

Alan Tordoff
10 Stumperlowe Hall Road
Fulwood
Sheffield
S10 3QR

Legal Services Department, Legal & Governance
Sheffield City Council
Town Hall
Pinstone Street
Sheffield
S1 2HH

8th February 2019

Dear Sirs,

OBJECTION TO TREE PRESERVATION ORDER REFERENCE LS/RC/86124, RELATING TO 10 STUMPERLOWE HALL ROAD, SHEFFIELD S10 3QR

We are writing to object to tree preservation orders put on two trees in our garden under the above TPO. The order affects four trees in all, two of which, trees T1 and T2, we are happy to retain and protect. The two trees we wish to object to are trees T3 and T4, which are described by our arboricultural consultant, Jon Coe, as 'unremarkable trees of very limited merit'. A letter in support of this objection, which expands on this description, is attached to this document.

A full planning application for development of this site with a single dwellinghouse, reference 17/03139/FUL, was validated on 3 August 2017. During the determination process the planning authority requested a tree report, which we commissioned from Jon Coe, and which we duly submitted on 17 October 2017. The application was refused planning permission on 5 March 2018 on the ground that the proposed house was 'out of scale and character in the street scene'. No mention was made at any point of any issue concerning trees on the site.

Taking into account planning officer and design officer comments, a second application, reference 18/02685/FUL, was submitted and was validated on 31 July 2018. On 5 November 2018 Lucy Hirst, the case officer, requested a revised tree report, stating that the initial tree report was no longer relevant to the revised scheme. In fact the footprint of the revised design affected exactly the same trees as in the initial tree report. Nonetheless we commissioned a second tree report from Jon Coe, which was submitted on 29 November 2018.

On 9 January 2019 the applicant received a letter from Sheffield City Council stating that as of 10 January 2019 the Council had made a tree preservation order on four trees on the site. Considering that the relationship between these four trees and the proposed development is no different to the relationship back on 17 October 2017 when the initial tree report was submitted, we wish to know what has changed in the interim period.

We find the decision to apply TPOs at this incredibly late stage in the planning application process extremely questionable. If there had been an issue with any trees on the site we should have known about it no later than November 2017. As a result of, at best, the planning authority's incompetence on

this matter, we are facing considerable bills in professional fees that could have been avoided with timely advice on the issue of trees back in 2017.

We seek both a retraction of the TPOs on trees 3 and 4 in TPO 430 and an explanation as to how, exactly, TPO 430 came about.

Yours Faithfully,

Alan Tordoff