

Eastleigh Borough Council Tree Preservation Order and Conservation Area Assessment Form	
Application Number	T/25/100112
Surveyor	AM
Address	21 BEECHWOOD RISE, WEST END, SOUTHAMPTON, SO18 3PW
Proposed work	1no. Beech (T1) - Remove. Tree works are proposed to stop the influence of the tree(s) on the soil below building foundation level and provide long term stability to No. 19. It is the expert opinion of both the case engineer and arboriculturist that on the balance of probabilities the supporting information demonstrates the influence of the tree(s).
Assessment Date	13 th November 2025
Officer comments	The application beech is protected within G7, under TPO ref: 327-E, confirmed 9th May 1995. The tree is a large, mature beech located in the back garden of 21 but clearly visible to the public by virtue of its elevated position. It measures in excess of 20m tall and has a stem diameter of approx. 80-100cm dbh (estimated by eye). It has an asymmetric crown attributable to past competition for space with neighbouring trees since removed. There is a strip of dysfunction running from roughly shrub-height (3.5m) to 15m above ground (the height of the main V union) on the west side. Exposed ripewood is beginning to decay and there is a small cavity forming at 10m above ground level. Small fungal fruiting bodies, possibly <i>Stereum subtomentosum</i> are emerging from several locations in this dysfunctional area. The strip of dysfunction is likely due to the previous removal of mature trees to the west of T1, resulting in previously shaded bark becoming sun-scorched and dysfunctional. The large area of exposed ripewood, albeit in a narrow strip, is a long time from occlusion and it is likely that stem hollowing will follow. There is little indication that this is a near-future issue though and the application provides no advice in this respect. The proposal is to fell the tree on the basis that it contributes to subsidence at No.19 Beechwood Rise. This application follows T/24/98156 which was refused permission on the basis of a lack of supporting information. That application was not appealed although EBC was informed of the Insurer's intention to claim compensation. The below plan (from the application particulars) shows the position of T1 and the parts of the building that have become damaged (marked with red dots):



The Engineering Report states that the mechanism of damage is downward, rotational movement, towards the vegetation. This has caused step-cracking, separation between walls and ceilings and a drop in floor levels. This is consistent with the influence of trees.

BGS mapping indicates that the underlying geology is the Wittering Formation. This comprises sand, silt and clay. It is within a few tens of metres from the mapped interface with the London clay. BGS mapping is indicative only but it would seem that the underlying geology is highly likely to have significant clay component. The soil investigations find that there is a clay of medium volume change potential once the modified plasticity index has been calculated.

The damage was first noticed in August 2022. This is near the end of the growing season, when one might expect to see damage occur when this has been caused by trees. Summer 2022 was notable as the hottest on record, with intense heat and low rainfall.

S1 (laurel) and T3 (cypress) have been removed so can no longer have an influence on the building. It is unclear when these were removed but the stumps appear relatively recently cut.

Level monitoring to 23rd July 2025 has been supplied. This updates evidence supplied under the previous application. There is a clear pattern of seasonal movement across all monitoring stations. The extent of movement varies across the building and demonstrates differential movement. Stations 1-5 (front right of building) show 1-4mm movement between winter and summer. Stations 6-10 (rear right of building) show up to 14mm movement between winter and summer. The greatest movement at stations 9 and 10. These stations are nearest the tree and this relationship is one which relates it to the damage. This is further reinforced by roots of *Fagus* (beech) being found in BH2, sunk adjacent to

	station 10. <i>Prunus</i> roots were also found in the borehole but the laurel which this was presumed to have originated from has since been removed. Alternative explanations for the damage e.g. drainage issued, have been discounted by the Engineer. The Agent states their intention to claim compensation under s202(e), should the application be refused permission. The stated costs are: £101,376 – to carry out repairs to the building with the tree remaining £5331 – to carry out repairs to the building with the tree removed. These figures differ considerably from what was previously warned of in the previous application (£45,000 to underpin with tree in situ, £9,500 if repaired with tree removed). It is unclear why the cost to underpin has more than doubled within the space of a year. The crucial evidence here is as follows: - Beech tree roots, recently alive, were found in the borehole nearest the tree; - There has been a pattern of seasonable movement which can only be attributable to the influence of trees; - There is an underlying clay subsoil, capable of volumetric change; - Actual damage has occurred to the property in a manner which is indicative of differential foundational movement; - Other potential causes have been discounted. In light of the above, and despite loss of amenity, it is recommended that the application is granted permission, subject to replacement planting.					
Decision	Consent	Refuse	Part consent/ Part refuse	Withdrawn / Invalid	Conservation Area	
					Raise no objection	TPO
	X					
Decision notice	Grant permission: 1no. Beech (T1) - Remove					
Conditions	Replacement planting (details tbc)					
Notes to applicant						
Parish comments	None.					
Public objection/ support	Support		Objection		Observation	
	0		0		0	

