amenity value of trees or woodlands, authorities may consider taking into account other factors, such as importance to nature conservation or response to climate change, although according to guidance these "Other factors" alone would not warrant the making an order.*

(Source: Tree Preservation Orders and trees in Conservation Areas/Planning Practice Guidance March 2014).

- 4.5** The Regulation 5 notice, which is a legal notice that is served with the tree preservation order documents on the owner and occupier of the land affected by a tree preservation order and also the owner and occupier of the adjoining land, states the reason why the trees have been protected and invites objections or representations to be made to the Local Planning Authority within a 28-day period. The Regulation 5 Notice issued in respect of the land affected by the TPO gave the reason for making the TPO as *“it is expedient in the interest of amenity”*.
- 4.6** Once made, a tree preservation order takes effect provisionally for six months, but must be confirmed by the Local Planning Authority within that period to continue to be effective. If it is not confirmed the tree preservation order ceases to have effect and the trees are unprotected. When objections or representations are received the Council must consider those before any decision is made whether or not to confirm the order. In these cases, referral to Planning Committee is usually appropriate.
- 4.7** Within the framework of a TPO, a Local Planning Authority may classify trees as occurring either as individuals, groups, woodlands, or areas.

5. Background to making the TPO

- 5.1** On 7 November 2022 the Tree Officer received a request from a member of the public, relayed from the Planning Department, to create a TPO in relation to trees located at the former Moy Veterinarian Surgery, Chapel Lane, Out Rawcliffe, PR3 6TB. The related planning application being 22/00991/COUMA Moy Farm vets - Prior notification for change of use of a building and land within its curtilage to residential. It was determined on 28 November 2022 that prior approval is not required in relation to this planning application.
- 5.2** The Tree Officer visited site on 10 November 2022 and undertook an appropriate tree evaluation method for preservation orders (“TEMPO”) which guided the subsequent decision to make the Wyre Council Tree Preservation Order No 13 of 2022: Land at former Moy Veterinarian Surgery, Chapel Lane, Out Rawcliffe, PR3 6TB . The TPO applies to G1 comprising of five oak trees, and woodlands W1 and W2. A copy of each of the completed TEMPO survey data sheet relating to the TPO along with associated images of the TPO are appended to this report at Appendix 1.
- 5.3** On 30 November 2022 Wyre Council made Wyre Council Tree Preservation Order No 13 of 2022: Land at former Moy Veterinarian Surgery, Chapel Lane, Out Rawcliffe, PR3 6TB (“ the TPO”). A copy of the TPO plan is appended to this report at Appendix 2.

The Council served correspondence on the owners and occupiers of the land affected by the TPO and on those adjoining, notifying them of the

making of the TPO in accordance with Regulation 5 of the Town and Country Planning (Tree Preservation) (England) Regulations 2012.

The period for any objections and representations to be made to the Council in respect of the TPO ended on 28 December 2022. However further to a request from the owner of the TPO trees to extend the deadline beyond the Christmas break a proposed new extended deadline of 5pm on 5th January 2023 was sanctioned by the Tree Officer.

The Council received an objection letter from the owner of the TPO trees on 5th January 2023. This was accompanied by a letter dated 24 December 2022 from their appointed Arborist supporting the objection. A redacted copy of each of these letters is appended to this report at Appendix 3.

6. Summary of Objections

6.1 The MA planning application was submitted and approved. There is absolutely no reason that the beautiful surrounding trees would be removed.

The trees need regular managing, pruning and care, many overhang the carriageway significantly posing a risk to traffic and pedestrians. To have to discuss and get permission for every branch or tiny section of every tree to be pruned will become onerous for the tree officer and myself very quickly. The decision to make the TPO seems a quite extreme option.

Please reconsider the three areas of protection that have been imposed.

I hope to be treated fairly and in keeping with other developments in our area that have not had Tree Preservation Orders imposed.

