

SECTION '3' – Applications recommended for PERMISSION, APPROVAL or CONSENT

Application No: 18/00098/TPO

Ward: Bickley

**Address: Land Adjacent To 10
Edgeborough Way Bromley**

OS Grid Ref: E: 541666 N: 169997

Applicant: Mr P Lewis

Objections: YES

Description of Development:

T1 Horse Chestnut - Fell.

T4 Holly - Fell.

T5 Holly - Fell.

T6 Holly - Fell.

Fell all Sycamores less than 10cm in diameter.

Crown lift all trees in woodland to 3m.

SUBJECT TO TPO 109 (A1)

Proposal

This application has been made in respect of various trees within this part of the TPO referred to as Land Adjacent to 10 Edgeborough Way.

The land is covered by the above referenced Tree Preservation Order (TPO) dating back to 1975. The TPO was made prior to the construction of the residential development we see today. Trees present at the time are protected under the order. Many properties back onto the wooded belt that surrounds the end of the cul-de-sac.

Location

The application site is comprised of a parcel of land located on the east side of Edgeborough Way.

Consultations

Nearby owners/occupiers were notified of the application and representations were received which can be summarised as follows:

- The Sundridge Residents' Association object to the proposals.
- No indication of the quantity of trees being removed and what the resultant tree count will be.
- Concern that tree clearance is a precursor to development.
- Loss of valuable wooded amenity space.
- No applicant details in application form.

Considerations

Site observations reveal the trees within the site have not been managed for some time. The multi-stemmed form of the sycamore trees would indicate earlier coppicing of the

trees. This would be consistent with management undertaken prior to the development of the cul-de-sac. The site was previously within the grounds of Carn Brae School.

Many trees within the site are in a poor condition and some have already failed. This can be linked with the poor structure of multi-stemmed sycamore trees. Sycamore are the dominant species in the site and as individuals are of limited amenity value.

A horse chestnut tree (T1) is noted for felling on the front boundary of the site. This tree has fallen into a state of decline with large sections of dieback in the upper canopy. This tree has been highlighted as a safety concern by the applicant, due to the close proximity to the road.

Crown lifting to 3m above ground is proposed to all trees covered by the order to enable light access.

The three holly trees (T4-T6) have been estimated younger than the TPO and do not fall under the scope of this Tree Preservation Order. This is also the case for the sycamore trees less than 10cm diameter.

Ivy is proposed to be severed from the mature trees and dead trees will be removed where necessary. Such works would be exempt from the TPO legislation. The works are proposed to improve the diversity of the tree coverage and reduce the likelihood of trespassing and fly tipping.

Conclusion

Trees over 40 years of age are covered by the TPO. A number of trees subject to this application are therefore not covered by the protection of the TPO. This exemption would clearly be applied to the smaller specimens below 10cm diameter.

The extension of protection to trees not already covered by the order is not merited, primarily on the basis of their poor condition.

Management needs to be encouraged on this site, as the current condition of multiple trees has gone unchecked for a number of years, resulting in defects. This application may appear harsh management, but the works have been sufficiently justified and should be allowed to proceed in accordance with good arboricultural practice.

It is recommended that a tree survey be carried out to highlight any further defects that may present a hazard to third parties with a focus on the street scene.

The management of holly in this instance will benefit trees growing amongst the understorey. This is acceptable management where the objectives are aimed at improving diversity. Improved light access will encourage sapling development at ground level that should naturally occur in the existing seedbank. Such management can take place outside of this decision.

The horse chestnut tree (T1) should be removed as the risk of failure is high. Given the position in respect of the road, this is considered a priority.

In response to the objections received, it is difficult to calculate the remaining tree stock. A tree survey has been recommended. The officer observed a number of protected sycamore stands that would be retained. Tree surveyor recommendations will determine future management of these trees. The applicant is guided to undertake a tree survey as stated in Informative 3.

The fear of development should not prevent necessary management. Sufficient justification has been supplied in the application. The proposed works are aimed at enhancement and should be supported. Leaving the trees unmanaged is likely to cause more of an issue to third parties and diminishing amenity value over time.

It has been established that the agent is the applicant. The application has passed validation screening.

It is recommended that consent be granted.

A replacement tree will be specified under condition to mitigate the loss of horse chestnut tree (T1).

RECOMMENDATION: CONSENT

Subject to the following conditions:

- 1. The tree works hereby granted consent shall be carried out within 2 years of the date of this decision.**

REASON: In order to comply with Policy NE8 of the Unitary Development Plan and in the interest of good arboricultural practice and the visual amenities of the area.

- 2. The work to the tree(s) hereby granted consent shall be carried out in accordance with British Standard 3998:2010 (Recommendations for Tree Work)**

REASON: In order to comply with Policy NE8 of the Unitary Development Plan and in the interest of good arboricultural practice and the visual amenities of the area.

- 3. A replacement Rowan tree (*Sorbus aucuparia*) of standard size, will be planted within 1m of horse chestnut (T1), in the planting season following the felling of the tree. Any replacement tree which dies, is removed or becomes seriously damaged or diseased within 5 years of the date of this consent shall be replaced in the next planting season with another of similar size and species to that originally planted. The planting season is typically October to March.**

REASON: In order to comply with Policy NE8 of the Unitary Development Plan and in the interest of the visual amenities of the area

INFORMATIVES

- 1. You are advised that formal consent is not required for the removal of deadwood, dangerous branches and ivy from protected trees.**
- 2. Only trees that existed in 1975 are covered by the TPO.**

- 3. A tree survey is recommended to ensure a duty of care to third parties is maintained.**
- 4. Attention is drawn to protected species covered by the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981.**