



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 3 December 2025

by Jon Heuch BSc(For.) PhD MICFor MArborA

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 24 December 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/TPO/W1715/10521

Tall Oaks, 25 Compton Close, Eastleigh, SO50 4RE

- The appeal is made under regulation 19 of the Town and Country Planning (Tree Preservation) (England) Regulations 2012 against a refusal to grant consent to undertake work to trees protected by a Tree Preservation Order (TPO).
 - The appeal is made by Mrs Hardip Sangha against the decision of Eastleigh Borough Council.
 - The application Ref: T/25/98771, dated 20 January 2025, was refused by notice dated 20 February 2025.
 - The work proposed is described as the crown reduction of three oak trees by 1 metre.
 - The relevant TPO is Tree Preservation Order No 321 Compton Close, Clandon Drive, Sherbourne Court, Bosville, Boyatt Wood, Eastleigh which was confirmed on 12 May 1995.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matter

2. The council issued a split decision allowing works to T3 and refusing works to T1 and T2. My deliberations therefore focus solely on the refused works and my decision does not affect the permitted works.

Main Issues

3. The main issues in respect of this appeal are the effect of the pruning of the two trees on the character and appearance of the area and whether sufficient justification has been demonstrated for the proposed pruning.

Reasons

4. The two oak trees are mature trees growing in a rear garden. Their tops are visible over the roof of Tall Oaks and are visible to neighbours on either side and at the rear. They make a positive contribution to the mature and verdant landscape of the area and to its character and appearance.
5. The pruning of the trees would erode the mature and verdant landscape of the area and would give rise to a little harm to its character and appearance. Given

that, any reasons given to justify their pruning need to be convincing. It is to those reasons, the second main issue, to which I now turn.

6. The stated reason for the original application was described on the decision notice as a desire to reduce leaf litter that had caused a mess. The seasonal fall of leaves and acorns is a predictable short-term cost of having oak trees. Whilst pruning is likely to reduce the volume of detritus falling, within accepted pruning regimes, it will do so only proportionate to the severity of the pruning and of course the tree will regrow. Minor pruning with a view to reducing leaf litter alone is not a convincing reason to justify works to protected trees.
7. Whilst the appeal is being decided using the written procedure I am unable to consider additional reasons to justify proposed works. However, I note that the appeal has raised the issue of trees T2 and T3 hindering the installation of solar panels. As the trees are located to the North of the property they should not shade any solar panels on the roof of the property. Thus, the desire to install solar panels is, in any event, an unconvincing reason to justify pruning of T2 and T3.

Conclusion

8. With any application to prune a protected tree, a balancing exercise needs to be undertaken. The essential need for the work applied for must be weighed against the resultant loss to the amenity of the area. In this case, the proposed pruning would result in a little harm to the character and appearance of the area and, in my judgement, insufficient justification has been demonstrated for the proposed works.
9. For the reasons set out above and having considered all matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Jon Heuch

INSPECTOR