





---

**MAIN CASE**

Proposal: Confirmation of Tree Preservation Order E/09/23

Location: Land To Front Of 11-13 Limes Close Wilburton Ely  
Cambridgeshire CB6 3LX

Applicant: N/A

Agent: N/A

Reference No: TPO/E/09/23

Case Officer: Kevin Drane, Trees Officer

Parish: Wilburton

Ward: Stretham  
Ward Councillors: Councillor Bill Hunt  
Councillor Caroline Shepherd

---

**[REPORT NO: Y104]**

1.0 **THE ISSUE**

1.1 To confirm a Tree Preservation Order (TPO) for one Oak tree to the front of 11-13 Limes Close Wilburton Ely Cambridgeshire CB6 3LX. This matter is being referred to Committee due to objections received within the 28 days consultation period, which ended on 16<sup>th</sup> October 2023, and for the requirement to confirm the TPO within six months to ensure the tree is protected for public amenity.

2.0 **RECOMMENDATIONS**

2.1 It is recommended that:

The TPO is confirmed, for the following reasons: The tree is a prominent feature, visible from the public realm, in good health, it offers a significant visual contribution to the amenity of the local landscape in this part of Wilburton with the new development designed around the retention of this tree from the start.

### 3.0 **COSTS**

If a TPO is made and confirmed and a subsequent application for works to the tree are refused then the tree owner would have an opportunity to claim compensation if, as a result of the Council's decision, the tree owner suffers any significant loss or damage as a result of the tree within 12 months of that decision being made costing more than £500 to repair.

### 4.0 **BACKGROUND**

4.1 The Order was made following an email enquiring about the process for the removal of the tree by a representative of the development company and the subsequent tree officers visit to site.

4.2 The TPO was served under Section 201 of the Town & Country Planning Act 1990, on 13<sup>th</sup> September 2022 because:

- The tree was assessed to have significant amenity value, as it makes a significant visual contribution to the local landscape in this part of Wilburton.

4.3 An objection to the serving of the TPO was received in writing from the tree owner during the statutory consultation period. The letter of objection is in Appendix 1. The details of the objection were:

- It has an excessive amount of deadwood for its age, and this significantly limit the tree's visual and aesthetic contributions to the locality.
- The ecological and environmental significance of this particular Oak tree is limited. The area already boasts extensive biodiversity, undermining the unique contribution of this tree.
- The trees squat form and low branches pose a safety risk due to children being able to climb the tree.
- The proximity of the branches to the adjacent property (within 1m) will require ongoing maintenance to prevent damage.
- The imposition of the TPO would adversely affect the development, particularly given the health and safety concerns and maintenance requirements associated with the tree.
- The proposed TPO would have a significant impact on our ongoing development project. The presence of the oak tree is limiting the layout possibilities and efficient land use, potentially leading to design compromises and increased costs.
- The preservation order would hinder the ability to optimise the residential units' layout, potentially impacting the overall quality of the development.

4.4 Support for the long-term protection of the tree was received from the Parish Council as per Appendix 2.

4.5 Given the comments received, including the objection to the serving of the TPO, it was considered appropriate for the Planning Committee Members to consider all the matter and reach a democratic decision on the future protection of the TPO Oak tree.

## 5.0 **CONCLUSIONS**

5.1 As part of the process for making the new TPO the tree was assessed relating to its current condition and no issues were noted relating to the foreseeable failure of the tree and there was no visible indication that the trees are in significantly poor health as per the TEMPO assessment in appendix 4.