Two examples of developments are at Hillhouse Farm, Chapel Lane, Out Rawcliffe. There are trees close to the house but no orders were served. Similarly, where the land opposite Church Farm was developed to build a lovely bungalow yet no TPO restrictions were put in place.

Summary of Arborists letter in support of objection

6.2 Discussions between the arborist and the owner of the TPO trees have highlighted the need for a maintenance schedule. Some tree works have commenced to roadside trees to address stripping ivy and removing deadwood. The Arborist has raised concern that the TPO application process will prevent regular maintenance of the trees.

The TPO should be amended to cover the specimen asset trees with permission granted to maintain the rest of the trees as necessary and in accordance with industry best practice.

7.0 Response to Objections

- 7.1** Regarding 22/00071/FUL | Two storey rear extension and single storey side extension | Hill House Farm Chapel Lane Out Rawcliffe Preston Lancashire PR3 6TB, and, the land opposite Church Farm developed to build a bungalow.

The Tree Officer was not consulted regarding these planning applications and each case is to be considered on its merits.

- 7.2** TPOs are made on a case by case basis. The TPO has been proactively made as a precaution. The tree officer exercised judgement having regard to Government guidance when deciding to make the TPO. A Tree Evaluation Method for Tree Preservation Orders (TEMPO) was undertaken on 10 November 2022 in respect of the TPO. The TEMPO comprised an amenity assessment in relation to the condition and suitability of the trees along with tree species, size, life expectancy, public visibility, other factors and expediency. The TPO has been created in a clear and consistent manner.

- 7.3** The TPO ensures that tree works that are applied for will only gain consent if in accordance with good arboricultural management.

- 7.4** The Forestry Commission has confirmed that there are no recent or historic Forestry Commission grants that apply to the land under consideration. It is encouraged that W1 and W2 should be managed sustainably and in accordance with UK Forestry Standard.

- 7.5** If the TPO is confirmed, an application for consent regarding TPO tree works would continue to be required for consideration in the absence of obtaining consent under a FC felling licence or meeting with an associated exception.

- 7.6** The purpose of woodland designations are to safeguard woodland as a whole. The Woodland designation can make allowance for some degree of woodland management taking place in order to sustain the woodland.

- 7.7** The woodland category is not intended to hinder beneficial woodland management. It is encouraged that landowners bring their woodlands into proper management under the grant schemes run by the Forestry Commission. If a woodland subject to an Order is not brought into beneficial woodland management via a Forestry Commission grant scheme then applications can still manage the trees in ways that would benefit the woodland without serious impact on local amenity, e.g. by making a single application for regularly repeated operations.

In the case of this particular TPO these operations could include the stripping of ivy from trees and maintaining 5.5 metres crown height clearance over the public highway.

An exception may exempt landowners or their agents from the normal requirement to seek consent before carrying out work on trees subject to a tree preservation order.. These exceptions include certain work such as:

- the removal of dead braches from a living tree;
- the cutting down, topping, lopping or uprooting of a tree which is dead if urgently necessary to remove an immediate risk of serious harm; and
- the cutting down, uprooting, topping or lopping of a tree, to the extent that such works are urgently necessary to remove an immediate risk of serious harm,

In all the circumstances, officer view is that it is expedient in the interests of amenity to make G1 , W1 and W2 subject of a confirmed tree preservation order without modification.

Advice pertaining to Planning Committee and its procedures along with a copy of this report relating to the TPO have been forwarded to the objector in reasonable advance of the meeting of Planning Committee on 1st March 2023.

8.0 Concluding remarks

- 8.1** It is considered that the TPO has been properly made in the interests of securing the contribution and benefit that the TPO applies to the public amenity in the area. The TPO protects important elements of the local landscape and contributes to the local environment. The trees presently protected by the TPO have been assessed in a structured and consistent way using an approved method.
- 8.2** It is considered that the procedural requirements of the legislation have been followed in the creation of the TPO and determinations made using a widely accepted method which includes expediency assessment have occurred in this case. Having regard to the legislation and the Government Guidance, it is considered that the TPO is fully justified in all respects and should be confirmed without modification.

