PLANNING APPLICATION NUMBER:P13/0116

Type of approval sought		Tree Preservation Order		
Ward		Belle Vale		
Applicant		Mr D. Saunders		
Location:	LAND TO THE MIDLANDS, E	E REAR OF 32 LINNET CLOSE, HALESOWEN WEST 362 8TW		
Proposal	TREE BY 25%	MORE TREES. CROWN REDUCE 1 SYCAMORE 6; CROWN LIFT 1 SYCAMORE TREE TO 4 METRES; 2 SYCAMORE TREES TO 4 METRES AND CROWN		
Recommendation Summary:	APPROVE SU	IBJECT TO CONDITIONS		

SITE AND SURROUNDINGS

- 1. The trees subject to this application are 6 early mature sycamore trees and 3 mature sycamore trees that are located on the former railway embankment behind 32 Linnet Close, Halesowen. The trees from part of a linear feature of trees that runs along the railway embankment. The group of trees is highly viable in the area above the adjacent properties. As part of the wider group the trees collectively provide a high amount of amenity to the area, but on an individual level the trees subject to this application provide a low to moderate amount of amenity to the area.
- 2. The trees are protected under W1 of TPO 139 that was served in 1983.

PROPOSAL

- 3. Summary of proposals for the works as written on application form is as follows:
 - Fell 5 sycamore trees (T3, T4, T5, T6 & T7);
 - Crown lift 1 sycamore tree (T2);
 - Crown lift and crown thin 2 sycamore trees (T8 & T9);
 - Crown reduce 1 Sycamore Tree (T1).
- 4. The trees have been marked on the attached plan.

HISTORY

5. There have been no previous Tree Preservation Order applications on these trees.

PUBLIC CONSULTATION

6. No public representations have been received.

ASSESSMENT Tree(s) Appraisal

Tree Structure	Tr	ee 1	Tre	e 2	Tre	Tree 3		ee 4
Species	Syca	umore	Syca	more	Syca	nore	Syca	umore
Height (m)	-	12	8	3		7		5
Spread (m)		6	2	1		3		3
DBH (mm)	5	00	30	00	25	50	2	50
Canopy Architecture	G	bod	Mode	erate	Mode	erate	Мос	lerate
Overall Form	G	bod	Good		Poc Suppr			or – ressed
Age Class Yng / EM / M / OM / V	Ма	ture	Early Mature		Early N	Nature	Early	Mature
Structural Assessment								
Trunk / Root Collar	G	boc	Good		Go	od	G	boc
Scaffold Limbs	G	bod	Go	od	Good		Good	
Secondary Branches	G	boc	Go	od	Good		Good	
% Deadwood		5%	5	%	3	%	-	7%
Root Defects	None	Evident	None E	vident	None E	vident	None	Evident
Root Disturbance	None	Evident	None E	Evident	None E	vident	None	Evident
Other								
Failure Foreseeable Imm / Likely / Possible / No	Whole No	Part No	Whole No	Part No	Whole No	Part No	Whole No	Part No

Vigour Assessment

Vascular Defects	None Evident	None Evident	None Evident	None Evident
Foliage Defects	None Evident	None Evident	None Evident	None Evident
Leaf Size	Not In Leaf	Not In Leaf	Not In Leaf	Not In Leaf
Foliage Density	Not In Leaf	Not In Leaf	Not In Leaf	Not In Leaf
Other				

Overall

Assessment

Structure	Good	Good	Good	Good
Vigour	Good	Good	Good	Good
Overall Health	Good	Good	Good	Good

Other Issues

Light Obstruction	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Physical Damage	None Evident	None Evident	None Evident	None Evident
Surface Disruption	None Evident	None Evident	None Evident	None Evident
Debris	Some	Some	Some	Some

<u>Amenity</u>

<u>Assessment</u>

Visible	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Prominence	Moderate / High	Moderate / High	Moderate	Moderate
Part of Wider Feature?	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Characteristic of Area	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Amenity Value	Moderate	Moderate	Low	Low

Tree Structure	Tree 5	Tree 6	Tree 7	Tree 8
Species	Sycamore	Sycamore	Sycamore	Sycamore
Height (m)	7	5	6	12
Spread (m)	3	2	3	6
DBH (mm)	250	150	200	300 & 200
Canopy Architecture	Moderate - previously topped	Poor– suppressed	Poor – suppressed	Moderate
Overall Form	Poor	Poor	Poor	Moderate / Good
Age Class Yng / EM / M / OM / V	Early Mature	Early Mature	Early Mature	Mature

Structural

Assessment				
Trunk / Root	Cood	Cood	Cood	Cood
Collar	Good	Good	Good	Good
Scaffold Limbs	Moderate – previously topped	Good	Moderate – horizontal limb on back side with excessive	Good

					d	ecay		
Secondary Branches	Good		Good		Good		Good	
% Deadwood	3%		5	%	5%			5%
Root Defects	None Evident		None E	vident	None Evident		None Evident	
Root Disturbance	None Evident		None Evident		None	Evident	None	Evident
Other								
Failure Foreseeable Imm / Likely / Possible / No	Whole No	Part No	Whole No	Part No	Whole No	Part Possible	Whole No	Part No