- The amount of deadwood is likely the result of a change in soil hydrology via the draining of the site for the development and will be a short-term consequence of the tree needing to save energy while it grows new root that reach the water in the soil. Or as a result of the repeated breaching of the tree's root protection barrier and exclusion zone.
- The biodiversity of this site was removed apart from the tree to facilitate development and the biodiversity improvements to be provided by the new planting will take a number of years to come into effect. The Woodland Trust state that this native species of Oak has a rich diversity of decay and mycorrhizal fungi, and lichens on trunks and branches. Is very important for nature recovery. Over 2,300 species are associated with this species of native Oak, and 320 are entirely dependent. Can have very high insect biomass at key times, supporting masses of insect predators, such as birds. The blossom is also important for insects.
- The tree's location means it is clearly visible allowing adult supervision should children chose or be allowed to climb the tree as children have climbed trees for hundreds of years and could be prevented via the installation of a suitable fence and signage. The potential of a tree to be climbed cannot be a reason for its removal as this sort of risk management would result in the removal of thousands of trees.
- The tree's branches are in excess of 1.5m from the scaffolding on the front of the nearest property which provided a working width of 1.5m as per the photos in appendix 3 and from the site visit.
- The development was designed around the retention of this tree from the start with it being identified as a category B tree in the submitted tree report.
- With the approval of the developments layout and landscaping being confirmed the tree having a TPO on it should not affect the approved proposals or effect the developments use of the land as it was designed around the retention of the tree.
- The unit's layout has been confirmed and approved with the presence and proximity of the tree in mind.

5.2 Whilst determining if the tree was of sufficient amenity value or not is to some extent subjective, this tree is visible from the public highway. The Trees

Officer remains of the opinion that the tree make a significant visual contribution to the local landscape, the amenity and character of the area.

- 5.3 Amenity is a subjective term open to individual interpretation. The Act does not define ‘amenity’, nor does it prescribe the circumstances in which it is in the interests of amenity to make a TPO. A public amenity can be described as a feature which benefits and enhances an area contributing to the areas overall character for the public at large. In this case the trees are large and visible from the public highway as well as neighbouring gardens and they are considered to benefit the area in relation to their contribution to the landscape and therefore considered a significant public amenity.
- 5.4 If the Planning Committee decide not to confirm the TPO, the TPO will lapse and the owner can then remove the tree or prune it if they wished to, without any permission required from the Council.

Appendix 1 - Letter of objection to the TPO from the tree owner.

Appendix 2 - Email of support from Wilburton Parish Council

Appendix 3 - Photograph of distance from property

Appendix 4 – Documents:

- ECDC TPO Assessment Sheet & user guide
- Copy of the TPO/E/09/23 document and plan

---

### **Background Documents**

### **Location(s)**

### **Contact Officer(s)**

Town & Country Planning Act 1990  
Town & Country Planning (Tree Preservation) (England) Regulations 2012  
National Planning Policy Guidance from 6<sup>th</sup> March 2014  
<http://planningguidance.planningportal.gov.uk/blog/guidance/tree-preservation-orders/how-are-offences-against-a-tree-preservation-order-enforced-including-tree-replacement/>

Kevin Drane,  
Trees Officer  
Room No. 002  
The Grange  
Ely

Kevin Drane  
Trees Officer  
01353 665555  
kevin.drane@eastcambs.gov.uk

East Cambridgeshire District Local Plan 2015

Natural Environment – Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) Adopted 24 September 2020.

## Appendix 1



Etopia Wilburton Limited

Millbank Tower  
21-24 Millbank  
London  
SW1 4QS

FAO: Simon Ellis  
East Cambridgeshire District Council  
The Grange  
Nutholt Lane  
Ely  
Cambridgeshire  
CB7 4E

**Re: Objection to Proposed Tree Preservation Order (TPO/E/09/23) at Land to the front of 11-13 Limes Close, Wilburton**

Dear Mr Ellis,

I am writing on behalf of Etopia Wilburton Limited, the landowner and developer of the 30 residential units situated at the location of the oak tree designated as T1 in the proposed Tree Preservation Order (TPO/E/09/23) issued on the 12th of September 2023.

We respectfully submit our objection to the proposed TPO in accordance with Regulation 6 of the Town and Country Planning (Tree Preservation) (England) Regulations 2012, for the following compelling reasons:

### 1. Background:

Our Net Zero Ready Home development project is a testament to our commitment to the community's welfare and environmental responsibility. We believe that our 30 residential units will not only provide comfortable housing but also contribute to the local economy and the area's overall well-being.

