GLOUCESTER CITY COUNCIL

COMMITTEE : PLANNING
DATE : 5TH FEBRUARY 2013
ADDRESS/LOCATION : LAND ADJACENT TO 2 AND 3 COMBROOK CLOSE
APPLICATION NO. & WARD : TPO 284 – LAND ADJACENT TO 2 AND 3 COMBROOK CLOSE

APPLICANT : GLOUCESTER CITY COUNCIL
PROPOSAL : CONFIRMATION OF TPO 284
REPORT BY : JUSTIN HOBBS.
NO. OF APPENDICES/ : 1. SITE LOCATION PLAN.
2. TPO 284.
3. LETTER FROM OWNER OF NO 4 COMBROOK CLOSE OBJECTING TO THE MAKING OF THE ORDER.
4. LETTER FROM OWNERS OF NO 3 COMBOOK CLOSE OBJECTING TO THE MAKING OF THE ORDER.
5. EMAIL FROM OWNERS OF 2 COMBROOK CLOSE IN SUPPORT OF THE MAKING OF THE ORDER.
6. TEMPO ASSESSMENT FORM

1.0 SITE DESCRIPTION AND PROPOSAL

1.1 The trees subject to this TPO form part of a belt of trees planted between Combrook Close and an area of open space / balancing pond. The trees are approximately 20 – 25 years old, consisting of mixed deciduous trees including field maple, hawthorn, poplar and cherry. The trees were planted around the time of the construction of the properties, in all likelihood as part of a landscaping scheme.

1.2 The land on which the trees stand is currently owned by Heron Homes, the original developer of the properties on Combrook Close. The City Council is in the process of adopting the land.

1.3 During the week of November 5th 2012, your tree officer was contacted by a resident of Combrook Close with information that trees on land to the front of
no’s 2 and 3 Combrook Close were under threat of removal and/or pruning works without the consent of the owner. The resident was deeply concerned and unhappy about the prospect of trees being removed in this area. Heron Homes have confirmed that no consent was given by them to remove trees to the front of no’s 2 and 3 Combrook Close.

1.4 Your tree officer visited the area and undertook an assessment of the trees. The assessment indicated that the trees were worthy of a TPO as a group or an area. A TPO was therefore made 9th November 2012.

2.0 RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

2.1 A small number of trees on land adjacent to 4 Combrook Close have been removed with consent of the land owner (Heron Homes) and in agreement with the City Council as part of a planning permission for an extension (ref12/00207/FUL)

3.0 LEGAL IMPLICATIONS

3.1 Once a TPO is made the tree(s) covered by the order are protected under the provisions of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990. The Town and Country Planning (Tree Preservation)(England) Regulations 2012 set out procedural requirements relating to TPOs.

3.3 The City Council has a maximum of six months following the making of the TPO to confirm it otherwise the TPO lapses at the end of this period and the tree(s) covered by the order are no longer protected.

3.4 The City Council may confirm a TPO either without modification or subject to such modifications as are considered expedient. Alternatively, the City Council may decide not to confirm a TPO at all.

4.0 PUBLICITY AND REPRESENTATIONS

4.1 As is the legal requirement, the owners of the land affected by the TPO and surrounding land owners deemed to have an interest in the TPO, have been served with a copy of the TPO.

5.3 The City Council has received three written submissions relating to the making of the TPO. Two objecting to the TPO (refer to appendix 3 & 4) and one in support of the TPO (refer to appendix 5).

5.4 The first letter objecting (dated 19th November 2012) to the TPO is 4 pages long from the owner of 4 Combrook Close. The key points being:

“These trees are causing damage to our property”
“The trees at the height they are, are actually causing nuisance to the residents. This is not only due to the continual damage they are causing to the property but, also due to their height, they are also blocking out a lot of light”

“Also a health and safety risk. As the trees are so tall (and thin at the top) smaller branches are falling off”

The letter also implies that the objector disagrees that the trees are of amenity value and that the City Council is discriminating against them as other trees that form part of this belt of trees have not had a TPO placed on them.

