Dear Members

Public Appeals Committee

A meeting of the Public Appeals Committee will be held in the Craddock Room, Civic Centre, Riverside, Stafford on Friday 18 October 2019 to deal with the business as set out on the agenda.

Please note that this meeting will be recorded.

The Committee will meet at the rear of the Civic Centre and depart at 10.00am to visit the site as set out in the Agenda and reconvene at the Civic Centre at approximately 11.30am to determine the Tree Preservation Orders.

Members are reminded that contact officers are shown in each report and members are welcome to raise questions etc in advance of the meeting with the appropriate officer.

[Signature]

Interim Head of Law and Administration
PUBLIC APPEALS COMMITTEE - 18 OCTOBER 2019

Chair - Councillor P W Jones
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1 Minutes of 22 January 2018 as published in Digest No 240 on 2 March 2018
2 Apologies
3 Officers' Reports

ITEM NO 3(a) Tree Preservation Order No 624 of 2019
- Land at Shaws Lane and Kerry Lane,
  Eccleshall, Staffordshire
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ITEM NO 3(b) Tree Preservation Order No 625 of 2019
- Land North of Trent Road, Stone,
  Staffordshire
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Tree Preservation Order No 624 of 2019 - Land At Shaws Lane And Kerry Lane, Eccleshall, Staffordshire

Report of Head of Development

Purpose of Report

To consider an objection to the above Tree Preservation Order.

1 Detail

1.1 The above Order was made by the Council on 18 April 2019. A copy of the Order is attached as APPENDIX 1.

1.2 One objection to the Order was received by email on 10 July 2019 from Avison Young as the agent on behalf of Taylor Wimpey. A hard copy of the objection was received by post on 11 July 2019.

1.3 The report of the Head of Development is attached as APPENDIX 2.

1.4 The Committee will visit the site at approximately 10.00am.

2 Recommendation

2.1 The Committee is asked to consider the objection and whether to confirm Tree Preservation Order No 624 of 2019.

Previous Consideration

Nil

Background Papers

File available in Law and Administration and Development.

Officer Contact

Mr G Pearce - Tree Officer, Tel 01785 619539
TREE PRESERVATION ORDER

TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING (TREE PRESERVATION)
(ENGLAND) REGULATIONS 2012
Town and Country Planning Act 1990

The Stafford Borough Council Tree Preservation Order 624 of 2019
AT SHAWS LANE AND KERRY LANE, ECCLESHALL, STAFFORDSHIRE.

The Stafford Borough Council, in exercise of the powers conferred on them by section 198 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, hereby make the following Order:

Citation

1. This Order may be cited as the Stafford Borough Council Tree Preservation Order 624 of 2019.

Interpretation

2. (1) In this Order “the authority” means the Stafford Borough Council.

(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, topping, lopping, uprooting, 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 18th day of April 2019

The Common Seal of the Stafford Borough Council was affixed to this Order in the presence of:

Signed on behalf of the Stafford Borough Council

Authorised by the Council to sign in that behalf
CONFIRMATION OF ORDER

This Order was confirmed by the Stafford Borough Council without modification on the ...... day of ................................. 20..
OR
This Order was confirmed by the Stafford Borough Council, subject to the modifications indicated by ............................... on the ...... day of ................. 20..

.................................................................
Authorised by the Council to sign in that behalf

DECISION NOT TO CONFIRM ORDER

A decision not to confirm this Order was taken by Stafford Borough Council on the ...... day of ................................. 20..

.................................................................
Authorised by the Council to sign in that behalf

VARIATION OF ORDER

This Order was varied by the Stafford Borough Council on the ...... day of ................................. 20. by a Variation Order under the reference number ................................................., a copy of which is attached.

.................................................................
Authorised by the Council to sign in that behalf

REVOCATION OF ORDER

This Order was revoked by the Stafford Borough Council on the ...... day of ................................. 20..

.................................................................
Authorised by the Council to sign in that behalf
SCHEDULE

Specification of trees

Note: All trees, group of trees and woodlands described in this Schedule are situated in the Borough Of Stafford on Ordnance Survey Sheet SJ9537 (1:1250)

### Trees specified individually
(encircled in black on the map)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference No.</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Situation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference No.</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Situation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Woodlands
(within a continuous black line on the map)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference No.</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Situation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Areas of trees
(within a dotted black line on the map)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference No.</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Situation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A1</td>
<td>Mixed species broadleaf trees comprising 3 tree groups and 7 individual specimens</td>
<td>Agricultural field network located between Shaw's Lane, Kerry Lane and Church Street, Eccleshall.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Tree Preservation Order No 624 of 2019 - Land at Shaws Lane and Kerry Lane, Eccleshall, Staffordshire

SECTION 1

1 General Introduction

1.1 The Law in relation to Tree Preservation

The law relating to Tree Preservation Orders (TPOs) is included in part VIII of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 as amended.

The principle regulations relating to TPOs are included in the Town and Country Planning (Tree Preservation Order)(England) Regulations 2012.

Guidance is given in Planning Practice Guidance - Tree Preservation Orders and trees in conservation areas.

The Borough Council is the Local Planning Authority (LPA) for the making of TPOs in the Stafford Borough area.

1.2 Power to Make TPOs

A Local Planning Authority may make a TPO if it appears to be;

“Expedient in the interests of amenity to make provision for the preservation of trees or woodlands in their area” (S198 (1) of the Act)."

Paragraphs 007 and 008 of the Planning Practice Guidance states:-

“WHAT DOES ‘AMENITY’ MEAN IN PRACTICE?

‘Amenity’ is not defined in law, so authorities need to exercise judgment when deciding whether it is within their powers to make an Order. Orders should be used to protect selected trees and woodlands if their removal would have a significant negative impact on the local environment and its enjoyment by the public. Before authorities make or confirm an Order they should be able to show that protection would bring a reasonable degree of public benefit in the present or future.
WHAT MIGHT A LOCAL AUTHORITY TAKE INTO ACCOUNT WHEN ASSESSING AMENITY VALUE?

When considering whether trees should be protected by an Order, authorities are advised to develop ways of assessing the amenity value of trees in a structured and consistent way, taking into account the following criteria:

Visibility
The extent to which the trees or woodlands can be seen by the public will inform the authority’s assessment of whether the impact on the local environment is significant. The trees, or at least part of them, should normally be visible from a public place, such as a road or footpath, or accessible by the public.

Individual, collective and wider impact
Public visibility alone will not be sufficient to warrant an Order. The authority is advised to also assess the particular importance of an individual tree, of groups of trees or of woodlands by reference to its or their characteristics including:

• size and form;
• future potential as an amenity;
• rarity, cultural or historic value;
• contribution to, and relationship with, the landscape; and
• contribution to the character or appearance of a conservation area.

Other factors
Where relevant to an assessment of the amenity value of trees or woodlands, authorities may consider taking into account other factors, such as importance to nature conservation or response to climate change. These factors alone would not warrant making an Order.”

1.3 Making Objections or Representations

The purpose of requiring a Local Planning Authority to serve a copy of the TPO and the Regulation 5 Notice on owners, occupiers and others with rights over the land is to ensure that they are all made aware of the TPO and given a chance to comment on it.

SECTION 2

2 Background

2.1 In April 2019 a request for information regarding the presence of Tree Preservation Orders was made by arboricultural consultancy EDP regarding the area of land defined by the TPO under consideration by this committee.

This combined with anecdotal evidence arising from conversations with local residents, regarding previous intentions by some of the land owners to develop the site, led to further investigations. A land registry search revealed that the volume housebuilder Taylor Wimpey has a registered interest in the land.
The council Tree Officer, Gavin Pearce, conducted a site visit and found a number of tree groups and individual specimens on site of significant value within the local landscape. These trees would present a constraint to potential future development, though not a prohibitive one.

In circumstances such as this trees are often at increased risk of removal as it is sometimes considered desirable to reduce potential on site constraints to a minimum. Therefore Tree Preservation Order No. 624 of 2019 was created in order to ensure the retention of the trees until such a point that they can be given full consideration as part of any potential future planning application.

2.2 Site and Surroundings

The site comprises of a collection of four or five agricultural fields on the western edge of Eccleshall. The site is located between Church Street on the northern boundary, Kerry Lane to the West, Shaw’s Lane to the South and the recently completed development of Overton Manor to the East. The field network is fairly typical being made up of open arable land divided up and edged by hedgerows. A significant number of the trees on site are contained within these hedgerows, but there are three groups of trees located at the centre and to the north west of the site.

Whilst the tree cover in the wider Eccleshall area is reasonably abundant the open agricultural nature of the area around this site means that the trees in question make a significant contribution to local amenity.

SECTION 3

3 Description of the Trees referred to in the Notice

The trees are comprised of several broadleaf species and are of a mixed age range, though predominantly mature. The tree group in the centre of the site surrounds a significant depression in the ground which is certainly a higher value habitat area. At this time the current Tree Preservation Order is of the Area type and therefore only includes basic information. A full detailed survey will be carried out as part of an imminent review of Tree Preservation Orders in the Eccleshall area.

The TEMPO (Tree Evaluation Method for Preservation Orders) amenity assessment in respect of the above site has been included as ANNEX 1.

SECTION 4

4 Reasons for the Making of a Tree Preservation Order

The trees are collectively considered to make a worthwhile contribution to amenity and they are visible from public places. The trees were considered to be potentially under threat and in these circumstances the service of an Order was considered to be expedient.
SECTION 5

5 Objections

5.1 Objections received

On 10 July 2019 Stafford Borough Council received an objection to the creation of this TPO from Avison Young as the agent on behalf of Taylor Wimpey. The objection, including all supporting information, is included in full as ANNEX 2 to avoid any misinterpretation or misrepresentation.

5.2 Responses to Objections

The objection received raises three points which are summarised and responded to as follows:

i) The council has failed to justify its conclusions in relation to the amenity value of the trees, or to accurately identify the trees to which the order relates.

