

	<p style="text-align: center;">PLANNING SERVICES DELEGATION</p> <p style="text-align: center;">RECOMMENDATION DATE: 21 JANUARY 2021</p>
	<p style="text-align: center;">Application Type: Tree Preservation Order Consent</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Application Number: 20/01908/TPO</p>

REPORT OF: DEVELOPMENT CONTROL MANAGER

WARD AFFECTED: ACKWORTH, NORTH ELMSALL AND UPTON

SUBJECT: TREE WORKS TO INCLUDE 5% & 10% CANOPY THINNING, CROWN REDUCTION BY 1.5 METRES, REMOVAL OF T5 (CHERRY) AND REMOVAL OF DEADWOOD. AT 14 Saddlers Grove Badsworth Pontefract WF9 1PE BY MRS DENTON C/O S & D LANDSCAPES

RECOMMENDATION

Refuse for the following reason(s):-

1. The proposed crown thinning works of between 5%-10% of trees T1, T2 & T4 is not agreeable. The proposal states that the works would benefit the trees in terms of wind penetration, and benefit the property in terms of light penetration. It is not clear whether there has been a history of branch failure that warrants the trees to be thinned for wind penetration, however, and based upon the current narrow form of the trees, I would discount any benefit to the trees in that regard.

Crown thinning is mainly used to increase light levels and reduce shade onto a garden, however, these trees, in my opinion, would need to be crown thinned to high percentages in order to achieve these aims. Unjustifiable crown thinning could lead to the premature decline of the trees. In addition, it has not quantified or qualified what 5% or 10% of the tree canopy would be in real terms, i.e. where is the 5%-10% being taken from - the whole canopy, the inner canopy, the branch ends, etc.? 5% - 10% in real terms constitutes every c. tenth or twentieth branch of a tree displaying a 100% tree canopy volume. However, these trees have a relatively small, narrow and thin canopy in real terms. In that context further loss of an existing canopy may impact further. Although the submitted notification is devoid of any specification upon which such works could be agreed, and without such specification the tree, and its amenity, could be harmed, it is unlikely that even with such a specification any consent could be granted.

The proposed lateral reduction of 1.5m canopy reduction of T4 is not agreeable and is also considered unjustified and unnecessary, and could harm the health and visual amenity of the tree. In essence it would be viewed as being contrary to the making of the TPO itself.

The proposed loss of tree T5 (Cherry) cannot be supported from an Arboricultural perspective. The application does not state the tree is dead or pose an imminent or foreseeable risk to persons or property. In that context its loss would be viewed as being detrimental to local levels of amenity as well as viewed as being contrary to the making of the TPO.

This recommendation is based on the following plans(s):-

Plan Type	Reference	Version	Date Received
Application Form			10.09.2020
Drawing	Location of trees		10.09.2020
Drawing	Aerial Photo		10.09.2020
Drawing	2 x Photos of Trees		10.09.2020

Case Officer: Mr Paul Casey