

Eastleigh Borough Council Tree Preservation Order and Conservation Area Assessment Form

Application Number	T/23/96410
Surveyor	Charlotte Holloway
Address	14 ASHDOWN CLOSE, CHANDLER'S FORD, EASTLEIGH, SO53 5QF
Proposed work	1no. Sweet Chestnut (T1) - Reduce height by 2-3m, reduce lateral growth by up to 1.5m, remove first low limb over garden, crown lift to 5m from ground level. 1no. Silver Birch (T2) - Reduce lateral growth towards property by up to 2m, crown lift to 5m from ground level. 1no. Sweet Chestnut (T3) - Reduce height by up to 1.5m, reduce lateral growth by up to 1m, crown lift to 5m from ground level. 1no. Silver Birch (T4) - Reduce height by 2-3m, reduce lateral growth towards property by 2-2.5m, crown lift to 5m from ground level.
Assessment Date	21/12/23
Officer comments	T1 is a large, mature, twin stem tree. It is situated on the eastern boundary of the property and can be seen from both Ashdown Close, Ashdown Drive and the footway that it is situated next to. The tree has high visual amenity. The applicant has proposed to reduce the height of the tree up to 3m, lateral growth by 1.5m, and the lowest lateral extending west, alongside a lift to 5m. The tree has limited lateral growth. The proposed height and lateral reduction would remove a significant volume of photosynthetic material. Full removal of the lateral limb extending over the garden would leave a large pruning wound on the stem. 7.2.3.2 of BS3998:2010 Tree Work Recommendations states <i>'mature and old trees generally have a reduced capacity to tolerate the potentially adverse effects of wounding'</i>. Given the trees age and slightly sparse condition, the proposed reduction is likely to have a negative impact and will have the potential to cause decline as it will further reduce the trees' ability to perform physiological functions. A reduction of the lowest lateral limb back to previous points, alongside the proposed crown lift is reasonable for the management of the tree within its location. T2 is a mature birch set back from the property boundary. It can be seen from the public realm and offers some visual amenity and character to the area. The tree offers sufficient clearance from the ground and is clear of structures. 7.2.2 of BS3998:2010 Tree Work Recommendations is clear in that it states, <i>'species of Betula, which generally have weak defences against development of decay, should be pruned as sparingly as possible, and without exposing heartwood or ripewood'</i>. Given the tree already has a number of historic pruning wounds and the reason stated for the proposal, the requested work is unjustified. T3 is a mature sweet chestnut. The tree is adjacent a drive and highly visible from the public realm, offering high levels of visual amenity. The

	tree has previously been pruned. There are a large number of wounds on the main stem, some occluding well. The canopy has an unnatural shape, likely from a combination of pruning and growth due to adjacent trees. No large volumes of deadwood were noted, and the tree appears in fair vitality. The applicant has proposed to reduce lateral growth up to 1m and lift the canopy to 5m above ground level. The tree provided sufficient clearance for vehicular access and regular garden use. The request to reduce the canopy contradicts BS3998 which details the effects of wounding on mature trees. The tree was not noted to be in significant decline; however, removal of photosynthetic material is likely to negatively impact overall tree health, therefore, the proposed work is deemed unjustified. T4 is a mature multi-stemmed birch. It is adjacent the drive and offers high levels of visual amenity. The applicant has proposed both a height and lateral reduction alongside a crown lift. As previously mentioned, birch do not tolerate pruning well, neither do mature trees. The height reduction appears to equate to 'topping' which would expose heart wood and accelerated decay of established trees, negatively impacting their longevity. BS3998 states 'topping should be used only as a last resort for retaining a valuable tree which would otherwise pose an unacceptable risk'. The applicant has not provided evidence that the tree poses an increased risk, therefore, the height and lateral reductions are not justified. The applicant has also stated within their application they do not have a fear the tree might break or fall. It is acknowledged that the tree is in proximity to structures, therefore, a localised reduction to provide 2m clearance from structures, limiting cut sizes would be more appropriate. The proposed lift is only likely to remove minor growth from the stem, cut sizes should be limited to prevent significant wounding.					
Decision	Consent	Refuse	Part consent/ Part refuse	Withdrawn / Invalid	Conservation Area	
					Raise no objection	TPO
			X			
Decision notice	REFUSE: 1no. Sweet Chestnut (T1) - Reduce height by 2-3m, reduce lateral growth by up to 1.5m, remove first low limb over garden. 1no. Silver Birch (T2) - Reduce lateral growth towards property by up to 2m, crown lift to 5m from ground level. 1no. Sweet Chestnut (T3) - Reduce height by up to 1.5m, reduce lateral growth by up to 1m, crown lift to 5m from ground level. 1no. Silver Birch (T4) - Reduce height by 2-3m, reduce lateral growth towards property by 2-2.5m. CONSENT: 1no. Sweet Chestnut (T1) - Reduce first low limb over garden back to previous reduction point, crown lift to 5m from ground level. Cut sizes to be limited to 25mm.					

	1no. Silver Birch (T4) - Reduce localised lateral growth towards property to provide a maximum of 2m clearance from buildings, crown lift to 5m from ground level. Cut sizes to be limited to 25mm.		
Conditions	Standard quality and time, cut sizes		
Notes to applicant	None		
Parish comments	None		
Public objection/ support	Support	Objection	Observation
	2	0	0
Objection/ support consideration	The supporting comments have been considered.		