Response
As with all new Tree Preservation Orders a TEMPO (Tree Evaluation Method for Preservation Orders) assessment was carried out. This assessment resulted in a score of 20, with 15+ being sufficient to justify the creation of a new order. An Area type order was created with only basic information in the interests of expediency. This was due to the need for a timely response to EDP regarding the TPO status of the trees on site. A more detailed order will be made in due course as part of plans to imminently review the Tree Preservation Orders in the Eccleshall area. This in turn is part of a much larger Borough wide TPO review.

ii) The council has made an Area order in respect of all trees on site regardless of their individual quality and contribution to amenity.

Response
As explained above the Area order was created in the interests of expediency. It is not the intention to maintain this order under the Area classification in perpetuity. However a current review of the Tree Preservation Orders within the Stafford Borough area is being carried out and will result in a more specific order being made in respect of this site. However it has not been possible to carry out this process to date and therefore the Area order will need to be confirmed and maintained until the stage that the review has been completed.
iii) It is not considered expedient to make the Order.

Response
It has been assumed that this point refers to an alleged lack of a present need to make an order due to the absence of foreseeable risk to the trees.
Stafford Borough Council judges that the vested interest of a volume house builder in the land which in turn is owned by multiple third parties and the material constraint that the trees present indicates a situation where there is a foreseeable risk. That it is considered a foreseeable risk rather than an immediate one has been reflected in the TEMPO assessment referred to above and included in ANNEX 1.

Representations received

A further representation was received on behalf of Eccleshall Parish Council which is included as ANNEX 3.

SECTION 6

6 Conclusion

The trees are considered to make a worthwhile and increasing contribution to the amenity of the area. They are clearly visible to the public, most particularly from the footpath and highways adjacent to the site and are of sufficient significance to warrant the making of the Tree Preservation Order. In these circumstances Committee is requested to confirm the Order.

Committee is requested to consider confirming the Order without modification.
STAFFORD BOROUGH COUNCIL
TREE EVALUATION METHOD FOR PRESERVATION ORDERS (TEMPO)

Tree / Group Number: TPO 624 of 2019  Species: Mixed broadleaf species

Part 1: Amenity Assessment

a) Condition and suitability for TPO

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>Suitability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5) Good</td>
<td>Highly suitable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Fair</td>
<td>Suitable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) Poor</td>
<td>Unlikely to be suitable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0) Dead</td>
<td>Unsuitable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0) Dying/dangerous*</td>
<td>Unsuitable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Retention Span</th>
<th>Suitability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5) 100+</td>
<td>Highly suitable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) 40 – 100</td>
<td>Very suitable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) 20 – 40</td>
<td>Suitable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) 10 – 20</td>
<td>Just suitable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0) &lt; 10*</td>
<td>Unsuitable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Includes trees that are an existing or near future nuisance including those clearly outgrowing their context, or which are significantly negating the potential of other trees

Part 2: Expediency Assessment

Trees must have accrued 9+ points to qualify

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Threat to the Tree</th>
<th>Suitability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5) Immediate threat to the tree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Foreseeable threat to the tree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Perceived threat to the tree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) Precautionary only</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Part 3: Decision Guide

Any 0 Do Not apply TPO
1-6.1 TPO indefensible
7-10 Does not merit TPO
11-14 TPO Defensible
15+ Definitely merits TPO

Total Score

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Score</th>
<th>Decision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Definitely merits TPO</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Score and Notes - 5
Whilst individuals within the wider group vary in condition the overall health and integrity of the tree group is good.

Score and Notes – 4
Being a mixed age range group the remaining contribution of individuals will vary, however it is reasonable to expect 40+ years for the tree group overall.

Score and Notes – 5
There are a number of large, mature specimens within the group that are clearly visible to surrounding areas within the public realm.

Score and Notes – 3
A number of specimens are of good form and will have habitat value within the agricultural landscape.

Score and Notes – 3
A volume housebuilder has an interest in the land which is next to a recently completed new build development. One of the existing landowners has expressed interest locally in developing the land.
Dear Sirs

STAFFORD BOROUGH COUNCIL TREE PRESERVATION ORDER NO. 624/2019 AT SHAWS LANE AND KERRY LANE, ECCLESHALL

Avison Young is instructed by Taylor Wimpey Strategic Land ("Taylor Wimpey") to provide advice in respect of town planning matters in relation to land at Shaws Lane, Eccleshall which it is promoting for residential development on behalf of the landowner.

On 13 June 2019, Stafford Borough Council ("the Council") made Tree Preservation Order No. 624/2019. The Council is currently seeking representations prior to deciding whether to confirm the Order.

The Order specifies that it relates to trees in an area identified as ‘A1’ which includes "mixed species broadleaf trees 3 groups and 7 individual specimens".

Area ‘A1’ extends to approximately 11 hectares and comprises five agricultural fields with a number of hedges and trees around the site perimeter and internal field boundaries. The site is bound to the south by Shaws Lane, to the east by development on Kerry Lane, to the west by the primary residential area of Eccleshall and north by Church Street.

On behalf of Taylor Wimpey, we wish to formally object to the Order. The Planning Practice Guidance ("PPG") states that objections can be made on any grounds. With that in mind, the remainder of this letter sets out the grounds for objection, with reference to the following matters:-

- relevant sections of the Planning Practice Guidance ("PPG") relating to Tree Preservation Orders;
- the Grounds for the Order as specified by the Council; and
- compliance of the Order with the PPG.
Planning Practice Guidance

The PPG provides additional guidance to the National Planning Policy Framework. It provides commentary on the application of policy and legislation.

In relation to Tree Preservation Orders (‘TPOs’), the PPG states that “a Tree Preservation Order is an order made by a local planning authority in England to protect specific trees, groups of trees or woodlands in the interests of amenity”.

It reflects the wording of Section 198 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 by confirming that “Local planning authorities can make a Tree Preservation Order if it appears to them to be ‘expedient in the interests of amenity to make provision for the preservation of trees or woodlands in their area’”.

To aid local planning authorities in the preparation of TPOs, the PPG provides guidance on how ‘amenity’ and ‘expediency’ should be considered and applied.

Amenity

In respect of amenity, the PPG recognises that there is no legal definition and establishes that local planning authorities should exercise judgement. However it states that:

“Orders should be used to protect selected trees and woodlands if their removal would have a significant negative impact on the local environment and its enjoyment by the public. Before authorities make or confirm an Order they should be able to show that protection would bring a reasonable degree of public benefit in the present or future.”

The PPG states that factors that the LPA should consider when assessing the amenity value include the visibility of the trees or woodland and the extent to which they can be seen by the public; as well as the individual, collective, and wider impact, by virtue of the size and form, rarity, cultural or historic value, or contribution to landscape.

Expediency

With regards to expediency, the PPG states that:

“It may be expedient to make an Order if the authority believes that there is a risk of trees being felled, pruned or damaged in ways which would have a significant impact on the amenity of the area”.

An important point to make is that the PPG notes that whilst trees may warrant protection on the basis of their amenity value, it does not necessarily follow that it is expedient to make an Order.

‘Area’ TPOs

In relation to ‘area’ TPO the PPG states that the area category is “intended for short-term protection in an emergency and may not be capable of providing appropriate long-term protection”. It goes onto state that “Authorities are advised to only use this category as a temporary measure until they can fully assess and reclassify the trees in the area.”

Reasons for the Order
The Order simply states that the Council’s reasons for making the Order are as follows:

- “The trees form a prominent landscape feature in the local area and will continue to contribute to landscape quality in the future.
- The trees add to the amenity and visual diversity of the immediate area.
- An ongoing review of Tree Preservation Orders at Stafford Borough Council has shown these trees to be potentially at risk from development, an unregulated pruning.”

**Compliance of the Order with the Planning Practice Guidance**

As drafted, the Order does not explain the assessment of the amenity value of the trees that has been undertaken by the Council. It makes no mention of the factors to which PPG states authorities must have regard. As such, it is impossible to determine on what basis the Council has reached the conclusion that the trees add to the amenity of the site.

The order also appears to be an ‘area’ TPO which does not identify specific trees, simply suggesting that the area includes “3 groups and 7 individual specimens”.

Taylor Wimpey has instructed EDP to undertake a detailed Tree Survey of the site (in accordance with BS5837:2012 which requires consideration of the arboricultural, landscape and cultural values of individual trees and groups of trees). EDP has identified a significantly higher number of trees and tree groups within and along the boundaries of area ‘A1’ (7 tree groups and 46 individual specimens – albeit a small number of these are beyond the boundary of ‘area ‘A1’). A copy of the tree survey plan and tree schedules is included at Appendix 1.

This provides further indication that the Council has not undertaken an appropriate assessment of the amenity value of the trees on the site. The PPG is clear that “the officer should gather sufficient information to enable an accurate Order to be drawn up” and “should record the number and species (or at least the genus) of the individual trees or groups of trees to be included in the Order and their location.” For this reason, it is considered that insufficient information has been gathered in this case to allow an accurate Order to be prepared.

Of the trees, assessed by EDP, within area A1 only three were identified as ‘Category A’ (high quality), sixteen were assessed as ‘Category B’ (moderate quality) and the remaining trees were assessed as ‘Category C’ (low quality) and below. One tree was assessed as ‘Category U’ (unsuitable for retention).

On this basis, only a relatively limited number of the trees are of ‘high quality’ and there is no justification for a ‘blanket’ or ‘area’ TPO on the grounds of ‘amenity’. Such an approach is in Taylor Wimpey’s view inappropriate having regard to the legislation and guidance.

The Council has indicated that it considers it expedient to make the Order because the trees are “potentially at risk from development, and unregulated pruning”. However, development poses no immediate risk. Taylor Wimpey is promoting the land for residential development through the review of the Borough Plan which is still at an early stage and unlikely to be adopted until late 2021. If allocated for residential development in the Plan, Taylor Wimpey would, in any case, seek to retain the highest quality trees where possible within the design of any proposals.

There is certainly no “emergency” which would justify short-term protection through an ‘area’ TPO in accordance with the PPG which is also clear that it is not appropriate for an ‘area’ TPO to be used to provide ‘long-term protection.”
The trees in the northern part of the site are already afforded protection by virtue of their location within the Eccleshall Conservation Area. As such, it would not appear to be expedient for a Tree Preservation Order to be created in this part of the site.