Financial and Legal Implications	
Finance	None.
Legal	Before confirming a Tree Preservation Order, the Local Planning Authority must consider any objections/representations made within the 28-day objection period. If, having considered any objections/representations received, the Local Planning Authority is satisfied that the tree merits a TPO; it may confirm the Order under the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 and supporting Regulations. The LPA may also confirm an Order in modified form, revoke it, or allow it to lapse. However it cannot add to the Schedule references to a tree to which the Order did not previously apply. There is no right of appeal to the Secretary of State, but a challenge may be made to the High Court on a point of law.

Other risks/implications: checklist

If there are significant implications arising from this report on any issues marked with a ✓ below, the report author will have consulted with the appropriate specialist officers on those implications and addressed them in the body of the report. There are no significant implications arising directly from this report, for those issues marked with an x.

implications	✓ / x
community safety	x

risks/implications	✓ / x
asset management	X

equality and diversity	x
sustainability	✓
health and safety	x

climate change	✓
data protection	X

report author	telephone no.	email	Date
Ryan Arrell BSc (Hons), HND, LANTRA qualified professional tree inspector.	01253 887614	Ryan.Arrell@wyre.gov.uk	01 February 2023

List of background papers:		
name of document	date	where available for inspection
Wyre Council TPO No 13 of 2022	30 November 2022	Room 134 or by email to Tree Officer.

List of Appendices

Appendices:

- 1** –TEMPO survey data sheet and also public visibility images of the TPO.
- 2** –TPO plan.
- 3** – (i) Redacted copy of letter of objection. (ii) Arborists Letter supporting objection.

References List

Tree Preservation Orders and trees in Conservation Areas. GOV.UK, (2014) Accessed Via <https://www.gov.uk/guidance/tree-preservation-orders-and-trees-in-conservation-areas>

(TEMPO) Tree Evaluation Method for Preservation Orders
<http://www.flac.uk.com/wp-content/uploads/2014/12/TEMPO-GN.pdf>

Town and Country Planning (Tree Preservation) (England) Regulations 2012.

Appendix 1

TREE EVALUATION METHOD FOR PRESERVATION ORDERS - TEMPO

SURVEY DATA SHEET & DECISION GUIDE

Date: 10/11/22 Surveyor: R. Appell

Tree details
 TPO Ref (if applicable): Tree/Group No: G1 Species: Oak x 5
 Owner (if known): Location: Former May vets, Chapel lane
 Out Rowcliffe

REFER TO GUIDANCE NOTE FOR ALL DEFINITIONS

Part 1: Amenity assessment

a) Condition & suitability for TPO

- 5) Good Highly suitable
- 3) Fair/satisfactory Suitable
- 1) Poor Unlikely to be suitable
- 0) Dead/dying/dangerous* Unsuitable

Score & Notes

3

* Relates to existing context and is intended to apply to severe irremediable defects only

b) Retention span (in years) & suitability for TPO

- 5) 100+ Highly suitable
- 4) 40-100 Very suitable
- 2) 20-40 Suitable
- 1) 10-20 Just suitable
- 0) <10* Unsuitable

Score & Notes

2

*Includes trees which are an existing or near future nuisance, including those clearly outgrowing their context, or which are significantly negating the potential of other trees of better quality

c) Relative public visibility & suitability for TPO

Consider realistic potential for future visibility with changed land use

- 5) Very large trees with some visibility, or prominent large trees Highly suitable
- 4) Large trees, or medium trees clearly visible to the public Suitable
- 3) Medium trees, or large trees with limited view only Suitable
- 2) Young, small, or medium/large trees visible only with difficulty Barely suitable
- 1) Trees not visible to the public, regardless of size Probably unsuitable

