



## SHEFFIELD CITY COUNCIL

### Planning & Highways Committee Report

---

**Report of:** Head of Planning

---

**Date:** 8<sup>th</sup> November 2022

---

**Subject:** Tree Preservation Order No. 451  
2 Broomgrove Road, Sheffield, S10 2LR

---

**Author of Report:** Vanessa Lyons, Community Tree Officer (Planning).

---

**Summary:** To seek confirmation of Tree Preservation Order No. 451

---

**Reasons for Recommendation**

To protect trees of visual amenity value to the locality

**Recommendation**

Tree Preservation Order No. should be confirmed unmodified.

---

**Background Papers:**

- A) Tree Preservation Order No. and map attached.
  - B) Tree Evaluation Method for Preservation Orders (TEMPO) assessment attached.
  - C) Objection letters attached.
  - D) Images of the tree trees.
  - E) Appraisal of the Broomhall Conservation Area.
- 

**Category of Report:** OPEN

---

## CITY GROWTH SERVICE

### REPORT TO PLANNING & HIGHWAYS COMMITTEE

08.11.22

2 Broomgrove Road, Sheffield, S10 2LR

### TREE PRESERVATION ORDER NO. 451

#### 1.0 PURPOSE

1.1 To seek confirmation of Tree Preservation Order No.451

#### 2.0 BACKGROUND

2.1 Tree Preservation Order No.451 ('the Order') was made on 23<sup>rd</sup> June 2022 to protect four lime trees and one horse chestnut which stand within the garden of 2 Broomgrove Road. A copy of the Order, with its accompanying map, is attached as Appendix A.

2.2 T1 to T4 (as described in the Order) are positioned to the north of the site, forming a linear group adjacent to a low boundary fronting Clarkehouse Road. T5 stands alone on the west of the site adjacent to a boundary wall fronting Broomgrove Road. As such the trees are very visible and form a prominent part of the street scene along a busy main thoroughfare. Images of the trees can be seen at Appendix D. The trees are located within the Broomhall Conservation Area, so they are already protected to a limited extent by Section 211 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

2.3 The trees have been implicated in several planning applications, beginning with 21/04101/FUL which concerns the conversion of the former offices into a residential dwelling. As part of this application the boundary wall was inspected on behalf of the applicant on the 16<sup>th</sup> August 2021 by an engineering consultant. They concluded that the wall was in poor repair, that the proximity of the trees was a contributing factor to the damage and that the trees should therefore be removed to facilitate repair and replacement of the wall.

A landscape officer with the Council expressed concern over the potential loss of mature trees from along a main arterial road into the city and within the conservation area. Having made their own assessment, they felt that the wall was deteriorating due to age and poor construction as opposed to the presence of the trees pushing at the wall. They were of the opinion that the wall could be rebuilt, and the trees retained, and subsequently on the 23<sup>rd</sup> November 2021 they requested that the trees be inspected for their suitability for a TPO.

- 2.4 In response to this Vanessa Lyons inspected the trees on 24<sup>th</sup> November 2021 and conducted a Tree Evaluation Method for Preservation Orders (TEMPO) assessment. The trees were scored with 15 points respectively. The assessment produced a clear recommendation for protection, and it was deemed expedient in the interest of amenity to make an order. A summary of the TEMPO can be found in Appendix B.
- 2.5 On the 26<sup>th</sup> November, the planning officer responsible for determining application 21/04101/FUL received communication from the applicant stating that the intention was to now retain the trees, while replacing the existing boundary with 2.4 and 2.8m new walls. The building of the boundary wall was removed from application 21/04101/FUL and the TPO process was paused pending receipt of detailed plans regarding the new wall. These were submitted on 8<sup>th</sup> March, reference 22/00944/FUL. The application was withdrawn following advice from planning officers regarding the likelihood of refusal due to the impact of the wall on the visual amenity of the conservation area and inadequate information regarding how the trees would be safely retained during the construction phase.

