

Planning Services, City Growth Department

Interim Head of Planning: Colin Walker
Howden House · 1 Union Street · Sheffield · S1 2SH

Tel: 0114 2734181
E-mail: lucy.hirst@sheffield.gov.uk
Website: www.sheffield.gov.uk



2nd May 2019

Mr Alan Tordoff
10 Stumperlowe Hall Road
Sheffield
S10 3QR

Dear Mr Tordoff

Objection to Tree Preservation Order LS/RC/86124 10 Stumperlowe Hall Road, Sheffield S10 3QR

I refer to your letter of 11th February and apologise for the delay in getting back to you.

I understand you are happy to incorporate trees T1 and T2 into your scheme but are objecting to the inclusion of T3 and T4 within the preservation order and have asked how the issuing of the tree preservation order (TPO 430) has come about.

In dealing with application 17/03139/FUL concerns were raised regarding the affect that development would have upon the character and appearance of the area and the officer's report does mention the loss of the trees. A tree report was requested and this identified the trees as being Category C which generally means that trees are of low quality and retention cannot be justified. As Officers had concerns regarding the impact that development would have upon the character and appearance of the area, and were looking to refuse the scheme, the content of the tree report was taken at face value and not reviewed by landscape officers.

A revised scheme was submitted under application reference 18/02685/FUL and a further tree report was submitted. This identified two of the trees as Category B (T1 and T2); however all the rest were classed as being within retention Category C. This seemed at odds with the description of the trees in the final column of the table contained within Appendix A of the report as a number of the trees identified as being Category C are referred to in the report as being of good physiological and structural condition (which would normally mean they are Category B).

The trees appear to be of good condition and in representations local residents have objected to their removal.

To establish the quality of the trees, and whether they were worthy of retention, landscape officers visited the site on 4th January 2019 and an assessment was made of each of the trees.

The assessment found T1 and T2 to be of good condition. T3 was assessed to be of fair condition, but still worthy of a preservation order, and T4 to be of good quality.

The assessment was made using a scoring sheet. Each of the trees was given a score for condition, potential life span, relative public visibility and other factors. The final part of the assessment sets out that a score of 12-15 means a TPO is defensible and a score of 16+ definitely would merit a TPO. T1 scored 17, T2 and T3 scored 16 and T4 had a score of 19. On the basis of these scores the trees were felt to merit the making of a preservation order.

The assessment has been reviewed by officers, alongside your letter and that of Jon Coe Tree Services, dated 7th February 2019; however the trees scored highly and so the Council's position with regard to the inclusion of T3 and T4 within the order remains unchanged.

I am sorry that the assessment of the trees was not carried out earlier in the process; however as stated above the originally submitted tree report was taken at face value.

As the trees are considered to be worthy of retention (hence the issuing of the TPO), the current scheme is not considered to be acceptable. The development would result in the loss of T3 and T4 and so would be detrimental to the character and appearance of the area.

Given the above, my advice would be to withdraw the application. If I do not receive confirmation from you of this within the next 14 days, I will assume you require a decision to be made on the application as it stands, in which case, it is likely that a refusal would be the outcome. You can of course appeal against a refusal of permission.

I trust this clarifies the Council's position.

Yours sincerely

Lucy Hirst
Planning Officer
West & North Team

This page is intentionally left blank