

TPO (2) 2015.

[REDACTED]
Bromsgrove
Worcestershire B60 2NF

Head of Legal
Equalities and Democratic Services,
Bromsgrove District Council
The Council House
Burcot Lane
Bromsgrove
Worcestershire B60 1AA

10 April 2015

Subject: Tree Preservation Order ● College Road, Bromsgrove

Dear Sir,

I write to object to the tree preservation order at ● College Road, Bromsgrove. I purchased this property in January 2015. During the purchase process the local authority search by Bromsgrove Council confirmed that there were no tree preservation orders at the property. I purchased the property on this basis. I would not have purchased this property if it had a TPO. I pulled out of my previous purchase in The Oakalls due to a TPO.

As the owner of ● College Road, the proposed TPO has the greatest impact on this property. The garden is narrower than all the other properties in the TPO. The property also had been empty for some time before purchase and was previously rented out. No garden maintenance had been carried out in recent times. It was my intention to clean up and improve the garden situation at the property, put a drive in the front and garage at the back. The TPO would prevent these activities.

Both my parents are in their 80's and getting access to the house for them was considered during the purchase process. The rear access is very poor and unmaintained and not that easy for my mother to negotiate in a car. College Road itself has parking restrictions. So I decided to put in a drive on the front and renovate the path to the house. The dropped kerb application was already made when Bromsgrove Council prevented me from cutting down the tree at the front of the property. It is not practical to park a car under such a large tree as the car will be damaged by bird excrement and leaves. I am not permitted to build any structure in front of the building line of the house. So I need to remove this tree so I can put a drive on the front of the property to allow my aging parents access.

7 College Road have a large tree in the central part of the front garden. This tree stretches about 3/4 of the way across my garden. My main path from the road to the house passes under this tree. My lawn and path are covered in bird excrement and the

path is disturbed by the roots. My 3 year old will face a hazard of playing in the garden with so much bird excrement present. It is not fair to have a TPO on this tree which is giving so much impact to my garden. I should be able to agree a course of action with the neighbour to resolve these issues.

Yours sincerely,

A large, solid black rectangular redaction covers the signature area of the letter.

TPO(2)2015

[REDACTED]
College Road
Bromsgrove

B60 2NF

14th April 2015

Your Reference KS/TPO (2) 2015

Bromsgrove District Council Tree Preservation order (No2) 2015

Trees on land at 7-21 College Road Bromsgrove

Dear Sir or Madam

I am responding to your letter dated 4th March and referenced as above concerning the "tree preservation order" which has a direct impact on all trees on my private property at [REDACTED] Bromsgrove, clearly defined within your Schedule 1 which was enclosed with your communication.

My areas of concern and objection are as follows.

1. I currently have outstanding approved planning permission to erect a double garage at the front of my property within my grounds, which was granted along with planning permission for a considerable house extension. The erecting of the double garage will require several trees to be totally removed to allow the approved plans to be exercised.

How will my planning permissions be affected or will my planning permission, given it was approved prior to this tree preservation order, still be fully applicable.

2. Why has the tree preservation order only been applied to one side of College road and impacting house numbers 7-21 only, which also is not the full extent of this side of College Road. No explanation is given as to why this is the case. Also the land behind College Road at the rear entrances to the properties shown in Schedule 1 and numbered as "17" on the map has many large mature trees on this land...many of which are far greater in size and benefit to the interests of local amenities. My question is why is this area not covered by the preservation order?

3 The nature of some of the trees within my property require regular upkeep during the course of a normal years gardening, ie pruning, trimming (as some overhang my driveway and the public footpath in college road) and removal of broken branches (wind damage). The impact of this tree preservation order seems to prevent, without approval, such upkeep and general tidiness in both my private garden and the overall street appearance.

A weighty burden seems to now be placed on myself and other residents which seems unnecessary to keep our properties tidy and in keeping with the mature nature of the road itself.

4. I would like the local authority to consider specifying which individual trees, rather than the blanket "all trees" should be covered by this preservation order as I fully understand the need to keep many of the trees that exist today in the road. Given some of the species of trees that exist in my own property which are either very fast growing "pine tree" type of trees or others which over many years prior to me acquiring the property have not been pruned, managed and now take up copious amounts of ground and light, then I feel an individual assessment of what trees would be best served by this order should be considered.

I look forward to your responses to my questions and challenges.

