



Bryan Clary <bryan.clary@peterborough.gov.uk>

Objection to TPO 02/2018

1 message

Bryan Clary <bryan.clary@peterborough.gov.uk>
To: bryan.clary@peterborough.gov.uk

26 October 2018 at 13:00

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **Kelly Olsen**
Date: Fri, 3 Aug 2018 at 10:00
Subject: Re: Objection to TPO 02/2018
To: Bryan Clary <bryan.clary@peterborough.gov.uk>

Dear Bryan,

Thank you for coming round the otherday and taking the time to explain the process and TPO, please see below my responses to your email (marked as KO:). I would like to continue my objection to the TPO, please advise on next steps.

Best regards,

Kelly Olsen

Further to our onsite conversation last week I asked you to reconsider your objection to Tree Preservation 02/2018 served 15 June 15 2018 on T1 Sycamore at [291A Thorpe Road, Peterborough](#). As may recall I explained that the objection will be heard at planning committee and that they will have the final decision on whether or not the TPO is confirmed.

The 211 Notification 17/02082/CTR requested the removal of the Sycamore and a TPO was served on the basis that it has sufficient amenity and longevity to be a component of the local landscape now, and in the foreseeable future. Your objections are noted and I respond to each of them in turn:

1. Seedlings, leaves, honeydew and other seasonal nuisances - These points are noted. However, the issues stated within the objection and discussed onsite are not sufficient reasons to severely prune or remove trees that are subject to, or are worthy of a TPO. These are all characteristics of trees and are considered a reasonable 'nuisance'. This stand is also in line with our Tree and Woodlands Strategy and how we also manage our own tree stock with reagrd to public complaints on these matters.

KO: This tree has been pruned significantly before and was not under a TPO then, so why is this different now? The tree has grown a lot one side (i.e. not over the neighbour's side, the bowling green) and is 'lopsided' The tree also takes up 75% of the garden (length along back garden fence) and the branches cover approx. 35% of the garden (width), this is inappropriate for a garden tree and adds to points 2 & 3 below in that it is not native and should be in large open areas not in medium sized gardens.

In addition, the tree attracts large numbers of greenfly, these also enter our bedroom (master bedroom) as the branches of the tree are very close to the windows, this is significant in the hot summer months and has meant we have had to keep the windows closed, this is not acceptable and creates severe discomfort.

2. The Sycamore is not a native tree - This is irrelevant under the TPO legislation. If the tree has public amenity it does not matter what its species is.

3. Shading of the garden - Shading and other seasonal nuisances are not sufficient reasons to severely prune or remove trees that are subject to, or are worthy of a TPO.

4. Limited public amenity - It is acknowledged that the tree cannot be seen from Thorpe Road to the north. However, the tree can be clearly seen from the playground to the south and west of your property.

KO: The bowling green has a gate that leads onto a path for access to it and a small part of this is aligned with the children's play area, it is opposite the play area, not an integral part and the play apparatus is mainly around the corner from this path. I would argue that this statement above is spurious and the tree does not constitute any form of public amenity and I have never seen anyone standing at this gate looking at the green, trees or anything else.

5. Safety of the tree with regard to its proximity to the dwelling at 291A Thorpe Road - The tree does not appear to be unsafe and is in good condition. There would be no objection to any future applications to lightly prune the tree from the dwelling.

KO: I am still concerned about severe weather with the proximity of this tree to the house, not in that the tree will fall down, but branches could and given that the tree has been heavily pruned one side it has spread out with branches, as stated above very close to the house and upstairs windows.

6. Size of the tree in relation to the garden - The tree is relatively small for the species and in my opinion will not grow significantly larger given its maturity. It is more likely to grow at a slow incremental rate and consolidate its current form. As such a crown reduction of any sort would be counterproductive and not recommended. I believe the tree is in proportion to its garden setting. However, whilst there will be an element of future growth there would be no objection to crown lifting and a light prune over the garden if an application was received.

KO: The tree, in relation to the size of garden is inappropriate as stated above, its spread and the percentage of garden it covers is significant, as stated above. Sycamores are not appropriate for medium sized gardens. We would like to replace this tree with an appropriately-sized native species. Given that young tree growth is beneficial for the environment, more so than existing trees we believe this would be more beneficial.

On 2 August 2018 at 17:32, Bryan Clary <bryan.clary@peterborough.gov.uk> wrote:

Kelly

Further to our onsite conversation last week I asked you to reconsider your objection to Tree Preservation 02/2018 served 15 June 15 2018 on T1 Sycamore at [291A Thorpe Road, Peterborough](#). As may recall I explained that the

objection will be heard at planning committee and that they will have the final decision on whether or not the TPO is confirmed.