5.5 The second letter objecting to the TPO (dated 30\textsuperscript{th} November 2012), is 2 pages long, from the owners of 3 Combrook Close. The key points being:

“the roots are causing the joint drive to numbers 3 & 4 to crack along the full length closest to the trees”

“They block off the natural light from our properties causing moss to grow on the tree side of our house, particularly the roof.

“Being of considerable height they pose a risk to causing injury”

“The trees to our knowledge have never been maintained”

The letter also questions the amenity value of the trees and questions why local residents were not consulted prior to the making of the TPO and also why other trees in this belt of trees have not been protected.

5.6 The final correspondence, an email (received 15\textsuperscript{th} November 2012) was in support of the TPO, from the owners of 2 Combrook Close. The key points being:

“My family...recently moved into our property...the reason for buying it was because of the trees, providing tranquility, security and number one nature”

“We feel extremely let down by the local residents at 3/4 Combrook Close with their actions to want to remove the trees and also without notifying us or asking for our opinion. Being as the trees are outside our house”

“Due to the fact of number 4 Combrook Close’s construction issue we fully appreciate them removing trees immediate to their home, but not the whole row”

5.7 The full content of all correspondence on this application can be inspected at the 4\textsuperscript{th} floor reception, Herbert Warehouse, The Docks, Gloucester, prior to the Committee meeting.
6.0 OFFICER OPINION

6.1 Using a nationally recognised system (TEMPO) to assess whether the trees would be suitable for a TPO in its present context resulted in a result of “TPO defensible” Refer to appendix 6 for TEMPO form.

6.2 Based on local information it would appear that at least some of these trees were under significant threat of removal and/or pruning works, without the consent of the landowner and that some local residents were unhappy about this. With the landowner not being present in the area and in the process of relinquishing ownership of the land to the City Council, the most expedient way to prevent potential removal/damage and retain the amenity value of the trees was to make a TPO.

6.3 The letter of objections express concern that the trees are damaging properties and driveways, the trees are a health and safety hazard, and the trees have never been “maintained”. In response, the making of a TPO does not prevent works being undertaken on these trees. What is it does do is to prevent (subject to certain exceptions) the removal of, and works to, these trees without first applying to and seeking consent from the City Council. In considering an application for works to protected trees the City Council are advised;

(1) To assess the amenity value of the tree(s) and the likely impact of the proposal on the amenity of the area, and
(2) In light of their assessment at (1) above, to consider whether or not the proposal is justified, having regard to the reasons put forward in support of it.

6.4 The damage to driveways is likely to be a combination of natural aging and weathering of the driveway (potentially over 20 years old), seasonal shrinkage and movement of the soils, and possibly the influence of some trees in the vicinity. As per para 6.3 the making of a TPO does not prevent works to these trees such as minor root severance / installation of root barriers that can be used to prevent damage from roots, where it is proven they are causing damage.

6.5 Having assessed the trees prior to making a TPO your officer could not see any significant defects, that would render them a significant health and safety hazard. Whether the trees are protected by a TPO or not, the responsibility for them remains with the landowner and not the City Council. Upon adoption of this land, the City Council will become owners of these trees and they will be subject to inspection and remedial works undertaken, if required.
7.0 **RECOMMENDATION**

In light of the above it is recommended that the TPO at land adjacent to 2 & 3 Combrook Close (TPO284) is confirmed.

Decision: ............................................................................................................................

Notes: ....................................................................................................................................
...........................................................................................................................................
...........................................................................................................................................

Person to contact: Justin Hobbs  
(Tel: 396897)
Town and Country Planning Act 1990

THE COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF GLOUCESTER
(LAND ADJACENT TO 2 AND 3 COMBROOK CLOSE)
TREE PRESERVATION ORDER 2012

The Council of the City of Gloucester in exercise of the powers conferred on them by section 198 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 make the following Order -

Citation

1. This Order may be cited as the Council of the City of Gloucester (Land adjacent to 2 and 3 Combrook Close) Tree Preservation Order 2012.