In June 2022, the council requested that one of their engineers survey the wall and trees. The aim of this survey was to gather information to better inform decision making on any subsequent application regarding the wall's construction. The report concluded that it would be possible to rebuild the wall with the trees in situ, using root bridging techniques and slimmer wall profiles adjacent to the trees to allow for future growth. A subsequent application (22/02968/FUL) was submitted by the applicant on 9<sup>th</sup> August 2022 and is currently pending decision.

- 2.6 Although it was indicated by the applicant that the trees were to be retained during construction of the walls, on 23<sup>rd</sup> June it was deemed expedient in the interest of amenity to make the TPO. This followed from a desire to ensure that the trees were fully considered during any subsequent work to the boundary walls, and due to concerns around on-going damage to the trees as a result of construction spoil being repeatedly piled in their rooting area. This prompted a site visit from Vanessa Lyons in April 2022, in which construction workers were advised to remove the spoil and avoid the rooting area of the trees for future storage of construction material. The amenity of the trees was also further compromised following excessive pruning pursuant to a section 211 notice, reference 22/00400/TCA, in which the specified recommendation of pruning to 5.2m to clear the highway was exceeded by the tree surgeon.
- 2.7 Objections.

One objection was received via letter on the 13<sup>th</sup> July, and can be seen in Appendix C. The objection was from a solicitor, acting on behalf of the owner of 2 Broomgrove Road and was accompanied by an arboricultural report on T5 (the lime tree which stands adjacent to Broomgrove Road). The report

provided evidence that the roots of the tree had been damaged during construction of a neighbouring wall associated with number 4 Broomgrove, with the implication being that long term retention of the tree was therefore unlikely. The author therefore objected to the protection of T5, based on its condition.

- 2.8 An email was sent to the objector on 18<sup>th</sup> August 2022 stating the Council's intention to vary TPO 451 so as to remove T5 from the order. This was achieved by way of a variation order, made by the Council on 27<sup>th</sup> October 2022. T5 has consequently been removed from the Order. All of the interested parties who were notified of the Order originally being made have been notified of the variation being carried out. It is therefore considered that the objection to the order has been addressed, although the objection must still be considered before a decision can be made whether to confirm the Order as it has not been withdrawn.

### 3.0 VISUAL AMENITY ASSESSMENT

Visibility: The trees are considered as having high public visibility, forming a linear group of large, mature trees which are entirely visible from Clarkehouse Road, a busy main road into the city. Images of the trees can be seen in Appendix D

Condition: The trees appear in reasonable condition, with upright canopies typical of trees which have previously been heavily pruned. Although this form is not typical for the species of tree, it is a form that is well suited to the location of the trees, the upright nature of the growth keeping the trees relatively clear of the adjacent highway.

Longevity: The trees have an estimated 20–40-year retention span, meaning they will provide good amenity to the local area for many years to come.

Additional factors: The trees are considered as contributing to the character of the Broomhall conservation area. An appraisal of the conservation area, which can be found at Appendix E, notes that trees are an essential part of the areas identity, giving the area a distinctly sylvan character.

- 3.1 Expediency. The TPO will ensure the trees are fully considered during any subsequent work to the adjacent boundary wall.

### 4.0 EQUAL OPPORTUNITIES IMPLICATIONS

- 4.1 There are no equal opportunities implications.

### 5.0 ENVIRONMENTAL AND PROPERTY IMPLICATIONS

- 5.1 There are no environmental and property implications based on the information provided.

