Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Printed on: 1 Response:	13/09/2022	09:10:07
2022/3761/T	Celia IIoyles	12:09/2022 16:04:05	OBJ	We lodge an objection to felling this huge, healthy plane tree, possibly one of the oldest and tallest in area? While semble pollarding and management in compliance with the TPO is supported, there is a conclusive rationale for destroying this almost unique tree, nor convincing evidence that felling the tre necessarily achieve the prevention of the differential foundation movements reported. We object to the proposal because a) the case for felling is inconclusive, are there not other plausible explanations for damage? And b) it is possible that cutting the tree down may actually have implications for the stability adjacent properties and structures. The tree is a large, mature public amenity and provides a high level of visibility in the area. It is subject TPO and nothing in the application provides convincing reasons for lifting the TPO. Permission to fell a similar huge plane tree was refused 18 June 2017 (2017/2512/T). The trees are s and the same reasons surely hold? We should be aware of the dangers of creating a precedent for o a TPO 2 which tree be will maxt? 15 years is a short time in the life of this tree, (maybe 250 years old) surely ought to be wary of quick fixes to the environment which subsequently turn out to have unfores consequences. The tree is a significant component of the views within the conservation area. In fact, the council note relation to the application 2017/2512/T mentioned above that there is a noticeable lack of street trees area. To be clear, just 5 years ago it was deemed a breach of the TPO in a conservation area for any persodown, too, lop, uproot, wilfully damage or wilfully destroy, any tree in the conservation area. We belie nothing has has changed in those 5 years to allow the felling of the entire tree and the poisoning (sic) stump as proposed in this application.	no ee will he	