

Eastleigh Borough Council Tree Preservation Order and Conservation Area Assessment Form

Application Number	T/23/96055
Surveyor	Charlotte Holloway
Address	88 LAKEWOOD ROAD, CHANDLER'S FORD, EASTLEIGH, SO53 5AA
Proposed work	1 no. Sweet chestnut (T1)- Fell. Reasons are detailed in attached report.
Assessment Date	09/11/23
Officer comments	The tree is situated within the front garden of the property, along the northern boundary. It is highly visible from both Lakewood Road and Coultas Road and is considered to have high amenity value. The applicant has proposed to fell the tree, on the recommendation of the submitted report. Within the report the tree is described as <i>"a mature sweet chestnut with a full unpruned crown."</i> It is evident that there have been two limb failures. The applicant has suggested that there is little structural support within the upper canopy. Having inspected the tree and reviewed available imagery, the tree has previously been subject to a harsh reduction. The limb failures occurred at previous pruning points, which is a potential when regrowth has been allowed to lapse. No evidence has been provided to suggest that decay extends beyond localised pockets at old pruning points. The applicant has cited literature entitled <i>"Current Understanding of Brown-Rot Fungal Biodegradation Mechanisms."</i> It should be noted that this source based the majority of their research on <i>Gloeophyllum</i>, a species found infrequently on pine in the UK, therefore bears little relevance to this tree. No significant deadwood or dieback was noted. The applicant references literature titled <i>"How much crown pruning is needed for a specific wind-load reduction"</i> to discount pruning as an option. Given that the extent of decay is unknown, a conclusion cannot be drawn that pruning as a management option is unviable. The applicant has included QTRA calculations within their report. It should be noted that QTRA should only be utilised by trained users. The applicant was asked what version of QTRA they had used. The response was version 4, which predates 2013. Therefore, methodology is not up to date. It is noted that the applicant has merged two versions of QTRA to get their output. Using the applicant's input, the risk is deemed tolerable under QTRA, not intolerable as the report would suggest. When questioned, on 30/10/23 the applicant stated they believed the likelihood of limb failure

	to be high. Therefore, it is arguable the applicants' inputs and therefore outputs are inaccurate, given green infrastructure is primarily the target, therefore, tolerance is likely to increase. The applicant has stated that the tree is colonised by <i>Armillaria mellea</i>, “confirmed via the TMA app.” Honey fungus was not present at the time of inspection and the applicant was unable to provide further supporting evidence. Given the climate, I would have expected honey fungus or its remnants to be present at the time of inspection. It should be noted that species cannot be confirmed via the TMA app, as it is a guide to identification and does not give detail beyond genus. Imagery has been reviewed with a colleague and we are both of the opinion identification is inconclusive. Positive identification is required to inform tree management. The case law cited is not relevant to this application given that it related to subsidence. The applicant has stated within their application that they do not have fears the tree might break or fall. The submitted report has not provided sufficient evidence to support the removal of the tree. The request to remove this tree is deemed unjustified.					
Decision	Consent	Refuse	Part consent/ Part refuse	Withdrawn / Invalid	Conservation Area	
		X			Raise no objection	TPO
Decision notice	REFUSE: 1 no. Sweet chestnut (T1)- Fell.					
Conditions	n/a					
Notes to applicant	None					
Parish comments	None					
Public objection/ support	Support		Objection		Observation	
	0		0		0	
Objection/ support consideration	n/a					