Score & Notes

4

d) Other factors

Trees must have accrued 7 or more points (with no zero score) to qualify

- 5) Principal components of formal arboricultural features, or veteran trees
- 4) Tree groups, or principal members of groups important for their cohesion
- 3) Trees with identifiable historic, commemorative or habitat importance
- 2) Trees of particularly good form, especially if rare or unusual
- 1) Trees with none of the above additional redeeming features (inc. those of indifferent form)
- 1) Trees with poor form or which are generally unsuitable for their location

Score & Notes

4

Part 2: Expediency assessment

Trees must have accrued 10 or more points to qualify

- 5) Immediate threat to tree inc. s.211 Notice
- 3) Foreseeable threat to tree
- 2) Perceived threat to tree
- 1) Precautionary only

Score & Notes

1

Part 3: Decision guide

- Any 0 Do not apply TPO
- 1-6 TPO indefensible
- 7-11 Does not merit TPO
- 12-15 TPO defensible
- 16+ Definitely merits TPO

Add Scores for Total:

14

Decision:

Create TPO

TREE EVALUATION METHOD FOR PRESERVATION ORDERS - TEMPO

SURVEY DATA SHEET & DECISION GUIDE

Date: 10/11/23 Surveyor: R. Arell

Tree details
 TPO Ref (if applicable): Tree/Group No: W1 Species: ash, beech, sycamore
 Owner (if known): Location: Former Mayfield Grade Willow, white poplar oak & hawthorn.

REFER TO GUIDANCE NOTE FOR ALL DEFINITIONS

Part 1: Amenity assessment

a) Condition & suitability for TPO

5) Good	Highly suitable	Score & Notes 3
3) Fair/satisfactory	Suitable	
1) Poor	Unlikely to be suitable	
0) Dead/dying/dangerous*	Unsuitable	
* Relates to existing context and is intended to apply to severe irremediable defects only		

b) Retention span (in years) & suitability for TPO

5) 100+	Highly suitable	Score & Notes 4
4) 40-100	Very suitable	
2) 20-40	Suitable	
1) 10-20	Just suitable	
0) <10*	Unsuitable	
*Includes trees which are an existing or near future nuisance, including those clearly outgrowing their context, or which are significantly negating the potential of other trees of better quality		

c) Relative public visibility & suitability for TPO

Consider realistic potential for future visibility with changed land use

5) Very large trees with some visibility, or prominent large trees	Highly suitable	Score & Notes 4
4) Large trees, or medium trees clearly visible to the public	Suitable	
3) Medium trees, or large trees with limited view only	Suitable	
2) Young, small, or medium/large trees visible only with difficulty	Barely suitable	
1) Trees not visible to the public, regardless of size	Probably unsuitable	

d) Other factors

Trees must have accrued 7 or more points (with no zero score) to qualify

5) Principal components of formal arboricultural features, or veteran trees	Score & Notes 1 (Habitat importance not checked)
4) Tree groups, or principal members of groups important for their cohesion	
3) Trees with identifiable historic, commemorative or habitat importance	
2) Trees of particularly good form, especially if rare or unusual	
1) Trees with none of the above additional redeeming features (inc. those of indifferent form)	
-1) Trees with poor form or which are generally unsuitable for their location	

Part 2: Expediency assessment

Trees must have accrued 10 or more points to qualify

5) Immediate threat to tree inc. s.211 Notice	Score & Notes 1
3) Foreseeable threat to tree	
2) Perceived threat to tree	
1) Precautionary only	

Part 3: Decision guide

Any 0	Do not apply TPO	Add Scores for Total: 13	Decision: Grade TPO
1-6	TPO indefensible		
7-11	Does not merit TPO		
12-15	TPO defensible		
16+	Definitely merits TPO		

TREE EVALUATION METHOD FOR PRESERVATION ORDERS - TEMPO

SURVEY DATA SHEET & DECISION GUIDE

Date: 10/11/22	Surveyor: R. Farrell
Tree details	
TPO Ref (if applicable):	Tree/Group No: W2 Species: silver birch
Owner (if known):	Location: former moor Willow, eucalyptus

