

From: [Sturgess, Tim \(Avison Young - UK\)](#)
To: [Claire Westwood](#)
Subject: RE: Maple Cross
Date: 08 September 2021 15:21:00

Hi Claire,

The original application (as submitted) included the removal of 30 trees as outlined in Table 5.1 of the Tree Survey and AIA below:

Previous Refused Application

Table 5.1 Proposed tree removals

Tree Ref.	Category	Reason for Removal
T1, T2, T3, T19, T20, T21, T24	3no. C 4no. U	Poor quality specimens recommended for removal and replacement within landscape strategy. Removal of these trees would reduce competition with TPO alders which are in decline
T10	1no. B	Moderate quality alder (TPO) growing on roadside - not possible to retain due to proximity to new footpath
T31, T32, T35	2no. B 1no. C	Low-moderate quality alders (TPO) not possible to retain due to new parking facilities / access
T5, T13, T14, T26, T33, T34, T36, T37	8no. U	TPO trees - but recommended for removal and replacement within landscape strategy due to poor condition. All Category U - Possible hazard risk.
T44	1no. U	Fallen willow tree in direct conflict with new hard surfacing
T55, T56, T57, G60, T61	1no. B 3no. C 1no. U	Mostly poor-quality specimens in direct conflict with new building construction
T63, T64, G65, G66, G67	5no. U	Over-mature willow trees of low arboricultural merit. Direct conflict with new building construction
T71, T72, T73	2no. C 1no. U	Poor quality specimens recommended for removal and replacement within landscape strategy. No direct conflict with proposals
Total: 4no. B; 10no. C; 16no. U		

The previous committee report at para. 3.11, cites amendments to the scheme led to the retention of a further three trees (T10, T73 and T61) leading to a total loss of 27. Extract below:

3.11 Originally 30 trees were proposed to be removed to facilitate the proposed works, these are identified within the Tree Survey and Arboricultural Impact Assessment and are predominantly located to the west and east site boundaries. As noted above, amended plans have been submitted during the course of the application to amend the vehicular access to Unit 1 and reduce the footprint of Unit 2. These changes have resulted in the retention of 3 trees originally proposed for removal (T10, T73 and T61). As such, a total of 27 trees are proposed to be removed. The Tree Survey and Arboricultural Impact Assessment categorises these as 3 x category B, 8 x category C and 16 x category U trees. A number of trees are also proposed to be retained, and these will be supplemented by additional planting (increased during application), with soft landscaping proposed around the Units and perimeter of the site. 46 new trees are proposed to the perimeter of the site to supplement the retained vegetation.

As you will note, the 'G' reference in the table refers to groups, with 'T' as individual trees. The previous reference to the loss of 27 trees (included 4 groups and 23 individual trees). This compares with the loss of 10 now (comprising four groups and six individual trees). This is reported in the same way in the current application. The losses are only Cat C and U. Appendix 2 (Tree Schedule) provides full details of the groups if required.

Do give me a call if needed.

Kind regards

Tim

Tim Sturgess

Director
Planning, Development & Regeneration

M: +44(0)7827 873 687

tim.sturgess@avisonyoung.com | avisonyoung.co.uk

65 Gresham Street, London, EC2V 7NQ



[Twitter](#) | [Property Listings](#)
[LinkedIn](#) | [Instagram](#)

Avison Young – Avison Young (UK) Limited | [Legal Disclaimer](#)

From: Claire Westwood <claire.westwood@threerivers.gov.uk>

Sent: 07 September 2021 11:58

To: Sturgess, Tim (Avison Young - UK) <Tim.Sturgess@avisonyoung.com>

Subject: RE: Maple Cross

CAUTION: External Sender

Hi Tim

Thanks for coming back to me.

I think my confusion is where there is reference to Groups rather than individual trees.

My previous report referred to a total of 27 trees being lost.

I understand that now only 3 category C trees, 4 category trees, 1 category C Group and 2 category U Groups are being lost but I was hoping to have a total figure that I could compare to the previous application. ie. *whereas the previous application proposed the removal of 27 trees, as a result of amendments to the access/parking layout the current application proposes the removal of x number of trees.*

I have not heard yet from Herts Ecology.

Kind Regards

Claire

Claire Westwood

Development Management Team Leader

Development Management

Three Rivers District Council

Three Rivers House, Northway, Rickmansworth, Herts, WD3 1RL

01923 776611

www.threerivers.gov.uk <https://my.threerivers.gov.uk/>



From: Sturgess, Tim (Avison Young - UK) [<mailto:Tim.Sturgess@avisonyoung.com>]

Sent: 07 September 2021 11:27

To: Claire Westwood <claire.westwood@threerivers.gov.uk>

Subject: RE: Maple Cross

Hi Claire,

Thanks for your email. For reference, this is set out in Para 7.96 of our Planning Statement and Table 5.1 of the Greengage Report should you need to cross refer to them.

