

From: Emma Swain
Sent: 11 September 2020 15:45
To: Strong Laura
Subject: Re: TPOs The Vicarage, 52 Main Street, Cossington

Hi Laura,

Thank you for letting me know.

I hope it's clear that my objection isn't necessarily an objection as such to the TPOs but to the non grant of permission for the work to go ahead whilst the TPOs are being administered. Although as we fall under conservation TPOs do seem unnecessary as we have to conform to applying for permission for work anyway.

But following your advice I formally objected in order to ensure I met the deadlines.

Thank you

Emma Swain
Sent from my iPhone

On 11 Sep 2020, at 15:01, Strong Laura <Laura.Strong@charnwood.gov.uk> wrote:

Dear Emma

Objection received, thank you. I will be in touch in due course regarding arrangements for the consideration of your objection by this Council's Appeals and Reviews Committee.

Best wishes

Laura Strong

From: Emma Swain
Sent: 11 September 2020 14:32
To: Strong Laura <Laura.Strong@charnwood.gov.uk>
Cc: Andrew Swain
Subject: TPOs The Vicarage, 52 Main Street, Cossington

Dear Laura

Ref: PT/53

Further to our recent telephone conversation I write to contest the fact that TPOs are being placed on certain trees within the garden of 52 Main Street, Cossington

prior to
granting written consent to the necessary maintenance work.

Whilst I have no objection per se to the trees being given TPO status I am very frustrated as to why written permission can not be granted at the same time, to go ahead with the works needed to lift crowns and top the trees in need and remove dead wood.

The garden has not been properly maintained for a very long time. Many of the trees are in less than optimum condition, and due to crowding are in general poor condition.

We purchased from The Leicester Dioceses who have rented the property for a number of years, possibly since it was built. Tenants and the previous owners have not maintained as needed. (Although several trees have been removed (one in particular being over a meter in diameter), prior to our purchase, assuming without permission considering your response to our request and the fact that no TPOs were registered when our solicitor completed the checks on purchase.)

The property is now a private family dwelling with a young child under 3 years old living there. There are other family members and friends with young children who visit.

Therefore the primary objective is to provide a safe environment for them to play. Also, as stated in the objections from yourselves to our proposal for maintenance, the driveway on the southern boundary is a public access to the church. It is also used as access to the property at the rear and by walkers. Other people's safety is also paramount to us and we are hoping to prevent an accident happening. Due to the declining condition and lack of management there is significant dead wood that needs to be removed for safety.

The request made by ourselves is that management of these trees as recommended within the arboricultural report can be undertaken.

There were a few trees advised for removal and this request also hasn't been acknowledged other than to say a TPO will be placed on them preventing this happening at this point. Very few trees actually need to be removed and ALL OF THE KEY CANOPY trees will remain. Those earmarked for removal are either of very poor quality or suppressed by other trees in the close vicinity. Mainly the holly trees which seem to be self seeded and very poor.

My husband and I asked a Tree Consultant to complete an Arboricultural Report on the understanding that this report was completed to a professional standard by a qualified professional to ensure that what was being requested was not just because we as unqualified individuals wanted it to be done for our own personal 'wants' but so it was noted what need to be done due to health and condition of the trees.

The purpose of the report was to obtain permission to maintain the trees and garden but did not (as not required on the report) provide any explanation as to our intentions to replant any trees or to hedge or fence the boundary for our security and personal use of the garden. Until the trees have been maintained or removed we are unable to put a proposal together as we do not know the exact space we then have or the amount of light that we will have to then be able to plant a suitable hedge or further trees. Therefore additional understory plants of native varieties can be established as part of this management and a low timber fence if necessary once we have completed maintenance.

Overall, since these trees are already in the Conservation Area and protected, we do feel that the placing of a TPO seems a little unnecessary. No work can be carried out without the written permission of yourselves regardless. The works proposed have been recommended both by our Consultant and also agreed as necessary by our Arborocultrual Contractor.

I have already discussed arranging a meeting with the Tree Officer on site to look at the trees and discuss what works would be appropriate and agree this and our Consultant would also be happy to meet up. I was copied into an email to the officer but have so far not heard anything. (Although I haven't had chance to chase this up, I am disappointed not to have heard from them!)

I assume this meets the relevant requirements for objecting to the TPO order. I will be throughly disappointed if we cannot come to a suitable agreement to continue with the work as requested and as soon as possible, or if this then means that we have to once again employ someone to reiterate the needs of the garden for maintenance and reapply for the same works to be completed.

I look forward to hearing from you soon.

Emma Swain

Sent from my iPhone

Data Protection For information about how and why we may process your personal data, your data protection rights or how to contact our Data Protection Officer, please view our Privacy Notice.