We, therefore, conclude that the Order is deficient for the following broad reasons:

- as a consequence of the failure of the Council to justify its conclusions in relation to the amenity value of the trees and to accurately identify the trees to which the Order relates;
- its proposal to apply a ‘blanket’ or ‘area’ TPO to all trees within the site regardless of quality and their contribution to amenity; and
- it is not considered expedient to make the Order.

It is on this basis that we request that the Order is not confirmed.

Notwithstanding the above, if the Council is able to robustly demonstrate why it might be expedient in the interest of amenity to make an Order in this case, Taylor Wimpey requests that the Order be amended to refer only to those trees which it would be expedient to protect in the interests of amenity. Taylor Wimpey’s view is that, at most, only those trees which have been assessed as ‘Category A’ (high quality) and do not fall within the Conservation Area should be cited in any Order.

Procedural Matters

Regulation 6 of the Town and Country Planning (Tree Preservation) (England) Regulations 2012 state that objections to an Order will be ‘duly made’ where they are: made in writing; delivered to the local planning authority not later than the date established under Regulation 5 (which, in this case, is 11 July 2019); specifies the trees to which the objection relates; and states the reasons for the objection.

Accordingly, this letter should be taken as Taylor Wimpey’s written objection to the Order. The reasons for objection have been clearly set out above. The letter will be emailed to the Council and posted in such time that it will be delivered to the Council no later than 11 July. Finally, and for the avoidance of doubt, the objection is in respect of all trees and groups of trees within area ‘A1’ specified in the Order.

It is on this basis, that we consider this objection to be duly made.

We trust that the above clearly sets out Taylor Wimpey’s grounds for objection. Should the Council require any clarification on any of the above points please do not hesitate to contact Stephanie Eastwood of this office on 0121 609 8120 or via email (stephanie.eastwood@avisonyoung.com). We request that the Council advises us of its decision on whether to confirm the Order.

Yours faithfully

Stephanie Eastwood BSc MSc
Principal Planner
0121 609 8120
stephanie.eastwood@avisonyoung.com
For and on behalf of
GVA Grimley Limited t/a Avison Young
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sequential Reference No.</th>
<th>Species</th>
<th>Height (m)</th>
<th>Stem Diameter (mm)</th>
<th>Canopy Coverage (%)</th>
<th>Life Stage</th>
<th>Physiological Condition</th>
<th>Structural Condition</th>
<th>Comments / Notes</th>
<th>Recommendations</th>
<th>Estimated Remaining Contribution (Years)</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Priority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H1</td>
<td>Blackthorn (Prunus spinosa)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6x80</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Early Mature</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Hedgerow - unmaintained</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T2</td>
<td>English Oak (Quercus robur)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Semi Mature</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Base obscured - by the hedgerow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T3</td>
<td>Common Ash (Fraxinus excelsior)</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>480</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Early Mature</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Crown - suppressed - within the group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G4</td>
<td>Common Ash (Fraxinus excelsior)</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Semi Mature</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Located outside the site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H5</td>
<td>Blackthorn (Prunus spinosa)</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>6x80</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Early Mature</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Hedgerow - unmaintained</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T6</td>
<td>English Oak (Quercus robur)</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1140</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Mature</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Bark loss</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T7</td>
<td>Common Lime (Tilia x europaea)</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Mature</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Located outside the site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T8</td>
<td>English Oak (Quercus robur)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Semi Mature</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Located outside the site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sequential Reference No.</td>
<td>Species</td>
<td>Height (m)</td>
<td>Main Diameter (mm)</td>
<td>Canopy Clearance (m)</td>
<td>Life Stage</td>
<td>Physiological Condition</td>
<td>Structural Condition</td>
<td>Comments / Notes</td>
<td>Recommendations</td>
<td>Estimated Remaining Contribution (Years)</td>
<td>Category (C)</td>
<td>Priority (P)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T9</td>
<td>Wild Cherry (Prunus avium)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Semi Mature</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Located outside the site - No obvious defects - Typical crown form for the species - Unable to gain access to base</td>
<td>No work required</td>
<td>20+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T10</td>
<td>Lombardy Poplar (Populus nigra 'Italica')</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Mature</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Located outside the site - No obvious defects - Typical crown form for the species - Unable to gain access to base</td>
<td>No work required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T11</td>
<td>Common Lime (Tilia x europaea)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Early Mature</td>
<td>Dead</td>
<td>Located outside the site - Stem - Dead - Unable to gain access to base</td>
<td>No work required</td>
<td>&lt;10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T12</td>
<td>Swedish Whitebeam (Sorbus intermedia)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Early Mature</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Located outside the site - No obvious defects - Typical crown form for the species - Unable to gain access to base</td>
<td>No work required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T13</td>
<td>Common Ash (Fraxinus excelsior)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>480</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Early Mature</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Located outside the site - No obvious defects - Typical crown form for the species - Unable to gain access to base</td>
<td>No work required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T14</td>
<td>English Oak (Quercus robur)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Early Mature</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Located outside the site - No obvious defects - Typical crown form for the species - Unable to gain access to base</td>
<td>No work required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T15</td>
<td>Beech (Fagus sylvatica)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6x120</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Early Mature</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Located outside the site - No obvious defects - Typical crown form for the species - Unable to gain access to base</td>
<td>No work required</td>
<td>20+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T16</td>
<td>Common Lime (Tilia x europaea)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Mature</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Located outside the site - No obvious defects - Typical crown form for the species - Unable to gain access to base</td>
<td>No work required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G17</td>
<td>Hawthorn (Crataegus monogyna)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Early Mature</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Dense undergrowth at the base - No growth - main stem - No obvious defects - Unable to gain access to base - Water logged ground</td>
<td>No work required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H18</td>
<td>Blackthorn (Prunus spinosa) Elder (Sambucus nigra) Hazel (Corylus avellana) Holly (Ilex aquifolium)</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>6x80</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Early Mature</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Hedgerow - unmaintained</td>
<td>No work required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T19</td>
<td>Common Lime (Tilia x europaea)</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Mature</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Cultivated ground at the base - to the west - No growth - main stem - Dense - No obvious defects - Typical crown form for the species</td>
<td>No work required</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sequential Reference Number**: This is the measurement of stem diameter in millimeters taken in an ascending order of the height above the ground. **Main Diameter**: This is the measurement of stem diameter in millimeters taken in an ascending order of the height above the ground. **Canopy Clearance**: This is the measurement of stem diameter in millimeters taken in an ascending order of the height above the ground. **Life Stage**: Early Mature - Mature - Late Mature - Old Mature - Dead - Semi Mature - Dead. **Physiological Condition**: Poor - Fair - Good - Excellent. **Structural Condition**: None - Minor - Major - Severe. **Comments / Notes**: Located outside the site - No visible defects - Typical crown form for the species - Unable to gain access to base. **Recommendations**: No work required - To be removed - To be observed - To be maintained - To be kept - To be removed for any works commencing on site and for future maintenance. **Estimated Remaining Contribution (Years)**: The estimate is based on the average life expectancy of the species. **Category (C)**: C1 - C2 - C3. **Priority (P)**: P1 - P2 - P3.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sequential Reference No.</th>
<th>Species</th>
<th>Height (m)</th>
<th>Main Diameter (mm)</th>
<th>Canopy Clearance (m)</th>
<th>Life Stage</th>
<th>Physiological Condition</th>
<th>Structural Condition</th>
<th>Comments / Notes</th>
<th>Recommendations</th>
<th>Estimated Remaning Contribution (Years)</th>
<th>Category Rating</th>
<th>Priority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T20</td>
<td>Holly (Ilex aquifolium)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6x80</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Early Mature</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Cultivated ground at the base - to the west</td>
<td>No work required</td>
<td>10+</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T21</td>
<td>Sycamore (Acer pseudoplatanus)</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Mature</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Cultivated ground at the base - to the west</td>
<td>No work required</td>
<td>20+</td>
<td>B1</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T22</td>
<td>Sycamore (Acer pseudoplatanus)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>250 250</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Semi Mature</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Cultivated ground at the base - to the west</td>
<td>No work required</td>
<td>10+</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T23</td>
<td>Hawthorn (Crataegus monogyna)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>100 150</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Early Mature</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Cultivated ground at the base - to the west</td>
<td>No work required</td>
<td>10+</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T24</td>
<td>Common Ash (Fraxinus excelsior)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Semi Mature</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Base obscured</td>
<td>No work required</td>
<td>20+</td>
<td>B1</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T25</td>
<td>Blackthorn (Prunus spinosa)</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>6x80</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Early Mature</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Hedgerow - unmaintained</td>
<td>No work required</td>
<td>10+</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T26</td>
<td>Common Ash (Fraxinus excelsior)</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Mature</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Bark wounds on the stem - minor Branch stubs</td>
<td>No work required</td>
<td>10+</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T27</td>
<td>Common Ash (Fraxinus excelsior)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>250 280</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Semi Mature</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Branches - broken</td>
<td>No work required</td>
<td>10+</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sequential Reference No.</td>
<td>Species</td>
<td>Height (m)</td>
<td>Stem Diameter (mm)</td>
<td>Canopy Clearance (mm)</td>
<td>North</td>
<td>East</td>
<td>South</td>
<td>West</td>
<td>Canopy Condition</td>
<td>Life Stage</td>
<td>Physiological Condition</td>
<td>Structural Condition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T28</td>
<td>English Oak (Quercus robur)</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>10 10 10 10 3</td>
<td>Mature</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td></td>
<td>Located outside the site</td>
<td>No obvious defects</td>
<td>Typical crown form for the species</td>
<td>No work required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T29</td>
<td>English Oak (Quercus robur)</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>10 10 10 10 3</td>
<td>Mature</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td></td>
<td>Located outside the site</td>
<td>No obvious defects</td>
<td>Typical crown form for the species</td>
<td>No work required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T30</td>
<td>English Oak (Quercus robur)</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>10 10 10 10 3</td>
<td>Mature</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td></td>
<td>Located outside the site</td>
<td>No obvious defects</td>
<td>Typical crown form for the species</td>
<td>No work required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G31</td>
<td>Elder (Sambucus nigra)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6x80</td>
<td>2 2 2 2 1</td>
<td>Early Mature</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td></td>
<td>Unmaintained scrub trees around a pond</td>
<td>No work required</td>
<td></td>
<td>10+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H32</td>
<td>Blackthorn (Prunus spinosa) Elder (Sambucus nigra) Hawthorn (Crataegus monogyna) Hazel (Corylus avellana) Holly (Ilex aquifolium)</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>6x80</td>
<td>1 1 1 1 0</td>
<td>Early Mature</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td></td>
<td>Pedigree - unmaintained</td>
<td>No work required</td>
<td></td>
<td>10+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H33</td>
<td>Blackthorn (Prunus spinosa) Elder (Sambucus nigra) Hawthorn (Crataegus monogyna) Hazel (Corylus avellana) Holly (Ilex aquifolium)</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>6x80</td>
<td>1 1 1 1 0</td>
<td>Early Mature</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td></td>
<td>Pedigree - unmaintained</td>
<td>No work required</td>
<td></td>
<td>10+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H34</td>
<td>Blackthorn (Prunus spinosa) Elder (Sambucus nigra) Hawthorn (Crataegus monogyna) Hazel (Corylus avellana) Holly (Ilex aquifolium)</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>6x80</td>
<td>1 1 1 1 0</td>
<td>Early Mature</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td></td>
<td>Pedigree - unmaintained</td>
<td>No work required</td>
<td></td>
<td>10+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H35</td>
<td>Blackthorn (Prunus spinosa) Elder (Sambucus nigra) Hawthorn (Crataegus monogyna) Hazel (Corylus avellana) Holly (Ilex aquifolium)</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>6x80</td>
<td>1 1 1 1 0</td>
<td>Early Mature</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td></td>
<td>Pedigree - unmaintained</td>
<td>No work required</td>
<td></td>
<td>10+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T36</td>
<td>Hawthorn (Crataegus monogyna)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>90 90 150</td>
<td>3 3 3 3 1</td>
<td>Early Mature</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td></td>
<td>Branch stubs, Branches - broken, Crown - sparse, Minor deadwood, Stems - leaning, to the north, Stems - multiple - 3 at 0.5m</td>
<td>No work required</td>
<td></td>
<td>10+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sequential Reference No.</td>
<td>Species</td>
<td>Height (m)</td>
<td>Mass (Kg)</td>
<td>Branch Spread (m)</td>
<td>Canopy Clearance (m)</td>
<td>Life Stage</td>
<td>Physiological Condition</td>
<td>Structural Condition</td>
<td>Comments / Notes</td>
<td>Recommendations</td>
<td>Estimated Remaining Contribution (Years)</td>
<td>Category</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T37</td>
<td>Goat Willow (Salix caprea)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6x80</td>
<td>4 4 4 4 4 1</td>
<td>Semi Mature</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>No obvious defects</td>
<td>Self-seeded</td>
<td>No work required</td>
<td>10+</td>
<td>C1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T38</td>
<td>Common Ash (Fraxinus excelsior)</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>3 6 7 6 3 3</td>
<td>Mature</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Crown - suppressed</td>
<td>pruned away from electrical lines so uneven</td>
<td>No obvious defects</td>
<td>No work required</td>
<td>10+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H59</td>
<td>Blackthorn (Prunus spinosa)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6x80</td>
<td>1 1 1 1 1 0</td>
<td>Early Mature</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Hedgerow - unmaintained</td>
<td>No work required</td>
<td>10+</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G40</td>
<td>Hawthorn (Crataegus monogyna)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6x80</td>
<td>3 3 3 3 3 1</td>
<td>Early Mature</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Crowns - interlocked</td>
<td>Located outside the site</td>
<td>No obvious defects</td>
<td>No work required</td>
<td>10+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T41</td>
<td>Common Ash (Fraxinus excelsior)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>9 9 9 9 9</td>
<td>Mature</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Base obscured</td>
<td>Branch stubs</td>
<td>No work required</td>
<td>20+</td>
<td>B1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G42</td>
<td>Hawthorn (Crataegus monogyna)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6x80</td>
<td>3 3 3 3 3 1</td>
<td>Early Mature</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Crowns - interlocked</td>
<td>Located outside the site</td>
<td>No obvious defects</td>
<td>No work required</td>
<td>10+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T43</td>
<td>Common Ash (Fraxinus excelsior)</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>9 9 9 9 9</td>
<td>Mature</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Bark wounds at the base</td>
<td>major - bark coming off stem but no wound</td>
<td>Deadwood - remove major deadwood</td>
<td>10+</td>
<td>C1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G44</td>
<td>Holly (Ilex aquifolium)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>3 3 3 3 3 1</td>
<td>Semi Mature</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Base obscured</td>
<td>Dense undergrowth at the base</td>
<td>No obvious defects</td>
<td>No work required</td>
<td>10+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Definitions:**
- **Height:** The approximate height (in metres) provided for the highest point of the tree.
- **Branch Spread:** This is the measurement of stem diameter in millimetres taken in accordance with Annex C of BS5937:2012. - estimated
- **Canopy Clearances:** This is taken of four cardinal points, with a stated value in metres to enable an accurate representation of the crown.
- **Physiological Condition:** Health of the tree (significant branch and shoot growth e.g. 2-4 A, measured from adjacent ground level).
- **Life Stage:** There are five classes to which trees are assigned: Young, Early Maturer, Mature, Over Maturer, Venerable.