- 5.2 Protection of the trees detailed in Tree Preservation Order No.451 will benefit the visual amenity of the local environment.
- 6.0 FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS
- 6.1 There are no financial implications.
- 7.0 LEGAL IMPLICATIONS
- 7.1 A local authority may make a Tree Preservation Order (TPO) where it appears that it is expedient in the interests of amenity to make provision for the preservation of trees or woodlands in their area (Section 198, Town and Country Planning Act 1990).
- 7.2 A TPO may prohibit the cutting, topping, lopping or uprooting of the trees which are the subject of the Order. It may also prohibit the wilful damage or destruction of those trees. Any person who contravenes a TPO shall be guilty of an offence and liable to receive a fine of up to £20,000.
- 7.3 The local authority may choose to confirm a TPO it has made. If an Order is confirmed, it will continue to have legal effect until such point as it is revoked. If an Order is not confirmed, it will expire and cease to have effect 6 months after it was originally made.
- 7.4 A local authority may only confirm an Order after considering any representations made in respect of that order. One objection has been received in respect of the Order. A response to that objection is provided at paragraph 2.7.
- 7.5 A local authority has the power to vary a Tree Preservation Order in accordance with the procedure set out in the Town and Country Planning (Tree Preservation)(England) Regulations 2012. This procedure has been followed and a variation order has made. As a result, the varied version of Tree Preservation Order No. 451 is that which is recommended for confirmation. Details of how the Order has been varied are described in paragraph 2.8.
- 8.0 RECOMMENDATION
- 8.1 Recommend Provisional Tree Preservation Order No.451 be confirmed.

Michael Johnson, Head of Planning,

28<sup>th</sup> October 2022

Appendix A. Tree Preservation Order No. 451 and map to follow.

Varied order to be supplied

Appendix B) Tree Evaluation Method for Preservation Orders (TEMPO) assessment

# TREE EVALUATION METHOD FOR PRESERVATION ORDERS - TEMPO

## SURVEY DATA SHEET & DECISION GUIDE

Date: 24/11/21	Surveyor: Vanessa Lyons
<b>Tree details</b>	
TPO Ref (if applicable): 448	Tree/Group No: T1.      Species: Lime
Owner (if known):	Location: 2 Broomgrove Road,

### REFER TO GUIDANCE NOTE FOR ALL DEFINITIONS

#### Part 1: Amenity assessment

##### a) Condition & suitability for TPO

- |                          |                         |
|--------------------------|-------------------------|
| 5) Good                  | Highly suitable         |
| 3) Fair/satisfactory     | Suitable                |
| 1) Poor                  | Unlikely to be suitable |
| 0) Dead/dying/dangerous* | <u>Unsuitable</u>       |

\* Relates to existing context and is intended to apply to severe irremediable defects only

##### 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 clearly outgrowing their context, or which are significantly negating the potential of other trees of better quality

##### 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  | Highly suitable     |
| 4) Large trees, or medium trees clearly visible to the public       | Suitable            |
| 3) Medium trees, or large trees with limited view only              | Suitable            |
| 2) Young, small, or medium/large trees visible only with difficulty | Barely suitable     |
| 1) Trees not visible to the public, regardless of size              | Probably unsuitable |

##### d) Other factors

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

- 5) Principal components of formal arboricultural features, or veteran trees
- 4) Tree groups, or principal members of groups important for their cohesion
- 3) Trees 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)
- 1) Trees with poor form or which are generally unsuitable for their location

#### Part 2: Expediency assessment

Trees must have accrued 10 or more points to qualify

- 5) Immediate threat to tree inc. s.211 Notice
- 3) Foreseeable threat to tree
- 2) Perceived threat to tree
- 1) Precautionary only

#### 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+   | <u>Definitely merits</u> TPO |

#### Score & Notes :

3. A previously pollarded lime prominent within the street scene of Clarkehouse Road. The tree has responded to previous pruning with vigorous upright growth that appears well attached. Small amount of dead wood in the canopy, of an amount normal for the species. Slight encroachment of lower branches onto highway, could be rectified with minor pruning of branches less than 10cm in diameter.

#### Score & Notes

2. A conservative estimate of 20-40 years is given. Although limes are a long-lived species, the tree is situated in limited soil next to a busy street. These unfavourable growing conditions have therefore been taken into account in estimating the trees remaining life span.

#### Score & Notes

4. This is a medium tree, clearly visible to the public.

#### Score & Notes

1. The tree's previous pruning renders it of indifferent form, though of a form well suited to its location, as the upright nature of the stems reduce encroachment to the highway

#### Score & Notes

5. The arborist acting on behalf of the developer has recommended the tree be felled to accommodate the development

#### Add Scores for Total:

15

#### Decision:

TPO defensible.

