

December 2015
JFA0069

Julian Jenkinson

40 Westridge Road,
Southampton

Arboricultural Report TPO Objection
The Southampton (40 Westridge
Road) Tree Preservation Order
2015) (T2-636)

James Fuller Arboriculture
...your complete arboricultural consultancy

54 Arundel Drive,
Fareham,
Hampshire,
PO16 7NS

+44 (0)7733 073588
james@jfarb.co.uk
www.jfarb.co.uk

Arboricultural Report to Tree Preservation Order (Ref The Southampton (40 Westridge Road) Tree Preservation Order 2015) (T2-636)

Client:	Site:
Julian Jenkinson	40 Westridge Road, Southampton
Arboricultural Consultant:	
James Fuller <i>FdSc.Arb, BTEC Nat.Dip Arb, TechArborA</i>	
Date:	
December 2015	

Contents

<u>Section</u>	<u>Title</u>	<u>Page No.</u>
1.0	INTRODUCTION	2
2.0	CLIENT'S BRIEF	2
3.0	DESCRIPTION OF THE SITE	2
4.0	OBSERVATIONS	3
5.0	OBJECTIONS TO TREE PRESERVATION ORDERS	4
6.0	CONCLUSION.....	5
7.0	BIBLIOGRAPHY	5

Appendices

JF1 Qualifications and Experience

1.0 INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 Southampton City Council made a provisional Tree Preservation Order (TPO) (Ref The Southampton (40 Westridge Road) Tree Preservation Order 2015) (T2-636) on the 26th November 2015.
- 1.2 James Fuller Arboriculture has been instructed by Julian Jenkinson (owner of 40 Westridge Road) to undertake a site visit and assess the trees included within the Tree Preservation Order.
- 1.3 I have been provided with a part copy of the relevant Provisional Tree Preservation Order, which was made, then signed on behalf of Southampton City Council. The Order is in respect of 1 (one) group of trees. The TPO plan provided by Southampton City Council shows a blue outline for the group.

2.0 CLIENT'S BRIEF

- 2.1 To undertake an assessment of the Tree Preservation Order (TPO) and a site appraisal in order to formulate an opinion on the trees and the TPO.
- 2.2 A Tree Evaluation Method for Preservation Orders (TEMPO) was also used to assess the suitability of trees for a TPO. TEMPO was designed by Julian Forbes-Laird, a practising, qualified independent Arboricultural Consultant, as "a systematic assessment tool for TPO suitability". TEMPO considers the condition, retention span, relative public visibility and expediency assessment of a tree. Once the TEMPO assessment has been carried out, a tree will be given a numerical value of between 0–16+, which then defines if the TPO is merited or not. TEMPO is a widely accepted system, used by a large number of Local Authorities to assess trees being considered for a TPO.
- 2.3 To prepare if I felt it supportable, a formal objection to the Provisional Order (based on the above, and the documentation/information provided to me).

3.0 DESCRIPTION OF THE SITE

- 3.1 The site is located on the northeast side of Westridge Road, directly south of the car park. The site is currently occupied with a large detached, run down dwelling, which will require future works with detached dilapidated out buildings in the garden. The site is heavily overgrown and lacking of any management.

3.2 **Photograph 1:** A view of the dwelling from the southwest



4.0 OBSERVATIONS

- 4.1 The 3 (three) trees included within the Provisional Tree Preservation Order (TPO) are Common Sycamore – *Acer pseudoplatanus*. Common Sycamore are non-native trees and are commonly referred to as weeds due to their ability to establish new trees from seed with ease.
- 4.2 The 3 (three) trees have been protected as a group under the TPO. This provides some confusion, as the trees do not have any merit as a group due to their being a significant distance between trees 1 and 2 and 3.
- 4.3 The TPO plan is ambiguous, as it does not set out the exact location of the trees within the group.
- 4.4 The Provisional Tree Preservation Order has been made by Southampton City Council. There seems to be some contradiction within the Tree Preservation Order as to when the order was made, signed and the timescale for objection. The Tree Preservation Order was made on the 26th November 2015 and would continue for a further 6 months or until it is confirmed by the council. The 28 day objection period is detailed within the regulation 3 notice, to end on the 24th December 2015. However, the provisional TPO wasn't signed until the 30th November 2015. Therefore, we should have until the 28th December to submit our objection.
- 4.5 Southampton City Council provide the following reason as to why the TPO has been made detailing that *“Without legal protection the long term retention of these trees is uncertain. It was considered that these significant trees should be protected as their loss would have a detrimental impact on the amenity of the area and the enjoyment by the public. The council has surveyed these trees and considers them worthy of protection under a Tree Preservation Order.* Southampton City Council refer to the trees as ‘significant’, yet use a group TPO to protect the trees and don't specify their location, there is doubt over which 3 trees are protected.

