

Eastleigh Borough Council Tree Preservation Order and Conservation Area Assessment Form

Application Number	T/25/99591
Surveyor	AM
Address	YEW TREE HOUSE, 4 HATHERELL CLOSE, WEST END, SOUTHAMPTON,
Proposed work	1no. Ash (T1) – Fell. Tree has quite clear signs of Ash dieback with no viable future. No access for MEWP, therefore recommended the tree be removed before it becomes hazardous to climb. Multiple targets beneath including a church & listed wall.
Assessment Date	26 th June 2025
Officer comments	The application ash (T1) is protected within G4 of TPO ref: 207, confirmed 12th February 1990. T1 is an early-mature ash estimated by eye to measure around 15m tall and with a stem diameter of around 40cm. The tree is visible to the public from the churchyard and car park. An application (T/24/98440) to fell this tree due to ash dieback was refused permission in winter 2024. This was refused on the basis that the tree showed no signs of ash dieback disease. The current application proposes to fell the tree on the basis that it has quite clear signs of ash dieback and that delaying its felling will cause difficulties in felling it when symptoms advance. No description of the “<i>clear signs</i>” or symptoms observed by the Agent were provided with the application and there has been no formal diagnosis. At the time of my site visit (26th June 2025), I found that the crown was slightly thin and less verdant than some ash. However, this is not necessarily attributable to ash dieback disease; other forms of environmental stress exist e.g. relating to low water availability, heat, soil compaction etc. There was evidence of insect browsing activity in parts of the crown (chewed up leaves) which may give the appearance of dieback. There was no obvious dieback, no blackened/wilting leaves, no lion-tailing of branches/clustering of epicormics, no lesions, no dead branches. No evidence of secondary infection e.g. by <i>Armillaria</i> sp. was reported.



I acknowledge that the progression of ash dieback makes infected trees increasingly harder to fell and that the Agent states that MEWP access is already impossible. However, as there is no clear indication of the disease, the and as per the previous application, it would be contrary to industry best practice (AA Ash Dieback Guidance for Tree Owners, Managers, Contractors and Consultants) to pre-emptively fell the tree.

Decision	Consent	Refuse	Part consent/ Part refuse	Withdrawn / Invalid	Conservation Area	
					Raise no objection	TPO
		X				
Decision notice	Refuse consent: 1no. Ash (T1) – Fell Reason for refusal: The application states that this tree has clear signs of ash dieback disease and should be removed before it becomes too hazardous to climb. No description of the "clear signs" of ash dieback disease was provided. At the time of the Council inspection (26th June					

	2025), whilst the crown was less dense and verdant than other ash, these are not characteristic symptoms on their own; other forms of environmental stress including low water availability, heat, soil compaction etc. can cause similar symptoms. There was also insect damage present at the periphery of the crown which could give the impression of dieback. Current industry best-practice does not recommend the pre-emptive felling of healthy ash trees. The proposed felling would remove the visual amenity currently provided by the tree and has not yet been fully justified.		
Conditions			
Notes to applicant			
Parish comments	None.		
Public objection/ support	Support	Objection	Observation
	0	0	0
Objection/ support consideration	None received.		