Yours Sincerely

A thick black horizontal bar redacting the signature of the sender.

TPO(2)2015

[Redacted]
[Redacted]
Bromsgrove
Worcestershire B60 2NF
United Kingdom.
[Redacted]
[Redacted]

18th March 2015

Dear Mrs Sodhi,

Town and Country Planning Act 1990
Bromsgrove District Council Tree Preservation Order [No.2] 2015
Trees on land at 7-21 College Road, Bromsgrove.

I acknowledge receipt of your letter dated 4th March together with various enclosures.

This property is surrounded by approximately 38 conifers which are maintained to a very high standard on a regular three year cycle by a firm of long established Tree Surgeons and have been since I purchased this property over 30 years ago.

I speak from experience that unless I am allowed to continue to control the height and width of these conifers they will grow out of control, to an unacceptable and dangerous height/width which will be a danger to both property and pedestrians alike.

I look forward to hearing from you in due course.

Yours faithfully,

[Redacted]
[Redacted]

Mrs K. Sodhi,
Legal Equalities and Democratic Services,
Bromsgrove District Council,
The Council House,
Burcot Lane,
Bromsgrove,
Worcestershire, B60 1AA.

Reviewed 14th April 2014.

TPO(2)2015

[REDACTED]

BROMSGROVE

WORCS

BWD 2NF

TO WHOM IT MAY CONCERN

I wish to lodge an objection to the pulling down of the beech tree at number 11 College Rd. This tree is opposite my house & to pull it down would be a travesty, & also open up a very untidy sight which I would be viewing everyday.

Yours sincerely

[REDACTED]

TPO (2) 2015


Bromsgrove

Worcestershire

B60 2NF

25th March 2015

Dear Sir or Madam,

I am writing in support of the beautiful Copper Beech at 9 College Rd.

I have lived in College Rd. for 24 years and have always enjoyed and appreciated the changing seasons displayed in the Copper Beech. It is a magnificent specimen, it is truly beautiful and I am extremely passionate about preserving it.

College Rd has several mature trees which give the street character and enhances the general environment.

Please protect this tree.

Yours faithfully



TPO Tree Evaluation Sheet

Evaluation by: **AHB** Date: July 2015 Sheet No. 1 of 4

Address/Site Details:

7 & 9 College Road, Bromsgrove

Tree Ref	Species	DBH (mm)	Amenity Assessment			Other factors	Expediency	Score	TPO Y/N?	Address	Notes
			Condition	Longevity	Visibility						
A1	Copper Beech	400	5	5	5	15	2	19	Y	7 College Rd	Adjacent to driveway / footpath / service routes
A2	Dogwood	m600	3	3	2	8	1	11		7 College Rd	
A3	Purple hazel	m800	5	5	2	12	2	16	Y	7 College Rd	Adjacent to driveway / footpath / service routes
A4	Cedar	800	5	5	4	14	5	21	Y	7 College Rd	Driveway proposed next door
A5	Strawberry Tree	400	4	4	2	10	1	13		7 College Rd	
A6	Japanese maple	m800	3	4	2	9	1	11		7 College Rd	
A7	Robinia	500	3	4	3	10	1	12		7 College Rd	
A8	Purple Beech	600	4	5	5	14	5	21	Y	9 College Rd	Proposed driveway
A9	Magnolia	200	3	2	1	6	5	12		9 College Rd	Proposed driveway
G1	2xCypress	400	3	4	3	10	2	13		9 College Rd	
A10	Blue Cedar	600	3	4	3	10	2	13		9 College Rd	Poor form, Suppressed by T11 & G1
A11	Silver Birch	400	5	4	3	12	2	16	Y	9 College Rd	
A12	Cedar	600	5	5	4	14	2	18	Y	11a College Rd	
A13	Swedish Birch	400	4	4	4	12	2	16	Y	11a College Rd	
A14	Swedish Birch	300	4	2	3	9	2	13		11a College Rd	suppressed by adjacent trees
A14a	Swedish Birch	200	4	2	3	9	2	13		11a College Rd	suppressed by adjacent trees

Trees must have accrued 7+ points (& no other factors)

Part 1: Amenity assessment

- a) Condition**
- 5) Good (highly suitable)
 - 4) Fair (suitable)
 - 3) Poor (unlikely)
 - 2) Unsafe
 - 1) Dead

