

Recommendation: **GRANT TPO CONSENT**

Number of site notices: 1

Statutory advertisement: Not applicable.

Number of representations received: 1

Summary: My home is immediately adjacent to the western boundary of the applicants property. The applicant owns tall trees, with roots, extending under my land and overhanging branches above. I refer to the applicant's Arborist's report submitted with the Planning Application, which is therefore, in the Public Domain. I record my observations and comments as follows.

1) At item 1. It is stated that "Our client is responsible for the management of trees within its ownership".

2) Item 11. "No plans or map of the site were provided by the client. The extent of the land to be surveyed has been agreed verbally".

3) Item 25. "The survey area is limited to that defined in section five and/or as shown on the associated maps". *My comment is that the survey area does not appear to be clearly defined either on the plan or in the written report.*

4) Item 10. "Trees not listed in the schedule have been assessed during the site survey; however they are not included as the surveyor has determined them to be an acceptable level of risk at the time of the survey". *My comment is that clarification is required on, if the report has deemed the tall trees on the western boundary, to be an acceptable risk? The applicant's response to 2) and 3) above may give clarification.*

5) Item 39. "With the exception of T1 and T4 (low risk) I consider that the trees present a moderate risk of failure". *My comment is that the tall trees on the western boundary are neither T1 or T4, thus imposing a moderate risk of failure.*

In consideration of the observation highlighted above I request that a planning decision is deferred until:-

The plans are re-submitted and revised to clearly identified the following:

- i) The site survey area and site boundaries.
- ii) Trees referred to as being of acceptable risk.
- iii) Trees that are not of acceptable risk.
- iv) The risk status of the tall trees on the western boundary.

The applicant's tall trees transcend both outside areas of the Nursery School and parts of my property. A definitive response to the above, will essentially serve to identify levels of risk to Health and Safety at my property. I do not comment here on any risk that may not relate to the applicant's property.

I enclose herewith, recent photographs showing the trees along the western boundary of the applicant's property. I do not consider that these trees fall within the definition of "acceptable risk", thereby underlining my request for a deferred decision pending the receipt of the clarifications referred to above.

I trust that the Council will consider my comments which are based upon the applicant's submitted plan and associated documents.

Comment: The only trees subject of this application are Horse Chestnut (T7) and Oak (T6) and the works for these are considered reasonable as per the reasoning in the submission. The other trees in the Arborist report are no a concern of this application and as such there is no requirement for the Council to make comment.

7 Planning Considerations

Having regard to the relevant policies of the development plan it is considered that the main issues arising from this application are:

Whether the degree of pruning works requested would undermine the amenity value of these trees and whether this could also be harmful to their ongoing health and vitality.

My inspection related specifically to assessing the proposed works rather than generally inspecting the tree's health and condition in any great detail. I visually inspected the tree from ground level and the following report deals with the relevant issues that have been raised on site, in the application form and from my site observations.

The trees subject to this application are mature specimens offering public amenity value to the street scene and contribute well to the local area.

Horse Chestnut: This is a mature specimen that is showing signs of reduced vigour and vitality, it has a codominant second stem that is connected via a tight union with included bark ridges. The tree would benefit from a reduction to the secondary stem so as to reduce the potential for future mechanical failure.

Oak: A mature asymmetrical specimen that has a damaged limb which would benefit from removal, in addition to the crown is hanging over the driveway to the centre and requires lifting to ease vehicular access.

The works outlined in this application are considered reasonable and should not impact negatively on the health of the trees or detriment the public amenity offered by them.

8 Conclusion

Recommend permission.

9 **RECOMMENDATION:**

That the Executive Head of Planning and Built Environment be authorised to **GRANT TPO CONSENT** for application APP/15/01049, subject to the following conditions:

- 1 The tree works for which consent is hereby granted shall not be carried out otherwise than in full accordance with all relevant content of BS 3998 (2010).
Reason: In the interests of tree health and safety.
- 2 The tree pruning/surgery for which consent is hereby granted shall not exceed the following: Reduce secondary stem by 2m of 1No. Horse Chestnut (T7); crown lift to 5m 1No. Oak (T6), remove damaged limb and dreadwood. Subject to TPO 1618.
Reason: To safeguard the health and well being of the trees and their importance in the local landscape.
- 3 The tree works for which consent is hereby granted shall be carried out and completed no later than 23/11/2016.

Reason: To control the timing of the works.