

Decision Maker: PLANS SUB-COMMITTEE NO. 4

Date: Thursday 28 February 2019

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

Title: CONFIRMATION OF TREE PRESERVATION ORDER (TPO)
2650 - 64, 64A & 66 SUTHERLAND AVENUE, BIGGIN HILL
TN16 3HG

Contact Officer: Chris Ryder, Principal Tree Officer
E-mail: christopher.ryder@bromley.gov.uk

Chief Officer: Chief Planner

Ward: Biggin Hill

1. Reason for report

To consider an objection received against the making of the above referenced Tree Preservation Order (TPO).

2. **RECOMMENDATION(S)**

The beech trees make an important contribution to the visual amenity of the surrounding local area and are awarded high amenity value. The TPO should therefore be confirmed to secure tree protection.

Considering the evidence submitted in objection to the protection of one of the group, members should consider modifying the TPO to protect three beech trees situated at 64 Sutherland Avenue.

Impact on Vulnerable Adults and Children

1. Summary of Impact:
-

Corporate Policy

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

Financial

1. Cost of proposal: No Cost
 2. Ongoing costs: Not Applicable
 3. Budget head/performance centre:
 4. Total current budget for this head: £
 5. Source of funding:
-

Personnel

1. Number of staff (current and additional): 3
 2. If from existing staff resources, number of staff hours:
-

Legal

1. Legal Requirement: Statutory Requirement
 2. Call-in: Not Applicable
-

Customer Impact

1. Estimated number of users/beneficiaries (current and projected): Those impacted by the TPO.
-

Ward Councillor Views

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

3. COMMENTARY

- 3.1** TPO 2650 was made on 25th September 2018 and relates to four beech trees situated in the rear gardens 64-66 Sutherland Avenue.
- 3.2** An objection has been received by Broadleaf Tree Services who are acting on behalf of the owner of No. 64A Sutherland Avenue. The objection is made on the grounds that one tree in the grouping is infected with (*Kretzschmaria deusta*) Brittle Cinder Fungus. The tree subject to the objection is situated along the boundary of 64 & 64A Sutherland Avenue. The named fungus has a significant influence upon the structural integrity of the tree causing a white rot. Upon sight of fruiting bodies, tree retention is not advisable in high risk target zones due to the risk of failure.
- 3.3** The objection letter makes reference to 9 labelled photos. Each indicates a defect to be drawn to the Council's attention. The presence of decay in the basal cavities is noted by the advising consultant (Broadleaf Tree Services). Reference is also made to a compressive union at the base of the tree, squirrel damage and the thinning of the canopy density.
- 3.4** The Tree Preservation Order (TPO) was considered following the receipt of two requests via the Council website.
- 3.5** Further to a visual assessment adopting the TEMPO (Tree Evaluation Method for Preservation Orders) scoring system, a new TPO was considered justified as the trees merit preservation. In summary, the trees were found to be of normal vitality with a suitable retention span and made a cohesive contribution to the locality. The trees are mature features of the local landscape.
- 3.6** The Order does not prevent future works from being carried out, but it requires that the Council's consent be gained prior to removing trees and prior to carrying out most forms of tree pruning. In assessing applications to remove trees or carry out pruning, the Council takes into account the reasons for the application, set alongside the effect of the proposed work on the health and amenity value of the trees.
- 3.8** The TPO is valid for 6 months from the date the order was made. If the TPO is not confirmed within this period, the TPO will cease to exist. Members are respectfully requested to confirm the order with or without modification.

4. CONCLUSION

Officer observations have not confirmed the presence of the named fungus during the site visits made to Nos. 66 and 64A Sutherland Avenue. The fruiting bodies of the fungus persist annually and could not be identified. Fruiting bodies would be expected to be visible year round in clefts around the base of the host tree.

Members are still respectfully requested to consider the photographic evidence submitted with the application and the statements made in the objection.

Members are subsequently requested to modify the TPO or confirm the TPO as currently designated.

5. PHOTO