The 211 Notification 17/02082/CTR requested the removal of the Sycamore and a TPO was served on the basis that it has sufficient amenity and longevity to be a component of the local landscape now, and in the foreseeable future. Your objections are noted and I respond to each of them in turn:

1. Seedlings, leaves, honeydew and other seasonal nuisances - These points are noted. However, the issues stated within the objection and discussed onsite are not sufficient reasons to severely prune or remove trees that are subject to, or are worthy of a TPO. These are all characteristics of trees and are considered a reasonable 'nuisance'. This stand is also in line with our Tree and Woodlands Strategy and how we also manage our own tree stock with regard to public complaints on these matters.

2. The Sycamore is not a native tree - This is irrelevant under the TPO legislation. If the tree has public amenity it does not matter what its species is.

3. Shading of the garden - Shading and other seasonal nuisances are not sufficient reasons to severely prune or remove trees that are subject to, or are worthy of a TPO.

4. Limited public amenity - It is acknowledged that the tree cannot be seen from Thorpe Road to the north. However, the tree can be clearly seen from the playground to the south and west of your property.

5. Safety of the tree with regard to its proximity to the dwelling at 291A Thorpe Road - The tree does not appear to be unsafe and is in good condition. There would be no objection to any future applications to lightly prune the tree from the dwelling.

6. Size of the tree in relation to the garden - The tree is relatively small for the species and in my opinion will not grow significantly larger given its maturity. It is more likely to grow at a slow incremental rate and consolidate its current form. As such a crown reduction of any sort would be counterproductive and not recommended. I believe the tree is in proportion to its garden setting. However, whilst there will be an element of future growth there would be no objection to crown lifting and a light prune over the garden if an application was received.

Please can you take this opportunity to review the comments above and take into account our discussion. I therefore ask you to reconsider your objection to the TPO.

I am happy to receive further comment although if you wish to still pursue the objection I will arrange a date for the next available planning committee. It may be helpful if you talk to an independent arboricultural consultant if you wish to seek third party clarity on the issue. Otherwise, I am happy to answer any queries.

I look forward to hearing from you

Regards

Bryan Clary
Tree Officer

Natural & Historic Environment Team
Sustainable Growth Strategy
Peterborough City Council
Town Hall , Bridge Street
Peterborough PE1 1HF

Email: bryan.clary@peterborough.gov.uk
Tel: 01733 453465
Mobile: 07920 160206

To find out more about Peterborough City Council please go to: www.peterborough.gov.uk

Please consider the environment before printing this email

We are moving.....

The Planning and Building Department is relocating to Fletton Quays on the 11 August 2018. From this date our new address will be:-

Sand Martin House

Bittern Way

Fletton Quays

Peterborough

PE2 8TY

Our email addresses will remain unchanged.

Please note that the Office will be closed on Friday 10 August and Monday 13 August to allow for the move. We expect to reopen on Tuesday 14 August.

On 12 June 2018 at 09:54, Planning Appeals Mailbox <planningappeals@peterborough.gov.uk> wrote:

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **Kelly Olsen**
Date: 10 June 2018 at 22:31
Subject: 17/02082/CTR
To: planningappeals@peterborough.gov.uk

DearSirs,

I would like to appeal the above decision. When we applied for permission we were completely unaware that this might lead to a TPO and this may have changed our approach had we known. I would like to appeal based on the following reasons:

We would like to appeal the decision regarding the felling of the sycamore tree for the following reasons:

- The tree sheds seeds and other pods/buds all year round and this creates lots of issues with the other plants in the garden as well as creating a massive re-seed during the winter where we have to daily stop new seedlings growing (there are many 1000s of these) both on the lawn and in the borders
- Sycamore is not native to the UK and we would look to plant a native tree that would be fast growing
- The tree blocks all of the sun from the garden during the afternoon, particularly where the patio has been built and the garden furniture is situated
- The tree is not visible, as suggested, from the playing field during the summer months when the other trees are in bloom and we do not believe that anyone would be adversely affected by the removal of this tree
- We are very concerned as to how close large branches are to the house as the tree is only growing out over our property (the other side of the tree has been severely cut back and this must have been done a while ago as this hangs over a lawn bowling green)
- The tree spreads across a quarter or more of the lawn

Best regards,

Kelly Olsen

[291a Thorpe Rd](#)

[Peterborough](#)

[PE3 6LU](#)

--

Technical Services

Planning and Building Control

Growth and Regeneration Directorate

[Peterborough](#) City Council

Town Hall

Bridge Street

[Peterborough](#)

PE1 1HF

Email: planningappeals@peterborough.gov.uk

Telephone 01733 453413

To find out more about Peterborough City Council please go to: www.peterborough.gov.uk

Please consider the environment before printing this email

Conditions apply to the confidentiality, copyright, legal liability and use of this email.

For full information relating to the transmission and use of this email

please visit www.peterborough.gov.uk/emaildisclaimer

--

Kelly Olsen