Interpretation

2. (1) In this Order “the authority” means the Council of the City of Gloucester.

   (2) In this Order any reference to a numbered section is a reference to the section so numbered in the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 and any reference to a numbered regulation is a reference to the regulation so numbered in the Town and Country Planning (Tree Preservation) (England) Regulations 2012.

Effect

3. (1) Subject to article 4, this Order takes effect provisionally on the date on which it is made.

   (2) Without prejudice to subsection (7) of section 198 (power to make tree preservation orders) or subsection (1) of section 200 (tree preservation orders: Forestry Commissioners) and, subject to the exceptions in regulation 14, no person shall -

   (a) cut down, top, lop, uproot, wilfully damage or wilfully destroy; or

   (b) cause or permit the cutting down, uprooting, topping, lopping, wilful damage or wilful destruction of,

any tree specified in the Schedule to this Order except with the written consent of the authority in accordance with regulations 16 and 17 or of the Secretary of State in accordance with regulation 23, and, where such consent is given subject to conditions, in accordance with those conditions.

Application to trees to be planted pursuant to a condition

4. In relation to any tree identified in the first column of the Schedule by the letter “C”, being a tree to be planted pursuant to a condition imposed under paragraph (a) of section 197 (planning permission to include appropriate provision for preservation and planting of trees), this Order takes effect as from the time when the tree is planted.

Dated this 9th day of November 2012
CONFIRMATION OF ORDER

This Order was confirmed by The Council of the City of Gloucester without modification on the

day of 20

This Order was confirmed by The Council of the City of Gloucester subject to the modifications indicated by

red ink on the day of 20

Group Manager, Legal and Democratic Services

DECISION NOT TO CONFIRM ORDER

A decision not to confirm this Order was taken by The Council of the City of Gloucester on the

day of 20

Group Manager, Legal and Democratic Services
VARIATION OF ORDER

This Order was varied by The Council of the City of Gloucester on the day of 20

by a variation order under reference number a copy of which is attached

THE COMMON SEAL of THE COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF GLOUCESTER affixed hereto is authenticated by the undersigned a person authorised by the said Council to act for that purpose

Group Manager, Legal and Democratic Services

REVOCATION ORDER

This Order was revoked by The Council of the City of Gloucester on the day of 20

THE COMMON SEAL of THE COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF GLOUCESTER affixed hereto is authenticated by the undersigned a person authorised by the said Council to act for that purpose

Group Manager, Legal and Democratic Services
## SCHEDULE

### SPECIFICATION OF TREES

Trees specified individually
(encircled in black on the map)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference on map</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Situation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Trees specified by reference to an area
(within a dotted black line on the map)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference on map</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Situation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A1</td>
<td>The deciduous trees within the area marked A1 on the map</td>
<td>On land to the west of 2 and 3 Combrook Close, Abbeymead, Gloucester</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Groups of trees
(within a broken black line on the map)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference on map</th>
<th>Description (including number of trees of each species in the group)</th>
<th>Situation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Woodlands
(within a continuous black line on the map)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference on map</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Situation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
THE COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF GLOUCESTER
(LAND ADJACENT TO 2 AND 3 COMBROOK CLOSE)
TREE PRESERVATION ORDER 2012

TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING ACT
1990

TREE PRESERVATION ORDER

relating to trees situated on land adjacent to 2 and 3 Combrook Close, Abbeymead, Gloucester
Ms S Mullins
Group Manager, Legal & Democratic Services
Gloucester City Council
5th Floor
Kimberley Warehouse
The Docks
Gloucester
GL1 2EQ

Monday 19th November 2012

Dear Ms Mullins

We are writing in relation to letters received dated 9th November 2012 (delivered by Hand to number 2, 3 & 7) and letter dated 12th November (Sent by recorded to us) in regard to the information that the trees adjacent to Number 2 and Number 3 Combrook Close have had a preservation order placed upon them.