Objection/ support consideration	1. I would like to raise some concerns regarding the proposed removal of the large Beech tree located near my property. While I understand the reasons for seeking its removal, I respectfully ask that the following points are taken into account as part of the decision-making process: 1. Soil Stability and Foundation Risk – Large, mature trees such as this beech have extensive root systems that play a role in stabilising surrounding soil and regulating moisture levels. Its sudden removal could alter ground conditions, particularly if the soil is clay-based, leading to possible ground heave or settlement that may affect the stability of nearby buildings, including my property. 2. Drainage and Water Management – The tree canopy and roots currently intercept and absorb a significant volume of rainfall. Once removed, surface water run-off patterns could change, potentially increasing water accumulation around my property and placing additional pressure on existing drainage. 3. Environmental and Amenity Value – Beyond its ecological benefits, the tree provides shade, reduces wind exposure, and contributes to the character of the area. Its removal may have a noticeable impact on both local biodiversity and residential amenity. 4. Monitoring Data and Ground Movement – I have reviewed the displacement map provided, and would like to highlight some concerns regarding its consistency. Specifically, the reading dated 06/09/2023 appears out of line with subsequent readings at Points 9 and 10, which are otherwise very similar and stable. In addition, the reading from 23/07/2025 also looks inconsistent with the overall trend. These anomalies should be clarified before firm conclusions are drawn from the data. Furthermore, I note that several large trees have already been removed in the area, and I question whether the observed ground movement may partly reflect soil settlement following that earlier removal work. Given these considerations, I would ask that a thorough assessment of soil type, hydrology, and potential impacts on neighbouring properties is undertaken before any final decision is made. If removal is approved, I would also urge that appropriate mitigation measures be put in place, such as replacement planting, ongoing monitoring of ground conditions, and clarification of the displacement data. <i>AM comments:</i> <i>Heave is a theoretical risk which requires a specific set of circumstances to occur. The “Engineering Final Report” assesses the risk of heave as</i>
--	--

low/none.

Comments on impact to drainage and amenity noted.

Level monitoring stations 9-10 show upward movement indicative of soil recovery between the first reading 6/9/23 and 31/10/23. The latter end of this timescale would be when trees are approaching dormancy so drawing less water from the soil. At the same time, the summer was recorded as higher than average rainfall. Overall, the level monitoring shows a pattern of seasonal movement which can only be attributable to trees.

A replacement tree condition will be imposed. We cannot require ongoing investigations as part of the TPO process but no doubt the insurer will continue to monitor the site to ensure soils have stabilised before carrying out their repairs.

2. We are writing to you in support of the application above that you have received for the removal of a Beech tree in the garden of 21 Beechwood Rise, West End, SO18 3PW.

Although the tree is in the garden of no; 21 it is at the bottom of their garden and is in fact closer to our property than theirs. It is having a severe impact on our garage and house with the roots now reaching our back door and it is causing considerable cracks in our kitchen, we are at times unable to open our back door (our escape route in case of fire) and our kitchen cupboards are now coming away from the walls.

Our young grandchildren are unable to play in the garden as we worry when the large branches fall off (which they frequently do) they would injure them if not kill them as the branches are very large, and as pensioners we are also concerned that we would not be able to move as quickly as we once could from a falling branch.

We are not opposed to trees and in fact when we moved to this house 25 years ago the trees were one of the features we liked, but 25 years ago things were very different and with climate change we are now experiencing weather extremes such as very hot summers and stronger storms in the winter months.

25 years ago there were three large Beech trees next to each other in the garden of no; 21 and over the years the other two were removed due to disease and concern for safety, so it would seem reasonable to us to expect that this tree could also be removed for the same reasons and due to the fact that our case engineer and arboriculturist report suggests that the tree is showing signs of disease and supporting information demonstrates the influence the tree is having on our home.

	Our main concern (although we have a few) is one of safety for ourselves and our family and we feel very anxious that this tree could come crashing down on our home and if this happened it would certainly destroy the back of our home and could potentially kill us if it were to come down at night as our bedroom is at the back of the house, our fear grows more when we read in the local paper of a similar situation in a street not far from us in Sharon Road when a large oak crashed down in daylight even though it had been reported to the council on several occasions because of a large amount of fungus at its base (as is the case with the Beech at no; 21). In closing we hope you treat this application seriously and take into account our real fear for our safety and the stress it is putting us under due to the long term damage to our home which is having a big negative impact on our wellbeing and the saleability and value of our home. <i>AM comment: Noted. For the avoidance of doubt, the tree that fell at Sharon Road was a highway tree which we had no control over. Despite extensive investigation, I have not noted any fungi at the base of the tree at 21 but did note fungal fruiting bodies emerging from a strip of dysfunctional wood extending up the trunk. No advice has been supplied in this respect therefore my observations are for information purposes only.</i>
--	--