

PLANNING APPLICATION NUMBER:P13/0338

Type of approval sought	Tree Preservation Order
Ward	Norton
Applicant	Mr C. Davis
Location:	LAND BETWEEN REAR 32 MELROSE AVENUE AND PUBLIC FOOTPATH, STOURBRIDGE, DY8 2LE
Proposal	PART A - FELL 1 OAK TREE PART B - FELL 1 OAK TREE AND PRUNE 2 OAK TREES
Recommendation Summary:	PART APPROVE & PART REFUSE (SPLIT DEC'N)

SITE AND SURROUNDINGS

1. The trees subject to this application are 2 mature oak trees and 2 early mature oak trees that are located on a strip of land between the rear boundary fence of 32 Melrose Avenue and the adjacent public open space. The trees form part of a linear feature of oak trees, most likely an old hedgerow boundary, which runs down the side of the open space. Rather than being a formal avenue the linear feature is made up of a couple of clumps of oak trees interspersed with hawthorn trees. The two largest trees are considered to provide a high amount of amenity to the surrounding area, one of the smaller trees is considered to provide a moderate amount of amenity to the area, and the remaining tree is considered to provide a moderate to low amount of amenity to the surrounding area.
2. The trees are protected under A5 of TPO 112 that was served in 1980. This is an area based Order covering multiple trees.

PROPOSAL

3. Summary of proposals for the works as written on application form is as follows:
 - PART A - Fell 1 oak tree;
 - PART B – Fell 1 oak tree, Prune 2 Oak trees by removal of lower branches.
4. The trees have been marked on the attached plan.

HISTORY

5. There has been one previous Tree Preservation Order application on these trees.

Application No	Proposal	Decision	Date
P08/1020	Prune various trees	Approved subject to conditions	12/08/2008

PUBLIC CONSULTATION

6. No public representations have been received.

ASSESSMENT

Tree(s) Appraisal

<i>Tree Structure</i>	Tree 1	Tree 2
Species	Oak	Oak
Height (m)	14	11
Spread (m)	12	6
DBH (mm)	700	300
Canopy Architecture	Good	Good
Overall Form	Good	Moderate - Suppressed
Age Class <i>Yng / EM / M / OM / V</i>	Mature	Early Mature

Structural Assessment

Trunk / Root Collar	Good	Good
Scaffold Limbs	Good	Good
Secondary Branches	Good	Good
% Deadwood	3%	5%
Root Defects	None Evident	None Evident
Root Disturbance	None Evident	None Evident
Other		

Failure Foreseeable Imm / Likely / Possible / No	Whole No	Part No	Whole No	Whole No
--	-------------	------------	-------------	-------------

Vigour Assessment

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

Overall

Assessment

Structure	Good	Good
Vigour	Good	Good
Overall Health	Good	Good

Other Issues

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

Amenity

Assessment

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

<i>Tree Structure</i>	Tree 3	Tree 4
Species	Oak	Oak
Height (m)	10	12
Spread (m)	6	8
DBH (mm)	300	550
Canopy Architecture	Moderate	Moderate
Overall Form	Moderate	Moderate / Good
Age Class <i>Yng / EM / M / OM / V</i>	Early Mature	Mature

*Structural
Assessment*

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

Vigour Assessment

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

*Overall
Assessment*

Structure	Good	Good
Vigour	Good	Good
Overall Health	Good	Good

Other Issues

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

**Amenity
Assessment**

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

Further Assessment

7. The applicant has proposed to fell two oak trees (T2 & T3) and to prune 2 oak trees by removing the lowest branch from either trees (T1 & T4). The proposal to fell the two trees has been made due to concerns about the condition of the trees and the proposal to prune the 2 trees has been made with a view to improving the visual balance of the trees.
8. On inspection all trees were found to be in a reasonable condition with no major defects present. It was noted that trees 2 & 3 did have some deadwood throughout the crown, but this was not considered to be symptomatic of poor health, more a response to suppression by the adjacent trees.
9. Given that the two trees that are proposed to be felled were found to be in a good condition, it is not considered appropriate to allow the felling of the trees for this reason.
10. However it was noted that tree 2, by virtue of its location, is predominantly screened from public view by tree 1. It is also considered that this tree is impairing the form of tree 1 & tree 3 due to competition between the branches. Overall, whilst the removal of the tree is not considered appropriate due to its condition, it is considered that its removal would allow for the better long term growth of the adjacent trees without having any significant impact on the amenity of the area. As such it is considered that the removal of this tree should be approved. Due to the surrounding trees it is not considered that a replacement tree will be required in this instance.
11. The proposed pruning involve the removal of the lowest branch on the southern side of tree 1 and the removal of the lowest branch on the northern side of tree 4. Both of these branches are relatively minor branches, and it is not considered that their removal will have any detrimental impact on the amenity or long term health of the trees. As such it is recommended that the proposed pruning to the trees is approved.
12. Overall it is considered that the proposed pruning works to tree 1 & 4, and the proposed felling of tree 2 are appropriate and it is recommended that they are

approved. It is not considered that the felling of tree 3 has been sufficiently justified and therefore it is recommended that the felling of this tree is refused.

CONCLUSION

13. The applicant has proposed to fell two oak trees and to prune 2 oak trees by removing a single lower branch from each tree.
14. On inspection it was considered that the felling of one of the trees (tree 2) and the pruning of the 2 trees (tree 1 & 4) is acceptable and should be approved. It is not considered that the felling of tree 3 is appropriate, and it is recommended that this part of the application should be refused.

RECOMMENDATION

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

Reason For Approval

16. Overall it is considered that the proposed pruning of the two oak trees and the felling of the one oak tree (tree 2) will have little impact on the amenity of the area, whilst appearing the visual form of the trees to be retained.

Conditions and/or reasons:

1. Notwithstanding any of the details on the submitted application forms, the works hereby approved are as follows: -
Schedule:
T1 - Oak (described as tree 'A' on application form) - remove lowest branch (shown marked with 'X' on the application form) on southern side of the crown.
T2 - Oak (described as tree 'B' on application form) - Fell to ground level.
T4 - Oak (described as tree 'D' on application form) - remove lowest branch (shown marked with 'X' on the application form) on northern side of the crown.
2. The tree works subject of this consent shall be carried out in accordance with British Standard BS 3998:2010 'Recommendations for Treework'.
The southernmost of the oak trees to be felled (described as tree 'C' on the application form) is considered to provide a moderate amount of amenity to the surrounding area, as part of the informal linear feature of oak trees. It is not considered that the felling of this tree, and the resultant loss of public amenity, has been adequately justified, especially as on inspection it was not considered that the tree was in a poor condition. The deadwood present within the crown can be removed without permission

Sports Ground



T1 88.1m
T2
T3
T4

MELROSE AVENUE

88.1m

