

Eastleigh Borough Council Tree Preservation Order and Conservation Area Assessment Form

Application Number	T/24/98156
Surveyor	SK
Address	21 BEECHWOOD RISE, WEST END, SOUTHAMPTON, SO18 3PW
Proposed work	1no. Beech (T1) - Remove. The tree works are proposed to stop the influence of the tree on the soil below building foundation level & provide long term stability to No. 19 Beechwood Rise.
Assessment Date	01/10/24
Officer comments	T1 beech tree grows in the garden of the applicant property and is cited as being a primary cause of damage to a dwelling in the adjacent property at no 19. T1 beech and T3 Cypress are cited as being causal agents. It is highly visible from Beechwood Rise, and being older than the development, was retained through the planning process. It has been severely lifted but retains good amenity in this location. The government guidance notes (available to view at Tree Preservation Orders and trees in conservation areas - GOV.UK (www.gov.uk) recommends that issues of subsidence will include a report by a structural engineer and /or a chartered surveyor and be supported by technical analysis from other experts e.g. root and soil analysis. The report must include: <i>(whether it is provided or not in brackets after the item)</i> • A description of the property, including a description of the damage and the crack pattern, the date that the damage first occurred/was noted, detail of any previous underpinning or building work, the geological strata for the site identified from the geological map. <i>(Partially supplied)</i> • Details of vegetation in the vicinity and its management since discovery of the damage. Include a plan showing the vegetation and affected building. <i>(Supplied)</i> • Measurement of the extent and distribution of vertical movement using level monitoring. Where level monitoring is not possible, state why and provide crack monitoring data. Data provided must be sufficient to show a pattern of movement consistent with the presence of the impacted tree(s) <i>(Supplied)</i> • A profile of a trial/bore hole dug to identify foundation type and depth and soil characteristics <i>(Supplied)</i> • The sub soil characteristics including soil type (particularly that on which the foundations rest), liquid limit and plasticity index <i>(Supplied)</i> • The location and identification of roots found. Where identification is inconclusive, DNA testing should be carried out. <i>(Genera identified)</i> • Proposals and estimated cost of options to repair the damage. <i>(Supplied)</i>

	Technical evidence in respect of other structural damage e.g. garden walls, drains, paving, drive surfaces) should be provided by a relevant engineer, building/drainage surveyor or other appropriate expert. <i>No evidence in relation to alternative potential sources of the damage have been submitted with the application and there is no consideration of alternative options, which could retain the tree.</i> It is noted that T5 Norway Maple is cited within the schedule as being a secondary causal agent. The tree has been severely and unsympathetically topped and is growing in a narrow bed to the side of the drive between two walls - (see photo in report SA-252874) and so it is highly unlikely that the roots are abstracting water beneath the subject property. This is borne out by the findings from the TP/BH1 returning no roots despite ‘<i>extensive inspection of soil samples</i>’. The soil analysis does not provide sufficient evidence in both bore holes to demonstrate that there is a likelihood of tree related indirect damage: the NHBC states: “<i>Shrinkable soils, which contain over 35% fine particles and have a Modified Plasticity Index of 10% or greater, undergo volume changes due to moisture fluctuations.</i>” The data provided shows that BH1 has 25% fine particles and Modified Plasticity Index (MPI) of 6%. BH2 shows a higher percentage of fine particles at 82% and resultant 25% MPI. Thus, BH2 meets the threshold for shrinkable clay soil, BH1 does not. Beech (<i>Fagus</i>) and Prunus (which includes laurel) are found in low numbers in TP/BH2 - only one x 2mm root is present, representing very low numbers. For the above reasons, there is potential for T1 beech to be a causal agent. However not all avenues that could retain the tree have been explored. There is no evidence of drainage investigations and given that there is reported damage at a location where no roots are found, it seems reasonable to require this a a minimum before removing a healthy tree.					
Decision	Consent	Refuse	Part consent/ Part refuse	Withdrawn / Invalid	Conservation Area	
					Raise no objection	TPO
		X				
Decision notice	Refuse: Fell T1 beech. Reason: Insufficient evidence					
Conditions	N/A					
Notes to applicant						

Parish comments	None		
Public objection/ support	Support	Objection	Observation
	0	1	0
Objection/ support consideration	The submitted objection has been considered during the decision-making process.		