Vigour Assessment

Vascular Defects	None Evident	None Evident	None Evident	None Evident
Foliage Defects	None Evident	None Evident	None Evident	None Evident
Leaf Size	Not In Leaf	Not In Leaf	Not In Leaf	Not In Leaf
Foliage Density	Not In Leaf	Not In Leaf	Not In Leaf	Not In Leaf
Other				

Overall

Assessment

Structure	Good	Good	Moderate	Good
Vigour	Good	Good	Good	Good
Overall Health	Good	Good	Moderate	Good / Moderate

Other Issues

Light Obstruction	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Physical Damage	None Evident	None Evident	None Evident	None Evident
Surface Disruption	None Evident	None Evident	None Evident	None Evident
Debris	Some	Some	Some	Some

<u>Amenity</u>

<u>Assessment</u>				
Visible	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Prominence	Low	Low	Low	Moderate / High
Part of Wider Feature?	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Characteristic of Area	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Amenity Value	Low	Low	Low	Moderate

Tree Structure	Tree 9
Species	Sycamore
Height (m)	12
Spread (m)	6

DBH (mm)	250 & 200	
Canopy	Moderate	
Architecture		
Overall Form	Good	
Age Class Yng / EM / M / OM / V	Mature	
Structural		

Assessment

Trunk / Root Collar	Good	
Scaffold Limbs	G	ood
Secondary Branches	Good	
% Deadwood		5%
Root Defects	None	Evident
Root Disturbance	None	Evident
Other		
Failure Foreseeable	Whole	Part
Imm / Likely / Possible	No	No
/ No		

Vigour Assessment

Vascular Defects	None Evident
Foliage Defects	None Evident
Leaf Size	Not In Leaf
Foliage Density	Not In Leaf
Other	

Overall Assessment

Assessment	
Structure	Good
Vigour	Good
Overall Health	Good

<u>Other Issues</u>

Light Obstruction	Yes
Physical Damage	None Evident
Surface Disruption	None Evident
Debris	Some

<u>Amenity</u>

<u>Assessment</u>

Visible	Yes	
Prominence	Moderate /	
	High	
Part of Wider	Yes	
Feature?	163	

Characteristic of	Yes	
Area Amenity Value	Moderate	

Further Assessment

- 7. The applicant has proposed to undertake the various works to the trees in order to allow more light to the rear of their property.
- 8. The trees subject to this application form part of a linear woodland that is situated on the sides and top of a former railway embankment that rises up from the rear boundaries of the properties in Linnet Close. At the rear of the applicants property the top of the embankment is approximately 7 metres higher than the rear garden of the property. The trees subject to the application are all growing alone the upper part of the embankment.
- 9. The applicant has proposed to prune the better trees and to remove a number of the smaller and poorer formed trees in order to create gaps in the trees to allow more light through to the rear garden and windows of their property.
- 10. It is considered that the trees that are proposed to be felled are all of a low amenity value, due to their limited size and aloes their poor form. The trees have grown up in competition with each other and as such have developed a poor suppressed form. As such these trees will never develop into good trees and it is considered that their removal is appropriate. The applicant has proposed to plant 4 hawthorn trees as replacements, which will be distributed across the embankment at the rear of the property.
- 11. The proposed pruning is relatively minor, with one tree being reduced by 25%, one tree being slightly crown lifted and the other two trees being crown lifted and crown thinned. These works are all considered appropriate and will not have any detrimental impact on the amenity of the area or the long term health of the trees, whilst increasing the amount of light received by the property.
- 12. Overall it is considered that the proposed works are all acceptable and as such it is recommended that the application is approved.

CONCLUSION

- 13. The applicant has proposed to fell 5 sycamore trees and to prune 4 sycamore trees in order to increase the amount of light that reaches the rear garden and elevation of the property.
- 14. The 5 trees to be felled are all suppressed and poorly formed trees. As such it is not considered that there will be any detrimental impact on the amenity of the area as a result of the felling.
- 15. The proposed pruning is relatively minor and the trees to be pruned will still continue to provide a useful amount of amenity to the area for years to come.
- 16. Overall it is considered that all of the proposed works are appropriate and justified. As such it is recommended that the application is approved.

RECOMMENDATION

17. It is recommended that application is approved subject to the stated conditions set out below.

Reason For Approval

Overall it is considered that the proposed works are justified and appropriate by virtue of the condition of the trees and their locations. The proposed works will have little impact on the amenity of the area, whilst ensuring the trees are maintained in a state appropriate for their locations.

Conditions and/or reasons:

- 1. The tree works subject of this consent shall be carried out in accordance with British Standard BS 3998:2010 `Recommendations for Treework'.
- 2. Four replacement trees shall be planted between the beginning of November and the end of March, within 1 year of felling (and replanted if necessary) and maintained until satisfactorily established. The size, species and location of the replacement trees shall be agreed in writing with the Local Planning authority prior to the felling of the trees to which this application relates.

