

Eastleigh Borough Council Tree Preservation Order and Conservation Area Assessment Form

Application Number	T/23/95970
Surveyor	SK
Address	KASBEN, RESERVOIR LANE, HEDGE END, SOUTHAMPTON, SO30 4AX Paul Freeman
Proposed work	1 no. Oak (T1)- Fell. Reason - The tree is a large, mature Oak infected with <i>Ganoderma Resinaceum</i> and showing increased signs of heavy decline (dieback and sparse leaf canopy.) As the tree is in close proximity to property and access lane, felling is the most appropriate course of action as a safety precaution to mitigate against damage to property or people. The health of the tree is too compromised to withstand any other remedial works.
Assessment Date	28/09/23
Officer comments	T1 oak is a prominent tree, viewed by pedestrians using the access from Reservoir Lane to Granada Road, as well as the other residents in Reservoir Lane. The tree is showing signs of stress. This is possibly a result of the recent adverse climatic conditions, though when compared with other oaks in the area it is looking sparse. Oaks often recover when conditions improve. It is colonised by <i>Ganoderma resinaceum</i> on the west side of the stem base. This is possibly associated with historic damage during the installation of a speedbump immediately to the east of the tree. There is recent vehicle impact damage on the east side of the lower stem. <i>Ganoderma spp</i> is known to primarily colonise the heartwood and <i>G. resinaceum</i> potentially the roots more than other <i>Ganoderma spp</i> . It produces a white rot that can cause failure when extensive, but this can take many years before failure is elevated the unacceptable risk levels. Trees can co-exist with <i>Ganoderma</i> for many generations where there is no or lower targets. However. The tree is not owned by the applicant. It is in a sheltered spot and a reduction in height would both be reasonable in terms of management of the tree, reducing the loading on the stem base and root system and meeting the criteria or 'minimum works necessary' to make the tree safe. This would retain most of the amenity and ecological benefit of the tree potentially for generations.

	The application does not cite that there are fears that the tree might break or fall, and no supporting evidence except photographs. No testing or arboricultural report has been submitted so it is impossible to determine the extent of fungal colonisation or degradation. If the applicant does have concerns over condition or damage, Regulation 16(1) of The Town and Country Planning (Tree Preservation)(England) Regulations 2012 states “<i>appropriate evidence describing any structural damage to property or in relation to tree health or safety, as applicable</i>”, is to be supplied with the application. Therefore, written arboricultural advice or other diagnostic information from an appropriate expert should be submitted with the application where the applicant believes work is required on safety grounds. <i>‘Decay is one of the more important causes of hazards, and it commonly occurs in many tree species and can weaken wood enough to increase the chance of mechanical failure. Failure can occur even in the absence of decay and other recognizable defects, given extreme conditions. Equally, the mere present of decay does not necessarily make failure more likely that it would be otherwise. In many instances, decay is not extensive enough to comprise the safety factor of the tree. Even if the mechanical characteristics of the tree have been affected its safety factor may have been largely or wholly maintained by compensatory development of new wood around the affected zone.’ (Lonsdale, Principles of tree hazard assessment and management 1999)</i> Trees are capital assets and deliver multiple ecosystem benefits in addition to amenity. To remove a third-party tree without sufficient, compelling supporting evidence would potentially be working beyond reasonable extents. If the owner of the tree is known, it would be reasonable to advise them of any concerns and remind them of their Duty of Care. No evidence has been supplied to demonstrate the the owner has been contacted or would be minded to remove the tree.					
Decision	Consent	Refuse	Part consent/ Part refuse	Withdrawn / Invalid	Conservation Area	
					Raise no objection	TPO
			X			
Decision notice	REFUSE: T1 oak, fell. CONSENT: T1 oak, reduce height of tree by up to 4m to reduce leverage on stem base.					
Conditions	Standard.					
Notes to applicant	Oak are known to co-exist with <i>Ganoderma</i> species fungi for many generations, and provide valuable habitat features as the stem hollows. Felling without supporting evidence to demonstrate the extent of any degradation that may be present would be an excessive response. If such evidence is to be produced, it is recommended that a suitably qualified					

	arboriculturist (Chartered or Arboricultural Association Registered Consultant is employed to inspect the tree and report their findings.		
Parish comments	Objection on the basis of insufficient evidence to support the application.		
Public objection/ support	Support	Objection	Observation
	2	0	0
Objection/ support consideration	The Parish objection, and the two supporting representations, have been considered.		