

Eastleigh Borough Council Tree Preservation Order and Conservation Area Assessment Form

Application Number	T/25/99409
Surveyor	AM
Address	1 OAKWOOD ROAD, CHANDLER'S FORD, EASTLEIGH, SO53 1LW
Proposed work	13no. Mixed species trees (1-13) - Works schedule within report RTS/RW/1ORCF/VTA/V1 dated 16/05/25.
Assessment Date	26 th June 2025
Officer comments	TPO ref: 265-E protects trees at this property. This TPO was confirmed 5th May 1994. Trees at this site are visible to the public from Oakwood Road and Hiltingbury Road. They contribute to the mature, sylvan character of the area. This application has been made to prune and fell trees following an inspection by an Arboriculturist. Individual trees will be referred to as they are in the supplied report. 1. Oak – crownlift to 5m/remove deadwood 2. Oak – crownlift to 5m/remove deadwood Both front garden trees, clearly visible to the public. Crownlifting in both cases will require the pruning of only small diameter branches and stem epicormics so will be of low impact to public, visual amenity and tree health. The removal of dead branches is exempt from application and can be carried out at any time. All reasonable. 3. Oak – reduce height and spread by 3m/remove deadwood Tree as described within the report (major deadwood, overall canopy dieback). Report speculates on potential root damage caused by recent hard surfacing. The proposed reduction would remove the sparse outer crown and would not be overly detrimental in terms of public amenity. 4. Oak – Reduce S aspect by 2m/remove deadwood Tree as described within the report (major deadwood, sparse canopy, misshapen canopy south side). The proposed pruning covers the garden side only and will be of minimal impact to visual amenity. 5. Oak – Reduce height and spread by 3m/remove deadwood

	Alleged to be an off-site, public tree; Land Reg layer on GIS shows property boundary as following outer edge of pavement. Beech hedge planted to this boundary, now fenced out by recent addition of fence. Does not show as HCC or EBC-managed hedge on Grounds Maintenance layers. Does not look like a hedge HCC or EBC would plant or maintain. Tree growing within this hedgeline. Although I'm not an expert on land ownership matters, the oak (T5) appears to form part of the boundary of 1 Oakwood Road and therefore the responsibility of the Applicant. Tree noted by Applicant's Arboriculturist as having "severe retrenchment"; tree is in very poor physiological condition and suffering substantial dieback. It's stag-headed, with large diameter deadwood over the highway and surrounding gardens. No advice has been provided which would explain its condition. Google Streetview images from 2018 show the tree as appearing under stress at that time, with its immediate neighbour standing dead. The proposed reduction would reduce the likelihood of branch failure, although is unlikely to be well tolerated by the tree. I expect that the tree will continue to decline. 6. Beech – no works NOT PROTECTED BY THE TPO* 7. Yew – no works NOT PROTECTED BY TPO 8. Silver birch – Fell Low vitality tree with potential root disturbance/damage. Bark lifting at base and several small bleeds. Grows through crown of early-mature beech. Birch are short-lived trees which are quick to deteriorate once subject to stress. The weak crown in combination with the lifting bark at the base implies that the tree would be unlikely to survive for more than a few years. Its removal would be of benefit to T6 (beech). 9. Silver birch – Fell Heavily smothered in ivy; very little foliage. Small area of dysfunction in the crown. Again, the removal of this tree would be of benefit to a more desirable tree (T10, beech). 10. Beech - no works NOT PROTECTED BY THE TPO* 11. Oak – Remove deadwood Off-site tree, overhangs part of Applicant's rear garden. Works exempt. 12. Beech – Reduce N aspect by 3m Off-site tree at 3 Oakwood Road. Main public views from Hiltingbury Road. The beech overhangs the central part of the Applicant's garden. The
--	---

	proposal to reduce the northern segment of the tree by 3m has been made on the basis that it encroaches on and excessively shades the garden. As a large, mature beech sited to the south of the property, it will cast shade to much of the garden. Beech does not respond well to pruning and becomes less tolerant with age. The proposal will remove a large proportion of foliage/twigs and potentially leave the public facing side of the tree bare. Lesser work can be permitted. 13. Oak – Reduce N aspect by 3m Off-site tree at 3 Oakwood Road. Main public views from Hiltingbury Road. The oak overhangs the central part of the Applicant’s garden. The proposal to reduce the northern segment of the tree by 3m has been made on the basis that it encroaches on and excessively shades the garden and recently-built conservatory. As a large, mature oak sited to the south of the property, it will cast shade to much of the garden and property. There will also be issues with acorns raining down on the building during the autumn. Work is justified on this basis but as with T12, the proposal is quite extensive. Again, lesser work can be permitted. Conclusion: The proposed works to trees numbered 1,2,3,4,5,8,9 should be permitted. The proposed works to trees 12 and 13 should be refused. Lesser works can be permitted to these trees (see Decision box). Trees not mentioned above either have no works proposed or the work is exempt from application. *The beech are not protected by TPO. The area in which the beech grow is included within group classification G14 and should include 10 silver birch. The beech clearly pre-date the two remaining silver birch. The beech are ultimately large, long-lived, native trees which provide clear benefit in terms of public visual amenity. I suspect that there was a drafting error in the making of the TPO and that the beech were intended for inclusion. However, for whatever reason, they weren’t. A separate recommendation will be made to the Service Director for Neighbourhoods and Greenspaces, to make a new TPO to protect the two remaining beech. If this is approved, this will negate the need to impose a replacement planting condition for the birch (T8 and T9).					
Decision	Consent	Refuse	Part consent/ Part refuse	Withdrawn / Invalid	Conservation Area	
					Raise no objection	TPO
			X			

Decision notice	The Council has issued a split decision and REFUSES PERMISSION for the following work: 12. Beech – Reduce N aspect by 3m 13. Oak – Reduce N aspect by 3m REASON FOR REFUSAL: The proposed reductions of the northern aspects of these trees by 3m will be detrimental to public, visual amenity. The proposed work is unlikely to be tolerated by the beech (T12) and will likely result in the northern aspect becoming bare and devoid of healthy, well-formed regrowth. The management of shading in a neighbourhood known for its sylvan character does not justify such extensive pruning. Lesser works have been permitted (see below). The Council GRANTS PERMISSION for the following work: 1. Oak – crownlift to 5m 2. Oak – crownlift to 5m 3. Oak – reduce height and spread by 3m 4. Oak – Reduce S aspect by 2m 5. Oak – Reduce height and spread by 3m 8. Silver birch – Fell 9. Silver birch – Fell 12. Beech – Crownlift the northern aspect to 5m above ground level 13. Oak – Crownlift the northern aspect to 5m above ground level. Selectively prune so that it no longer overhangs the corner of the conservatory, with acceptable horizontal clearance/growing margin of 1.5m.		
Conditions	BS3998		
Notes to applicant	Dead branches exempt, ownership of hedge/T5, note to justify TPO'ing of the beech.		
Parish comments	None recieved		
Public objection/ support	Support	Objection	Observation
	0	0	1
Objection/ support consideration	Neighbour response: I have no objection to the removal of trees 8 and 9 as for the others the removal of the ivy from the other trees would significantly improve their condition and would mitigate the need for removal in the future. I am surprised by their comment that the trees are reaching maturity as there are many trees in the area that are much older.		