

Eastleigh Borough Council Tree Preservation Order and Conservation Area Assessment Form

Application Number	T/25/99889
Surveyor	AM
Address	5-9 ROEBUCK CLOSE, BISHOPSTOKE, BISHOPSTOKE, SO50 6JS
Proposed work	1no. Oak (T1, originates from Western boundary of No.5) - Pruning to reduce canopy extents by 2m. Canopy has grown beyond line of property with limb tips conflicting with roof. 1no. Sweet Chestnut (T2, originates from No.5) - Fell. As the tree matures it will be in constant conflict with building. 1no. Sycamore (T3, originates from No.5) - Fell. Historically lost a major stem. Extensive decay within a basal cavity leaving the remaining original stem structurally insecure. 1no. Sycamore (T8, originates from No.7) - Fell. Extensive decay at base. Fungus Kretzschmaria deusta leading to death of tree. 1no. Sycamore (T9, originates from No.9) - Prune long & over-extended stem, emanating from base of tree to source. Growing across the boundary & over neighbouring outbuildings. Its attachment point is considered to be structurally poor. Replanting of native deciduous trees for T2, T3 & T8.
Assessment Date	25 th September 2025
Officer comments	Area TPO ref: 635-E applies. This covers all trees present when the order was made in 2008. As this catches all trees, it does not differentiate between trees that merit individual (or group) protection from those that do not justify TPO. T1 – Lateral branches in contact with and otherwise within very close proximity to No.5. Reducing these branches to provide 2m clearance is reasonable maintenance. T2 – Early-mature sweet chestnut measuring approx. 10m tall x 20cm stem diameter (estimated by eye), reasonable form. Questionable as to whether this tree existed when the TPO was made 17 years ago. Growing within 3-4m of the building. Sweet chestnut are ultimately large tree species, very capable of achieving in excess of 20m tall and with crown spreads tip to tip of similar dimensions. The narrow gap between the fence and the side of the property isn't a sustainable location for a tree of this species so it's reasonable that it be removed. T3 – Mature sycamore, previously twin-stemmed but second stem now gone and stump extensively decayed. As these trees share a rootplate, it is highly likely that decay extends beneath the remaining tree; sycamore

	lacks a durable heartwood so is most unlikely to have compartmentalised the decay/dysfunction. Taking into account the surrounding land use i.e. domestic garden and house, the retention of this tree is not viable. T8 – Mature sycamore, again a single remaining stem of a previous twin; exposed wood extensively decayed, colonised by significant species of decay fungi <i>Kretzschmaria deusta</i> (brittle cinder). Colonisation of the remaining stem cannot be prevented. Failure of this stem is foreseeable. T9 – Sycamore; maturing secondary stem of approx. 40cm diameter growing at 45 degree angle over fence and neighbouring outbuildings. Largely obscured from public view. Removal of this stem will leave a large wound near the base of the main tree stem. Would have been preferable that this was pruned out before it became established. On balance, the removal of this stem is acceptable.					
Decision	Consent	Refuse	Part consent/ Part refuse	Withdrawn / Invalid	Conservation Area	
					Raise no objection	TPO
	X					
Decision notice	GRANT CONSENT: 1no. Oak (T1, originates from Western boundary of No.5) - Pruning to reduce canopy extents by 2m. 1no. Sweet Chestnut (T2, originates from No.5) - Fell. 1no. Sycamore (T3, originates from No.5) - Fell. 1no. Sycamore (T8, originates from No.7) - Fell. 1no. Sycamore (T9, originates from No.9) -Prune long & over-extended stem, emanating from base of tree to source. Replanting of native deciduous trees for T2, T3 & T8.					
Conditions	BS3998; replacement trees x 3 (field maples)					
Notes to applicant						
Parish comments	Bishopstoke Parish Council Planning Committee raised no objection to this planning application but would like to see a tree management plan put in place for the future. AM response: We cannot require a tree management plan to be provided.					
Public objection/ support	Support		Objection		Observation	
	0		2		0	
Objection/ support consideration	<u>Neighbour 1</u>: If a tree has a TPO, surely that means it shouldn't be felled! Why do people move into a property then choose to cut the trees already there... AM response: TPO's are not intended to hinder reasonable tree management. Planning tree surveys are usually caveated to state that					

they do not constitute a tree safety/risk survey. Subsequent tree inspections can feasibly detect previously unknown issues which require remedial work.

Neighbour 2: I am writing today 8.9.25 to strongly object to the planning application T/25/99889 for the following reasons:

The original planning permission clearly states to RETAIN and PROTECT existing tree's which form an important part of the amenity of the locality, felling 3 tree's with T.P.O 's plus 4 under an exemption is not adhering to this planning order. As I understand 9 tree's were felled prior to building work commencing as discussed in a prior planning application meeting, this development will have cost the local amenity 16 trees with only 3 saplings proposed to negate the loss of diverse and mature tree's.

The tree's show signs of extreme stress and damage from the development T3 sycamore no5 shows scrapes and indents. The decay and fungus in T3 and T8 appear to be in stumps to the side of the existing tree's can they not be spared?.

The line of tree's provide a natural habitat for birds, Owls, Woodpeckers and many more Bats, Stag Beetles a protected species all are found here ,removal of the trees will adversely effect the environment and biodiversity.

Felling and pruning the tree's will open up the space revealing the car park beyond which is used for the S.AN.G this with the raised nature of the surrounding properties will result in loss of privacy, security and the residential amenity

If this application is carried out in conjunction with the crown lifting already granted permission T/24/97710 it is my belief that more tree's may be damaged due to stress and limb removal further loss of the tree's could occur

Thank you for considering my objections.

AM response: TPO's are not intended to hinder reasonable tree management. Planning tree surveys are usually caveated to state that they do not constitute a tree safety/risk survey. Subsequent tree inspections can feasibly detect previously unknown issues which require remedial work.