



From: Simon Davis <Simon.Davis@arun.gov.uk>
Sent: 11 February 2020 14:30
To: Planning.Responses <Planning.Responses@arun.gov.uk>
Subject: FW: 34 Wakefield Way AW/246/19/PL

Further Tree Officer comments

From: Mark Warwick <Mark.Warwick@arun.gov.uk>
Sent: 10 February 2020 16:30
To: Ivon Blumer [REDACTED]
Cc: Simon Davis [REDACTED]
Subject: 34 Wakefield Way AW/246/19/PL

Dear Mr Blumer

Thank you for your email. Please accept my apologies for the much later than intended reply.

I am familiar with the asymmetrical shape of the tree, which unfortunately has detracted slightly from its visual amenity value. I consider this a temporary state in its anticipated lifespan (whilst free of direct interference) and not so visually diminished to substantially downgrade it.

- 1) I undertook my initial site visit on 15th November 2019 (see my report). I did not need to access the property, as I had an adequate view from the public footpath to the north, garage complex to the south and public highway to the east - from which to consider the development proposal.
- 2) Mr Davis confirms that the oak tree was made the subject of a provisional Tree Preservation Order on Thursday 6th February 2020.
- 3) Your client must henceforth submit a formal application to our planning department if they intend to undertake any further pruning of live growth. I observed recently that substantial pruning had been carried

out to reduce back all branches overhanging the garden and approximately to the boundary fence-line. I presume this was undertaken prior to the Order being served. The work is of poor quality; it does not meet the requirements of BS3998:2010 Tree work – Recommendations and I would not have recommended approval had a tree work application been necessary. We now have a tree of greater asymmetry although it appears to remain viable for long-term retention and if allowed to 'grow on' from those stubs should recover an attractive crown profile.

- 4) I accept that statement of intent and had not assumed otherwise.
- 5) I am sorry to disappoint you but all our time is valuable and it would be disingenuous of me to agree to such a meeting only to re-iterate past statements. As I have said before, I am happy to correspond further on any specific points of contention or if new information is made available.
- 6) I am unaware of who owns the land on which the oak tree grows, although our records suggest it is neither ADC or WSCC. That seems entirely logical to me; I suspect the land (and tree) either attaches to the adjacent landowner or most likely belongs to the original estate developer. Perhaps a land registry search would be revealing, although as you probably know – it is not always possible to identify a titleholder or indeed make contact with them.

Yours sincerely,

Mark Warwick

From: Ivon Blumer [REDACTED]
Sent: 14 January 2020 10:54
To: Mark Warwick <Mark.Warwick@arun.gov.uk>
Cc: Simon Davis <Simon.Davis@arun.gov.uk>; Trish Paul [REDACTED]
Subject: 34 Wakefield Way AW/246/19/PL

Dear Mark

I apologise for the e-mail sent yesterday, I was not aware that you had already responded to the Lizard report.

Firstly I have attached a photo of the tree in question, which shows the asymmetrical shape of tree since the loss of a large bough.

However, can I ask the following:

- 1) Can you please confirm when you made your site visit.
- 2) Can you please confirm the current status of the tree, I know it does not have a TPO, but is it covered by any area TPO?
- 3) On the basis that the tree is not covered by any TPO's, can my client, in the future, prune any overhanging branches.
- 4) I would confirm that my client has no wish to have this tree removed or damage it RPA in any way whatsoever.
- 5) My client & I are disappointed that you are not prepared to meet on site with our consultant to discuss the matter.
- 6) Can you please if possible confirm on whose land the tree is located, I assume it is either ADC or WSCC highway land.

In the meantime I look forward to hearing from you.

Kind regards

Ivon

Ivon Blumer Architects Ltd