### 2. Condition of the Tree:

The oak tree is approximately 50 years old, and regrettably is not in an ideal state. It has an excessive amount of deadwood for its age. The extensive dead branches significantly limit the

---

Be smart. Buy smart. Live smart.



Etopia Wilburton Ltd  
020 3781 8444  
info@projectetopia.com  
projectetopia.com  
Reg. number: 12562413  
VAT: GB279403382

Address  
3rd Floor  
Millbank Tower  
21-24 Millbank  
London  
SW1P 4QP



tree's visual and aesthetic contributions to the locality. We contend that the tree's present condition does not justify the imposition of a TPO for long term public amenity.

### 3. Limited Ecological and Environmental Significance:

While we acknowledge the importance of preserving trees that contribute to the biodiversity and green infrastructure of an area, we assert that the ecological and environmental significance of this particular oak tree is limited. The area already boasts extensive biodiversity, undermining the unique contribution of this tree.

### 4. Health and Safety Concerns:

The oak tree's squat form with very low branches is a potential health hazard. Situated in the centre of a development of 30 residential units, the tree is easily accessible to children who might be tempted to climb its branches, posing significant safety risks. Moreover, the proximity of the tree branches to adjacent properties (within 1 meter) necessitates ongoing maintenance to mitigate risks to property and residents. There is a genuine concern and risk that the management company, to be owned by the residents of the development, may not want or be able to fulfil the required maintenance obligations to an adequate level.

### 5. Impact on Approved Development Plans:

The council granted planning permission for the development of 30 residential units at this site, an indication of the alignment of our development plans with the broader community interests and planning standards. The imposition of the TPO would adversely affect the development, particularly given the health and safety concerns and maintenance requirements associated with the tree.

The proposed TPO would have a significant impact on our ongoing development project. The presence of the oak tree is limiting the layout possibilities and efficient land use, potentially leading to design compromises and increased costs. The preservation order would hinder our ability to optimise the residential units' layout, potentially impacting the overall quality of the development.

### Alternative Solutions:

We are committed to enhancing the environmental quality and biodiversity of the area. To this end, we propose the following alternative solutions:

---

Be smart. Buy smart. Live smart.



Etopia Wilburton Ltd  
020 3781 8444  
info@projectetopia.com  
projectetopia.com  
Reg. number: 12562413  
VAT. GB279403382

Address  
3rd Floor  
Millbank Tower  
21-24 Millbank  
London  
SW1P 4QP



a. **Removal and Replacement:** Safely remove the oak tree and replace it with a suitable planting of mid-level bushes and shrubs, which will themselves further enhance the local biodiversity and do not present similar health and safety risks, ensuring enhancement of both the aesthetic and ecological value of the area.

b. **Maintenance Plan:** If the TPO is to proceed, we strongly urge the establishment of a comprehensive maintenance plan to address the deadwood and proximity issues, ensuring the safety and amenity value of the tree are upheld. The financial and logistical responsibility for this maintenance should be clarified.

We request that these objections and alternative proposals be duly considered in the evaluation of the proposed TPO. We are open to collaborative discussions to reach a resolution that upholds the safety, amenity, and ecological value of the area.

Yours sincerely,

*Stephen Auda*

(Director)

**Etopia Wilburton Limited**

---

Be smart. Buy smart. Live smart.



Etopia Wilburton Ltd

020 3781 8444

info@projectetopia.com

projectetopia.com

Reg. number: 12562413

VAT: GB279403382

Address:

3rd Floor

Millbank Tower

21-24 Millbank

London

SW1P 4QP

## Appendix 2

[EXTERNAL] FW: New Tree Preservation Order TPO E/09/23 Oak tree Land To Fro...



Andrew Milne <clerk2@wilburtonparishcouncil.org>  
To: Kevin Drane



17/10/2023

**Caution:** External email. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognise the sender and know the content is safe. The original sender of this email is Andrew Milne <clerk2@wilburtonparishcouncil.org>

---

Hello Kevin,

Thank you for your e mail, just to advise we do not have any objections to the TPO on this tree and support the order.