**Recommendations:**
- Deadwood - remove major deadwood
- No work required
- Deadwood - remove major deadwood
- No work required
- Deadwood - remove major deadwood
- No work required
- No work required
- No work required
- No work required
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sequential Reference No.</th>
<th>Species</th>
<th>Height (m)</th>
<th>Stem Diameter (mm)</th>
<th>Survey Clearance (m)</th>
<th>Life Stage</th>
<th>Physiological Condition</th>
<th>Structural Condition</th>
<th>Comments / Notes</th>
<th>Recommendations</th>
<th>Estimated Remaining Contribution (Years)</th>
<th>Category Coding</th>
<th>Priority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T45</td>
<td>Common Ash (Fraxinus excelsior)</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>10 10 10 10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Mature</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Base obscured. Dense undergoing at the base. Located outside the site. No obvious defects. Typical crown form for the species. Unable to gain access to base - down an embankment.</td>
<td>No work required</td>
<td>20+</td>
<td>B1</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T46</td>
<td>Common Ash (Fraxinus excelsior)</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>8 8 8 8 8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Mature</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Base obscured. Dense undergoing at the base. Located outside the site. No obvious defects. Typical crown form for the species. Unable to gain access to base.</td>
<td>No work required</td>
<td>20+</td>
<td>B1</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T47</td>
<td>Haworth (Crataegus monogyna)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>150 180 180</td>
<td>5 3 2 3 1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Mature</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Branch stubs. Branches - broken. Old at the base. Crown - suppressed - to the south. Minor deadwood.</td>
<td>No work required</td>
<td>10+</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T48</td>
<td>Common Ash (Fraxinus excelsior)</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>820</td>
<td>7 7 7 7 3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Mature</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Branches - broken. Minor deadwood. Pruning wounds - unsympathetic. Unable to gain access to base - on an embankment.</td>
<td>No work required</td>
<td>20+</td>
<td>B1</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T49</td>
<td>Common Ash (Fraxinus excelsior)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>850</td>
<td>7 7 7 7 3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Mature</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Branches - broken. Minor deadwood. Pruning wounds - unsympathetic. Unable to gain access to base - on an embankment.</td>
<td>No work required</td>
<td>20+</td>
<td>B1</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T50</td>
<td>Common Ash (Fraxinus excelsior)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>850</td>
<td>7 7 7 7 3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Mature</td>
<td>Dead</td>
<td>Major deadwood. Minor deadwood. Stem - dead.</td>
<td>No work required</td>
<td>&lt;10</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T51</td>
<td>Haworth (Crataegus monogyna)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6x80</td>
<td>4 4 4 4 4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Mature</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Located outside the site. No obvious defects. Typical crown form for the species. Unable to gain access to base - down an embankment.</td>
<td>No work required</td>
<td>10+</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T52</td>
<td>Wych Elm (Ulmus glabra)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>4 4 4 4 4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Mature</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Located outside the site. No obvious defects. Typical crown form for the species. Unable to gain access to base - down an embankment.</td>
<td>No work required</td>
<td>10+</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T53</td>
<td>Common Ash (Fraxinus excelsior)</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>10 10 10 10 10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Mature</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Located outside the site. No obvious defects. Typical crown form for the species. Unable to gain access to base - down an embankment.</td>
<td>No work required</td>
<td>20+</td>
<td>B1</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sequential Reference No.</td>
<td>Species</td>
<td>Height (m)</td>
<td>Mean Diameter (mm)</td>
<td>Branch Spread (m)</td>
<td>Survey Clearance (m)</td>
<td>Life Stage</td>
<td>Physiological Condition</td>
<td>Structural Condition</td>
<td>Comments / Notes</td>
<td>Recommendations</td>
<td>Estimated Remaining Contribution (Years)</td>
<td>Category Rating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T54</td>
<td>Common Ash (Fraxinus excelsior)</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>7 2 7 3</td>
<td>Early Mature</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Located outside the site</td>
<td>Minor deadwood</td>
<td>No obvious defects</td>
<td>Typical crown form for the species</td>
<td>Unable to gain access to base - down an embankment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T55</td>
<td>Wyth Elm (Ulmus glabra)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>4 1 4 3</td>
<td>Early Mature</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Located outside the site</td>
<td>Minor deadwood</td>
<td>No obvious defects</td>
<td>Typical crown form for the species</td>
<td>Unable to gain access to base - down an embankment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T56</td>
<td>Common Ash (Fraxinus excelsior)</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>9 9 9 6</td>
<td>Mature</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Located outside the site</td>
<td>Minor deadwood</td>
<td>No obvious defects</td>
<td>Typical crown form for the species</td>
<td>Unable to gain access to base - down an embankment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T57</td>
<td>Common Ash (Fraxinus excelsior)</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>9 9 9 6</td>
<td>Mature</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Located outside the site</td>
<td>Minor deadwood</td>
<td>No obvious defects</td>
<td>Typical crown form for the species</td>
<td>Unable to gain access to base - down an embankment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H58</td>
<td>Elder (Sambucus nigra)</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>6x60</td>
<td>1 1 1 0</td>
<td>Early Mature</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Pedigree - unmaintained</td>
<td>Hedgerow - unmaintained</td>
<td>No work required</td>
<td>10+</td>
<td>C1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H59</td>
<td>Hawthorn (Crataegus monogyna)</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>6x60</td>
<td>1 1 1 0</td>
<td>Early Mature</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Pedigree - unmaintained</td>
<td>Hedgerow - unmaintained</td>
<td>No work required</td>
<td>10+</td>
<td>C1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T60</td>
<td>English Oak (Quercus robur)</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1070</td>
<td>5 4 5 4</td>
<td>Mature</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Bark wounds on the stem - minor branches - broken Crown - storm damage Cultivated ground at the base - north south and west Minor deadwood Pruning wounds</td>
<td>No work required</td>
<td>20+</td>
<td>B1</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sequential Reference Number** - T. Individual specimens; G. Groups. Trees that form extensive architectural features either aerodynamically, visually or culturally. H. Linear group of specimens that form a hedge in continuity. W. A larger group or area in trees that should be regarded as a single woodland unit.

