24th July 2019

Your Ref: Our Ref: P.1219.19

Ms Emma Hood Arboricultural Officer Cheshire East Council PO Box 606 Municipal Buildings Earle Street **Crewe CW1 9HP**

By Email

Attention: Emma Hood

Dear Ms Hood,

TOWN & COUNTRY PLANNING ACT 1990 THE TOWN & COUNTRY PLANNING (TREE PRESERVATION) (ENGLAND) REGULATIONS 2012 The Cheshire East Borough Council (ADLINGTON – LITTLE BRECK, SUGAR LANE) TREE PRESERVATION ORDER 2019

We refer to the above Tree Preservation Order, (the Order) and by way of this letter we object to the Order on behalf of our client Mr Ron Scurr and respectfully request that the Order is not confirmed. This objection is in accordance with Regulation 6 of the Town & Country Planning (Tree Preservation)(England) Regulations 2012.

We object to the Order on the grounds that (i) Area A2 description appears inaccurate and could lead to ambiguity; and (ii) the plans are poor quality which could lead to misidentification of trees.

(i) Area A2 description appears inaccurate and could lead to ambiguity:

The description provided for A2 does not follow the prescribed format of the Model Order in that it states, "*The trees of whatever species within area marked A1 on the map*", when it presumably should refer to A2. It is not clear whether this was the intention of the council or in fact an error, but the use of the document cannot rely on an assumption and therefore this ambiguity needs addressing.

(ii) The plans are poor quality which could lead to misidentification of trees:

The plan following the *Specification of trees* is of such poor quality that it is difficult to confidently identify the location of the trees subject to the Tree Preservation Order. The colour difference between roads and other land use is almost indistinguishable and the outlines of buildings are faded and almost non-existent for the property that is subject to this Order (Little Breck). The '*Ordnance Survey Overlaid onto Current OS map*' is also unhelpful and does not contain clear identification of the Tree Preservation Order Area designations or any labels for

the Areas or individual trees. The clarity of both plans needs to be improved if they are to be used reliably to inform any future decisions concerning the trees.

On the basis of the above points, we consider that the Order contains sufficient ambiguities and errors that it could be considered invalid. On this basis we recommend that it is not confirmed in its current form.

Please acknowledge receipt of this objection and address the acknowledgement and any other correspondence in the matter of the objection and this order, to this office.

Yours sincerely

Robert Armitage BSc (Hons) MArborA Ascerta