We are writing to object to this preservation order for the following reasons.

- These trees, along with trees that have been removed, have been and are causing damage to our property. At this present time we are having our garage and rooms above demolished and rebuilt (and having to have new foundation put in). This has had to happen because the trees at the side of the property were so tall the roots had caused subsidence to our house. We have a report from Wilsons Associates (dated 2006) stating that the tree roots (back then) were causing this subsidence problem. These trees, along with the ones now with the preservation order, have NEVER been maintained or looked after.

  Mr Justin Hobbs (Tree Officer – Planning) is aware of this and has been for over two years as we have been in communication with him regarding this. He, along with Mr Alan Barnett (Principal Structural Engineer – Regeneration Directorate) have been out to view our property and had seen the cracks in the inside of our house. Had these trees been maintained all these years ago (as we requested to Mr Hobbs) then there would have been a chance that we could have repaired the damage to our property (at a less cost). However as nothing has been done and the damage has got so bad we have had to knock down and rebuild – at an estimated cost of £110K - £120K which we are having to pay for ourselves.

- The trees with the preservation order on them are also causing damage to our property. These are causing damage to our driveway, causing cracks in it. Mr Hobbs is aware of this and saw the damage first hand during one of his site visits but has refused to manage the trees as the he felt the damage the trees were causing wasn’t worth the effort.
- On the first page of your letter dated 9th November 2012 it states that these “...these trees should be safeguarded for the enjoyment of the residents...” This statement is actually factually incorrect. The trees, at the height that they are, are actually causing a nuisance to the residents. This is not only due to the continual damage they are causing to the property but, also due to their height, they are also blocking out a lot of light.

- There is also a HEALTH and SAFETY risk. As the trees are so tall (and thin at the top) smaller branches are falling off (especially when it is windy). This is a danger to the residents, including the young children that live there, if the branches were to fall down on them as well as a danger to crashing down on cars.

As an example it was highlighted to Mr Hobbs on at least two occasions a major branch that had split from the main trunk and was left balanced precariously on a lower branch. After promises that this would be removed, nothing ever happened.

This has recently been removed by ourselves’ at our cost following permission from the landowner.

- Another reason that you gave was “...enjoyment of the residents of the area and citizens of Gloucester in general”. If you know the area then, again you will know that this statement is factually incorrect. We live in a cul-de-sac and these trees line the driveway of Number 3 and Number 4 Combrook Close. The only people that see these trees are the residents of these two properties who are both objecting to this preservation order.

- To be clear all residents that the trees are in proximity to, find them a nuisance and at no point gain any enjoyment out of them. It would be appreciated that the council doesn’t make false or misleading statements on our behalf to justify their own agenda.

- We have also been informed that this has occurred as, allegedly, some of our neighbours have requested removing some other trees. After speaking to various neighbours it seems that none have phoned you. Therefore once again we would appreciate the council giving out allegedly false information/reasons to justify their own agenda.

- We also feel that we are being discriminated against. There are a long row of trees along various properties, yet these are the only ones that have had a preservation order placed upon them. (Number 5, Number 6 and resident in Rendcomb Close) have not had letters or trees near them placed under a preservation order. Therefore we feel that this has been done for a personal reason and we have been discriminated against.

- We have taken advice from a Tree Surgeon who has stated that the main reasons for imposing a Tree Preservation order is:

  o There are no other trees like it in the area (FALSE – there are lots of trees like this in the area)
  o Someone has requested that the tree(s) are not altered as they like them (FALSE – to our knowledge, after speaking to neighbours, nobody has requested such a thing)
- The trees add amenity value to the area – (FALSE – there are other trees in the area, see paragraph above, that have bigger trees in there which could have had an order placed upon them but haven’t)

- Mr Hammond, Number 7 Combrook Close, has been informed, by yourselves, that he has to maintain the trees near his property as you believe that they are causing damage to Number 2 Combrook Close. However Mr Hobbs has known for over two years that the trees under the preservation order has been causing damage to our property but he has refused to do anything about it. How can you instruct Mr Hammond to maintain trees causing damage but refuse to do it yourselves?

