

Responses to 25 May Objection Letter TPO No.808/441

The following sets out my responses to the objections raised by Mr C Evans in his objection letter.

The main central trunk of the tree is within 6 m of the building....many of the branches hang over a great deal of the building....

I do not agree with the statement the tree overhangs the building. While not measured, I estimated the tree is in the region of 8 m from the rear elevation of the building at its nearest point. The photo below clearly shows that at no point does the tree overhang the building.

When viewed, the tree was not in leaf, and the branch structure of the tree could clearly be seen. I could see no major dead wood, defect limbs, or evidence of large limbs lost. The tree is in excellent health and vigour and poses little risk of failing in its current condition. The tree does contain minor deadwood, but this is very small and limes retain deadwood. When it is shed it is generally very light and unlikely to break a window.

The serving of the TPO would not prevent the owner carrying out appropriate and proportional pruning to remove any deadwood, dangerous branches or branches causing a nuisance.



Photo demonstrating the tree canopy is clear of building and does not overhang it at any point.

Other than the issue of falling branches...casts a lot of shade...severely affect the guttering....

The tree is located directly north of the building, therefore its shadow arc will track west, north, east during the day, and at no point will the tree cast direct shade on the tree. As previously discussed, the tree is located far enough from the building to allow airflow around the building, and a level of careful crown reduction (in line with BS3998:2010) could further enhance this.



Picture 2 Google earth image. Tree stem marked with red cross.

The tree is not visually prominent....

I would argue the objector's own photographs indicate that the tree is visible from public areas and is especially prominent in views from Torwood Drive. Furthermore, the tree is clearly of considerable age, and its presence enhances the setting of the historical property. In one photo, the objector claims the cherry tree on the frontage blocks views of the tree. As part of the TCA application which lead to the serving of the TPO permission was granted to reduce the frontage cherry tree by 30%, thus reducing the screening effect.

The tree scored well in a TEMPO assessment gathering 17 points. Only 3 of these were awarded for public visibility, with it being acknowledged that the tree fell in C) Medium trees, or large trees with limited views only. However, due to its excellent health, form, size and historical context, the tree still scores highly to warrant a TPO.

I am not suggesting the tree is unhealthy...decay pocket....

The decay pocket was noted during the site visit, but it is shallow, occluding well, and typical of the species. I could see no significant structural or physiological issue which would suggest the tree didn't have a minimum of 40 + years future safe contribution.

I feel strongly the tree is simply too close...

I estimate the tree to be in the region of 150 – 180 years old. The tree has co-existed with the house for this period up to this point. I could see no evidence of any structure impact of the tree on the property, nor did the owner claim, or offer any evidence of any such damage. To remove such a significant tree as a precaution over potential future damage appears to be a gross over reaction.

I would be happy to plant other trees....

As the tree removal was the subject of a TCA application SCC could not enforce this measure, nor would new planting compensate for such a large and significant trees removal, taking over 150 years to reach the age of the current tree.

Other Comments

During the site visit I offered to compromise with the applicant and allow a crown reduction of the tree, in line with BS3998:2010 to reduce the size of the canopy, allay some of his fears, and retain the tree. This was rejected outright, with the applicant feeling the tree is too big, and in the wrong place.

While the purpose of the visit was to review a TCA application, it was noted some tree works which would have required notification had been completed in the garden.

The lime tree in question is of considerable age and stature. Limes are commonly found in historical properties and it is likely this tree represents a component of a landscaping scheme from over a 150 to 200 years ago. As such it has cultural and heritage significance, as well as arboricultural merit.

Large canopied trees are increasingly being recognised for the significant role they play in air quality improvement and carbon sequestration. In the era of climate emergencies historic trees with such fine form as this should be offered a level of protection from removal without significant justification.

This page is intentionally left blank