[redacted]

[redacted],

I've not been able to locate either the Biosecurity Management Plan or the amended site plan, however after reviewing the submitted AIA I am still of the opinion that the proposal fails to provide convincing evidence that the functionality of the woodland along with its future development and well-being will be protected and enhanced through the proposed and continued usage of the site.

On a number of occasions the application refers to the existing hard surfacing around the site and its impact in reducing ecological and arboricultural concerns however, the standard concrete hard surfacing, laid down in the 1940's and unmanaged since, will have a finite life expectancy of approximately70 – 100 years, thus it is acceptable to consider that degradation of the material is already occurring on some, thus already providing increasing points of access for vegetation and natural regeneration and assisting in the continuing transformation and development of this protected woodland. The concrete surfacing should not be considered a 'barrier' to the future development of the woodland and as an 'excuse' to facilitate development.

Photographic evidence (attached) has previously been provided which clearly demonstrates the removal of trees and vegetation over a passage of time (2017 – 2024) from around the area currently proposed for the application; such pre-emptive clearance work is noted and dismisses the argument that no trees or vegetation will be removed to facilitate the proposal.

I cannot look upon this application favourably as there is insufficient evidence demonstrating that the welfare, development and protection of this woodland, subject of a TPO, is of a primary concern.

I trust these comments arrive in time. Let me know your thoughts.