- Mr Hobbs, along with Ms S Mullins (Monitoring Officer & Group Manager, Legal & Democratic Services) and Miss E Blackwood (Planning Officer) know how stressful the past 6-7 years have been for us where our property has been falling down to the subsidence from the tree roots as we have discussed this with all three people over time.

- It has also been, allegedly, brought to our attention that this order has occurred for personal reasons (as stated). Do you think we:

  Have enjoyed the stress from the past 6 plus years of sleepless nights, high blood pressure and chest pains which the consultant from the hospital put down to stress?
  Have enjoyed paying £1000’s to maintain the trees as they were overhanging and hitting the side of our house and then paying to have them removed?
  Have enjoyed the stress of seeing cracks appear in our property – cracks that were so big you could see light and the outside through them?
  Have enjoyed seeing part of our house move away from another part of your house – again so daylight could be seen through it and the gap was big enough to put your hand through it?
  Have enjoyed going away and, when coming back, worry about how the house is?
  How big the cracks are? How much more it had moved due to the subsidence?
  Have enjoyed the stress and hassle of having to find companies to rebuild?
  Have enjoyed/enjoying the stress and hassle of having part of our house knocked down and being rebuild?
  Have enjoyed/enjoying paying £110k plus for this work to be done?

- It has also come to our attention that members of the council came onto our property – WITHOUT permission – to look at and take photos of the trees. Not one of them knocked on either ours or our neighbours doors to ask permission to be on our property. Also they were told, by the builders, that we were in and still they did not seek permission. Surely people are NOT allowed to ‘just go’ on other people’s property without the courtesy of asking and gaining permission?

We object and would like this preservation order removed so that these trees can be maintained and looked after so that no further damage is caused to our property/driveway. The trees have been causing damage for many years and are not yet mature (yet are already the height and a half of our house). What constant further damage are they going to cause if they are not maintained and are
allowed to grow to mature height? Who is going to pay for the repair to our property of this constant damage if the order stays and we are not allowed to maintain and look after them? What happens if they continue to grow like they are and a branch falls on someone (including a child) and causes serious damage to that person?

Therefore we request, for all these reasons above, that the preservation order on these trees is removed so that they can be maintained at a safe height so no further damage to property or person can occur.

Yours Sincerely

Jayne Biles (Mrs)

CC:
Mr M Brentnall – Principal Planning Officer
Miss J Tye - Legal & Democratic Services
Miss W Jones – Customer Services Manager – I have highlighted complaints in black/red for you.

Mr D Collard – Heron Land Development

Mr R Jones – Gregg Latchams Solicitors – Bristol
Mr B Preece – Gregg Latchams Solicitors - Bristol
Mr & Mrs Kershaw  
3 Combrook Close  
Abbeymead  
Gloucester  
GL4 SUN

Ms S Mullins  
Group Manager  
Legal & Democratic Services  
Gloucester City Council  
5th Floor  
Kimberley Warehouse  
The Docks  
Gloucester  
GL1 3EQ

30th November 2012

Dear Ms Mullins

We are writing to object to the Tree Preservation Order 284 placed on the trees to the front of our property 3 Combrook Close, Abbeymead, Gloucester, GL4 5UN.

The trees in question are causing damage to the property of numbers 3 & 4 Combrook Close.

We have lived at number 3 for over sixteen years, moving in 7 years after the houses were built by Heron Homes in 1989.

We assume that either Heron Homes or Gloucester City Council planted the trees around 1989 as part the development of the Housing surrounding Stuarts Mill Lane.

When we moved into our property in Sept 1996 the trees were not a problem being 15 to 20 foot tall. Since then they have grown considerably and are now causing serious problems.

1. The roots are causing the joint drive to numbers 3 & 4 to crack along the full length closest to the trees. Please see photograph number 1. Number 4 Combrook Close is also objection to the TPO as they have also caused serious damage to the garage part of their house which is currently having to be rebuilt.