Best Wishes

Andy Milne

---

**From:** [Wilburton Parish Council](#)

**Sent:** 17 October 2023 12:12

**To:** [Andy Milne](#)

**Subject:** Re: New Tree Preservation Order TPO E/09/23 Oak tree Land To Front Of 11-13 Limes Close Wilburton

Hi Andy. We didn't have any objections to registering the trees as protected if you would let them know that please. We are happy with the plans to put TPO on those trees Especially considering it's a development that runs on the exceptions created by being an eco friendly development.

Thanks John

John

Sent from my iPhone

**Appendix 3**



**Appendix 4**

**TREE EVALUATION METHOD FOR PRESERVATION ORDERS - TEMPO**

SURVEY DATA SHEET & DECISION GUIDE

<b>Postal Address/Location</b>		<b>11-13 Limes Close Wilburton Ely Cambridgeshire CB6 3LX</b>	
<b>Date:</b>	<b>08/09/2023</b>	<b>Surveyor:</b>	<b>Kevin Drane</b>

<b>DESCRIPTION OF TREE(S) – Please continue on separate sheet if needed</b>		
<b>Category</b>	<b>Description (incl. species)</b>	<b>Situation</b>
T1	Pedunculate Oak low squat form, estimated age of 50yrs, normal amount of deadwood for age and species	Located to front of the new properties approx. 12-14m away

**REFER TO GUIDANCE NOTE FOR ALL DEFINITIONS**

**Part 1: Amenity assessment**

**a) Condition & suitability for TPO**

- 5) Good Highly suitable
- 3) Fair/satisfactory Suitable
- 1) Poor Unlikely to be suitable
- 0) Dead/dying/dangerous\* Unsuitable

**Score & Notes = 5 some deadwood present but normal for age and species**

*\* Relates to existing context and is intended to apply to severe irremediable defects only*

**b) Retention span (in years) & suitability for TPO**

- 5) 100+ Highly suitable
- 4) 40-100 Very suitable
- 2) 20-40 Suitable
- 1) 10-20 Just suitable
- 0) <10\* Unsuitable

**Score & Notes = 5 the development has provided sufficient space for the future growth potential of the tree**

*\*Includes trees which are an existing or near future nuisance, including those clearly outgrowing their context, or which are significantly negating the potential of other trees of better quality*

**c) Relative public visibility & suitability for TPO**

*Consider realistic potential for future visibility with changed land use*

- |   |                     |
|---|---------------------|
| 5) Very large trees with some visibility, or prominent large trees  | Highly suitable     |
| 4) Large trees, or medium trees clearly visible to the public       | Suitable            |
| 3) Medium trees, or large trees with limited view only              | Suitable            |
| 2) Young, small, or medium/large trees visible only with difficulty | Barely suitable     |
| 1) Trees not visible to the public, regardless of size              | Probably unsuitable |

**Score & Notes = 4 medium sized tree with clear visibility within the site and from Clarkes Lane**

**d) Other factors**

*Trees must have accrued 7 or more points (with no zero score) to qualify*

- 5) Principal components of formal arboricultural features, or veteran trees
- 4) Tree groups, or principal members of groups important for their cohesion
- 3) Trees with identifiable historic, commemorative or habitat importance
- 2) Trees of particularly good form, especially if rare or unusual
- 1) Trees with none of the above additional redeeming features (inc. those of indifferent form)
- 1) Trees with poor form or which are generally unsuitable for their location

**Score & Notes = 1 a single tree relatively common for the area though the species does have a very high habitat potential**

**Part 2: Expediency assessment**

*Trees must have accrued 10 or more points to qualify*

- 5) Immediate threat to tree inc. S.211 Notice
- 3) Foreseeable threat to tree
- 2) Perceived threat to tree
- 1) Precautionary only

**Score & Notes = 5 an email has been received indication the developer's intention to remove the tree (currently only protected by planning condition)**

