

Eastleigh Borough Council Preservation Order and Conservation Area Application Assessment Form

Application Number	T/22/93619
Surveyor	Charlotte Holloway
Site assessment Date	11/10/22
Address	ORCHARD GARDENS CARE HOME, 1 GARNIER DRIVE, BISHOPSTOKE, EASTLEIGH, SO50 6HE
Work notification/ request	1. 1 no. Monterey Pine (0321) - Reduce upper crown to reduce loading on failure point. Reduce by 1m and selective thin secondary branches. 2. 1 no. Monterey Pine (0340)- Reduce 1x long overextended slender limb in south-west crown that overhangs the woodland path. Reduce by approx. 4m to suitable secondary growth point. Maintain balanced crown outline. 3. 1 no. Monterey Pine (0401) - Fell and replant. 4. 1 no. Corsican Pine (0483) - Reduce outer secondary branches from northern stem by 2m to suitable growth points. 5. 1 no. Holly (0489)- Crown reduce by 3-4m to create framework and install a prop to support the stem. 6. 2 no. Limes (0298, 0300) - Cut basal epicormics. 7. 2 no. Atlas Cedar (0073, 0074)- Fell and replant. 8. 1 no, Wellingtonia (0087)- Fell and replant. 9. 1 no. Beech (0112)- Reduce crown overhanging the road by 3m in height and spread. 10. 1 no. False Acacia (0098)- Fell 11. 1 no. Lime (0105) - Cut basal epicormics and deadwood 12. 1 no. Sycamore (0038)- Fell and replant. 13. 1 no. Oak (0231) - Reduce unstable deadwood, reducing crown by 5-6m to create high habitat tree 14. 1 no. Oak (0232) - Remove split branch back to suitable growth point. 15. 1 no. Sweet Chestnut (0540)- Reduce upper dead crown, removing deadwood down to stable height, retain for habitat. 16. 1 no. Copper Beech (0195)- Reduce south limb by 2m to suitable growth point. Reduce outer crown of eastern primary limb by 2m93619 to reduce end weight and load on union. 17. 1 no. Copper Beech (00952)- Remove hanging branch over path and any unstable deadwood. 18. 1 no. Fir (1018) - Fell. 19. 1 no. Cypress (1025)- Remove hung up stem. 20. 1 no. Western Red Cedar (1032) - Fell.

Comments/ observations following site visit	There are a good number of trees on this site providing good canopy cover and habit value. The majority of trees can be viewed and enjoyed by the public; however, some are more prominent than others. 1. 1 no. Monterey Pine (0321). The tree is in a wooded belt adjacent to an internal road. There is evidence of limb failure, with the remaining canopy extending towards structures to the north. A light reduction is reasonable to allow the trees to adapt and put on reaction growth. The proposed crown thin is unquantified. Whilst the desired outcome was discussed onsite, it is noted and documented in 7.5 of BS3993:2010 Tree work recommendations that crown thinning is not the most suitable method to reduce wind loading and can increase the probability of branch failure, therefore given the trees proximity to structures, a thin has not been justified. 2. 1 no. Monterey Pine (0340). The tree is in a wooded belt adjacent an internal road. It has good amenity value for those within the vicinity. The tree has a limb that extends out from under the canopy, described by the applicant as 'over extended.' Whilst trees put on growth to support themselves and the footway below is relatively low risk, the proposed work is unlikely to be detrimental to the overall health or amenity value of the tree. 3. 1 no. Monterey Pine (0401). The tree is on the edge of a wooded belt. The form is typical for a woodland edge tree. The extent of the canopy shows clear phototropic growth as would be expected and is in good condition. There are no features that suggest the tree has recently moved, or that indicate failure is likely. Removal of the tree would negatively impact amenity. The applicant has not provided a justification for removal. 4. 1 no. Corsican Pine (0483). The tree is situated within a wooded area adjacent to an informal path. The tree is accessible and has fair amenity. The proposed work is unlikely to have a significantly negative impact on the tree. 5. 1 no. Holly (0489). The tree is within a wooded area. It has historic partial root plate failure over an informal woodland path. The tree appears to have stabilised. The proposed work will remove a proportion of leaf bearing structure, bringing the canopy back in line with the edge of the path. The proposed removal of up to 4m of the canopy will enable the tree to build more momentum should it fail further, when compared to the tree in its current form. Propping will limit this; however, I believe the proposed works will not significantly impact the amenity of the area, which
---	--