REFER TO GUIDANCE NOTE FOR ALL DEFINITIONS

Part 1: Amenity assessment

a) Condition & suitability for TPO

5) Good 3) Fair/satisfactory 1) Poor 0) Dead/dying/dangerous*	Highly suitable Suitable Unlikely to be suitable Unsuitable	Score & Notes <div style="font-size: 2em; text-align: center;">3</div>
--	--	---

* Relates to existing context and is intended to apply to severe irremediable defects only

b) Retention span (in years) & suitability for TPO

5) 100+ 4) 40-100 2) 20-40 1) 10-20 0) <10*	Highly suitable Very suitable Suitable Just suitable Unsuitable	Score & Notes <div style="font-size: 2em; text-align: center;">4</div>
---	---	---

* Includes trees which are an existing or near future nuisance, including those clearly outgrowing their context, or which are significantly negating the potential of other trees of better quality

c) Relative public visibility & suitability for TPO

Consider realistic potential for future visibility with changed land use

5) Very large trees with some visibility, or prominent large trees 4) Large trees, or medium trees clearly visible to the public 3) Medium trees, or large trees with limited view only 2) Young, small, or medium/large trees visible only with difficulty 1) Trees not visible to the public, regardless of size	Highly suitable Suitable Suitable Barely suitable Probably unsuitable	Score & Notes <div style="font-size: 2em; text-align: center;">4</div>
--	---	---

d) Other factors

Trees must have accrued 7 or more points (with no zero score) to qualify

5) Principal components of formal arboricultural features, or veteran trees 4) Tree groups, or principal members of groups important for their cohesion 3) Trees with identifiable historic, commemorative or habitat importance 2) Trees of particularly good form, especially if rare or unusual 1) Trees with none of the above additional redeeming features (inc. those of indifferent form) -1) Trees with poor form or which are generally unsuitable for their location	Score & Notes <div style="font-size: 2em; text-align: center;">1 (habitat importance) not checked</div>
--	--

Part 2: Expediency assessment

Trees must have accrued 10 or more points to qualify

5) Immediate threat to tree inc. s.211 Notice 3) Foreseeable threat to tree 2) Perceived threat to tree 1) Precautionary only	Score & Notes <div style="font-size: 2em; text-align: center;">1</div>
--	---

Part 3: Decision guide

Any 0 1-6 7-11 12-15 16+	Do not apply TPO TPO indefensible Does not merit TPO TPO defensible Definitely merits TPO	Add Scores for Total: <div style="font-size: 2em; text-align: center;">13</div>	Decision: <div style="font-size: 1.5em; text-align: center;">Create TPO</div>
--------------------------------------	---	--	--



Above image: View of TPO when looking north west from Chapel Lane.



Above image: View of TPO when looking south east from Dry Bread Lane.

Appendix 2

Wyre Council Tree Preservation Order No 13 of 2022



Land at former Moy Veterinarian Surgery, Chapel Lane, Out Rawcliffe, PR3 6TB.



Appendix 3

(i) Redacted copy of letter of objection.

To Whom it may Concern,

I am writing to express my concerns in regards the **Wyre Borough Council Tree Preservation Order- 013/2022/TPO-Moy Veterinary Surgery, Chapel Lane, Out Rawcliffe, PR36TB.**

My late husband and I purchased Moy Farm and developed what was Moy Farm Veterinary Centre in early 1992. Our aim was always to preserve the natural environment in which we lived and worked. Since 1992 we have managed the woodland area, planted two new woodland areas in the field and cared for the trees in front of the veterinary clinic.

When the clinic eventually closed and moved permanently to our larger site on Carr Lane in Hambleton the building was left vacant but the trees still regularly checked by to ensure their safety and wellbeing. No trees have ever been removed unless damaged or diseased.

