

Eastleigh Borough Council Tree Preservation Order and Conservation Area Assessment Form

Application Number	T/25/98879
Surveyor	AM
Address	65 HOCOMBE ROAD, CHANDLER'S FORD, EASTLEIGH, SO53 5QA
Proposed work	1no. Sweet Chestnut (T1) & 1no. English Oak (T2) - Fell both trees. Justification within report RTS/RW/65HRCF/VTA/V1.
Assessment Date	20 th March 2025
Officer comments	Trees at this property are or have been protected by the following TPO's: - 58-H (W2 / woodland classification; revoked 9th January 1998) - 248-E (T15 protects the sweet chestnut, T1, and G5 protects the oak, T2). Confirmed 20th October 1993. 248-E was served as a replacement of 58-H as the area was developed and the woodland classification became inappropriate. The replacement TPO was made to protect specific trees and tree groups. The sweet chestnut, T1, is a mature specimen sited in the rear garden. It is visible from Hocombe Road between the houses. It stands within a wider block of wooded gardens, giving the area a pleasant, sylvan character. T1 is as described in the accompanying report; around 19m tall and with a stem diameter of approx. 600mm dbh. The upper crown is completely dead and the lower crown is in poor health, low bud coverage and with sections dying back. This is unlikely to be reversible. The report offers an explanation for this, suggesting that it may be linked to pathogens thought to have been found on T2. I don't agree with this but it's a moot point as the condition of T1 is such that felling should be granted permission. The oak, T2, is a mature specimen also situated in the rear garden. It is behind the line of T1, leaning to the south and only visible with difficulty from Hocombe Road. However, it forms part of the wooded background and makes contribution to its wider sylvan character. T2 is described in the accompanying report as measuring 19m tall and with a stem diameter of 480mm dbh. It has an asymmetric crown due to suppression by adjacent, dominant trees. The Tree Survey Schedule states that the tree is in poor structural and physiological condition. It advises the following:

Significant bark wound SW aspect 2000mm x 500mm at ground level, consistent with a whole stem loss.

On this exposed sap wood are black fruiting bodies consistent with either *Kretzschmaria deusta* or *Hypoxylon multifforme*.

Heavily suppressed tree with poor form.

The Schedule states that the tree is highly likely to cause damage or harm. Further advice is provided within Section 10 (Findings) and Section 11 (Analysis). These state that the fungal fruiting bodies *are present on the exposed sapwood of the branch tear around 1m W aspect*. At the time of my site visit, I did not observe any fungal fruiting bodies. No evidence has been supplied with the application which would convince me otherwise. The stem condition on 20th March was as follows:



The black mass in the above photograph is at approx. 1m above ground on the west aspect of the tree. The black mass is historic fire damage on exposed heartwood rather than fungal fruiting bodies. There are two *gateposts* of occlusion surrounding this. The inner gateposts are dead/dysfunctional, probably killed off by fire. Outer, live, gateposts have formed. I can't time the fire damage but suspect was many years ago, with the two eras of woundwood formation and the relatively small area that the blackened heartwood occupies.

	The proposed removal of T2 would be difficult to notice from Hocombe Road; it is set back some 50m from the pavement, visible only between properties and amongst dominant trees. However, the permitted removal of T1 will marginally increase the view of T2 from Hocombe Road. On balance, the loss of amenity would be relatively low. However, Hocombe Road has a very sylvan character and the wooded backdrop is very much a desirable feature of the area. The loss of smaller individual trees might not have a major impact but if permitted, it would be difficult to defend similar trees and the character would soon become degraded. The reasons put forward to fell T2 are factually incorrect. As such, the report does not justify its removal. The felling of this tree should be refused permission.					
Decision	Consent	Refuse	Part consent/ Part refuse	Withdrawn / Invalid	Conservation Area	
					Raise no objection	TPO
			X			
Decision notice	REFUSE PERMISSION: 1no. English Oak (T2) – Fell REASON FOR REFUSAL: The proposal to fell T2 has been made on the basis that it is alleged to have fungal fruiting bodies of <i>Kretzschmaria deusta</i> or <i>Hypoxylon multiforme</i>. Neither are present; the area of concern is a section of scorched wood. As such, there is no justification to fell the tree. Whilst by no means a prominent specimen, it still contributes to the overall verdant character of the area and it’s loss would only degrade this feature. GRANT PERMISSION: 1no. Sweet Chestnut (T1) – Fell					
Conditions	Replacement of T1					
Notes to applicant	Standard					
Parish comments	None.					
Public objection/ support	Support		Objection		Observation	
	0		0		0	
Objection/ support consideration	None received.					