2. They block off the natural light from our properties causing moss to grow on the tree side of our house particularly on the roof. The house frontage has to be cleaned every year to remove the this. This can be seen on photograph number 2. It can also be seen by looking at other properties close by that are moss free.

3. Being of considerable height they pose a risk to causing injury to the resident of in 2, 3 & 4 Combrook Close and visitors, these include small children and old age pensioners, by branches being blown off. It was only a couple of years ago that a very large branch fell from a tree at the bottom of our drive, luckily it fell on the park side. The tree in question had to be felled.
The trees to our knowledge have never been maintained since they were planted. many of them are of considerable height and are very close to our property. Several of the trees or less than 1 metre from our property. there are 35 trees in an area 25 metres long by 5 metres wide. The diameters of the tree trunks vary from 400 to 600mm. The trees are mainly White Poplar and Wild Cherry. Considering that these grow to 50 or 60 foot tall the density of such trees for the space they are in is far too much. Or indeed the wrong types of trees were planted in such close proximity to residential properties in the first place. There are trees that do not grow to such a height that would have been more suitable. The trees have not reached maturity and will continue to grow in both width, height and the size of their roots. There are trees of the same species to the right of Combrook Close and at the bottom of Rendcombe Close that are larger than the ones that you have placed the TPO on.

In your documentation you refer to "visual amenity of the area, these trees should be safeguarded for the enjoyment of residents of the area and citizens of Gloucester in general." We do not see why the Council feel it is necessary to place a TPO on these trees without discussing it with the people that are most affected by the trees. Combrook Close is a tee shaped cul de sac where numbers 2, 3 & 4 to the left and number 5, 6 & 7 to the right are the only residents to be affected by the trees particularly 3 & 4 to the left & 5 & 6 to the right. We at numbers 3 & 4 do not see why it is necessary to place a TPO on these trees as we are the only residents affected by the trees and they are not likely to be seen by the other citizens of Gloucester being at the bottom a small cul de sac of 8 houses.

Our properties are along the edge of Stewarts Mill Park around which are many trees planted. We cannot help noticing that you have only considered the trees that are adjacent to numbers 2, 3 & 4 Combrook Close. Can you explain why? There are many other trees all planted at the same time as these trees and of similar type and size. Why are these trees not being protected? There are many other properties in Stewarts Mill Lane, Combrook Close and Rendcombe Close that have large trees very close to their properties.

We request that you remove the Tree Preservation Order from these trees and enter into dialogue with ourselves and our neighbours regarding the future of these trees. The main issue as we see is that structural damage is being caused by them. Maintenance is necessary, either removing them all and planting more suitable trees, thinning out the trees and Lombarding to minimise the root damage and overcome light issues and if necessary putting a root wall into place to prevent the ingress of roots onto our properties.

Yours sincerely

Mr Rodney Kershaw
Enclosed : Photograph 1 - Damage to drive
Photograph 2 - Moss on number 3
Dear Justin,

In reply to the TPO we received on Friday 9th November from you I would like to say thank you and we are in full support of it. My family and I have only recently moved into our property 2 Combrook Close in August this year. The reason for buying it was because of the trees, providing tranquillity, security and number one nature (SO MUCH WILDLIFE AND GREENERY). At the time of buying we looked at two identical properties, one was well maintained with no work needing to be done to it in a built up area off Lobleys Drive and our one in Combrook Close that was the same price but needed about £40,000 worth of work doing too it. Obviously we decided to buy the property in Combrook close due to the surroundings mentioned above. We wanted to make this house our family home which we would then need to spend the money to upgrade it just so we could live in such a beautiful area along side nature.

We feel extremely let down by the local residents at 3/4 Combrook close with their actions to want to remove the trees and also without notifying us or asking for our opinion. Being as the trees are outside our house and that we love very much too potentially come home one day to find them removed.

