

# APPENDIX (4)

**Gavin Boyes**

---

**From:** Matt Fe. [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 04 August 2017 16:15  
**To:** Gavin Boyes; Rasma Sultana  
**Subject:** TPO Order No.11 2017 Ref: RS/TPO(11)2017

Dear Sirs,

This is an objection to the Tree Preservation Order No.11 2017 on Land adjoining 73 Linthurst Newtown Blackwell, under Regulation 6.

For the avoidance of doubt, we do not own the Former Mink Farm simply referred to as Land adjoining 73 Linthurst Newtown. We own No.73 Linthurst Newtown, known as Charlton House. We are the most affected neighbour to the site as we border it on 3 sides.

We object to the use of a group order for G1. This gives some poor quality trees that would not usually merit a TPO, protection. We are greatly concerned with the first 2 Lawson Cypress trees in G1 and object to their protection. For almost a year we have sought to have these poor quality trees removed to improve highway safety. We have improved the vision to the East of our property but are unable to do so to the West due to the previous flawed TPO and now this one. The access to our property is directly opposite a bus stop, most often used by school children. An accident due to not being able to see traffic from our drive and vice versa could have fatal consequences. All to protect 2 non native poor examples of Conifer trees! This goes against all common sense and natural justice.

We also note the Spruces and other Lawson Cypress in G1 are of very poor form, namely they look like lollipops, are very top heavy and potentially dangerous given their close proximity to Linthurst Newtown, we therefore object to their protection.

We object to T15 on 2 grounds. The first is that it is an 'actionable nuisance'. The tree is approximately 20m tall and directly on our boundary, with a canopy that is within 1m of our house. The roots have already started to lift part of our rear patio and will no doubt start to cause problems with the rear of our property. The attached plan to the TPO does not reflect the true position of T15, it is much closer than shown. The 2nd ground for objecting to T15 is that it is of particularly poor form. The tree has suffered extensive Squirrel damage. The squirrels gnaw through the bark into the stem of the tree to access the sap. These wounds to the tree are then weak points for disease and rot. We have had already had a large branch snap out of the tree and land in our garden. This tree does not merit any protection.

We object to T16 and T17. Both trees are of poor form and not visible to the public. T16 which was referred to as 'lop sided' by a councillor on a previous site visit can only be seen from the North and not from any public place.

T17, has already been heavily cut back due to works with the electricity cables, has obvious and visible rot, and last year a large branch snapped out of the tree. Neither of these trees should be protected.

We support the protection of the large trees in G3. It is not clear why any tree directly North of G3 would be protected as they can not be seen from a public place. Indeed any tree which is Northerly of another cannot be seen from Linthurst Newtown. We understand that if a tree cannot be seen from a public place it does not merit protection. Therefore we object to T5, T6, T7, T8, T9, T10, T11, T18, T19 (which has fallen over), G5, G6, 4x apple trees in G4 and the use of a Woodland Order for W1. Regarding W1 only a handful of trees are visible to the public, surely these should be individually protected?

We trust our objections are taken into account.

Yours faithfully,

Mr & Mrs Fell