Para. 7.96: The proposed development includes a number of minor amendments to the access and car park layouts to further reduce the impact on RPAs. These amendments have resulted in the requirement to remove only three category C and four category U trees and one category C and two category U groups.

Table 5.1 Proposed tree removals

Tree Ref.	Category	Reason for Removal
T44	U	Removed due to poor quality. Additionally, significant canopy overhanging the proposed parking area, and crown-lift not possible
T38	U	Removed due to poor quality. Additionally, canopy overhanging the proposed service yard
T55, T56, T57 and G60	3no. C 1no. U	All conflict with the proposed location of Unit 2
T64, G66, G67 and G70	1no. C 3no. U	All conflict with the proposed location of Unit 1
Total: 4no. Category C and 6no. Category U		

Trust this is helpful.

Assume you are still waiting on HE.

KR

Tim

Tim Sturgess

Director
Planning, Development & Regeneration

M: +44(0)7827 873 687

tim.sturgess@avisonyoung.com | avisonyoung.co.uk

65 Gresham Street, London, EC2V 7NQ



[Twitter](#) | [Property Listings](#)
[LinkedIn](#) | [Instagram](#)

Avison Young – Avison Young (UK) Limited | [Legal Disclaimer](#)

From: Claire Westwood <claire.westwood@threerivers.gov.uk>

Sent: 06 September 2021 17:37

To: Sturgess, Tim (Avison Young - UK) <Tim.Sturgess@avisonyoung.com>

Subject: RE: Maple Cross

CAUTION: External Sender

Hi Tim

No I haven't received anything further from Herts Ecology yet. I will let you know as soon as I do.

Separately are you able to provide some clarification to assist with my report please? A total of 27 trees were previously proposed to be removed with 46 new trees proposed.

Turning to the current application, this includes further minor amendments to the access and car parking layouts to reduce the impact on RPAs and the reports submitted indicate that this has resulted in the retention of additional trees.

Please can you confirm how many trees are proposed to be removed in total? I appreciate the 46 figure in terms of new trees is the same as previous.

Many thanks

Kind Regards

Claire

Claire Westwood

Development Management Team Leader

Development Management

Three Rivers District Council

Three Rivers House, Northway, Rickmansworth, Herts, WD3 1RL

01923 776611

www.threerivers.gov.uk <https://my.threerivers.gov.uk/>



From: Sturgess, Tim (Avison Young - UK) [<mailto:Tim.Sturgess@avisonyoung.com>]
Sent: 06 September 2021 15:56
To: Claire Westwood <claire.westwood@threerivers.gov.uk>
Subject: Maple Cross

Hi Claire,

Sorry to chase as I know you spoke with both me and Matt over the last few days on this, but our client has asked whether Herts Ecology have come back to you on the application yet.

Kind regards

Tim

Tim Sturgess

Director
Planning, Development & Regeneration

M: +44(0)7827 873 687

tim.sturgess@avisonyoung.com | avisonyoung.co.uk
65 Gresham Street, London, EC2V 7NQ



[Twitter](#) | [Property Listings](#)
[LinkedIn](#) | [Instagram](#)

Avison Young – Avison Young (UK) Limited | [Legal Disclaimer](#)

Click [here](#) to report this email as spam.

In line with council policy, we aim to give a full response to your enquiry within 10 working days. However, there may be a delay in our response to some enquiries due to the continuing impact of Covid-19. We are working hard to balance the delivery of critical services while keeping people safe.

Thank you for your patience and understanding.

This message has been scanned for malware by Websense. www.websense.com

For help email enquiries@threerivers.gov.uk or call 01923 776611

This email is confidential and is intended solely for the use of the individual for whom it is addressed.

Any views or opinions presented are solely those of the author and do not necessarily represent those of
Three Rivers District Council. If you are not the intended recipient, be advised that you have received

this email in error and that any use, dissemination, forwarding, printing or copying of this email is strictly prohibited. If you have received this email in error please notify Three Rivers by telephone on +44 (1923) 776611.

Please be aware that emails sent to or received from Three Rivers District Council may be intercepted and read by the Council. Interception will only occur to ensure compliance with Council policies or procedures or regulatory obligations, to prevent or deter crime, or for the purposes of essential maintenance or support of the email system.

We take your privacy seriously and will only use your personal information to provide you the service you have requested from us. We want you to understand the choice and control you have over the personal data we hold about you.

To find out more, please view our Privacy Notice at <https://threerivers.gov.uk/privacy-notice>

This message has been scanned for malware by Websense. www.websense.com