

Horseshoe Cottage
100A, The Strand
Nr. Semington
Wiltshire
BA14 6LN

28th March 2013

Bath & North East Somerset Council
Planning Services
PO Box 5006
Bath
BA1 1JG



For the attention of Jane Brewer

Dear Sirs,

Reference Tree Preservation Order 2013, 21 February 2013

Group of 3 Alders.

As owner of the land on which these trees are located I object to the imposition of this Tree Preservation Order on the following grounds.

1) On 20 February the arboriculturalist of BANES issued a consultation response to planning application 13/00288/OUT. The application site covered an area which included these trees. The consultation response was specifically, and should have been only, about the trees affected by the proposals of this planning application. The consultation response made no mention at all of any trees within the application site. The trees which are the subject of this TPO were not deemed significant enough to even merit a mention. There only trees mentioned in the consultation response, however, were trees which are outside the application site boundary - "the importance of the trees along Wellow Brook".

2) On 21 February, the very next day to the consultation response, the same arboriculturalist issued a TPO on trees which she had ignored, or had deemed insignificant, in her response of the previous day. This inconsistency, contradiction even, undermines the credibility of this officer. How is it possible to make two appraisals on the same location in so short a time with opposite outcomes?

3) If any TPOs were to be made, they should surely have been given to the important trees along Wellow Brook, not to the trees which merited no mention. There is a strong suspicion that the choice of trees selected for this TPO was directly made to interfere with the planning application. The timing of the issue of this TPO, in the middle of the planning application, was not co-incidental. If these trees merited a TPO, that could have been done at any previous time.

There are other trees in this area, but not within the planning application site, which it could be argued are equally deserving of protection. But only the trees affecting the planning application were singled out.

4) The above matters indicate that factors other than the intrinsic merit of the trees have motivated the imposition of this TPO, and this TPO should be rescinded forthwith.

5) There is a public sewer which runs directly under the trees which are the subject of this TPO. The trees represent a risk to that sewer:

a) Roots could penetrate the pipe and cause blockage, and/or allow seepage into the surrounding ground

b) Storm damage could uproot the trees pulling the pipe upwards affecting the integrity and flow

c) The trees falling over could push the pipe out of line again affecting the integrity of the pipe and flow.

These scenarios would require emergency work to the sewer, be very disruptive to the sanitation of this area, cause pollution to the soil, and possibly also Wellow Brook, and be a threat to public health.

On these grounds it would be prudent to rescind this temporary TPO.

Please advise me that you have taken heed of the strong arguments in this objection, and have rescinded the TPO.

Yours faithfully,

L. Bodey