**Species** - Common English names are used wherever possible for simplicity.

**Height (m) -** The approximation of height (m) is provided for the highest point of the tree.

**Mean Diameter (mm) -** The measurement of stem diameter is in millimetres taken in accordance with Annex C of BS5837 2012. If estimated then noted. Branch Spread (m) is taken at four cardinal points, with a stated value in metres to enable an accurate representation of the crown.

**Important Branched Height (m) -** The measurement of height (m) is provided for the highest point of the tree.

**Survey Clearance (m) -** The approximation of height (m) is provided for the highest point of the tree.

**Life Stage** - There are five classes to which trees are assigned: Young, Early Maturing, Mature, Over Maturing, Senescent.

**Physiological Condition** - An indication of the tree’s physiological condition is represented and classified as good, fair, poor or dead. This is informed by the following Canopy Density: It should be taken that unless otherwise stated with each individual entry, leaf size and coloration is typical of the species.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sequential Reference No.</th>
<th>Species</th>
<th>Height (m)</th>
<th>Main Canopy (mm)</th>
<th>Branch Spread (m)</th>
<th>Canopy Clearance (m)</th>
<th>Life Stage</th>
<th>Physiological Condition</th>
<th>Structural Condition</th>
<th>Comments / Notes</th>
<th>Recommendations</th>
<th>Estimated Remaining Contribution (Years)</th>
<th>Category grading</th>
<th>Priority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TB1</td>
<td>Pear (Pyrus communis)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>420</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>South West</td>
<td>Mature</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>No work required</td>
<td>10+</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TB2</td>
<td>Common Ash (Fraxinus excelsior)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>760</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Mature</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>No work required</td>
<td>No obvious defects</td>
<td>B1</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TB3</td>
<td>Beech (Fagus sylvatica)</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Young</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>No work required</td>
<td>10+</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TB4</td>
<td>Beech (Fagus sylvatica)</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Young</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>No work required</td>
<td>10+</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TB5</td>
<td>Beech (Fagus sylvatica)</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>6x40</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Early Mature</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>No work required</td>
<td>10+</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TB6</td>
<td>Common Ash (Fraxinus excelsior)</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>640</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Mature</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>No work required</td>
<td>10+</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TB7</td>
<td>Blackthorn (Prunus spinosa)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6x80</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>Early Mature</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>No work required</td>
<td>10+</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TB8</td>
<td>Goat Willow (Salix caprea)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Mature</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Located outside the site</td>
<td>No work required</td>
<td>10+</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Species Note:** Common names are used interchangeably for clarity. **Height:** - Approximation of height (in metres) is provided for the highest point of the tree. **Main Canopy:** - This is the measurement of the main stem diameter in millimetres taken in an arc at 1.3 m above ground level. **Branch Spread:** - This is taken at four cardinal points, with a stated value in metres to enable an accurate representation of the crown. **Canopy Clearance:** - Height of the top of the branches from the ground level. **Life Stage:** - There are five classes to which trees are assigned: Young, Early Mature, Mature, Over Mature, Veteran. **Physiological Condition:** - An indication of the tree's physiological condition is represented and classified as good, fair, poor or dead. This is informed by the following Canopy Density: It should be taken that unless otherwise stated with each individual entry, leaf size and coloration to typical of the species. **Estimated Remaining Contribution:** - Time to the last harvestable foliage to be removed. **Category:** - Trees on a farm can be assigned to one of four categories based on their ecological value and potential economic value. **Priority:** - Trees that should be harvested before any others to ensure the maximum yield from the farm.
To conform to BS 5837:2012 and planning validation requirements, this plan should be reconciled with topographical survey data once it is available.
To conform to BS 5837:2012 and planning validation requirements, this plan should be reconciled with topographical survey data once it is available.
To conform to BS 5837:2012 and planning validation requirements, this plan should be reconciled with topographical survey data once it is available.
Dear Andrew

Stafford Borough Council Tree Preservation Order No. 624

Eccleshall Parish Council are writing with regards to an appeal submitted against the TPO listed above, which is due to be considered by the Public Appeals Committee on the 14th October.

The Council wish the committee to note its strong objection to the removal of this Tree Preservation Order.

As noted in the original TPO paperwork, the trees are a prominent landscape feature in the local area and it is vital that ancient woodlands are protected from any harm should the land ever be considered for future development.

Trees provide a valuable habitat for many species of flora and fauna, as well as being able to reduce pollution and mitigate flooding. In the current climate where there are many pressures and challenges to promote biodiversity and to support a declining natural environment, preservation of natural woodland is essential.

The piece of land where the trees are situated has been identified in the Eccleshall Conservation Appraisal document as part of Character Area 2 and is noted to be a site of important green space. Retention of the TPO will further support and strengthen the retention of the character of this area.

It is also noted that the adjacent area has been previously picked up for comment in an appraisal by Staffordshire Wildlife Trust for the 2011 Borough Council local plan.
I would be grateful if you could ensure our objection is brought to the attention of the committee.

Yours sincerely,

Kind Regards,

Stacey J Worden
Clerk to the Council.
Tree Preservation Order No 625 of 2019 - Land North of Trent Road, Stone, Staffordshire

Report of Head of Development

Purpose of Report

To consider an objection to the above Tree Preservation Order.

1  Detail

1.1 The above Order was made by the Council on 5 June 2019. A copy of the Order is attached as APPENDIX 1.

1.2 One objection to the Order was received on 30 July 2019 from Mr James Preston, with the same objection being forwarded to Legal Services on 2 August 2019.

1.3 The report of the Head of Development is attached as APPENDIX 2.

1.4 The Committee will visit the site at approximately 10.30am.

2  Recommendation

2.1 The Committee is asked to consider the objection and whether to confirm Tree Preservation Order No 625 of 2019.

Previous Consideration

Nil

Background Papers

File available in Law and Administration and Development.

Officer Contact

Mr G Pearce - Tree Officer, Tel 01785 619539
TREE PRESERVATION ORDER
TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING (TREE PRESERVATION) (ENGLAND) REGULATIONS 2012
Town and Country Planning Act 1990

The Stafford Borough Council Tree Preservation Order 625 of 2019
AT LAND NORTH OF TRENT ROAD, STONE, STAFFORDSHIRE.

The Stafford Borough Council, in exercise of the powers conferred on them by section 198 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, hereby make the following Order:

Citation

1. This Order may be cited as the Stafford Borough Council Tree Preservation Order 625 of 2019.

Interpretation

2. (1) In this Order “the authority” means the Stafford Borough Council.

   (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, topping, lopping, uprooting, 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 5th day of June 2019

The Common Seal of the Stafford Borough Council was affixed to this Order in the presence of:

Signed on behalf of the Stafford Borough Council

[Signature]

Authorised by the Council to sign in that behalf
CONFIRMATION OF ORDER

This Order was confirmed by the Stafford Borough Council without modification on the ...... day of ....................... 20..

OR

This Order was confirmed by the Stafford Borough Council, subject to the modifications indicated by .................. on the ...... day of ....................... 20..

Authorised by the Council to sign in that behalf

DECISION NOT TO CONFIRM ORDER

A decision not to confirm this Order was taken by Stafford Borough Council on the ...... day of ....................... 20..

Authorised by the Council to sign in that behalf

VARIATION OF ORDER

This Order was varied by the Stafford Borough Council on the ...... day of ....................... 20. by a Variation Order under the reference number .................................., a copy of which is attached.

Authorised by the Council to sign in that behalf

REVOCATION OF ORDER

This Order was revoked by the Stafford Borough Council on the ...... day of ....................... 20..

Authorised by the Council to sign in that behalf
SCHEDULE

Specification of trees

Note: All trees, group of trees and woodlands described in this Schedule are situated in the Borough Of Stafford on Ordnance Survey Sheet SJ9537 (1:1250)

Trees specified individually (encircled in black on the map)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference No.</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Situation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference No.</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Situation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Woodlands (within a continuous black line on the map)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference No.</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Situation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Areas of trees (within a dotted black line on the map)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference No.</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Situation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A1</td>
<td>Mixed broadleaf and coniferous species trees</td>
<td>Land north of Trent Road, Stone. Between A34 and rear of properties on Newcastle Road.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Tree Preservation Order No 625 of 2019 - Land North of Trent Road, Stone, Staffordshire

SECTION 1

1  General Introduction

1.1  The Law in relation to Tree Preservation

The law relating to Tree Preservation Orders (TPOs) is included in part VIII of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 as amended.

