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Dear Susan,

**20/00861 - Sunningdale Park, Larch Avenue, Ascot SL5 0QE**

**Details required by condition 3 (materials), 4 (landscape and arboriculture), 5 (landscape and arboriculture) and 26 (listed/curtilage structures) of planning permission 18/00356/FULL**

The Planning Committee **objects** to this application.

On reviewing the application, it became apparent that in requesting amendment to the conditions placed upon the permission granted for 18/00356 and this application, the applicant has used **two separate and different arboricultural reports.**

The Ruskins Tree Consultancy tree removals plan (Revision 4) produced for both Berkeley and Audley was part of the arboricultural report used to support planning permission 18/00356. It was dated 28/08/2018 and identified by number all the trees recommended for removal.

18/00356 was approved on November 8th, 2019.

Now, in requesting a Discharge of Condition, (20/00861/CONDIT) Audley has used a completely new arboricultural report dated March 2020 which uses an entirely new and different tree numbering system in comparison to the Ruskins report. Furthermore, Audley has made no attempt to show what tree number on the original Ruskins report is referred to on the new Tim Moya report.

One logical explanation for such a decision is that Audley have chosen to confuse the reader. How can anyone compare what is now proposed to what has been approved?

If there is a genuine reason for Audley disregarding the original Ruskins Consultancy report then that should be explained. More importantly, it would have been a simple exercise for Audley to have issued an accompanying addendum spreadsheet which listed the original Ruskins Consultancy tree number and then alongside each of those numbers the new (different) number for the Tim Moya report could be added.

Further justification for Audley adding confusion is that Tim Moya Associates would have had sight of the published Ruskins Tree Consultancy report so they were able (had they been advised by Audley) to use the identical tree numbering system as in the approved scheme.

**The Parish Council therefore requests that Audley include an addendum chart for all trees showing what the Ruskins tree number has now become under the Tim Moya report.**

There is only 17 months between the publication dates of the two reports, so the condition of the trees is unlikely to have changed hardly at all: another reason for continuing with the Ruskins report.

The Parish Council have summarised our views below:

**Significant differences between the two reports**

1. In the Ruskins report no rhododendron trees are shown on the tree removals plan. However, in the Tim Moya report there are 7 large separate groups of rhododendron trees scheduled for removal. In total **1,483 rhododendron trees** will be felled according to the report: 180927-PD-12-Planning Tree Works Schedule.
2. Trees are now included in an arbitrary way in groups with little attempt to add detail. For example, **Group 398** comprises an Acer tree where we are informed of the height but a Sweet chestnut tree and 6 Leylandii cypress trees are also included in the same group. All are scheduled for felling but no information about the height or tree condition is provided. There are multiple examples of similar poor classification and all for trees that are scheduled for felling e.g. groups **G392, G405** and **G415. G415** contains a total of 377 trees. All are scheduled for felling, but no information is provided.
3. Information contained within other groups is also misleading. **Group 448** includes many different trees as well as a total of 75 English oak trees in this one group alone that are to be felled. There is no indication of height or category. The Parish Council question this number but that is the number indicated in the Tim Mayo report.
4. **Group 415** in the current application is in an important position on the boundary with Larch Avenue and so the trees here are important to screen the development from public view. On 18/00356 the trees at this location are indicated for retaining. However, in the 20/00861 application there are a total of 12 different types of tree at this location all scheduled for felling. According to the report (which the Parish Council again finds difficult to believe) this also indicates a total of 397 trees for removal at this point.
5. A number of trees that are scheduled to be retained are now specified for the following action: ‘lift low canopy’. This attempt to ‘manicure’ the trees contrasts with the retention of the sylvian nature of the site. This canopy lift involves a number of category A and B trees (e.g. T15 oak, T132 beech and T171 Atlas cedar) and is now prevalent throughout the site as can be seen in the Tree Works Schedule.
6. This request to ‘lift low canopy was not indicated under 18/00356. For example, the three category B1 and B2 sweet chestnut trees (T419, T422 and T425) are all scheduled for ‘ low lift canopy’ manicuring but in the approved scheme (18/00356) there were ‘ no works’ listed against these 3 trees (numbers 322, 319 and 324 of the Ruskins report).
7. Most concerning is that there are trees now scheduled to be felled individually (excluding the comments made above about group felling) that are opposite to what had been proposed and accepted under 18/00356. Making comparisons between the two applications is difficult and time consuming. Hence, the examples below are used for illustrative purposes, not as a definitive list. Three of these are listed below:

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Tim Moya report (20/00861** | | | | | **Ruskins report (18/00356)** | |
| **Tree number** | **Tree** | **Height (m)** | **Category** | **Action** | **Tree number** | **Action** |
| T61 | Beech | 17.5 | B1 | Fell to facilitate development | T388 | No works |
| T102 | Sweet chestnut | 15 | B1 | Fell to facilitate development | T578 | No works |
| T426 | Sweet chestnut | 10 | C2 | Fell to facilitate development | T322 | No works (Ruskins classified this as a B2 tree) |

The overall number of trees now scheduled for felling on the Audley site is truly astounding and represents the number of trees one might find in a substantial wood. Yet this is in the centre of Sunningdale.

The current application bears little or no relationship to the arboricultural report submitted in support of the approved scheme (18/00356). This attempt by Audley to facilitate the destruction of so many trees on the site, much of which appears to be for cosmetic reasons, is to be condemned.

The applicant must reference the tree works proposed in the Ruskin report. Instead, this comparison with the approved scheme has been completely ignored.   
  
The Parish Council **STRONGLY OBJECT** to this application and request it is **DISMISSED**.

Regards

Yvonne Jacklin and Michael Burn

Co-Chairs of Planning