# TREE EVALUATION METHOD FOR PRESERVATION ORDERS - TEMPO

## SURVEY DATA SHEET & DECISION GUIDE

Date: 24/11/21	Surveyor: Vanessa Lyons
<b>Tree details</b>	
TPO Ref (if applicable): 448	Tree/Group No: T2.      Species: Lime
Owner (if known):	Location: 2 Broomgrove Road, adjacent to boundary with Clarkehouse Road

### REFER TO GUIDANCE NOTE FOR ALL DEFINITIONS

#### Part 1: Amenity assessment

##### a) Condition & suitability for TPO

- |                          |                         |
|--------------------------|-------------------------|
| 5) Good                  | Highly suitable         |
| 3) Fair/satisfactory     | Suitable                |
| 1) Poor                  | Unlikely to be suitable |
| 0) Dead/dying/dangerous* | Unsuitable              |

\* Relates to existing context and is intended to apply to severe irremediable defects only

##### 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 clearly outgrowing their context, or which are significantly negating the potential of other trees of better quality

##### 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  | Highly suitable     |
| 4) Large trees, or medium trees clearly visible to the public       | Suitable            |
| 3) Medium trees, or large trees with limited view only              | Suitable            |
| 2) Young, small, or medium/large trees visible only with difficulty | Barely suitable     |
| 1) Trees not visible to the public, regardless of size              | Probably unsuitable |

**Score & Notes**  
**4. This is medium tree, clearly visible to the public.**

##### d) Other factors

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

- 5) Principal components of formal arboricultural features, or veteran trees
- 4) Tree groups, or principal members of groups important for their cohesion
- 3) Trees 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)
- 1) Trees with poor form or which are generally unsuitable for their location

#### Score & Notes

1. The tree's previous pruning renders it of indifferent form, though of a form well suited to its location, as the upright nature of the stems reduce encroachment to the highway

#### Part 2: Expediency assessment

Trees must have accrued 10 or more points to qualify

- 5) Immediate threat to tree inc. s.211 Notice
- 3) Foreseeable threat to tree
- 2) Perceived threat to tree
- 1) Precautionary only

#### Score & Notes

**5. The arborist acting on behalf of the developer has recommended the tree be felled to accommodate the development**

#### 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:

15

#### Decision:

TPO defensible.



# TREE EVALUATION METHOD FOR PRESERVATION ORDERS - TEMPO

## SURVEY DATA SHEET & DECISION GUIDE

Date: 24/11/21	Surveyor: Vanessa Lyons
<b>Tree details</b>	
TPO Ref (if applicable): 448	Tree/Group No: T3. Species: Horse chestnut
Owner (if known):	Location: 2 Broomgrove Road, adjacent to boundary with Clarkehouse Road

### REFER TO GUIDANCE NOTE FOR ALL DEFINITIONS

#### Part 1: Amenity assessment

##### a) Condition & suitability for TPO

- |                          |                         |
|--------------------------|-------------------------|
| 5) Good                  | Highly suitable         |
| 3) Fair/satisfactory     | Suitable                |
| 1) Poor                  | Unlikely to be suitable |
| 0) Dead/dying/dangerous* | Unsuitable              |

\* Relates to existing context and is intended to apply to severe irremediable defects only

#### Score & Notes :

3. A previously pollarded horse chestnut prominent within the street scene of Clarkehouse Road. The tree has responded to pruning with good upright growth which appears well attached. Evidence of multiple pruning wounds which have completely occluded, indicating the tree is vigorous. No evidence of bacterial bleeding canker, common in mature trees of this species. Tree would require minor tip pruning to clear the highway.

##### 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 clearly outgrowing their context, or which are significantly negating the potential of other trees of better quality

#### Score & Notes

2. A conservative estimate of 20-40 years is given. Horse chestnut are long-lived species, but the tree is situated in limited soil next to a busy street. These unfavourable growing conditions have therefore been taken into account in estimating the trees' remaining life span.

