

Eastleigh Borough Council Tree Preservation Order and Conservation Area Assessment Form

Application Number	T/25/99078
Surveyor	AM
Address	LAND TO THE WEST OF 40 BARTON DRIVE, HAMBLE-LE-RICE, SOUTHAMPTON, SO31 4RE
Proposed work	2no. Norway Maple (T1 & T2, originating from Hamble Parish Council land) - Remove and replant. The trees are unsuitable for their location & will cause issues as they continue to grow, additional reasons for proposed removal in report attached to application. Applicant is willing to fund the planting of two replacement standard sized Field Maples.
Assessment Date	7 th May 2025
Officer comments	The application trees are within the boundary of area A2 of TPO ref: 125-E. This TPO was confirmed 2nd June 1986. The application trees are a pair of early-mature Norway maples: - T1 measures approx. 40cm dbh x 14m tall, leans towards the property to the east and is in good health. There is a large wound which is showing signs of decay on the lower stem but is not considered a structural issue at this point. - T2 measures approx. 30cm dbh x 14m tall, leans towards the property and is in good health. It is sandwiched between a mature oak (on presumed Hamble PC land) and an early-mature cedar in the Applicant's garden. The removal of T2 will be of benefit to both trees, reducing shading of their canopies and providing greater space in which to grow into. - Both trees are clearly visible to the public as they stand immediately adjacent to a public footpath. As such, they offer some benefit in terms of public visual amenity. At best, they contribute to the wider tree group, helping provide green separation between Barton Drive and Deanfield Close. However, neither are of any particular arboricultural merit. The application to fell the trees has been made on the basis that there is a risk of subsidence occurring and that there are future management considerations as each tree grows. I've given no weight to the matter of subsidence as this is not able to be predicted with any precision. In the absence of any evidence of actual subsidence damage, this cannot be considered as justifying the felling of trees. Future management considerations are a reasonable justification; both trees lean out to the

	property and are capable of become very large trees and are not particularly appropriate in the particular site circumstances. T2 is also affecting the growth of an oak and a cedar so its removal would be beneficial in that respect. It is difficult to be sure whether either trees was present at the time the TPO was made. Neither are large enough that I could be sure that they were present and therefore protected. If the Area classification were to be reviewed (in accordance with good TPO-administration), neither would justify being protected by individual (T) or group (G) classifications in their own right. The felling of both trees is acceptable, regardless of whether they are actually protected. It would be reasonable to grant permission but to avoid making a condition to replant on the basis that the protected status of T1 and T2 is not able to be determined until after (if) they are felled and the annual growth rings counted. Hamble PC's comments have been considered in the determination of this application.					
Decision	Consent	Refuse	Part consent/ Part refuse	Withdrawn / Invalid	Conservation Area	
					Raise no objection	TPO
	X					
Decision notice	2no. Norway Maple (T1 & T2) - Remove and replant.					
Conditions	None					
Notes to applicant	OWNERSHIP					
Parish comments	<i>The above application was discussed at last evenings Planning Committee and the Parish Object to this application to fell Parish Council Trees. The Committee said that they would support the applicant planting replacement trees at this time with a view to revisiting this in 5 years' time and if these are established they would consider the felling of the two mature trees.</i> <i>As far as the Parish is concerned these are healthy trees and have not been identified as needing any work in the Parish's own tree surveys. If an arboriculturist provides advice that these could be crown lifted, the Council would consider allowing these works.</i> <i>Also if an arboriculturist advises that they consider these trees to be diseased or dangerous, the Parish Council would be willing to review its decision.</i> AM Comment: EBC's consideration is to whether the works are acceptable in planning terms; should permission be granted, this does not compel					

	either the tree owner or neighbour to carry out the work. However, should permission to fell be acted on, the tree owner (Hamble PC) would be responsible for replanting (if such a condition were to be imposed). This is because conditional replants are tied to the land owner (whoever that may be, from time to time) and not the applicant.		
Public objection/ support	Support	Objection	Observation
	0	0	0
Objection/ support consideration	None received.		