

Eastleigh Borough Council Tree Preservation Order and Conservation Area Assessment Form

Application Number	T/25/99233			
Surveyor	AM			
Address	14 RANDALL ROAD, CHANDLER'S FORD, EASTLEIGH, SO53 5AL			
Proposed work	1no. Tulip Tree - Fell. Located between Nos. 14 & 12, it is quite close to the houses & a risk of damage to the houses in heavy winds. Happy to grow new Saplings (one or two) in a safer area of the property.			
Assessment Date	14 th May 2025			
Officer comments	The application tulip tree measures approximately 18m tall and has a stem diameter of approximately 50cm dbh. The stem divides at approx. 2.5m above ground into two tightly forked, co-dominant stems attached by bark included union. There is slight bulging to one side of the union but one the other. Although this is a weaker branch attachment than a normal union, there is no indication that it is at imminent risk of failure and it can be managed effectively by occasional, judicious pruning. The crown is visually healthy although appears to have been reduced at approx. 12m above ground level and has healthy regrowth above this point. The tree stands between two properties, with a garage wall approx. 1.5m from the base to the west and the Applicant's house 3m to the west. The tree is mainly visible on approach from the west. Other views are limited by mature tree cover. The potential size of the tree is such that pruning would be necessary to maintain a reasonable relationship between the buildings and the tree. The tree does not appear to be protected by TPO. The original woodland TPO (ref: 58-H and dated 1955) was revoked so no longer has any legal status. That TPO was replaced by 244-E (dated 1993). The latter order protected specific trees and groups of trees. Several other trees in the immediate vicinity were protected by that order but the tulip was not included. The tree is of a size/maturity today that it would have existed in 1993 and I am confident would have been considered for suitability at that time. However, it appears that the Council chose not to protect it. Given the proximity to the buildings, the sub-optimum form (bark inclusion = weaker branch attachment) and the presence of considerably more prominent, mature trees, it would not be expedient to prevent this tree from being felled by imposing a new TPO.			
	Consent	Refuse		Conservation Area

Decision			Part consent/ Part refuse	Withdrawn / Invalid	Raise no objection	TPO
				Not protected		
Decision notice	Not protected					
Conditions	N/A					
Notes to applicant	The tree has been determined to have not been protected by TPO ref: 244-E. The older, woodland TPO (58-H) was revoked in 1993 so no longer has any effect.					
Parish comments	None.					
Public objection/ support	Support		Objection		Observation	
	1		0		0	
Objection/ support consideration	As neighbours at no 12 we support this proposal.					
	AM comment – Noted.					