##### 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  | Highly suitable     |
| 4) Large trees, or medium trees clearly visible to the public       | Suitable            |
| 3) Medium trees, or large trees with limited view only              | Suitable            |
| 2) Young, small, or medium/large trees visible only with difficulty | Barely suitable     |
| 1) Trees not visible to the public, regardless of size              | Probably unsuitable |

#### Score & Notes

4. This is medium tree, clearly visible to the public.

##### d) Other factors

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

- 5) Principal components of formal arboricultural features, or veteran trees
- 4) Tree groups, or principal members of groups important for their cohesion
- 3) Trees 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)
- 1) Trees with poor form or which are generally unsuitable for their location

#### Score & Notes

1. The tree's previous pruning renders it of indifferent form, though of a form well suited to its location, as the upright nature of the stems reduce encroachment to the highway

#### Part 2: Expediency assessment

Trees must have accrued 10 or more points to qualify

- 5) Immediate threat to tree inc. s.211 Notice
- 3) Foreseeable threat to tree
- 2) Perceived threat to tree
- 1) Precautionary only

#### Score & Notes

5. The arborist acting on behalf of the developer has recommended the tree be felled to accommodate the development

#### 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:

15

#### Decision:

TPO defensible.

# TREE EVALUATION METHOD FOR PRESERVATION ORDERS - TEMPO

## SURVEY DATA SHEET & DECISION GUIDE

Date: 24/11/21	Surveyor: Vanessa Lyons
----------------	----------------------------

<b>Tree details</b>		
TPO Ref (if applicable): 448	Tree/Group No: T4.	Species: Lime
Owner (if known):	Location: 2 Broomgrove Road, adjacent to boundary with Clarkehouse Road	

### REFER TO GUIDANCE NOTE FOR ALL DEFINITIONS

#### Part 1: Amenity assessment

##### a) Condition & suitability for TPO

- |                          |                         |
|--------------------------|-------------------------|
| 5) Good                  | Highly suitable         |
| 3) Fair/satisfactory     | Suitable                |
| 1) Poor                  | Unlikely to be suitable |
| 0) Dead/dying/dangerous* | Unsuitable              |

\* Relates to existing context and is intended to apply to severe irremediable defects only

#### Score & Notes :

3. A previously pollarded lime prominent within the street scene of Clarkehouse Road. The tree has responded to pruning with good upright growth which appears well attached. Tree has some lower growth obstructing the highway, this could be remedied with minor pruning of branches less than 10cm in diameter.

##### 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 clearly outgrowing their context, or which are significantly negating the potential of other trees of better quality

#### Score & Notes

2. A conservative estimate of 20-40 years is given. Lime are long-lived species, but the tree is situated in limited soil next to a busy street. These unfavourable growing conditions have therefore been taken into account in estimating the trees' remaining life span.

##### 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  | Highly suitable     |
| 4) Large trees, or medium trees clearly visible to the public       | Suitable            |
| 3) Medium trees, or large trees with limited view only              | Suitable            |
| 2) Young, small, or medium/large trees visible only with difficulty | Barely suitable     |
| 1) Trees not visible to the public, regardless of size              | Probably unsuitable |

#### Score & Notes

4. This is medium tree, clearly visible to the public.

##### d) Other factors

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

- |  |  |
|--|--|
| 5) Principal components of formal arboricultural features, or veteran trees                    | <b>Score &amp; Notes</b><br>1. The tree's previous pruning renders it of indifferent form, though of a form well suited to its location, as the upright nature of the stems reduce encroachment to the highway |
| 4) Tree groups, or principal members of groups important for their cohesion                    |  |
| 3) Trees 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) |  |
- 1) Trees with poor form or which are generally unsuitable for their location

#### Part 2: Expediency assessment

Trees must have accrued 10 or more points to qualify

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 5) Immediate threat to tree inc. s.211 Notice | <b>Score &amp; Notes</b><br>5. The arborist acting on behalf of the developer has recommended the tree be felled to accommodate the development |
| 3) Foreseeable threat to tree                 |   |
| 2) Perceived threat to tree                   |   |
| 1) Precautionary only                         |   |

#### 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:

15

#### Decision:

TPO defensible.

