



*Objection*

*ack  
22/10/09  
PF*

**TERANCE BUTLER HOLDINGS**

Terance Butler Holdings Limited • Court Lodge • Lower Road • West Farleigh • Kent ME15 0PD  
Team Leader T +44 (0)1622 812285 • F +44 (0)1622 816880 • www.tbholdings.com

Landscape, Conservation and Design,

Maidstone Borough Council

Maidstone House

King Street,

Maidstone

Kent

ME15 6JQ

PR. Correspondence?	
REF:	
22 OCT 2009	Init'l
CHQ. DET. A	
DRAWER	

20<sup>th</sup> October, 2009.

Dear Sir/Madam,

**TREE PRESERVATION ORDER No. 21 of 2009 – TREES ON LAND AT COURT LODGE, LOWER ROAD, WEST FARLEIGH.**

The owner of Court Lodge, Jason Butler, objects to the proposed making of the above Tree Preservation Order.

The proposed Order is unnecessary because the trees are not under threat.

When the Council's Landscape officer, Guy Stevens, visited the property recently, he stated that the change ownership of Court Lodge was a reason justifying the Order. Mr Butler acquired Court Lodge in October 2008. Mr Butler has made no changes to the landscaped garden surrounding the property. He places great value on the amenity afforded by both the mature and more recent planting within the garden. There is absolutely no justification for the Council to make this Order based on a change of ownership that occurred one year ago and which has seen no changes to the landscaped gardens since then.

As the Council recognises in its letter of the 2<sup>nd</sup> September, 2009, there is no planning application for development that could affect the trees subject to the proposed Order or any other trees within the gardens to Court Lodge.

The trees the subject of the proposed Order cannot be readily seen from any public viewpoint, such as Lower Road, West Farleigh, and therefore make very little if any contribution to the character and amenity of the area. These trees are set back into the grounds of Court Lodge and have a dense belt of other, more recently planted trees in front of them that obscure any views from Lower Road. The trees subject to the proposed Order have a very significant private amenity value for the owner of Court Lodge and his family but this is not a justification for the proposed Order.



The grounds surrounding Court Lodge are not registered historic parkland. The trees within the garden form a valuable screen protecting the privacy of the owner of Court Lodge. It stands to reason, therefore, that his best interest is served by the retention of all the trees in the garden.

The trees are, consequently, not under threat but essential to the privacy and amenities of Court Lodge and its occupants and this provides an imperative for them to be retained.

The Order does nothing to ensure the future health of the trees or their longevity which is what the Council's letter of the 23<sup>rd</sup> September, 2009, asserts.

This Order is consequently not proportionate or justified in the circumstances.

Would you please confirm the safe receipt of this objection to the making of the proposed Order.

Yours faithfully,



Paul Graham.

