

Eastleigh Borough Council Tree Preservation Order and Conservation Area Assessment Form

Application Number	T/22/94678
Surveyor	Charlotte Holloway
Address	23 OAKWOOD ROAD, CHANDLER'S FORD, EASTLEIGH, SO53 1LW
Proposed work	1 no. Silver birch (T1) - Fell for reasons detailed in the attached report.
Assessment Date	13/03/23
Officer comments	T1 is situated within the centre of a model railway. It has an incredibly high crown break, however, appears in good vitality. The tree historically consisted of two stems, with the western stem having previously been removed. There is visible reaction growth within the stem of the tree. Visually there is degradation at the site of stem removal. The applicant has submitted a report outlining their justification for removal, however, there are number of inaccuracies and inconsistencies throughout the report. The applicant has stated that <i>"50% of anchorage has been lost from the tensile side of the stem"</i>. However, there is no visible sign of heave, and no root mapping has been provided. When asked how the conclusion was drawn the statement <i>"around 50% of the anchorage was shown to be lost via manual probing of the ground with fork and spade. There is half the root plate missing, therefore approximately half the anchorage"</i> was received. Probing is not an appropriate form of root mapping; therefore, the applicant's statement is unjustified. The applicant has attempted to calculate the likely anchorage of the tree. Their report states <i>"I refer to the study of 'analysing key factors of roots and soil contributing to tree anchorage', Ming & Defoussez 2018'."</i> This scientific report has been cited incorrectly. Its title is <i>"Analyzing key factors of roots and soil contributing to tree anchorage of Pinus species"</i>. Within the report it states, <i>"our results should be indicative for a number of Pinus species found in Europe with the same pattern of root system architecture"</i>. The tree within this application is not a young pine, soil has not been tested and rooting has not been mapped, therefore mathematical conclusion cannot be drawn for the birch utilising methodology within this scientific study. The applicant has included QTRA calculations within their report. It should be noted that QTRA should only be utilised by trained users. It is noted that the applicant has used the 2013 version to get their output, which is

	not up to date. Using the applicant's input, the risk is deemed tolerable under QTRA. It is arguable the applicants' inputs and therefore outputs are inaccurate given they have stated that the tree has a strong northwest bias, which would have primarily green infrastructure as the target. The report also states that the tree is at risk of imminent failure (which would likely be a 5-day notice under TPO regulations) yet has recommended the tree removed within six months. There is no evidence that the tree is 'missing' half its root plate, therefore the probability of failure is unlikely to be 2 and the QTRA output unjustified. The applicant has stated that <i>"the cost benefit analysis of the value of the tree vs the likelihood of failure does not add up"</i>, however, the applicant has only utilised one method of applying monetary value to trees, and this does not consider the cost in terms of lost benefit. Given the risk is tolerable and the probability of failure is unlikely to be 2, the value of the tree alone (£300.79) outweighs the value of the risk. £2,000,000 x 1/30,000 (VOSL x Risk) = proportionate annual cost of risk control £66. The applicant references EBC's tree strategy. However, it should be noted that the document does not suggest felling and replacing trees to encourage resilience against climate change. The document is designed to preserve and increase canopy cover within the borough. Page 8 refers to increasing canopy cover on Council managed land, not that within the private domain. The applicant is correct that the document is <i>'promoting an active policy moving forward to 2030'</i>. The document is also clear that the Council intend to <i>'manage natural decline through succession planting'</i> on their own land, something that has not been suggested in the submitted report. Whilst the report does not give any reasonable justification for tree removal, it is acknowledged that the tree has some level decay, and the applicant has attempted to provide information as required by 16(1) of The Town and Country Planning (Tree Preservation) (England) Regulations 2012. Therefore, it is the photographic evidence that has supported the request to remove this tree, not the submitted report. The removal should be conditional on a replacement within 3m of the removed tree as the suggested eastern section of the garden is unsuitable for replanting due to shed and existing canopy cover.					
Decision	Consent	Refuse	Part consent/ Part refuse	Withdrawn / Invalid	Conservation Area	
					Raise no objection	TPO
	X					
Decision notice	CONSENT: 1 no. Silver birch (T1) - Fell					

Conditions	Standard plus replant. The removal of the tree is conditional upon a replacement tree being planted: One replacement tree within the 3m of the felled tree within the rear of 23 Oakwood Road is required. Tree to be selected from the following unless an alternative is agreed in writing with the Tree Officer: <i>Quercus rubra</i> , <i>Ulmus 'New Horizon'</i> <i>Magnolia grandiflora</i>		
Notes to applicant	None		
Parish comments	None		
Public objection/ support	Support	Objection	Observation
	0	0	0
Objection/ support consideration	n/a		