**Part 3: Decision guide**

- Any 0 Do not apply TPO
- 1-6 TPO indefensible
- 7-11 Does not merit TPO
- 12-15 TPO defensible just
- 16+ Definitely merits TPO

**Add Scores for Total:**  
**= 20**

**Decision:**  
Serve TPO ASAP due to risk of removal.

**TEMPO**  
**Tree Evaluation Method for Preservation Orders A systematised assessment tool for TPO suitability**  
GUIDANCE NOTE FOR USERS

**Part 1: Amenity Assessment**

**a) Condition**

This is expressed by five terms, which are defined as follows:

**GOOD** Trees that are generally free of defects, showing good health and likely to reach normal longevity and size for species, or they may already have done so.

**FAIR** Trees which have defects that are likely to adversely affect their prospects; their health is satisfactory, though intervention is likely to be required. It is not expected that such trees will reach their full age and size potential or, if they have already done so, their condition is likely to decline shortly, or may already have done so. However, they can be retained for the time being without disproportionate expenditure of resources or foreseeable risk of collapse.

**POOR** Trees in obvious decline, or with significant structural defects requiring major intervention to allow their retention, though with the outcome of this uncertain. Health and/or structural integrity are significantly impaired and are likely to deteriorate. Life expectancy is curtailed and retention is difficult.

**DEAD** Tree with no indication of life

**DYING** Trees showing very little signs of life or remaining vitality, or with severe,

**DANGEROUS** irremediable structural defects, including advanced decay and insecure roothold.

For trees in good or fair condition that have poor form deduct one point.

A note on the pro forma emphasizes that 'dangerous' should only be selected in relation to the tree's existing context: a future danger arising, for example, as a result of development, would not apply. Thus, a tree can be in a state of collapse but not be dangerous due to the absence of targets at risk.

**b) Retention span**

It has long been established good practice that trees incapable of retention for more than ten years are not worthy of a TPO (hence the zero score for this category); this also ties in with the R category criteria set out in Table 1 of BS5837:2005 TEMPO considers 'retention span', which is a more practical assessment based on the tree's current age, health and context as found on inspection.

It is important to note that this assessment should be made based on the assumption that the tree or trees concerned will be maintained in accordance with good practice, and will not, for example, be subjected to construction damage or inappropriate pruning. This is because if the subject tree is 'successful' under TEMPO, it will shortly enjoy TPO protection (assuming that it doesn't already).

**c) Relative public visibility**

The first thing to note in this section is the prompt, which reminds the surveyor to consider the 'realistic potential for future visibility with changed land use'. This is designed to address the commonplace circumstance where trees that are currently difficult to see are located on sites for future development, with this likely to result in enhanced visibility. The common situation of backland development is one such example.

The categories each contain two considerations: size of tree and degree of visibility. TEMPO is supposed to function as a guide and not as a substitute for the surveyor's judgement. In general, it is important to note that, when choosing the appropriate category, the assessment in each case should be based on the minimum criterion.

Whilst the scores are obviously weighted towards greater visibility, we take the view that it is reasonable to give some credit to trees that are not visible (and/or whose visibility is not expected to change: it is accepted that, in exceptional circumstances, such trees may justify TPO protection.

**Sub-total 1**

The prompt under 'other factors' states, trees only qualify for consideration within that section providing that they have accrued at least seven points. Additionally, they must not have collected any zero scores.

The scores from the first three sections should be added together, before proceeding to section d, or to part 3 as appropriate (i.e., depending on the accrued score). Under the latter scenario, there are two possible outcomes:

Any 0 equating to do not apply TPO - 1-6 equating to TPO indefensible.

