

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2021/4863/T	D Pelk	08/10/2021 09:54:41	OBJ	Another sparsely-supported application to demonstrate the need to fell this tree to the ground. Not even a photograph to substantiate the claim it is of low amenity. As we know from other failed applications, young trees are sometimes planted to replace previously felled trees that are under a TPO. These young trees have the same protection of the precious tree's TPO. That may not be the case here but there is nothing to go by in favour of the application. At 9m distance from the property the only problem stated is that it *may* eventually touch the windows. Surely pruning is the solution here, not necessarily felling? Again, without photographic support - easily done nowadays - I would ask that the planning committee either reject this application or seek better information.
2021/4863/T	S. Nix	08/10/2021 07:52:11	OBJ	Could more information be provided to justify why this tree should be felled, please? Could a picture be provided? Has an arborist assessed the tree? The 'reasons' given on the application do not justify, in my opinion, the felling of this tree. Permission to fell trees in this conservation area appears to be granted increasingly easily and often for very flimsy reasons, e.g. 'low amenity value', and here, 'too close to property within 3m' (which does not even make sense); 'future risks...' - ??? Really??