



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 14 January 2026

by R M Nicholson MArb MICFor FArborA

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 30 January 2026

Appeal Ref: APP/TPO/F2605/10680

44 Valley Road Chandler's Ford Hampshire, SO53 1GP

- 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 Emily Price against the decision of Eastleigh Borough Council.
 - The application Ref: T/25/99183, dated 4 April 2025, was refused by notice dated 13 May 2025.
 - The work proposed is T1 and T2 Birch - crown reduce & reshape by circa 1-1.5 m to suitable growth points, minimising pruning cuts to 50 mm in diameter.
 - The relevant TPO is Tree Preservation Order No. 460 Two Silver Birches on boundary of 44 Valley Road, Chandlers Ford. 2002, which was confirmed on 17 December 2003.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are the effect of the proposed works on the character and appearance of the area; and whether the reasons given for the proposed works justifies that course of action.

Reasons

3. Turning to the first issue, Valley Road is in a residential area of mixed mainly 2 storey detached dwellings on the north western side of Chandlers Ford. 44 Valley Road is an established property standing on the corner of Neilson Close, a cul-de-sac development of more recent housing. The properties in Valley Road have established hedging on the boundaries and there are mature and early mature oaks and cypresses in several of the gardens and a wooded broadleaf belt surrounding the Neilson Close cul-de-sac.
4. The garden of No 14 is laid to lawn with a patio next to the house, some established beds on the boundaries and a dense laurel hedge facing Valley Road. The two Silver birch trees stand on the Neilson Close boundary on the east side of the rear garden which flanks Valley Road. The trees are early mature and grow close together to the point that the canopies merge into one. There are some old pruning wounds and branch stubs, the canopies are upright and the

branch ends have an attractive pendulous habit.

5. Valley Road drops down in level from the main Dursley Road to the west and No 44 is in the bottom of this dip. The two Silver birch trees are highly visible from Neilson Close, the junction of Heathlands Road opposite and Valley Road to the east but the views from the west are limited by the change in levels and other vegetation in other properties. The trees are an important feature in the landscape and make a significant contribution to the character and appearance of the area.
6. In light of this, the proposed reduction of the trees would adversely alter their appearance causing harm to the character and appearance of the area and the work would therefore need a clear and convincing justification. It is to those reasons, the second main issue, to which I now turn.
7. The reasons given for the work on the application form is ongoing routine maintenance and management. There is no evidence before me of periodic management of either tree, both have attractive natural weeping canopies with no evidence of pruning. The area has maturing tree cover and there is no sign of recent development or changes to the surroundings of these established trees to suggest an increase in exposure to wind. The works would remove many of the weeping branch ends which would have an adverse impact on the appearance of the trees.
8. With any application to prune protected trees, a balancing exercise needs to be undertaken. The essential need for the works applied for must be weighed against the resultant impact on the contribution the trees make to the amenity of the area. In this case the proposed pruning of the trees would cause considerable harm to the natural appearance of both trees and therefore to the character and appearance of the area and, in my judgement, insufficient compelling justification has been demonstrated for the proposed work.
9. Accordingly, for the reasons set out above and having considered all matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

RM Nicholson

INSPECTOR