

Objections received to application 23/01287/TREECA

Objection 1 – submitted 06.11.2023

Strongly object to removal of this tree. There were other trees on this site which were felled sadly years ago by the previous developer without permission. Ridiculous that this in danger of being removed when it clearly seems to be in good health and is home for various birds to nest in.

Objection 2 – submitted 27.10.2023

We were under the impression that this tree has a TPO. A silver poplar tree is a highly effective windbreaker in coastal areas like ours. It develops extensive root systems (both directions: into the ground depth and along the ground) and is known to be quickly growing further roots should these be damaged therefore it is hard to make such tree "unstable" Thus the tree has been there before the houses have been build and been planned into the development, which has already destroyed multiple trees which were located within this conservation area. Which in fact makes the term conservation area a joke if the council allows the trees to be felled and houses to be built.

Objection 3 – submitted 26.10.2023

Strongly object to this proposal. Once again, another example of NTC and the Walker Place Developers doing whatever they want regardless of existing regulations. Are we not supposed to be protecting trees like this in this age of climate change? It's scandalous that the tree has already been damaged during the building works.

Objection 4 – submitted 25.10.2023

The Legal Agreement of the Walker Place development dated 21/10/22, Condition 2 states: "Existing trees and shrubs to be retained within the site and any on adjacent sites growing close to the boundary of the development site shall be protected from damage during construction works in accordance with best practice and to BS5837: 2012 'Trees in Relation to Design, Demolition and Construction - Recommendations'. This shall include appropriate protective barriers and other

relevant physical protection measures including ground protection and construction exclusion zones to protect the root protection areas. Reason: To avoid physical damage to trees and root plates during construction, to ensure the satisfactory retention of existing trees and shrubs in the interests of visual amenity to preserve the character and appearance of the Conservation Area having regard to policy DM5.9 and DM6.6 of the North Tyneside Local Plan 2017.

This application states that the roots have been severed on one side due to the laying of the services and that it is on North Tyneside Councils' property.

Who at North Tyneside Council gave permission for the services provider to dig into the root plates of this protected tree to carry services to this development?

The poplar tree in this application is protected and therefore should not be removed.

Objection 5 – submitted 24.10.2023

We object to the application to remove this tree. Other trees which existed on this site were removed without permission. This tree has received inadequate protection throughout the building phase of this development. This sort of practice was outdated twenty years ago. Throughout the development period building materials have been stored too close to the main trunk, under the trees canopy, causing compaction. To fell this tree is not the right course of action, merely covering up for the council and developers true responsibility for proper arboricultural care and due diligence.

For a resident to purchase a new house with a tree adjacent to its property and then apply for its removal is erosion of visual amenity and wildlife value to the rest of the community. NTC has committed to a climate change pledge and every tree matters in an increasingly urban environment. This site is so close to the conservation area and council designated greenspace. How much more is going to be destroyed at a time of biodiversity crisis.

Objection 6 – submitted 22.10.2023

This tree is not part of the housing development and is protected there has also been trees felled on brewhouse bank with out permission. This tree has no effect

whatsoever on no 1 and has stood for years to no avail .Developer also was supposed to erect bird boxes and bat boxes and none have materialised on this developer too date

Objection 7 – submitted 22.10.2023

For a tree that is allegedly semi-dead it seems to do very well and has withstood many harsh winters in an exposed position for many years. It is also home to a pair crows and other birds that return year on year. Unnecessary damage to the roots has been recently caused by the dumping of building material on land that is not owned by the developer around the tree. As per usual NTC has, and no doubt will continue to turn a blind eye to this. Some proper care and pruning of the tree would alleviate any concerns the prospective house owners may have. And maintain the character of the area. There are countless examples of trees on NTC property across the borough that are in close proximity to private housing that have not been removed, why should this one be?