

**From:** max wallis <[REDACTED]>  
**Sent:** 17 October 2016 14:00  
**To:** Planning & Transportation (Customer Care)  
**Cc:** green keith; Anne Crowley; emma\_perry  
**Subject:** Northcliffe Lodge: App. No. 2015/01449/FUL

Planning Dept., Vale of Glam Council

case officer Mrs. Y. J. Prichard

**Northcliffe Lodge development: App. No. 2015/01449/FUL**

In connection with the application to use part of the Northcliffe apartments site for an entrance drive, including felling of trees and re-structuring the carparking in the easterly (Dyfed), could you say if you have reviewed the TPO replacement trees that should exist under decisions since 2007?

The Lime tree in the easterly (Dyfed) carpark was subject of approved work 2014/01256/TPO. There is no record in this and other files of replacement trees being planted and surviving. Three Sycamore trees in the east of the carpark were to be replaced under 2007/00050/TPO, to include a Common Oak and a Field Maple near where the sycamores were felled. It is not evident that these were planted and survived (or replaced) as under the TPO conditions.

# No record of agreement on two replacement trees, to replace the TPO Ash and Holm Oak “of a species to be agreed in writing” 2014/01256/TPO and where to be sited.

# No written scheme re. new planting as required on the 2008/00177/TPO file. Not evident that the planting scheme was proceeded with. Not evident that new trees were planted nearby, between the flats and the cliff edge, in order to ensure protection of *the visual amenities of the area*.

# three mature TPO Sycamore trees at the SE end of the Dyfed carpark were felled under 2007/00050/TPO, which required “three heavy standard replacements shall be planted in locations near those to be felled, during the first planting season following felling and shall include a Common Oak and a Field Maple”.

The new trees should have been assigned TPOs, like those they were replacing. Can you please check if they were in fact planted (and survived or replaced) and assigned TPOs? If not, can this be remedied, at least insofar as replacement trees in the development area should be regarded as having TPOs?

Second, the 2007 Order required “in the event of any tree dying or becoming diseased it shall be replaced with a similar size tree”. That would presumably require heavy standard replacement with a further 10-years growth, which we’d expect you to apply to any re-replacements. Would you also retain the criterion “*ensure the visual amenities of the area are protected*” to the Northcliffe developers in respect of changes to the apartments site?

This would mean planting heavy standards as well as other largish trees between the access road and the restructured carpark, though the space they allow appears insufficient. Could you ask the developers to show they can meet this criterion?

Third, I wished to check if this was covered in the pre-application discussions, but the file 2015/00086/PRE appears to have been taken down from your vgonline.planning-register. Could you please restore the documents from this file as relevant to the current application?

With thanks,

Max Wallis



3 Penarth Head Lane, Penarth CF64 1BB

Friends of the Earth, Barry & Vale