- 4.6 The Provisional Tree Preservation Order includes trees of poor condition and trees growing in close proximity to a dwelling, and therefore the Order is not expedient in the interests of amenity. The 3 (three) trees included within the group TPO, which had to be identified on a separate plan provided by Southampton City Council are not considered to merit a Tree Preservation Order.

5.0 OBJECTIONS TO TREE PRESERVATION ORDERS

- 5.1 Group Tree Preservation Order (TPO) (Ref The Southampton (40 Westridge Road) Tree Preservation Order 2015) (T2-636)

We object to the Tree Preservation Order being placed on this group of trees as it includes trees of low quality and trees in close proximity to a dwelling.

Tree 1 – as identified in the photo below, grows in close proximity to the northern corner of 40 Westridge Road. The branches from this tree are almost touching the building and would need to be pruned clear of the building to allow for any maintenance to be carried out. This tree is a multi-stemmed, semi-mature, Common Sycamore with the ability to put on significant future growth. This tree would be under significant future pressure to be pruned or removed due to its proximity to the existing dwelling. The Tree Preservation Order (TPO) is not sustainable as this tree will be under pressure to be pruned or removed and would cause increased workloads for Southampton City Councils Tree Team if the TPO is confirmed.

This tree didn't make it to the end of the TEMPO assessment as it scored a 0 in Part 1 (b). This was down to the fact that the tree will clearly outgrow its context and therefore does not merit a TPO.

Photograph 2: A view of Tree 1 from the west



Tree 2 – as identified in the photo below, is a heavily suppressed, multi-stemmed, semi-mature, Common Sycamore. Tree 3 suppresses tree 2. It is an accepted arboricultural technique to remove a lower quality tree to improve the growth of a better quality tree. Therefore an application to remove Tree 2 could not be refused and this makes the TPO on this tree indefensible.

This tree didn't make it to the end of the TEMPO assessment as it scored a 0 in Part 1 (b). This was down to the fact that the tree is negating the potential of a neighbouring tree of better quality.

Photograph 3: A view of Trees 2 and 3 from the west



6.0 CONCLUSION

- 6.1 We object to the Tree Preservation Order (TPO) (Ref The Southampton (40 Westridge Road) Tree Preservation Order 2015) (T2-636) as it includes 2 (two) trees that do not merit a TPO.
- 6.2 The objection to the Provisional Tree Preservation Order being confirmed relates to 2 (two) trees within 1 (one) group of trees as identified by Southampton City Council.
- 6.3 In consideration of the foregoing information, we ask that the Tree Preservation Order (TPO) (Ref The Southampton (40 Westridge Road) Tree Preservation Order 2015) (T2-636), is modified to include only those trees that merit a TPO.

7.0 BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Julian Forbes-Laird BA(Hons), MICFor, MEWI, M.Arbor.A, Dip.Arb.(RFS)
Tree Evaluation Method for Preservation Orders (TEMPO)







Qualifications of James Fuller

James Fuller, has over 8 years experience within the field of Arboriculture and has attained a Foundation Degree in Arboriculture (FDSc Arb.) and a BTEC National Diploma in Forestry & Arboriculture (BTEC Nat.Dip. Forestry & Arb.).

James is also a Technical Member of the Arboricultural Association (TechArborA) and has successfully completed the Professional Tree Inspector's, Capital Asset Value for Amenity Trees (CAVAT), Quantified Tree Risk Assessment (QTRA) and Visual Tree Assessment (VTA) Courses.

James previously worked as an Arboricultural Consultant, providing professional advice in relation to trees for one of the leading arboricultural consultancy practices in the country. As part of this role James was instrumental in providing clients with advice from the initial Tree Survey through to site completion and sign off.

James has experience of working on a variety of sites throughout the UK, from individual Visual Tree Assessments (VTA) to large development sites (BS5837: 2012) with 1'000s of trees.

James is now building an ever-growing portfolio of private clients whilst providing consultancy advice to local arboricultural companies and their clients.