**d) Other factors**

Only one score should be applied per tree (or group):

- 'Principle components of arboricultural features, or veteran trees' – The latter is hopefully self-explanatory (if not, refer to Read 20006). The former is designed to refer to trees within parklands, avenues, collections, and formal screens, and may equally apply to individuals and groups.
- 'Members of groups of trees that are important for their cohesion' – This should also be self-explanatory, though it is stressed that 'cohesion' may equally refer either to visual or to aerodynamic contribution. Included within this definition are informal screens. In all relevant cases, trees may be assessed either as individuals or as groups.
- 'Trees with significant historical or commemorative importance' – The term 'significant' has been added to weed out trivia, but we would stress that significance may apply to even one person's perspective. For example, the author knows of one tree



placed under a TPO for little other reason than it was planted to commemorate the life of the tree planter's dead child. Thus, whilst it is likely that this category will be used infrequently, its inclusion is nevertheless important. Once again, individual or group assessment may apply.

- 'Trees of particularly good form, especially if rare or unusual' – 'Good form' is designed to identify trees that are fine examples of their kind and should not be used unless this description can be justified. However, trees which do not merit this description should not, by implication, be assumed to have poor form (see below). The wording of the second part of this has been kept deliberately vague: 'rare or unusual' may apply equally to the form of the tree or to its species. This recognises that certain trees may merit protection precisely because they have 'poor' form, where this gives the tree an interesting and perhaps unique character. Clearly, rare species merit additional points, hence the inclusion of this criterion. As with the other categories in this section, either individual or group assessment may apply. With groups, however, it should be the case either that the group has a good overall form, or that the principal individuals are good examples of their species.

Where none of the above apply, the tree still scores one point, in order to avoid a zero-score disqualification (under part 3).

### **Sub-total 2**

The threshold for this is nine points, arrived at via a minimum qualification calculated simply from the seven-point threshold under sections a-c, plus at least two extra points under section d. Thus, trees that only just scrape through to qualify for the 'other factor' score, need to genuinely improve in this section in order to rate an expediency assessment. This recognises two important functions of TPOs:

- TPOs can serve as a useful control on overall tree losses by securing and protecting replacement planting
- Where trees of minimal (though, it must be stressed, adequate) amenity are under threat, typically on development sites, it may be appropriate to protect them allowing the widest range of options for negotiated tree retention

### **Part 2: Expediency assessment**

This section is designed to award points based on three levels of identified threat to the trees concerned. Examples and notes for each category are:

- 'Immediate threat to tree' – for example, Tree Officer receives Conservation Area notification to fell
- 'Foreseeable threat to tree' – for example, planning department receives application for outline planning consent on the site where the tree stands
- 'Perceived threat to tree' – for example, survey identifies tree standing on a potential infill plot

However, central government advice is clear that, even where there is no expedient reason to make a TPO, this is still an option. Accordingly, and in order to avoid a disqualifying zero score, 'precautionary only' still scores one point. This latter category might apply, rarely for example, to a garden tree under good management.

As a final note on this point, it should be stressed that the method is not prescriptive except in relation to zero scores: TEMPO merely recommends a course of action. Thus, a tree scoring, say, 16, and so 'definitely meriting' a TPO, might not be included for protection for reasons unconnected with its attributes.

### **Part 3: Decision Guide**

This section is based on the accumulated scores derived in Parts 1 & 2, and identifies four outcomes, as follows:

- Any 0 Do not apply TPO Where a tree has attracted a zero score, there is a clearly identifiable reason not to protect it, and indeed to seek to do so is simply bad practice
- 1-6 TPO indefensible This covers trees that have failed to score enough points in sections 1a-c to qualify for an 'other factors' score under 1d. Such trees have little to offer their locality and should not be protected.
- 7-11 Does not merit TPO This covers trees which have qualified for a 1d score, though they may not have qualified for Part 2. However, even if they have made it to Part 2, they have failed to pick up significant additional points. This would apply, for example, to a borderline tree in amenity terms that also lacked the protection imperative of a clear threat to its retention.
- 12-15 Possibly merits TPO This applies to trees that have qualified under all sections but have failed to do so convincingly. For these trees, the issue of applying a TPO is likely to devolve to other considerations, such as public pressure, resources and 'gut feeling'.
- 16+ Definitely merits TPO Trees scoring 16 or more are those that have passed both the amenity and expediency assessments, where the application of a TPO is fully justified based on the field assessment exercise