The principle regulations relating to TPOs are included in the Town and Country Planning (Tree Preservation Order)(England) Regulations 2012.

Guidance is given in Planning Practice Guidance - Tree Preservation Orders and trees in conservation areas.

The Borough Council is the Local Planning Authority (LPA) for the making of TPOs in the Stafford Borough area.

1.2  Power to Make TPOs

A Local Planning Authority may make a TPO if it appears to be;

"Expedient in the interests of amenity to make provision for the preservation of trees or woodlands in their area" (S198 (1) of the Act).

Paragraphs 007 and 008 of the Planning Practice Guidance states:-

"WHAT DOES ‘AMENITY’ MEAN IN PRACTICE?"

‘Amenity’ is not defined in law, so authorities need to exercise judgment when deciding whether it is within their powers to make an Order. Orders should be used to protect selected trees and woodlands if their removal would have a significant negative impact on the local environment and its enjoyment by the public. Before authorities make or confirm an Order they should be able to show that protection would bring a reasonable degree of public benefit in the present or future.
WHAT MIGHT A LOCAL AUTHORITY TAKE INTO ACCOUNT WHEN ASSESSING AMENITY VALUE?

When considering whether trees should be protected by an Order, authorities are advised to develop ways of assessing the amenity value of trees in a structured and consistent way, taking into account the following criteria:

Visibility
The extent to which the trees or woodlands can be seen by the public will inform the authority’s assessment of whether the impact on the local environment is significant. The trees, or at least part of them, should normally be visible from a public place, such as a road or footpath, or accessible by the public.

Individual, collective and wider impact
Public visibility alone will not be sufficient to warrant an Order. The authority is advised to also assess the particular importance of an individual tree, of groups of trees or of woodlands by reference to its or their characteristics including:

- size and form;
- future potential as an amenity;
- rarity, cultural or historic value;
- contribution to, and relationship with, the landscape; and
- contribution to the character or appearance of a conservation area.

Other factors
Where relevant to an assessment of the amenity value of trees or woodlands, authorities may consider taking into account other factors, such as importance to nature conservation or response to climate change. These factors alone would not warrant making an Order.”

1.3 Making Objections or Representations

The purpose of requiring a Local Planning Authority to serve a copy of the TPO and the Regulation 5 Notice on owners, occupiers and others with rights over the land is to ensure that they are all made aware of the TPO and given a chance to comment on it.

SECTION 2

2 Background

2.1 In April 2019 enquiries were made with the legal services team of Stafford Borough Council requesting confirmation that Tree Preservation Orders, previously made in regard of the land which is the subject of this appeal, were not confirmed.

The council Tree Officer, Gavin Pearce, was contacted for confirmation of this fact and it was found that the previous order had never been confirmed.
As the land in question had previously been the site of a planning application which was subsequently refused consent, it seemed reasonable to presume the enquiries were potentially linked to a forthcoming new planning application.

As the trees on site represent a material constraint to potential development and considering their current lack of protected status, it was deemed appropriate to make them the subject of a new Tree Preservation Order. This in turn would ensure their retention until a point where they could be given due consideration as part of any forthcoming planning application.

2.2 Site and Surroundings

The site is comprised of a contiguous area of green space located in Stone. Trent Road forms the southern boundary and the A34 (Fillybrooks) the western. There is housing on Hartley Close backing onto the northern boundary with properties on Newcastle Road forming the eastern boundary.

The site is characterised by areas of open space bounded by trees on the northern and eastern sides and with further specimens interspersed throughout.

The trees on site are visually prominent within the landscape and provide a significant visual break between the Cauldron Way estate and properties to the south of Trent Road.

The tree cover to the West of the A34 is good, but south of Trent Road the landscape becomes characterised by either open space or housing.

SECTION 3

3 Description of the Trees referred to in the Notice

The trees on site are of mixed broadleaf and evergreen species representing a diverse age range.

The trees are of varying quality with some good specimens interspersed with others of moderate or poor value. However, as a tree group across the site as a whole, they are possessed of significant amenity value within the area that they are situated.

At this stage the Tree Preservation Order is of an Area type and only includes basic information. It is probable given the information available from prior tree surveys that a subsequent more detailed order will exclude a number of trees on the grounds that they do not warrant protection. However at this time it has not been possible to complete a more detailed up to date survey and Preservation Order. Therefore the current Area order is required to ensure the retention of trees on site so that they may be given due consideration as part of any subsequent planning application.
The TEMPO (Tree Evaluation Method for Preservation Orders) amenity assessment in respect of the above site has been included as ANNEX 1.

SECTION 4

4 Reasons for the Making of a Tree Preservation Order

The trees are collectively considered to make a worthwhile contribution to amenity and they are visible from public places. The trees were considered to be potentially under threat and in these circumstances the service of an Order was considered to be expedient.

SECTION 5

5 Objections

5.1 Objections received

On 30 July 2019 Stafford Borough Council received an objection to the creation of this TPO from Mr James Preston, with the same objection being forwarded to Legal Services on 2nd August 2019. The objection, including all supporting information, is included in full as ANNEX 2 to avoid any misinterpretation or misrepresentation.

5.2 Responses to Objections

The grounds for objection have been summarised and responded to as follows:

i) The decision notices and appeal decision for a prior planning application ref. 15/23033/OUT made no mention of trees being a reason for refusal.

Response
The outcome of a prior planning application has no bearing on the current status of the trees or the implications they may have for potential future planning applications. The trees require due consideration as part of any future application received.

ii) The Council Tree Officer’s response to planning application 15/23033/OUT describes the poor condition of several trees on site.

Response
It is accepted that not all trees on site are suitable for statutory protection. However this will be reflected in a subsequent review of TPO 625. In the interim period the appellant is free to make an application under the TPO to remove specific trees.
iii) An updated survey by Tree Heritage states that a number of the trees on site have deteriorated further since 2015 and are no longer worthy of statutory protection.

Response
Refer to the response given above to the second point.

iv) The Council has acknowledged on several occasions that the previous TPO on site was never confirmed.

Response
The decision by a previous Tree Officer to not confirm a historical Order has no direct bearing on the current Order.

v) A current draft layout plan for potential development of the site shows trees of merit retained and those which are removed to be replaced.

Response
A Tree Preservation Order is superseded by full planning consent. If the trees are given due consideration during the application process and planning consent is given, the Preservation Order will not prevent tree pruning or removal being carried out.

vi) The affordable homes proposed for the western section of the site will have no impact on the Willows and Poplars in this area.

Response
Refer to the response given above to the fifth point.

vii) Requests were made to discuss alleged errors in TPO 625.

Response
The plan used to produce the TPO map is supplied to Stafford Borough Council by Ordnance Survey and as such has no control over discrepancies in this. The important factor in the TPO map is the marked boundary edge of the TPO itself which does not need to conform to any other geographic boundaries or features.

TPO 625 is currently an Area type order and as such contains different information to previous Orders that have been made. However TPO 625 is a standalone Order and does not need to make reference to that which has gone before.

TPO 625 has been made under the current regulations and prior notification of the intent to make a Tree Preservation Order is not provided to those parties that may be affected by it.

Representations received

No other representations were received.
SECTION 6

6 Conclusion

The trees are considered to make a worthwhile and increasing contribution to the amenity of the area. They are clearly visible to the public, most particularly from the footpath and highways adjacent to the site and are of sufficient significance to warrant the making of the Tree Preservation Order. In these circumstances Committee is requested to confirm the Order.

Committee is requested to consider confirming the Order without modification.
STAFFORD BOROUGH COUNCIL
TREE EVALUATION METHOD FOR PRESERVATION ORDERS (TEMPO)

Tree / Group Number: TPO 625 of 2019  Species: Mixed broadleaf and coniferous

Part 1: Amenity Assessment
a) Condition and suitability for TPO

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>Suitability</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Highly suitable</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Suitable</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Unlikely to be suitable</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>Dead</td>
<td>Unsuitable</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>Dying/dangerous*</td>
<td>Unsuitable</td>
<td>*Relates to existing context and is intended to apply to severe irremediable defects only</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Retention Span</th>
<th>Suitability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>100+</td>
<td>Highly suitable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>40 – 100</td>
<td>Very suitable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>20 – 40</td>
<td>Suitable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>10 – 20</td>
<td>Just suitable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>&lt; 10*</td>
<td>Unsuitable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Includes trees that are an existing or near future nuisance including those clearly outgrowing their context, or which are significantly negating the potential of other trees


c) Relative public visibility & suitability for TPO

Consider realistic potential for future visibility with changed land use

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Visibility</th>
<th>Suitability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Very large trees with some visibility or prominent large trees</td>
<td>Highly suitable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Large trees, or medium trees clearly visible to the public</td>
<td>Suitable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Medium trees, or large trees with limited view only</td>
<td>Suitable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Young, small or medium/large trees visible only with difficulty</td>
<td>Just Suitable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Trees not visible to the Public, regardless of size</td>
<td>Unsuitable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Score and Notes – 4
There are a significant number of large trees on site clearly visible from the public realm. They comprise a prominent landscape feature in the local setting.


d) Other factors

Trees must have accrued 7+ points (with no zero scores) to qualify

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Other Factors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Principle components of arboricultural features, or veteran trees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Tree groups, or members of groups important for their cohesion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Trees with identifiable historic, commemorative or habitat importance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Trees of particularly good form, especially if rare or unusual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Trees with none of the above additional redeeming features</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Score and Notes – 4
The site as a whole has local wildlife/habitat value and the trees on site provide a significant visible break between Trent Road and the Cauldron Way estate.

Part 2: Expediency assessment

Trees must have accrued 9+ points to qualify

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Expediency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Immediate threat to the tree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Foreseeable threat to the tree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Perceived threat to the tree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Precautionary only</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Score and Notes – 3
The current owner requested confirmation of the current TPO status of the trees and has previously expressed an interest in developing the land.

