

**PLANNING
COMMITTEE**

DATE 22/05/2025

**Tree Preservation Order (18 2024 Tree on land at 2 The Coppice, Hagley,
Worcestershire, DY8 2XZ**

Relevant Portfolio Holder	Cllr Kit Taylor
Portfolio Holder Consulted	No
Relevant Head of Service	Head of Planning and Environmental Services
Ward(s) Affected	Hagley
Ward Councillor(s) Consulted	No
Non-Key Decision	

1. SUMMARY OF PROPOSALS

- 1.1 The Committee is asked to consider the confirmation without modification of Tree Preservation Order (18) 2024, relating to a tree on land at 2 The Coppice, Hagley, Worcestershire, DY8 2XZ.

2. RECOMMENDATIONS

- 1.2 It is recommended that provisional Tree Preservation Order (18) 2024 is confirmed without modification and made permanent as provisionally raised and shown in appendix (1).

3. KEY ISSUES

Financial Implications

- 3.1 There are no financial implications relating to the confirmation of the TPO.

Legal Implications

- 3.3 Town and Country Planning (Trees) Regulations 2012 covers this procedure.

Service / Operational Implications

Background:

- 3.4 The provisional order was raised on the 19th December 2024 as shown in appendices (1) in response to an indication received by the Council that the owner of the tree at 2 The Coppice, Hagley intended to fell the Cedar tree at that property.

**PLANNING
COMMITTEE**

DATE 22/05/2025

A TEMPO (Tree Evaluation Method for Preservation Orders) was carried out on the tree within the order by David Whittles on 10th December 2024 which can be seen in appendix (2). This showed that the tree accrues a score worthy of consideration for TPO protection.

3.5 Three objections have been received in respect of the provisional TPO having been raised as follows and shown in appendix (3):

- A letter from Paul and Nicola Collins, 2 The Coppice Hagley dated 8th January 2025.
- A letter from Stuart and Emma Booton, 3 The Coppice, Hagley dated 8th January 2025.
- A letter from Mrs Joan Cope, 11 Sweetpool Lane, Hagley dated 19th January 2025.

My comments in relation to the issues raised in the objection are as follows:

Public Amenity Value: The tree does stand within the grounds of a property served by a private road serving 9 houses, but the tree is still visible from the public highway at Sweetpool Lane and side roads and paths nearby. This is shown in several photos in appendices (4). The claim that the tree is an “eyesore” and “lacks any local amenity value” are subjective. A TEMPO assessment has been carried out and indicates that the tree definitely merits a TPO.

Safety Issues: The initial request to remove the tree came in on the 9th December 2024, immediately after Storm Darragh had dissipated. Prior to this, the tree was subject to an Arboricultural survey in relation to a proposed extension at No.2 The Coppice. No safety issues were recorded either in this report or by the Tree Officer’s visit in regard to the Planning Application. The behaviour of a tree in a large storm can be alarming to witness, but it is these dynamic properties that allow a tree to withstand the complex loading forces produced by wind - and are not necessarily representative of day-to-day life. The ability of the Cedar to withstand a storm such as Darragh with only minor damage can also be seen as an indicator of the quality of the tree.

General Deris Fall Nuisance: All trees do unfortunately bring a level of leaf and minor stature deadwood twig / branch fall all of which is due to the natural growth habit of the tree. I feel that this is an acceptable nuisance in view of the level of influence the tree has on the properties this instance and taking into account the

**PLANNING
COMMITTEE**

DATE 22/05/2025

quality of the tree and the value it has to offer to the landscape and character of the area.

Risk Of Root Invasion: It has been highlighted that the roots of the tree are affecting the driveway at No.2. and it is suggested that the roots could, in future, affect the foundations of the property. Some Root activity has to be expected when living near trees. This tree significantly pre-dates the surrounding properties, and the houses at the Coppice have been there since the early 2000's with no reported influence of the tree on foundations. These are modern houses and as such would be expected to have high quality and robust foundations and infrastructure. Even if root intrusion were the case, there are engineering solutions such as root barrier systems that can help mitigate these issues.

3.6 Policy Implications- None
HR Implications- None
Council Objective 4- Environment, Priority C04 Planning

3.7 Climate Change / Carbon/ Biodiversity- The proposal in relation to confirming the TPO can only be seen as a positive impact on the environment.

Customer / Equalities and Diversity Implications

3.8 The customers have been provided with the relevant notification and the responses received are attached in the appendices. The customers will receive notification by post of the decision of the committee.

3.9 Equalities and Diversity implications- None

4. RISK MANAGEMENT

4.1 There are no significant risks associated with the details included in this report.

5. APPENDICES

List Appendices.

Appendix (1) Schedule and Plan of Provisional Order as raised.

Appendix (2) Tempo Assessment

Appendix (3) Letters of Objection

Appendix (4) Photographs

Appendix (5) Arb Report by Jim Unwin

6. BACKGROUND PAPERS

Arboricultural Report produced by Jim Unwin in relation to the proposed extension at No.2 The Coppice.

7. KEY

TPO - Tree Preservation Order

TEMPO – Tree Evaluation Method for Preservation Orders

7.1 Conclusion and recommendations:

I feel that the Cedar within this order offers a valuable level of visual amenity value, being visible from the local public road network and pathways, and adds considerably to the character of the estate and landscaping of the area. It has a considerable future life span and although it may need periodic crown management due to the constraints of the growing position and existing bracing, it is sustainable in the longer term within the infrastructure of the estate.

During the recent planning application there was no mention of removing the tree to facilitate an extension and indeed, the extension was designed to work with the tree, with pile and beam foundations to protect the root system. The attached tree survey from this application categorised the Cedar as “B1” under BS 5837:2012 (Trees in relation to design, demolition and construction). This classification also indicates that this is a tree is worthy of retention.

Therefore, I recommend to the committee that Tree Preservation Order (18) 2024 is confirmed and made permanent without modification as shown in appendix (1) of this report.

AUTHOR OF REPORT

Name: David Whittles

Email: David.Whittles@bromsgroveandredditch.gov.uk

Tel: 01527 881600