

DELEGATED APPLICATIONS

ASSESSMENT SHEET

APPLICATION NO: DC/26/0725: Tralawney, 7 Beedingwood Drive, Colgate.

REPRESENTATION AND CONSULTATION RESPONSES:

Colgate Parish Council has stated an objection to this proposal.

No additional representations have been received in respect of this application.

ASSESSMENT:

1. The application relates to the removal of a yew tree protected by Tree Preservation Order (TPO) reference 0653/1989, the tree is protected by virtue of its position within the Area A2 of the TPO. The tree is located within the rear garden of the dwelling Tralawne, situated on the private gated estate of Beedingwood Drive.

2. Two separate applications have been submitted in respect of the same tree. The first seeks consent for its removal due to concerns regarding its close relationship with the dwelling, and vermin entering the loft space of the property via the tree. The second application (ref. DC/26/0725) proposes crown reduction works should consent for removal be refused.

3. The yew tree in question is located in the rear garden on the boundary with the adjacent property to the north. Due to the built form and orientation of the dwelling, it has very limited visibility from any public viewpoints in the nearby or wider area. The tree is effectively screened from the surrounding area by the dwelling itself and by other vegetation at the property and that with wider estate. Consequently, it is not a prominent landscape feature and makes only a limited contribution to the wider public amenity of the area. Whilst the tree contributes to the private amenity of the property, its visibility and influence within the wider landscape are significantly constrained.

4. The tree is positioned in very close proximity to the dwelling, with the stem located approximately 1.5 metres from the building at ground level. The crown is in direct contact with the dwelling and overhangs the roof by up to approximately 1 metre in places. Its size and species characteristics give rise to ongoing management requirements typically associated with mature conifers in close proximity to buildings, including shading, dominance, and the need for regular maintenance works to maintain a reasonable degree of spatial separation between the tree and the dwelling.

5. In considering the amenity value of the tree, weight has been given to its limited public visibility and restricted contribution to the character of the wider estate. Although the tree is protected by the TPO, its location and relationship with the existing built form substantially limit its contribution to wider public visual amenity when compared with other protected trees within the locality.

6. Consideration has been given to the additional application, which seeks only tree surgery works to facilitate the retention of the tree. Whilst it is acknowledged that the tree could technically be pruned to maintain clearance from the dwelling, given the tree's position in relation to the property, such management would need to be relatively severe in nature to achieve and maintain an adequate degree of spatial separation between the live crown and the built form.

7. Consequently, the relationship between the tree and the dwelling does not lend itself to a sustainable long-term management solution based solely on pruning. Furthermore, the extent of the works required to maintain sufficient clearance, coupled with the tree's overall form and the need to repeatedly undertake these works on a cyclical basis, would result in a progressive reduction in the tree's already limited amenity value.

8. Furthermore, the applicant has confirmed an intention to undertake replacement planting should consent for removal be granted. The proposed replacement tree would be planted within the front curtilage of the property, in a location where it would be readily visible from Beedingwood Drive and surrounding viewpoints. As a result, the replacement tree would have the potential to make a more positive, meaningful, and far-reaching contribution to the visual amenity and character of the estate than the existing yew, whose benefits are largely confined to the private rear garden setting.

9. Having regard to the limited public amenity value of the existing tree, its close proximity to the dwelling, and the commitment to replacement planting in a more publicly prominent location, it is considered that in this instance the loss of the tree can be adequately mitigated. Subject to an appropriate replacement planting condition, the proposal would not result in an unacceptable loss of amenity to the immediate or wider area, as the replacement tree would over time as it matures contribute to tree cover and visual amenity of the estate.

RECOMMENDATION:

Grant consent subject to the conditions below.

CONDITIONS TO BE APPLIED:

- | | |
|--------|----------------------------------|
| 1. TR2 | <i>Time limit, 2 years</i> |
| 2. TR7 | <i>Replacement (single tree)</i> |
| TINF1 | <i>Note to applicant.</i> |
| TINF2 | <i>Wildlife protection.</i> |

DELEGATED

Authorising Officer sign.....ANBU..... **Arboricultural Officer (Development).**

Date.....09 Jul 26.....