

22/01/2026

Dear Katie,

The site contains a number of trees, which are subject to a Tree Preservation Order (TPO). There is also an individual TPO on the lime tree to the front of the hall (the tree that is subject to this application), on a beech and on a group of oaks.

Because, from an arboricultural perspective, there is little to object to regarding the *theoretical* placement of a shed-like structure on site, the crux of this application is the removal of the tree, including whether it is justified with regards to the proposal, and whether the proposed mitigation in the form of replacement planting can replace the amenity lost by the proposed removal.

At pre-app. in 2022, we advised that we would not support a full planning application because there was no arboricultural justification to remove the tree. The tree was described as being in “good” physiological and structural condition in a supporting tree risk assessment.

The lime tree is visible from the public realm of Elizabeth Close and contributes to the amenity provided to the area because of its location and significant size. The tree is on the public-realm-side of a group, and is visible as an individual tree. The proposal is, therefore, impactful on the amenity.

As part of this full planning application, the applicant has submitted a tree survey relating to development (differing slightly in its remit from a tree risk assessment as submitted at pre-app.). It describes the tree as of “fair” physiological and structural condition and categorises the tree a “C”.

The tree is typical of common lime of this age and setting – we would expect to see deadwood, mistletoe and have other structural defects. As such, we do not consider anything has *significantly* changed since the pre app. enquiry and, therefore, maintain our objection – the proposal to install a shed-like structure, regardless of how honourable the justification may be, does not outweigh the loss of the tree.

The proposed replacement tree, whilst appreciated and in-line with the minimum requirements of our Trees and Development SPD, is not expected to be able to reach maturity in the location identified. The space is physically limited, both above ground and below it. Therefore, the replacement proposal contrary to advice in the Trees and Development SPD.

Ultimately, whilst we are sympathetic to the constraints on site, we consider that the proposal is contrary to policy DM1 and advice in the Trees and Development SPD.

Afternote: whilst it is beyond our remit and expertise, from a lay perspective, we are not convinced that the applicant has demonstrated that all other options have been

exhausted. For example, the rejected option of building an extension, did not mention that same location for a shed-like structure, akin to the one proposed, only dismissing a more structural extension with associated foundation.