

Eastleigh Borough Council Tree Preservation Order and Conservation Area Assessment Form

Application Number	T/24/98325
Surveyor	SK IF
Address	HUNTINGTON, 72 VICTORIA ROAD, NETLEY ABBEY
Proposed work	1no. Eucalyptus (TPO505) - Fell. Replace with 2 trees. Tree is displacing wall in its immediate vicinity & has significantly raised soil level. Tree appears to have been heavily reduced/topped previously, at the regrowth location there are many unintegrated compression unions. Adjacent Beech tree is being stifled & suppressed by the Eucalyptus. Removal is necessary to protect, enhance & preserve biodiversity, maintaining the ecological succession of the area.
Assessment Date	24/10/2024
Officer comments	The Eucalyptus is one of the largest and most prominent trees in this area located near Victoria Country Park. The tree occupies an elevated position and can be seen all round from the public areas and main road offering a great public amenity. The tree is late mature and healthy-looking, species suitable/typical for this coastal location. The applicant provided a few reasons to justify the proposed removal which are addressed below: 1. Raised soil level - no evidence of soil movement has been observed during the site visit, no further evidence has been provided. The eucalyptus and beech both originate from a historically existing bank (a strip of soil raised between the properties) and it does not appear as if the trees caused any soil levels change. 2. Wall displacement- a slight distortion of the low (half a meter) brick wall (possibly a boundary feature) has been observed however this has been duly accommodated by the expansion joint between the sections of the wall, there are no cracks or other visible damage that could pose risks or be deemed hazardous at this point. Removal of such a prominent tree would have been an extremely disproportionate response to such minor distortion. 3. Unintegrated compression unions -the unions are all currently covered by peeling bark (which is typical for this species and does not signal a disease or dysfunction), assessment from the ground does not confirm tight forks or included bark, further evidence from the applicant will be required to support their statement. 4. Adjacent beech tree stifled and suppressed- the beech appears healthy growing under the much larger eucalyptus which is rather typical for this shade-tolerant species. The beech is not deformed or misshaped in any way to indicate it suffers from competition or suppression.

	The applicants did indicate on the application form that they have fear regarding the condition of the tree, however, no arboricultural evidence has been provided to support this statement despite the application form states that it must be accompanied by the necessary evidence. Based on the above, the proposal is considered unjustified. Due to its size and prominence, suggested replacing of the eucalyptus with 2no. trees will not be sufficient to mitigate the loss of public amenity/character of the area if the tree was to be removed.					
Decision	Consent	Refuse	Part consent/ Part refuse	Withdrawn / Invalid	Conservation Area	
					Raise no objection	TPO
		x				
Decision notice	Refuse: 1no. Eucalyptus (TPO505) - Fell. Replace with 2 trees.					
Conditions						
Notes to applicant						
Parish comments	None					
Public objection/ support	Support		Objection		Observation	
	4		1		0	
Objection/ support consideration	The 1 objection and 4 support comments have been considered during the decision-making process. Recommendation to refuse was made based on the site visit and lack of arboricultural evidence provided by the agent to support statements regarding safety and condition of the tree as required by the guidance and regulations of TPO planning.					