

Eastleigh Borough Council Tree Preservation Order and Conservation Area Assessment Form

Application Number	T/26/101526
Surveyor	AM
Address	UNIT 1B, HEDGE END RETAIL PARK, TOLLBAR WAY, HEDGE END, SOUTHAMPTON, SO30 2UH
Proposed work	1no. Oak (T1982) - Fell, dead 1no. Oak (T1983) - Dead stem, remove 1no. Oak (T1985) - Fell. Rotten at the base, decay 1no. Oak (T1986) - Fell. Very poor buttress roots, historic movement, Stag heading. 1no Oak (T1992) - Fell. Dying off, stag heading. 1no. Oak (T1990) - Fell. Decay in the base, poor buttress roots. 1no. Oak (T1989) - Fell. Twin stem, buttress decay, decay in the trunk. Deadwood in the canopy.
Assessment Date	21 st July 2026
Officer comments	Group of oaks protected within G1 of 269-E also G6 and G11 of 93-E. These trees provide a high level of public, visual amenity as they are located as a prominent landscape area to the front of several retail outlets. A low knee rail discourages public access but the soil appears well compacted so I'm sure the area beneath the trees is well-used. The proposal is to fell multiple trees. Limited information has been supplied with the application and the Agent has ticked the box to confirm that the reason for the application is not based on the condition of the trees, i.e. that they are diseased or that there are fears that the trees may break or fall. Taking each tree in turn (individually numbered with tags on stems): Oak (T1982) - Fell, dead Confirmed as dead therefore exempt from application; legal duty to replace this tree will be stated as an informative. Oak (T1983) - Dead stem, remove This is a twin-stemmed tree with the secondary stem being a several metre tall dead stump. The removal of this dead stump is exempt from application. There is no duty to replace this as the primary stem remains alive and is not proposed to be removed.

	Oak (T1985) - Fell. Rotten at the base, decay Ivy-clad stem with extensive basal decay. Stem epicormics form the remaining canopy. Majority of the buttress are severely degraded. The poor condition of the buttresses is such that retention is not realistic. A condition can be imposed to require the replacement of this tree. Oak (T1986) - Fell. Very poor buttress roots, historic movement, Stag heading Mature tree with extensive dieback, lean towards the front of B+M and with degraded tension buttresses. Felling is reasonable. Again, replacement planting can be required by condition. Oak (T1992) - Fell. Dying off, stag heading Estimated by eye to be approx. 18m tall x 50cm dbh. There is a life-belt / fibre kink at approx. 2m above ground level which is indicative of historic, localised stress on the stem. Visually healthy for majority of the crown but thinning in the upper parts where clumpy branch epicormics have formed. Given the soil compaction, reflected heat and general inhospitable growing environment, the physiological condition is not surprising but does not justify felling. This should be refused consent. Oak (T1990) - Fell. Decay in the base, poor buttress roots Approx. 7m tall x 60cm dbh stem with healthy epicormics forming a secondary crown. There is a strip of dysfunction with exposed heartwood decaying which occupies approx. 20% of the circumference of the stem. Woundwood has formed at the margins but will be unlikely to fully close off the exposed heartwood. The cracks and crevices between functional and dysfunctional wood here are probably useful habitat. Whilst the Agent states the tree has decay in the base and poor buttress roots, no assessment has been made of the amount of sound wood remaining nor has any credit been given to the sound buttresses which grow from the 80% non-dysfunctional proportion of the stem. Given the short height of the tree, the very modest crown/sail and the presence of mostly healthy buttresses, the likelihood of the tree falling is probably low. There is certainly no supporting information which would convince me otherwise. Oak (T1989) - Fell. Twin stem, buttress decay, decay in the trunk. Deadwood in the canopy Large tree, twin-stemmed from ground level. Bark included to approximately 6m above ground level. Natural bracing (crossing branch inosculated into adjacent stem) has deteriorated. The crossing branch has long-since died and what remains no longer appears to be reliable. There is fibre buckling (creases in the wood where it becomes crushed by compression) apparent on the underside of the stem that leans towards the front of B+M. This feature in combination with the deteriorated natural brace lead me to believe that the stem has
--	--

	undergone primary failure. Complete, catastrophic failure of this stem into a busy public space is foreseeable. This stem, in fact the entire tree, is in poor physiological health. The amount of pruning which would be required to retain this tree would more than likely lead to its rapid demise. Replacement planting can be required by condition.					
Decision	Consent	Refuse	Part consent/ Part refuse	Withdrawn / Invalid	Conservation Area	
					Raise no objection	TPO
				X		
Decision notice	The Council REFUSES CONSENT for the following works: 1no Oak (T1992) - Fell. Dying off, stag heading. 1no. Oak (T1990) - Fell. Decay in the base, poor buttress roots. REASON FOR REFUSAL: 1. Both T1990 and T1992 provide a high level of public, visual amenity. Both are clearly visible within the busy retail park. As such, the felling of trees must be suitably justified. The proposal has not been supported by written arboricultural advice, only very brief notes on the condition of each tree. This makes it difficult to support all of the proposed works. 2. T1992 shows some loss of vitality in the upper crown, likely reflective of its harsh growing environment (soil compaction, reflected heat). It is otherwise visually healthy. No evidence has been supplied which would support the view that the tree is dying off and that felling is justified. 3. T1990 is a short, standing stem living off healthy epicormic growth. It has obvious decay in the stem but the extent of this has not been substantiated. A strip of dysfunction occupies approximately 20% of the stem circumference and the buttress roots associated with this are poor. However, the remaining 80% of the stem circumference and buttressing appears sound. Insufficient evidence has been supplied to justify the felling of this tree. The Council GRANTS CONSENT for the following works: 1no. Oak (T1985) - Fell. Rotten at the base, decay 1no. Oak (T1986) - Fell. Very poor buttress roots, historic movement, Stag heading. 1no. Oak (T1989) - Fell. Twin stem, buttress decay, decay in the trunk. Deadwood in the canopy.					

	The following work is exempt from application: 1no. Oak (T1982) - Fell, dead 1no. Oak (T1983) - Dead stem, remove In the case of T1982, there is a duty to replace this tree once it has been felled. Suitable replacement tree species include English oak (<i>Quercus robur</i>) or Dutch elm disease-resistant elm (e.g. <i>Ulmus</i> 'New Horizon').		
Conditions	2 x replacement trees		
Notes to applicant			
Parish comments	None.		
Public objection/ support	Support	Objection	Observation
	0	0	0
Objection/ support consideration	None received.		



