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Dear Toby

**19/03047 Elder Houser and Chestnut House, Sunningdale**

**Works To Trees Covered by TPO 30 of 2004**

This application was reviewed at the Planning Committee meeting on Tuesday 19th November and the committee **objected** to this application for the following reasons.

**History**

Looking at the history on this site, the application 13/01658 was approved at Appeal; Ref: APP/T0355/A/13/2205541 dated 6th February 2014 and at this time the retention of the TPO trees on the site was a critical factor when considering the development of the site.

This was recognised in the Appeal Notice dated 6th February 2014, when the Inspector wrote under item 19: ...***being within a defined TPO there remains the possibility of the requirement to replace any trees lost with others of similar long-term amenity value. Conditions can be attached to a planning permission to require suitable protection is given to retained trees during the course of development, and additional planting to be undertaken where it may be necessary*.**

Included in the original 13/01658 application was a 52-page arboricultural report from Barrell Tree Consultancy which listed all the trees on the site by number, species, height, maturity and category.

**Subsequently, supporting the Inspector’s comments there were conditions placed on the site**. This included 14/03834/ CONDIT which included: Details required by Condition 5 (Arboricultural Method Statement). The last file shown under this application is titled: *Supporting information – Trees*. This refers to the same Barrell Tree consultancy report from 13/ 01658 which has been amended to list works that were recommended to individual trees on the site. 14/03834 was approved on 8th April 2015.

In summary there are detailed, consistent and comprehensive records of the trees on the site and any proposed works required.

**Current application 19/03047**

Now, just 5 years since the Appeal decision this application 19/03047 is proposed which includes a chart identifying a number of trees. However, what is striking and most unfortunate is that the numbers used to identify these trees have no resemblance to the numbers used in the original Barrell Tree Consultancy report. Also, the accompanying one page tree position chart does not include any reference to the species, height, maturity and category of any of these trees. This is a serious omission.

There are two separate sections under this application (19/03047); namely SS1 and SS2.

**SS1**SS1 lists 6 trees to be felled but there is no substantive arboricultural evidence and no tree category or tree heights supplied. Also, due to a completely new tree numbering system no comparisons can usefully be made between this application and the original 13/01658.

**SS2**
A second page under this application is headed SS2. This is more concerning. This lists 10 trees under the heading: *Application under exemption to fell dead tree (see photos).* Firstly, there are no photographs included in the application and secondly the Parish Council are not aware of what exemption the applicant is referring to. The Parish Council are also unsure how under SS2:

1. 10 substantial trees (eg cedar, lime, holly and western red cedar) are now classified as dead whereas 4 years ago they were not identified on the list of trees requiring work to be undertaken when 14/03834 / CONDIT was approved.
2. 5 of the trees under column 1 are listed as *felled 23/10.* The Parish Council have seen no TPO application to support this request for felling.

Also, under SS2 in column 3 headed: *Full application to be made to work on tree*: there are a further 11 trees including lime, poplar, and oak. But there is no indication what is the work that is envisaged to be undertaken on these trees. What is proposed: felling or pruning or something else?

**Conclusion**

This application is characterised by poor classification and recording of almost all aspects of the trees including size, category, position on the site, age and maturity. This is most unfortunate given that the information has been meticulously prepared before and was available to the applicant. Additionally, the actual tree works requested are not at all clearly indicated.

T**he Parish Council strongly object to this application and request it be refused**. It would also request that the RBWM Tree Team ask the applicant to refer to the existing detailed and comprehensive historical arboricultural information from 13/ 01658 and use this information as the basis for re submitting any future applications. Such action would then better reflect the recommendations of the Inspector when the detailed and comprehensive arboricultural conditions were recommended just 5 years ago. At present it would appear those recommendations have been overlooked.

Yours sincerely

Michael Burn

Co-Chair Planning Committee