

PLANNING APPLICATION NUMBER:P07/0027

Type of approval sought	Tree Preservation Order
Ward	Coseley East
Applicant	THE WORCESTER DIOCESE BOARD
Location:	THE VICARAGE, 40, CHURCH ROAD, BILSTON, WV148YB
Proposal	FELL 1 LIME TREE.
Recommendation Summary:	REFUSE

TREE PRESERVATION ORDER NO: D009 (1967) – G1

SITE AND SURROUNDINGS

1. The tree subject to this application is a mature lime tree that is located in the front garden of the Vicarage, 40 Church Road, Coseley. The tree is located adjacent to the boundary wall between the vicarage and the adjacent church.
2. The tree is visible from the adjacent highway and provides a moderate to high amount of amenity to the surrounding area.

PROPOSAL

3. Summary of proposals for the works as written on application form is as follows:
 - Fell 1 lime tree
4. The tree has been marked on the attached plan.

5. The application also contained proposals for the removal of a sycamore tree located at the property. However inspection of the appropriate TPO has shown that the tree would not have been present at the time of service and therefore is not protected.

HISTORY

6. There have been no previous Tree Preservation Order applications on this site.

PUBLIC CONSULTATION

7. No representations have been received.

ASSESSMENT

Tree(s) Appraisal

Criteria	Tree 1
TPO No	G1
Species	Lime
Height	15m
Spread	9m
Diameter	400mm
Form	Moderate
Vigour	Moderate
Approx Age	Mature
Pests / Diseases	None evident.
Canopy	Moderate
% Deadwood	3%
Cavities	None Evident
Bark	Good
Roots	Moderate – lifting adjacent wall, only slight damage at present.
Overall Health	Good
Visibility	High
Amenity Value	Moderate / High

Further Assessment

8. The lime tree subject to this application is a mature specimen that is located in the front garden of 40 Church Road, Coseley. The tree is in good health and provides a moderate to high amount of amenity to the surrounding area.

9. The applicant would like to fell the tree to allow for the better development of the adjacent beech tree and to prevent the tree from doing further damage to the wall.
10. On inspection the tree was found to be a healthy specimen that provides a moderate to high amount of amenity to the surrounding area. No major defects were identified on the tree.
11. Whilst the lime tree and the adjacent beech tree are growing in close proximity, there does not appear to be any signs of one of the tree becoming dominant. As such as long as the happily co-exist as a group they should be retained as such. However if one of the starts to become dominant over the other further consideration should be given to their future management. Currently this reason is not considered sufficient grounds for the removal of the lime tree.
12. With regard to the damage that is being cause to the wall, it appears that due to root expansion under the wall the roots are pushing the tree upwards. This has causes a crack to open up from the top of the wall. Currently it extends downwards for approximately half the height of the wall.
13. The damage only appears to be minor at the moment and could be corrected by repair works to the wall. It is not considered that this is not sufficient grounds for removal at present. However should evidence be submitted of deterioration of the wall in the short term has happened, and that repair of the wall cannot be practicably completed without the removal of the tree, then it would be prudent to consider the future retention of the tree.

CONCLUSION

14. The applicant would like to fell the lime tree subject to this application in order to allow better development of the adjacent beech tree and to prevent further damage to the wall.
15. On inspection the tree was found to be in a healthy condition that provides a moderate to high amount of amenity to the surrounding area.
16. The lime tree and the adjacent beech tree appear to be growing together happily with neither exerting a strong dominance over the other. It is not considered that removal of the lime tree would benefit the amenity of the area, event if it allows the beech tree to develop a perfect form.

17. On inspection of the damage to the wall it was found to be minor and could be remedied by carrying out repairs to the wall. As such unless the wall deteriorates quickly, to a state where repairs cannot be carried out by methods other than removal of the wall, approval should not be granted for the trees removal, or the subsequent loss of amenity.

RECOMMENDATION

18. It is recommended that this application is refused for the reason set out below.

Conditions and/or reasons:

1. Refuse on the grounds that the reasons for the application and the supporting information do not sufficiently justify the detrimental affect on the local amenity that would result from the proposed felling.