Part 3: Decision Guide

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Decision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Any 0</td>
<td>Do Not apply TPO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-6.1</td>
<td>TPO indefensible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-10</td>
<td>Does not merit TPO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-14</td>
<td>TPO Defensible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15+</td>
<td>Definitely merits TPO</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Score: 16

Decision: Definitely merits TPO
Dear Mr Bailey

Following on from our telephone conversation on Tuesday morning, I am setting out our case as you kindly suggested evidencing our reasons for strongly objecting to the making of Tree Preservation Order No 625 for trees on our Land North of Trent Road, Stone for inclusion please in the Agenda for the Public Appeals Committee on Monday, 14 October, 2019.

I shall be immensely grateful if the members of the committee are able to have copies of not only the information which follows below, but also that which is contained in all the attachments in both my emails numbers 1 and 2 and for it to be reproduced in the agenda in order that they may fully understand my case. They will observe the following from the attachments:

1. In the attached Decision Notices for both the planning application 1523033OUT and subsequent appeal there is no mention whatsoever of the presence of trees on the site being a reason for refusal;
2. In the relevant extract from the agenda report on planning application 1523033OUT the then Council’s Tree Officer described in great detail the very poor condition of five of the specimen trees covered by TPO 234 – 2000 stating as he did:

   “It is disappointing to note the general structural condition of the aforementioned trees which will essentially be required to be removed with any change of use of the land. However trees can be compensated for within a submitted landscape scheme.”

3. Moreover the condition of those trees which he so described will obviously have deteriorated even further in the last four years and are now as comprehensively described in the updated survey carried out in late September 2019 by Tree Heritage,
our arboricultural consultants, a copy of which is attached in my separate email number 2 of 2. Their professional conclusion on the condition of the trees on the land can be summarised as follows: “We believe that a Tree Preservation Order should only be used to protect trees that have at least 20 years of useful life and clearly our survey backed up by the comments made in 2015 by the Stafford Borough Council Tree Officer suggest that few of these trees meet that criteria” and it will be observed in the survey that only three warrant protection; please also see Tree Heritage’s Statement of Condition of Trees which is also attached to my separate email no. 2 of 2.

4. The Council have recognised and stated on several occasions the TPO was “not ever confirmed” (in the Council’s appeal statement); “it was not confirmed” (SBC email dated 2 July 2019); and “having never been made”;

5. The attached draft site layout plan shows if planning consent is granted for this sustainable residential development many of the poplars on the northern boundary will be pollarded or removed and replaced with semi-mature native specimen trees; we are tree lovers and all existing specimen trees worthy of retention within the development will be kept wherever practicable but, if not, will be replaced;

6. It will be observed from the draft site layout plan that the small triangular area to the west which we propose is used exclusively to provide much-needed one- and two-bedroom affordable starter homes would have no effect on the poplar and willow trees bordering that site; and

7. I did make requests to meet and indeed would have liked to have met with the Council’s Tree Officer for a discussion on the site to correct the numerous errors in TPO No. 625 which could have been made before this stage was reached namely:
   (i) the boundary of the land as shown on the plan has two significant errors;
   (ii) the description of the trees in the Schedule does not correspond with the original list of specified trees;
   (iii) the coniferous trees referred to are not situated within the site but belong to and are within the boundary of the garden of our home, ‘Seefeld’;
   (iv) the new TPO has been couched under a completely different set of (later) Regulations; and
   (v) the Council’s email dated 2 July 2019 was the first I knew of it and given the conclusions of the Tree Officer in 2015 was shocked by the decision.

I therefore respectfully hope very much that the members of the Public Appeals Committee will kindly take all the evidence I have provided into account when arriving at their decision and conclude that a Tree Preservation Order is both inappropriate and unnecessary for this land.

Yours sincerely
Stafford Borough Council, in pursuance of powers under the Town and Country Planning Act, hereby refuse the above development in accordance with the accompanying plans and subject to the following reasons:-

1. The proposed development is on a green field site adjacent to Stone. The Council can demonstrate a 5 year supply of housing land, including a 20% buffer. The Plan for Stafford Borough has demonstrated that for the plan period objectively assessed need can be fully met.

Although a proportion of the Borough’s housing provision is required at Stone (10%) the amount of housing currently committed at this level of the hierarchy has exceeded this proportion. Approval of this application, therefore, would contribute towards a disproportionate amount of development taking place at this level of the sustainable settlement hierarchy. This would conflict with and undermine the development strategy set out in Spatial Principle 4 of the Plan for Stafford Borough.
TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING ACT 1990

REFUSAL OF PERMISSION FOR DEVELOPMENT

and would not be in accordance with the genuinely plan-led approach advocated in paragraph 17 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

Head of Planning and Regeneration
On behalf of the Council
The Planning Inspectorate

**Appeal Decision**

Site visit made on 17 January 2017

by Andrew Owen  BA(Hons) MA MRTP

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 13 February 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/Y3425/W/16/3162353

**Land at Trent Road, Stone, Staffordshire ST15 8LE**

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant outline planning permission.
- The appeal is made by Mr Chris Jaram & James Preston against the decision of Stafford Borough Council.
- The application Ref 15/23033/OUT, dated 30 September 2015, was refused by notice dated 22 June 2016.
- The development proposed is residential development of up to 11 dwellings.

**Decision**

1. The appeal is dismissed.

**Preliminary Matter**

2. The application was originally made in outline form with all matters except access and layout to be reserved for later consideration. However during the Council’s determination of the application the appellant withdrew matters of layout. As such the Council determined the application in outline with only matters of access for consideration, and I have determined the appeal on the same basis.

3. Part 2 of the Council’s Plan for Stafford Borough (PSB2) was adopted on 31 January 2017. Both parties were given the opportunity to comment on its relevance to the appeal.

**Main Issue**

4. The main issue is whether the proposed development would represent proportionate sustainable growth.

**Reasons**

5. Part 1 of The Plan for Stafford Borough 2011 – 2031 (PSB1) was adopted in June 2014. Policy SP2 of this document states that provision will be made for 500 dwellings to be built per annum over the plan period i.e. 10,000 in total. Policy SP4 of the PSB1 sets out the proportions of these homes that should be built in Stafford, Stone, the key service villages and the rest of the borough. The parties agree that the Council can demonstrate a five year supply of housing land and I therefore consider these policies are up to date and can be given considerable weight.
6. The proportions in Policy SP4 reflect the level of services and facilities within the settlements and also aim to redress historic patterns of house building in the borough which was more concentrated in the rural areas. This Policy advises that 10% of the Borough’s new housing will be within Stone, which equates to 1,000 homes in Stone over the plan period. It is not disputed between the parties that the 1,000 figure is a target, not a limit, and this is supported by the appeal case quoted by the appellant, and by the fact that a moratorium to restrict house building above this figure was considered unsound by the Inspector into PSB2.

7. The Council’s Statement of Five Year Housing Land Supply (at 31st March 2016) shows that house building throughout the Borough is slightly below the PSB target, although this same document makes it clear that there are enough commitments in the Borough over the next five years to make up the shortfall. Conversely, house building in Stone is far above the PSB1 target and, as of March 2015, there were 1,105 commitments in Stone including 625 units over the next five years. These commitments do not include the proposed development.

8. I accept the proposal is relatively small in relation to the housing targets for Stone and would not significantly add to the total number of homes in the town. For this reason it is not directly comparable with the development at Ashflats referred to by the Council, where the proposal was for 320 units on a greenfield site. Nonetheless, despite agreeing that the PSB1 targets are not ceilings, the Inspector into that appeal concluded that the development at Ashflats would not have accorded with the plan-led system which is a fundamental principle of the National Planning Policy Framework (the ‘Framework’) and is articulated through the PSB1.

9. So whilst I agree the PSB1 target is not a limit, this does not outweigh the fact that the Council have an up to date development plan, can currently demonstrate a five year supply of housing and that in Stone there are already housing commitments which exceed the PSB1 target. As such the proposed development would conflict with the plan-led principle and would prejudice the proportionate sustainable growth of the Borough.

10. Furthermore Policy SP7 of the PSB1 advises that development boundaries will be established in PSB2 and within these boundaries, development in accordance with the proportions in Policy SP4, would be supported. Though I understand that previously the appeal site was shown to be part of Stone, the maps accompanying PSB2 show the appeal site to be excluded from the settlement boundary of the town. Policy SP7 goes onto add that only where insufficient sites on previously developed land, in sustainable locations, are available to meet new development requirements should greenfield sites be released.

11. I acknowledge the site has good access to public transport, as there are bus stops a short distance from the site on Newcastle Road, and it is within walking distance of Stone town centre. Accordingly it can be considered to be reasonably sustainably located. Also it is clear that Stone, as one of the largest settlements in the Borough, is generally a sustainable location for new development. However because the Council can demonstrate that there are 

---

1 APP/D0840/A/13/2209757
2 APP/Y3425/A/14/2217578
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already sufficient sites to meet new development requirements in Stone, there is no need to release greenfield sites for development, such as the appeal site.

12. Accordingly I consider that the proposal would not represent proportionate sustainable growth in the Borough and so would be contrary to Policy SP4 and Policy SP7 of the PSB1 which aim to direct housing proportionately to locations to support sustainable growth. It would also fail to accord with the Framework which, in paragraph 17, identifies a plan-led system as one of its core principles.

Other Matters

13. A planning obligation has been provided within which there is an undertaking to provide affordable housing. I consider this would be necessary to make the development acceptable in this regard, is directly related to the development and is fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the proposal. As such I consider this obligation would be necessary and I can take it into account. However, though I recognise the local shortfall of affordable housing, I do not consider the limited benefit of three affordable units would outweigh the harm identified above.

14. The planning obligation also seeks to provide financial contributions towards education and open space provision. In light of my conclusion on the main issue I need not consider these further.

15. I recognise the benefit both economically and socially resulting from the construction and occupation of 11 units. This benefit would be considerable, consistent with the view taken by the Inspectors in the appeals referred to by the appellant\(^2\). Nonetheless, such benefits would result from any development of this nature, including development which would accord Policy SP4, and so these benefits do not outweigh the conflict with Policy SP4.