Appendix C. Objection letter.



Richard Cannon,  
Legal Services Department,  
Legal and Governance,  
Sheffield City Council,  
Town Hall,  
Pinstone Street,  
Sheffield,  
S1 2HH

**Your Ref: LS/RC/1904317**

**Our Ref: MA/MA/MKA/06437/21/Sall**

**Date: 13 July 2022**

Dear Sirs

**Re: Tree Preservation Order No.451: 2 Broomgrove Road, Sheffield, S10 2LR. Reference No. LS/RC/1904317**

We confirm we act for [REDACTED]

We wish to object on [REDACTED]  
[REDACTED] to the tree preservation order T5 (Lime Tilia x europaea) as marked on Drawing  
No. A4/UED/808/451.

The grounds for objection for this tree are attached in Weddle Landscape Design Tree Protection  
Note.

Please confirm receipt of this objection.

Yours sincerely

[REDACTED]

Athi Law LLP

285 LONDON ROAD SHEFFIELD S2 4NF

---

Job: 2 Broomgrove Road, Sheffield Date & Time: 1.00pm 28.06.2022  
Weather Conditions: Dry, Warm  
WLD representative: [REDACTED]

---

**PURPOSE: INSPECTION OF T5**

---

[REDACTED] has asked Weddle Landscape Design to inspect Lime tree T5 (Referred to as T1 within the Tree Preservation Order) due to concerns over its health.

The site has very recently been served notice that the council intend to put a permanent Tree Preservation Orders on the 5 site trees (council reference LS/RC/1904317). The 5 site trees have recently had crown reduction works as per tree works application 22/00400/TCA.

Regarding T5 (TPO T1), nearby excavation for construction of an approx. 2.5m high retaining wall to 4 Broomgrove Road has cut through part of the root area of T5 (TPO T1). Based on historic google street view it appears this replaced a lower retaining wall, in a similar position. The depth of the recent excavation would have severed roots leading south. The client believes this happened between 6 and 9 months ago.

Based on T5 (TPO T1) 600mm $\varnothing$  trunk the total RPA should be approx. 131m<sup>2</sup>. Approx. 32m<sup>2</sup> has been lost within the boundary excavations, a 24% loss (shown green below). The root loss may be larger due to the tree being constrained by a low retaining wall to Broomgrove Road and impermeable hardstanding to the west, north and east.



*Extract of Tree Protection Plan with green indicating approx. area of root loss*

The top 1m of the cut face is still exposed. This was inspected to see if and how many roots were potentially damaged during the works. There are 3no. larger roots exposed: 1 45mm severed root, 1 35mm severed root and 1 25mm partially severed root:



*Major roots identified within excavation of 4 Bromgrove Road retaining wall.*

Additional deeper roots (in the now backfilled area) may have been damaged during the excavation, however due to their depth this is less likely than the exposed section.

As a mature Lime, a 24% root area loss and severing of at least 3 major roots is likely to significantly weaken the tree, possibly to an extent it may not survive. Additionally, the low

retaining wall at the base of the tree also needs rectification due to health and safety concerns. Although this work could be carried out with minimal impact to the tree roots (using hand tools and special construction techniques) the pragmatic approach may be to replace this tree with suitable replacement which will offer similar amenity benefit and diversify the sites tree stock age. I'd suggest replacement in the same planting area of 2no. Semi-mature *Carpinus betulus* 'Fastigiata' (Hornbeam); 20-25 Girth; 500-550 Height; RB; 3x; Semi-mature; clear stem minimum 200cm. These trees would have the correct form and spread for this position and require less maintenance than the existing Lime.

Appendix D Images of trees.



Trees looking north looking along Clarkehouse Road. Images taken from Google Street view.



Trees looking south along Clarkehouse Road. Images taken from Google Street view