	has good canopy cover. Any associated risk with proposed works will need to be considered prior to undertaking works given the trees location over the footway. 6. 2 no. Limes (0298, 0300). The trees are adjacent to a parking area and are visible from carriageways both north and south of the trees. They are highly visible. The proposed work is fair to enable further inspection of the stem. 7. 2 no. Atlas Cedar (0073, 0074). The trees are on the access way. They offer a screen between the carriageway and adjacent property. They are very prominent. Both are dead. 8. 1 no, Wellingtonia (0087). The tree is on an island adjacent a new access road into the site. It is very prominent and provided a good focal point. The tree has a slightly sparse canopy and referring to google Streetview, the decline is consistent with root damage. Looking at the access road that was constructed for the care home, it is level with the carriageway on Church Road, before gradually declining away into the site. This suggests that construction was dug in, which is likely to have caused extensive root damage. The slight increase in canopy decline this year (2022) is also consistent with the extended periods of drought we have experienced. The diagnostic data provided is limited. The resistograph shows potential for some degradation on the underside of roots, however no data has been provided to indicate size of buttress roots, therefore it is not clear its readings are consistent with the roots onsite. With the data being inconclusive, and the prominence of the tree, felling at this stage is unjustified. The supplied report suggests monitoring and rootzone improvement, this is the preferred option. Having spoken to the maintenance manager on site, it is apparent there is pressure from properties opposite to remove the tree. 9. 1 no. Beech (0112). The beech is a prominent entrance tree adjacent to the historic entrance to the site. It forms part of a wooded belt between Church Road and properties. The tree is not particularly low over the highway; however, the proposed works will ensure sufficient clearance is maintained. The works is unlikely to be significantly detrimental to the longevity of the tree. 10. 1 no. False Acacia (0098). The tree is a roadside edge tree forming part of a wooded area. The tree is in decline with a volume of deadwood. The removal of this tree will not negatively impact
--	---

	amenity, however, will open some space to enable canopies of adjacent trees to develop. Replanting in this exact location is not practical as the tree is likely to be highly shaded. 11. 1 no. Lime (0105). The tree is a prominent road site tree. It is highly visible from the public carriageway. The proposed removal of epicormic growth will facilitate the inspection of the stem. It is unlikely to be detrimental to the long-term health of the tree. Deadwood removal does not require LPA consent. 12. 1 no. Sycamore (0038). The tree is situated on a green space surrounded by properties. It has fair amenity value. The tree is in very poor condition with very minimal growth. The southern stem has previously been removed. The tree is unlikely to recover. 13. 1 no. Oak (0231) - The tree is a woodland edge tree. It forms part of a backdrop to adjacent properties. The tree is in very poor condition with large volumes of deadwood. The proposed work will significantly reduce the visual amenity; however, it will allow for the retention of habitat features and in its location is preferable to whole tree removal. 14. 1 no. Oak (0232) - The tree is a woodland edge tree situated just west of tree 0231. When on site with Richard O'Shea it was noted that the branch was already removed. No other works have been proposed. 15. 1 no. Sweet Chestnut (0540). The tree is to the rear of properties in a wooded area. Its amenity is limited to those using the adjacent permissive path. The tree is dead. The proposed work will enable the retention of some standing dead for habitat value. 16. 1 no. Copper Beech (0195). The tree is a very prominent focal feature surrounded by properties, it has very high amenity value. It has a slightly sparse canopy and fruiting fungal bodies were noted at the time of site visit. The tree is close to structures; therefore, the proposed work to selectively reduce limbs will prevent contact. 17. 1 no. Copper Beech (00952). The tree is a substantial woodland beech adjacent to a permissive footway. Its amenity is limited to those using the path. The tree has a failed hung-up branch over the footway. The proposed work to remove the branch is reasonable and will not negatively impact the tree. Deadwood is exempt from needing LPA consent.
--	--

