

Report No.
TPO2437

London Borough of Bromley

PART 1 - PUBLIC

Decision Maker: Plans Sub Committee 2

Date: 8th December 2011

Decision Type: Non-Urgent Non-Executive Non-Key

Title: **OBJECTIONS TO TREE PRESERVATION ORDER 2437 at
2 PONDFIELD ROAD, ORPINGTON**

Contact Officer: Coral Gibson, Principal Tree Officer
Tel: 020 8313 4516 E-mail: coral.gibson@bromley.gov.uk

Chief Officer: Bob McQuillan - Chief Planner

Ward: Farnborough and Crofton

1. Reason for report

To consider objections that have been made in respect of the making of a tree preservation order.

2. **RECOMMENDATION(S)**

The Chief Planner advises that whilst the trees currently make an important contribution to the visual amenity of the street scene pruning works will be necessary because of damage to the adjoining property. These pruning works will seriously reduce the amenity value of the trees and it is recommended that the order should not be confirmed.

Corporate Policy

1. Policy Status: Existing policy.
 2. BBB Priority: Quality Environment.
-

Financial

1. Cost of proposal: No cost
 2. Ongoing costs: N/A.
 3. Budget head/performance centre: Planning Division Budget
 4. Total current budget for this head: £3.3m
 5. Source of funding: Existing revenue budget
-

Staff

1. Number of staff (current and additional): 103.89ftes
 2. If from existing staff resources, number of staff hours: N/A
-

Legal

1. Legal Requirement: Statutory requirement.
 2. Call-in: Call-in is not applicable.
-

Customer Impact

1. Estimated number of users/beneficiaries (current and projected): Those affected by the tree preservation order.
-

Ward Councillor Views

1. Have Ward Councillors been asked for comments? No.
2. Summary of Ward Councillors comments: N/A

3. COMMENTARY

- 3.1. This order was made on 8th September 2011 and relates to a larch and maple tree in the front garden. Objections have been received from the owner of the adjoining property. His concerns relate to the possible impact of the trees on the path, drive, garage and house and he also expressed concern about the risks of the trees falling in a high wind and damaging his property.
- 3.2. He was advised that with regard to the cracking of the drive and path, there are several options for the repair of driveways which need not adversely affect the trees. If total replacement of the driveway were required, again there are technical solutions which may allow the retention of the trees without damage. The owner has had part of the drive lifted to expose tree roots. A site visit has taken place and the drive of the objectors property is built of concrete and it is damaged to the extent that the garage door cannot be shut. A large root from the larch was clearly visible and the growth of this root has caused the drive to lift immediately in front of the garage door. Another section of the drive has been damaged by a large root from the maple. To enable repairs to the drive and to enable the garage door to be shut it will be necessary to remove the two large roots.
- 3.3. The tree owner has received advice from an arboricultural consultant and to ensure that the two trees can be retained and remain stable both will have to be the subject of extensive surgery. It has been recommended that the height of the larch be reduced by 50% and the proposal for the maple is to reduce the height from 18 metres to 11, and the crown spread from 8 metres to 6 metres. It will also be necessary to maintain the trees at these sizes. The works very seriously reduce the amenity value of the trees to such an extent that it is considered that they will not be worthy of statutory protection.

4. POLICY IMPLICATIONS

- 4.1 This report is in accordance with Policy NE6 of the Council's adopted Unitary Development Plan

5. LEGAL IMPLICATIONS

- 5.1 If not confirmed the order will expire on 8th March 2012.

Non-Applicable Sections:	Financial and Personnel implications.
Background Documents: (Access via Contact Officer)	