- b) Longevity**
- 5) 100+
 - 4) 40 - 100
 - 3) 20 - 40 (suitable)
 - 2) 10 - 20 (just suitable)
 - 1) <10 (unsuitable)

c) Relative public visibility

- 5) Very large trees, or large trees that are prominent features (V lge=200sqm+)
- 4) Large trees, or medium trees clearly visible to the public (lge=100-200sqm)
- 3) Medium trees, or larger trees with limited view only (Suitable, med=25-100sqm)
- 2) Small trees, or larger ones visible only with difficulty (Unlikely, small = 5-25sqm)
- 1) Young/v.small or not publicly visible regardless of size (prob unsuitable, <5sqm)

d) Other factors

- 5) Principal components of arboricultural features, or veteran trees
- 4) Members of groups of trees that are important for their cohesion
- 3) Trees with significant historical or commemorative importance
- 2) Trees of particularly good form, especially if rare or unusual
- 1) Trees with none of the above additional redeeming features

Part 2: Expediency assessment

- 5) Known threat to tree
- 3) Foreseeable threat to tree
- 2) Perceived threat to tree
- 1) Precautionary only
- 0) Known as an actionable nuisance

Part 3: Decision guide

- Any 0 Do not apply TPO
- 1 - 6 TPO indefensible
- 7 - 11 Does not merit TPO
- 12 - 15 Possibly merits TPO
- 16+ Definitely merits TPO

TPO Tree Evaluation Sheet

Evaluation by: **AHB** Date: July 2015 Sheet No. 2 of 4

Address/Site Details: **11, 11a & 15 College Road, Bromsgrove**

Tree Ref	Species	DBH (mm)	Amenity Assessment			Expediency	Score	TPO Y/N?	Address	Notes
			Condition	Longevity	Visibility					
A15	Cypress	2x200	3	2	4	9	2	12	11a College Rd	
A15a	Cypress	400	3	2	2	7	2	10	11a College Rd	
A16	Silver Fir	200	4	2	2	8	2	11	11a College Rd	
A17	Hazel	m800	2	2	2	6	5	12	15 College Rd	Topped at 3m, garage application proposed
A18	Cherry	200	1	2	2	5	3	9	15 College Rd	
A19	Cypress	300	2	2	4	8	2	11	15 College Rd	Topped 8m
A20	Oak	150	2	2	2	6	2	9	15 College Rd	Topped 6m
A21	Cypress	300	2	2	4	8	2	11	15 College Rd	Topped 8m
A22	Cypress	150	2	2	3	7	2	10	15 College Rd	Topped 8m
A23	Cypress	150	2	2	3	7	2	10	15 College Rd	Topped 8m
A24	Cherry	m200	2	1	3	6	2	9	15 College Rd	suppressed by T25
A25	Holly	200	2	3	3	8	2	11	15 College Rd	Topped 8m
A26	Holly	200	2	3	2	7	3	11	15 College Rd	Topped 8m, garage application proposed
A27	Walnut	m200	2	2	2	6	3	11	15 College Rd	Topped 8m, garage application proposed
A28	Holly	300	2	3	2	7	2	10	15 College Rd	Topped 5m
A29	Birch	300	5	3	4	12	2	16	17 College Rd	

Trees must have accrued 7+ points (& no other factors)

Part 1: Amenity assessment

- a) **Condition**
 - 5) Good (highly suitable)
 - 3) Fair (suitable)
 - 1) Poor (unlikely)
 - 0) Unsafe
 - 0) Dead
- b) **Longevity**
 - 5) 100+
 - 4) 40 - 100
 - 3) 20 - 40 (suitable)
 - 1) 10 - 20 (just suitable)
 - 0) <10 (unsuitable)
- c) **Relative public visibility**
 - 5) Very large trees, or large trees that are prominent features (V/ige=200sqm+)
 - 4) Large trees, or medium trees clearly visible to the public (lge=100-200sqm)
 - 3) Medium trees, or larger trees with limited view only (Suitable, med=25-100sqm)
 - 2) Small trees, or larger ones visible only with difficulty (Unlikely, small = 5-25sqm)
 - 1) Young/v.small or not publicly visible regardless of size (prob unsuitable, <5sqm)
- d) **Other factors**
 - 5) Principal components of arboricultural features, or veteran trees
 - 4) Members of groups of trees that are important for their cohesion
 - 3) Trees with significant historical or commemorative importance
 - 2) Trees of particularly good form, especially if rare or unusual
 - 1) Trees with none of the above additional redeeming features