	18. 1 no. Fir (1018) The tree is a woodland tree. The tree is dead, has limited amenity value and would only be visible to those using an adjacent permissive path. The removal of the tree would enable adjacent trees space to grow. Replanting in this location is not practical due to shading and current tree volume. 19. 1 no. Cypress (1025). The tree is a woodland tree. It has limited amenity value and would only be visible to those using an adjacent permissive path. The removal of a hung-up stem will reduce risk of failure. It will have minimal impact on amenity value. 20. 1 no. Western Red Cedar (1032). The tree is a woodland tree. The tree is dead and has limited amenity value. It is only visible to those using an adjacent permissive path. The removal of the tree would enable adjacent trees space to grow. Replanting in this location is not practical due to shading and current tree volume					
Decision	Consent	Refuse	Part consent/ Part refuse	Withdrawn / Invalid	Conservation Area	
					Raise no objection	TPO
			X			
Decision notice	REFUSE: 1 no. Monterey Pine (0321) - selective thin secondary branches. Reason: The proposed works is unjustified and has the potential to increase likelihood of branch failure, negatively impacting longevity of the tree. 1 no. Monterey Pine (0401) - Fell and replant Reason: The proposed works is unjustified and will negatively impact the local amenity. 1 no, Wellingtonia (0087)- Fell and replant. Reason: The proposed works is unjustified and will negatively impact the local amenity. CONSENT: 1 no. Monterey Pine (0321) - Reduce by 1m 1 no. Monterey Pine (0340)- Reduce 1x long overextended slender limb in south-west crown by approx. 4m to suitable secondary growth point. 1 no. Corsican Pine (0483) - Reduce outer secondary branches from northern stem by 2m to suitable growth points					

	1 no. Holly (0489)- Crown reduce by 3-4m to create framework and install a prop to support the stem 2 no. Limes (0298, 0300) - Cut basal epicormics. 2 no. Atlas Cedar (0073, 0074)- Fell and replant. 1 no. Beech (0112)- Reduce crown overhanging the road by 3m in height and spread. 1 no. False Acacia (0098)- Fell 1 no. Lime (0105) - Cut basal epicormics and deadwood 1 no. Sycamore (0038)- Fell and replant. 1 no. Oak (0231) - Reduce unstable deadwood, reducing crown by 5-6m to create high habitat tree 1 no. Sweet Chestnut (0540)- Reduce upper dead crown, removing deadwood down to stable height, retain for habitat. 1 no. Copper Beech (00952)- Remove hanging branch over path and any unstable deadwood. 1 no. Fir (1018) - Fell. 1 no. Cypress (1025)- Remove hung up stem. 1 no. Western Red Cedar (1032) - Fell.
Conditions	Standard, no trespass, and replant. 2 no. Atlas Cedar (0073, 0074)- Fell and replant - The removal of 2 x Atlas Cedar is conditional upon tree replacements being planted: Two replacement trees adjacent to Breach Lane, as close to possible to the original trees is required. Tree to be selected from the following unless an alternative is agreed in writing with the Tree Officer: <i>Pinus sylvestris</i> 1 no. Sycamore (0038)- Fell and replant - The removal of 1 x sycamore is conditional upon a replacement tree being planted: One replacement tree as close to possible to the original tree is required. Tree to be selected from the following unless an alternative is agreed in writing with the Tree Officer: <i>Magnolia grandiflora</i>

Notes to applicant	1 no. Oak (0232) - Remove split branch back to suitable growth point – this work has already been undertaken; therefore, a decision is not required.		
Parish comments	Bishopstoke Parish Council objects to the planned felling of trees pending an inspection by the EBC Tree Officer and the production of a long-term maintenance plan for the replacement trees		
Public objection/ support	Support	Objection	Observation
	0	0	0
Objection/ support consideration	The Parish comment has been noted. A site visit occurred.		