We have heard numerous lame excuses for the trees removal which none are of that importance to ruin England's woodlands and so many wildlife's homes just for small needless human benefits which do not justify this type of destruction.

As you can see and hear (please have speakers on to be able to listen to the birds) from the video above we do love the trees and wildlife due to recording it prior to moving in. Due to the fact of number 4 Combrook close's construction issue we fully appreciate them removing trees immediate to their home, but not the whole row which would amount to about 14+ trees in total. There is no reason that justifies the removal of these trees. Any work can be resolved around them. With the new break in the trees by 4 Combrook Close I'm sure you could appreciate the reduction of wildlife already, which we have noticed dramatically and to remove more would be a devastating loss all around.

In the two links below of Google street view/map you can identify trees/ a hedge row that is still in situ compared to the video above and to the present day which may have been an issue before but to keep removing trees is surely a sinful crime.

Also in photo 2 above you can see that there are two trees half removed that have been cut down on weekends by residents themselves after the tree surgeons had finished their works. In photo 3 they are completely gone.

Thank you very much for your help in this matter, it's extremely appreciated. Let's hope that no further destruction to trees and wildlife will be done.

Kind Regards,

Mr Karl Shepherd & Dr Evelina Polakova.

http://goo.gl/maps/Bs6P2
http://goo.gl/maps/66m25
TREE EVALUATION METHOD FOR PRESERVATION ORDERS - TEMPO

SURVEY DATA SHEET & DECISION GUIDE

Date: 8/11/12  Surveyor: T.J.

Tree details
TPO Ref (if applicable): Land Adj front of 2+3 Cookbrook Close
Owner (if known): Hereon Homes
Tree/Group No:  Mix decid.
Species: 
Location: 

REFER TO GUIDANCE NOTE FOR ALL DEFINITIONS

Part 1: Amenity assessment
a) Condition & suitability for TPO; where trees in poor or fair condition have poor form, deduct 1 point

5) Good  Highly suitable
   4) Fair  Suitable
   3) Poor  Unlikely to be suitable
0) Dead/dying/dangerous  Unsuitable

* Relates to existing condition and is intended to apply to severe irretrievable defects only

Score & Notes: 3 14% as group 1 area.

b) Retention span (in years) & suitability for TPO

5) 100+  Highly suitable
4) 40-100  Very suitable
2) 20-40  Suitable
1) 10-20  Just suitable
0) <10*  Unsuitable

*Includes trees which are an existing or near future nuisance, including those encroaching growing their context, or which are significant in negating the potential of other trees of better quality

Score & Notes: 3 14% mature/semi mature

c) Relative public visibility & suitability for TPO

Consider realistic potential for future visibility with changed land use

5) Very large trees with some visibility, or prominent large trees
4) Large trees, or medium trees clearly visible to the public
3) Medium trees, or large trees with limited view only
2) Young, small, or medium/large trees visible only with difficulty
1) Trees not visible to the public, regardless of size

Score & Notes: 3 see location but footpath in area also.

Highly suitable
Suitable
Barly suitable
Probable unsuitable


d) Other factors

Trees must have accrued 7 or more points (with no zero score) to qualify

5) Principal components of arboricultural features, or veteran trees
4) Tree groups, or members of groups important for their cohesion
3) Tree with identifiable historic, commemorative or habitat importance
2) Trees of particularly good form, especially if rare or unusual
1) Trees with none of the above additional redeeming features (inc. those of indifferent form)

Score & Notes: but trees form part of a continuous belt

Part 2: Expediency assessment

Trees must have accrued 5 or more points to qualify

5) Immediate threat to tree
4) Foreseeable threat to tree
3) Perceived threat to tree
2) Precautionary only
1) 

Score & Notes: local information that 4/15 removal/pruning is imminent

Part 3: Decision guide

Any 0  Do not apply TPO
1-6  TPO indefensible
7-11  Does not merit TPO
12-15  TPO defensible
16+  Definitely merits TPO

Add Scores for Total: 14/17

Decision: TPO