Part 2: Expediency assessment

- 5) Known threat to tree
- 3) Foreseeable threat to tree
- 2) Perceived threat to tree
- 1) Precautionary only
- 0) Known as an actionable nuisance

Part 3: Decision guide

- Any 0 Do not apply TPO
- 1 - 6 TPO indefensible
- 7 - 11 Does not merit TPO
- 12 - 15 Possibly merits TPO
- 16+ Definitely merits TPO

TPO Tree Evaluation Sheet

Evaluation by: **AHB** Date: July 2015 Sheet No. 3 of 4

Address/Site Details: **11, 11a & 15 College Road, Bromsgrove**

Tree Ref	Species	DBH (mm)	Amenity Assessment				Expediency	Score	TPO Y/N?	Address	Notes
			Condition	Longevity	Visibility	Sub					
A30	Hornbeam	300	3	3	4	10	2	13	19 College Rd	Topped 8m	
A31	Walnut	2x200	4	3	2	9	2	13	19 College Rd		
G2	8xCypress	200	2	3	3	8	1	11	19 College Rd	Forming boundary hedge	
A32	Ironwood?	200	3	2	2	7	1	10	19 College Rd		
A33	Hazel	200	3	4	2	9	1	12	19 College Rd		
A34	Holly	m150	2	4	4	10	1	13	21 College Rd	Topped 8m	
A35	Holly	3x150	2	4	4	10	1	13	21 College Rd	Topped 8m	
A36	Yew	150	3	5	2	10	1	13	21 College Rd		
A37	Cypress	400	2	4	4	10	1	13	21 College Rd	Topped 8m	
A38	Cypress	400	2	4	3	9	1	12	21 College Rd		
A39	Chestnut	300	3	3	2	8	1	11	21 College Rd		
A40	Cypress	400	2	4	3	9	1	12	21 College Rd	Topped 8m	
G3	10xCypress	3-400	2	4	3	9	1	12	21 College Rd	Forming boundary hedge	
A41	Cedar	600	5	5	4	14	2	18	21 College Rd		
A42	Birch	300	2	2	2	6	1	9	21 College Rd	Topped 8m	
A43	Cypress	300	2	3	2	7	1	10	21 College Rd	Topped 6m	

Part 1: Amenity assessment

a) Condition

- 5) Good (highly suitable)
- 3) Fair (suitable)
- 1) Poor (unlikely)
- 0) Unsafe
- 0) Dead

b) Longevity

- 5) 100+
- 4) 40 - 100
- 2) 20 - 40 (suitable)
- 1) 10 - 20 (just suitable)
- 0) <10 (unsuitable)

c) Relative public visibility

- 5) Very large trees, or large trees that are prominent features (V lge=200sqm+)
- 4) Large trees, or medium trees clearly visible to the public (lge=100-200sqm)
- 3) Medium trees, or larger trees with limited view only (Suitable, med=25-100sqm)
- 2) Small trees, or larger ones visible only with difficulty (Unlikely, small = 5-25sqm)
- 1) Young/v.small or not publicly visible regardless of size (prob unsuitable, <5sqm)

d) Other factors

- 5) Principal components of arboricultural features, or veteran trees
- 4) Members of groups of trees that are important for their cohesion
- 3) Trees with significant historical or commemorative importance
- 2) Trees of particularly good form, especially if rare or unusual
- 1) Trees with none of the above additional redeeming features

Part 2: Expediency assessment

- 5) Known threat to tree
- 3) Foreseeable threat to tree
- 2) Perceived threat to tree
- 1) Precautionary only
- 0) Known as an actionable nuisance

Part 3: Decision guide

- Any 0 Do not apply TPO
- 1 - 6 TPO indefensible
- 7 - 11 Does not merit TPO
- 12 - 15 Possibly merits TPO
- 16+ Definitely merits TPO