Dated: 12th September 2023

TPO/E/09/23

=====

**TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING ACT 1990**

=====

# **TREE PRESERVATION ORDER**

Relating to: - Land To Front Of 11-13 Limes Close Wilburton Ely  
Cambridgeshire CB6 3LX

=====

Printed and Published by:  
East Cambridgeshire District Council The Grange Nutholt Lane Ely Cambs CB7 4EE

=====

ORDER.TPO

**TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING (TREE PRESERVATION) (ENGLAND)  
REGULATIONS 2012**

**TREE PRESERVATION ORDER**

---

**Town and Country Planning Act 1990  
The Tree Preservation Order at Land To Front Of 11-13 Limes Close Wilburton Ely  
Cambridgeshire CB6 3LX , TPO/E/09/23 2022**

The East Cambridgeshire District Council, in exercise of the powers conferred on them by section 198 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 make the following Order—

**Citation**

1. This Order may be cited as the Tree Preservation Order at Land To Front Of 11-13 Limes Close Wilburton Ely Cambridgeshire CB6 3LX , TPO/E/09/23 2022

**Interpretation**

2. (1) In this Order "the authority" means the East Cambridgeshire District Council
- (2) In this Order any reference to a numbered section is a reference to the section so numbered in the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 and any reference to a numbered regulation is a reference to the regulation so numbered in the Town and Country Planning (Tree Preservation) (England) Regulations 2012.

**Effect**

3. (1) Subject to article 4, this Order takes effect provisionally on the date on which it is made.
- (2) Without prejudice to subsection (7) of section 198 (power to make tree preservation orders) or subsection (1) of section 200 (tree preservation orders: Forestry Commissioners) and, subject to exceptions in regulation 14, no person shall-
  - (a) cut down, top, lop, uproot, wilfully damage, or wilfully destroy; or
  - (b) cause or permit the cutting down, topping, lopping, uprooting, wilful damage or wilful destruction of,any tree specified in the Schedule to this Order except with the written consent of the authority in accordance with regulations 16 and 17, or of the Secretary of State in accordance with regulation 23, and, where such consent is given subject to conditions, in accordance with those conditions.

**Application to trees to be planted pursuant to a condition**

4. In relation to any tree identified in the first column of the Schedule by the letter "C", being a tree to be planted pursuant to a condition imposed under paragraph (a) of section 197 (planning permission to include appropriate provision for preservation and planting of trees), this Order takes effect as from the time when the tree is planted.



**SCHEDULE  
SPECIFICATION OF TREES**

**Trees specified individually**  
(encircled in black on the map)

Reference on map	Description	Situation
T1	<b>Pedunculate Oak low squat form, estimated age of 50yrs, normal amount of deadwood for age and species</b>	<b>Located to front of the new properties approx. 12-14m away</b>

**Trees specified by reference to an area**  
(within a dotted black line on the map)

Reference on map	Description	Situation
	<b>NONE</b>	

**Groups of trees**  
(within a broken black line on the map)

Reference on map	Description (including number of trees in the group)	Situation
	<b>NONE</b>	

**Woodlands**  
(within a continuous black line on the map)

Reference on map	Description	Situation
	<b>NONE</b>	



**East Cambridgeshire  
District Council**

Town and Country Planning Act 1990  
Town and Country Planning  
(Tree Preservation) (England)  
Regulations 2012

**TREE PRESERVATION  
ORDER**

No. E/09/23

Land to the Front of  
11-13 Limes Close  
Wilburton  
Ely  
Cambridgeshire  
CB6 3LX

**T1 - Pedunculate Oak**

**PLANNING SERVICE**

The Grange, Nutholt Lane, Ely, Cambs CB7 4EE  
S. Ellis, Planning Manager

The tree locations are indicative and  
may not reflect the exact locations



Date: 11/09/2023  
Scale: 1:1,000

© Crown copyright.  
All rights reserved 100023279 (2023)