The vacant ex veterinary building needs a new purpose, but the aim is to stay in keeping with the land and woodland as has been the precedent set for 30 years. The land and wood have much sentimental value and meaning as it belonged to my late husband's family.

The MA planning application was submitted and approved. This planning requires no alteration to the exterior of the building and as such there is absolutely no reason that the beautiful surrounding trees would be removed.

However, there are a lot of trees and they do need regular managing, pruning and care as many overhang the carriageway significantly so pose a risk to traffic and pedestrians. To have to discuss and get permission for every branch or tiny section of every tree to be pruned will become onerous for the tree officer and myself very quickly.

If I were a developer who was planning to remove hedges, fell trees and build multiple houses I would understand this decision. However, as one person wanting to restore a vacant property to become part of the community again and not an eyesore (as it is now) and to retain the rural and beautiful attributes of this woodland and site, it seems to me a quite extreme option.

The majority of my neighbors are hugely supportive of the property being restored and trust that I will create a property that is attractive and sits well in the environment that it exists. They have seen the new vet building in Hambleton and know that I have created an attractive building, with sensitive planting and environmental features (including a naturally draining carpark rather than tarmac). They trust that I will do the same on the site next to my home of 30 years.

I hope that you may reconsider the three areas of protection that have been imposed.
G1-the 5 oak trees at the front of the building
W1-the whole L shaped woodland area running along the roadside of the property

W2-the area of trees that we planted ourselves in the field. These are much younger trees. Planted approx. 15 years ago.

I hope that W1 & W2 will be lifted and even that G1 would be reconsidered.

I hope to be treated fairly and in keeping with other developments in our area that have not had Tree Preservation Orders imposed.

Two examples of developments are at Hillhouse Farm, Chapel Lane, Out Rawcliffe.

There are trees close to the house but no orders were served.

Similarly, where the land opposite Church Farm was developed to build a lovely bungalow yet no TPO restrictions were put in place.

Both of these properties are my neighbours.

I appreciate your time reading and considering my appeal.

I also attach a report to support my claims from Michael Hewitt (Arborist, NPTC Certified).

Yours Sincerely

BVSc, MRCVS.

31.12.22

(ii) Arborists Letter supporting objection.

Re, [REDACTED] Moy Farm, Chapel Lane, Out Rawcliffe.

To whom it may concern,

I am writing in support of [REDACTED] regarding the Tree Preservation Order which has been applied to the above property.

I am a qualified arborist, with training in tree hazard awareness, and 20 years experience of practical tree surgery.

I have worked for [REDACTED] for many years, both at the above address, and also at the various business venues connected to her veterinary practice. At all times, I have found [REDACTED] to be a very careful and considerate property manager, always ready to accept professional advice concerning tree issues, and always mindful of the environment and her neighbours.

I am well acquainted with the trees which are highlighted on the order, and the area of land which contains them. I have had preliminary discussions with [REDACTED] regarding these trees, and particularly the land adjoining the road, (Chapel Lane). I understand from these discussions that [REDACTED] has no intention of felling these trees for any purpose, and is in fact intent on keeping them as a managed woodland, which would be a marvelous asset to her property.

In fact, we had discussed the necessity of planning a maintenance schedule for the area, as several of the trees are in need of attention, with regards to dead-wooding, and clearing of ivy. I have already done some work on the roadside trees, and we were looking to start on the rest when the weather improves.

I am rather concerned that this general TPO which is mandated will prevent us from maintaining the trees on a regular basis, as it will require a planning application to be submitted each time.

I agree that the large oaks at the front are specimen trees and well worth protecting, but a lot of the smaller trees are in poor condition, such as willows, which will require regular maintenance.

It is my submission that the TPO should be amended to cover the specimen asset trees, but with permission granted to prune and maintain the rest of the trees as necessary, with due regard to approved tree management procedures.

[REDACTED]

ARBORIST.