TPO Tree Evaluation Sheet

Evaluation by:		Date: 1st July 2015		Sheet No. 4		of 4				
AHB										
Address/Site Details:										
11, 11a & 15 College Road, Bromsgrove										
Tree Ref	Species	DBH (mm)	Amenity Assessment			Expediency	Score	TPO Y/N?	Address	Notes
			Condition	Longevity	Visibility					
Trees must have accrued 7+ points (& no zero)										
G4	7xCypress	300	2	3	2	7	2	10	21 College Rd	Topped 6m, forms boundary hedge
A44	Cedar	500	2	3	2	7	2	10	21 College Rd	Topped 8m
A45	Cherry	200	1	1	1	3	2	6	21 College Rd	Topped 6m, decayed stems
G5	5xCypress	200	2	4	3	9	2	12	21 College Rd	Topped 6m, forms boundary hedge
G6	15xCypress	300	2	4	3	9	2	12	21 College Rd	Topped 6m, forms boundary hedge
G7	11xCypress	300	2	4	4	10	2	13	21 College Rd	Topped 6m, forms boundary hedge
A46	Robinia	600	3	3	4	10	2	13	21 College Rd	Topped 12m
G8	3xCypress	300	3	3	2	8	2	11	21 College Rd	
G9	2xCypress,1xCherry	200	3	3	2	8	2	11	21 College Rd	
G10	3xCypress	200	3	4	3	10	2	13	21 College Rd	
A47	Scots Pine	400	3	4	3	10	2	13	19 College Rd	
A48	Cherry	300	2	3	2	7	2	10	19 College Rd	Damaging garage roof
A49	Norway maple	300	3	4	2	9	2	12	17 College Rd	
A50	Birch	150	4	3	2	9	2	12	15 College Rd	
A51	Cypress	m300	2	4	2	8	2	11	11a College Rd	Topped 6m
A52	Golden Cypress	300	4	4	2	10	2	13	11a College Rd	
A53	Cypress	m300	2	4	2	8	2	11	11a College Rd	collapsing crown, topped 6m
A54	Golden Cypress	300	4	4	2	10	2	13	11a College Rd	

Part 1: Amenity assessment

a) Condition

- 5) Good (highly suitable)
- 3) Fair (suitable)
- 1) Poor (unlikely)
- 0) Unsat
- 0) Dead

b) Longevity

- 5) 100+
- 4) 40 - 100
- 2) 20 - 40 (suitable)
- 1) 10 - 20 (just suitable)
- 0) <10 (unsuitable)

c) Relative public visibility

- 5) Very large trees, or large trees that are prominent features (V (ge=200sqm+))
- 4) Large trees, or medium trees clearly visible to the public (lge=100-200sqm)
- 3) Medium trees, or larger trees with limited view only (Suitable, med=25-100sqm)
- 2) Small trees, or larger ones visible only with difficulty (Unlikely, small = 5-25sqm)
- 1) Young/v.small or not publicly visible regardless of size (prob unsuitable, <5sqm)

d) Other factors

- 5) Principal components of arbicultural features, or veteran trees
- 4) Members of groups of trees that are important for their cohesion
- 3) Trees with significant historical or commemorative importance
- 2) Trees of particularly good form, especially if rare or unusual
- 1) Trees with none of the above additional redeeming features

Part 2: Expediency assessment

- 5) Known threat to tree
- 3) Irreversible threat to tree
- 2) Perceived threat to tree
- 1) Precautionary only
- 0) Known as an actionable nuisance

Part 3: Decision guide

Any 0 Do not apply TPO

1 - 6 TPO indefensible

7 - 11 Does not merit TPO

12 - 15 Possibly merits IPO

16+ Definitely merits IPO



104.9m

CHAPEL WALK

First Schedule**Trees specified individually**

(encircled in black on the map)

<u>No. on Map</u>	<u>Description</u>	<u>NGR</u>	<u>Situation</u>
T1	Beech	396257, 270665	Frontage of 7 College Road, Bromsgrove
T2	Purple Hazel	396247, 270671	Frontage of 7 College Road, Bromsgrove
T3	Cedar	396258, 270685	Frontage of 7 College Road, Bromsgrove
T4	Beech	396275, 270683	Frontage of 9 College Road, Bromsgrove
T5	Birch	396208, 270727	Rear of 9 College Road, Bromsgrove
T6	Swedish Birch	396284, 270699	Frontage of 11a College Road, Bromsgrove
T7	Cedar	396286, 270701	Frontage of 11a College Road, Bromsgrove
T8	Birch	396301, 270718	Frontage of 17 College Road, Bromsgrove
T9	Cedar	396323, 270753	Frontage of 21 College Road, Bromsgrove

Trees specified by reference to an area

(within a dotted black line on the map)

NONE**Groups of Trees**

(within a broken black line on the map)

NONE**Woodlands**

(within a continuous black line on the map)

NONE