

# APPENDIX 15

## Review of Trees Bromsgrove District Council Tree Preservation Order (11) 2017 in view of the issues raised in Barton Hyett Associates report date 24<sup>th</sup> November 2017.

The access to the site and trees has been greatly improved by the management of ground flora and epically Brambles from that available on the occasion of earlier survey opportunities which has helped greatly in being able to survey the trees in detail. Also they are now in full leaf drop with has helped in being able survey their structural condition and particularly the condition of the crown structures and identify any defects.

Having further surveyed the trees on the site on the 8<sup>th</sup> December 2017 and in view of the items of objection raised in the Barton Hyett Associates report I proposed to remove the following trees for the reasons stated (following the order in the provisional tree preservation order attached at Appendix 1 of the Report).

T5: Willow (Which was wrongly recorded as an Ash on the earlier schedules produced): The tree is not of great quality or prominence only being very slightly visible from outside of the site and is only a relatively short expected life span tree. It is of multi stem growth habit which will most likely lead to it losing stems in the longer term future which is likely to compromise its longer term quality sustainability.

T10: Ash: The tree has been heavily crown reduced in the past. Although the tree has produced good regrowth from most pruning points since its last pruning there are a number of pruning points that have developed die back or suffered Squirrel damage. Therefore there is a high future risk of structural failures occurring within the crown from these earlier pruning points as the tree matures. To manage this would require the regular pruning of the tree which would have a major detrimental influence on its visual amenity value and general quality.

T17: Willow: The tree is in good growth and does have reasonable level of prominence being partially visible from outside of the site. But it has been heavily pruned on the Northern side to achieve the required safety clearance from the overhead power lines. This has led the tree to produce a heavily asymmetrical crown to the Southern side. The power line clearance is a statutory requirement and the power company a have the right statutory to perform this work. Therefore this tree will undoubtedly have to receive more heavy crown management in the future which will greatly affect it visual amenity value and quality. It is also a short life span tree so on reflection this tree should be removed from the order.

T18:Oak: On closer inspection it is clear that there is extensive Squirrel damage within the crown to a level that would have a potential to cause major structural failures occur within the crown as it matures.

T19:Apple: TPO Guidance advises that Fruit trees can be protected if the Local Planning Authority believe it to be in the interest of amenity to do so. I feel that this

tree does not offer a high enough degree of amenity value. Its maturity and condition would lead to a low life expectancy than thought on first inspection.

G3 on latest revised plan (G4 on plan referenced in the Barton Hayett Associates report dated 24<sup>th</sup> November): 1 x Pear 4 x Apple) : TPO Guidance advises that Fruit trees can be protected if the Local Planning Authority believe it to be in the interest of amenity to do so. I feel that on further reflection this group of trees although being partially visible from Linthurst Newtown does not offer a high enough degree of amenity value only the end tree being visible. They have also been unmaintained for lengthy period of time and therefore would potentially require extensive crown management to improve their condition which would greatly impact on their amenity value. They are also fully mature trees and would therefore in view of their age and condition they would have a lower life expectancy than thought on first inspection.

In addition to the removal of these trees from the order the size of Group 1 has been reduced to show clearly which three Cypress trees are protected by the TPO. In reducing the size it has been necessary to remove the horse chestnut tree which was within the original G1 and protect it as an individual tree. It is now listed as T5 in the revised schedule.

Also the description of the trees covered within Group 2 (formerly G3 in the original provisional order) has been made more detailed in the revised schedule as there are more Sycamore trees in this group than were listed within the schedule. The amendments **do not** expand the group to include any more trees but make it clear that the trees protected in this group are the ones that accord with the dimensions listed in the schedule.