16. The provision of a pavement outside the site would primarily serve only the proposed houses and would be of limited wider benefit. The appellant refers to a future intention to provide 14 units on an adjacent site. Nevertheless without further details of this, I can give it only very minimal weight.

17. I cannot attach any weight to any on site environmental benefits the scheme may provide, such as formal planting and the creation of a pond, as these would be set out and assessed as part of a reserved matters application.

Conclusions

18. For the reasons given above, and taking account of all other considerations, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Andrew Owen

INSPECTOR

\(^2\) APP/B3438/A/14/2217581 & APP/P3420/A/14/2222484
REASON FOR REFERRAL TO COMMITTEE

This application has been called in by Councillor G Collier (Ward Member for St Michael’s and Stonefield) for the following reasons:

"Sustainable development in an accepted growth area. Town development boundary not yet taken on".

This application was deferred by Committee on 11 May 2016 in order for additional information relating to drainage to be considered.

Additionally, only access is now being considered under this outline application. Layout was previously included for consideration but has been removed following an objection from the Tree Officer.

The applicant has also confirmed that they are willing to enter into a legal agreement to provide affordable housing in addition to an education contribution and open space provision.

Context

The site is approximately 1.1 hectares in size and is situated to the north of Trent Road. The site is located outside, although adjacent to on three sides, the proposed settlement boundary for Stone and is not allocated for housing or any other development within The Plan for Stafford Borough.

The site is green field which accommodates trees and hedgerow to the boundaries. It is proposed to access the site via Trent Road. Trent Road runs between the A34 and Newcastle Road, it is rural in character with no footpath. The immediate surrounding area is predominantly residential. Immediately north west of the site is housing situated on Hartley Close and to the north east is housing on Newcastle Road. There is a footpath
5. Trees and Biodiversity/Environmental

There are numerous trees on site, some of which are protected by Tree Preservation Orders (TPO). The Tree Officer supports the removal of some of the trees on site in accordance with the submitted arboricultural report but has raised an objection on the grounds that the proposed layout will adversely impact upon some TPO trees to be retained. Layout is no longer under consideration as part of this outline application and would be dealt with by a reserved matters application.

The submitted ecology assessment concludes that on the basis of the surveys completed the site has limited opportunities for protected species. It states however that the removal of habitats should be completed in a manner to avoid potential harm. The Council's Biodiversity Officer has considered the proposal, including the submitted ecological assessment and does not raise any objections subject to conditions.

A Phase 1 Geo-Environmental Report also supports the application. This report concludes that there are no issues relating to ground contamination and that the site can be safely developed for residential use. The Environmental Health Officer does not raise any objections subject to conditions.

The submitted topographical survey and tree constraints plan show that levels across the site vary with the lower levels (up to 7m) being situated more centrally in the site. It is likely that some levelling works may be required in this area which, may possibly impact upon some of the retained TPO trees. The ground level of Hartley Close is shown to be slightly higher than the application site which is considered an acceptable relationship between the existing and proposed dwellings. The ground levels of the adjacent dwelling Seefeld are however not shown. Seefeld is also accessed from Trent Road and whilst it is well distanced from the proposed dwellings, it is unclear how this dwelling relates to the proposed site in terms of ground levels.

As proposed levels are not shown, it is not possible to assess the impact of such works on the site and the retained trees.

Policies and Guidance:-

National Planning Policy Framework:
Paragraph 118 - Conserving and Enhancing the Natural Environment
Paragraph 103 - Meeting the Challenge of Climate Change, Flooding and Coastal Change
Paragraph 118 - Conserving and Enhancing the Natural Environment

Plan for Stafford Borough
N1 Design
N2 Climate Change
N4 The Natural Environment and Green Infrastructure
N8 Landscape Character
The report recommends a Construction Method Statement is prepared to ensure that the LNR is not affected by any potential pollution from the development.

Hedgerows and trees should be retained where possible and appropriate native species used to fill any gaps. Where hedgerows are lost, new hedges should be planted in compensation. It is recommended that these are managed on a three-year rotation for wildlife value.

The new attenuation pond is recommended to be designed to support the suggested ecological enhancements. The stream corridor should also be enhanced for ecological functionality. Log piles should provide good habitat for invertebrates. Finally, efforts should be made to reduce and remove Himalayan balsam from the site.

All the above should be included within a site management plan.

Housing Policy and Research Officer:
This development of 11 dwellings is outside the settlement boundary for Stone therefore it is required to deliver 30% affordable housing, which equates to 3 affordable homes.

Tree Officer:
The structural quality of the following Tree Preservation Order trees are in such a condition that removal will be required with any change of use of the land:

TPO T2 (T92 – Beech – Failed main leader with major squirrel damage on the remaining main scaffold limbs in the upper crown).
TPO T3 (T91 – Horse chestnut – Bacterial canker, included bark unions, decay present on main stem and dieback noted in the crown).
TPO T4 (T55 – Norway maple – heavily included main limbs with structural movement evident).
TPO T6 (T1 – Horse chestnut – declining rapidly with bacterial canker).
TPO T7 (T51 – Weeping willow – Major failed limbs in the canopy, resulting in a tree that requires major arboricultural works to be retained in a safe condition if the land use changes.

It is disappointing to note the general structural condition of these aforementioned trees, which will essentially be required to be removed with any change of use of the land. However these trees can be compensated for within a submitted landscape scheme.

The trees with the highest degree of visual amenity, as can be viewed from a considerable distance from the site are the linear feature of screening planting of the single species of Hybrid Black Poplar; however this cannot be classified as a woodland area. These trees also form a visual buffer to the new properties located on Hartley Close. However I have to concur with the submitted Arboricultural Survey (Tree Heritage – 16th September 2015), the trees are in general decline with large amounts of deadwood in the crowns and a degree of die-back evident. There are also many trees with structural issues (weak forks, heavily leaning). These trees in their current condition with the aforementioned structural and physiological issues would not be suitable for retention within any proposed scheme. The trees have been categorised as ‘U’ (those trees in such a condition that they cannot realistically be retained as living trees in the context of the current land use for longer than
10 years).

Therefore it would be required that substantial boundary planting is created within a landscaping scheme to compensate for the loss of these trees if planning permission is granted.

The proposed layout in the vicinity of Plot 4 has made no allowance for any potential growth of the relatively young tree (T65 – Red oak). This tree will attain a substantial size and allowances should be made in the layout to reflect this. This will prevent continuous arboricultural operations being performed on the tree as it matures.

The proposed layout in the vicinity of Plot 8 has made no allowance for any potential growth of T127 – Copper beech. This tree will also attain a substantial size and allowances should be made in the layout to reflect this to prevent continuous arboricultural operations being performed on the tree as it matures. Root disturbance on this species of tree should be avoided if possible and the location of Plot 8 suggests that the layout could be altered to achieve a greater separation distance.

The proposed layout in the vicinity of T49 (Copper beech) will have a minor impact on the Root Protection Area of this aforementioned tree. As the canopy of the tree is low spreading the layout should make allowances for this root area and canopy to remain undisturbed.

T15 – Beech is in serious decline with major bark removal present on the main stem (possibly from squirrels). Therefore the tree should be removed if land use changes.

The indicative layout of the lake area impacts upon the Root Protection Area of TPO T8 (T13 – Beech) therefore allowances should be made to prevent any detrimental impact on this Root Protection Area. It is accepted that the location of the lake may be indicative at this point. The removal to allow pavements and visibility splays on the boundary of the site adjacent to Trent Road is regrettable as all hedgerows provide essential ecological corridors. However the plans do indicate that there will be replacement hedging along the frontage of the site to compensate for this loss. The quantity of tree removal associated with this development is high; however a vast majority of these removals are on arboricultural grounds.

Therefore as the planning permission includes layout, I would raise an objection to the current application.

Latest response from the Tree Officer following the removal of layout as a consideration:

I have no objections to the proposal in principle as the matter of layout has now been withdrawn from the application. Any further submission in relation to layout should take the retained trees ultimate size into consideration; this is to prevent any unnecessary arboricultural operations resulting from post development pressure.

Environment Agency:
No objections subject to conditions.
TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING ACT 1990

SECTION 78 APPEAL

APPEAL BY MR CHRIS AND JAMES JARAM AND PRESTON AGAINST THE DECISION OF STAFFORD BOROUGH COUNCIL TO REFUSE OUTLINE PERMISSION FOR THE RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT OF UP TO 11 DWELLINGS AT LAND NORTH OF TRENT ROAD, STONE, STAFFORDSHIRE

PLANNING INSPECTORATE REF: APP/Y3425/W/16/3162353

STAFFORD BOROUGH COUNCIL REF: 15/23033/OUT

STATEMENT OF STAFFORD BOROUGH COUNCIL
1.0 THE APPEAL

1.1 The appeal is against the decision of Stafford Borough Council to refuse outline planning application, reference 15/23033/OUT, submitted on 14 December 2015 for a development of up to 11 dwellings on land north of Trent Road, Stone, Staffordshire. Whilst the application was outline, access was included for consideration at this stage.

1.2 The application was originally reported to Planning Committee on 11 May 2016 with a recommendation to refuse on the grounds of policy, drainage, provision of affordable housing and layout. The outline application as originally submitted included the consideration of access and layout. The application was however deferred in order for additional information relating to drainage to be considered. The application was amended and reported back to Planning Committee on 22 June 2016. The application was amended to remove the consideration of layout but was refused for the following reason:-

"The proposed development is on a green field site adjacent to Stone. The Council can demonstrate a 5 year supply of housing land, including a 20% buffer. The Plan for Stafford Borough has demonstrated that for the plan period objectively assessed need can be fully met. Although a proportion of the Borough's housing provision is required at Stone (10%) the amount of housing currently committed at this level of the hierarchy has exceeded this proportion. Approval of this application, therefore, would contribute towards a disproportionate amount of development taking place at this level of the sustainable settlement hierarchy. This would conflict with and undermine the development strategy set out in Spatial Principle 4 of the Plan for Stafford Borough and would not be in accordance with the genuinely plan-led approach advocated in paragraph 17 of the National Planning Policy Framework".

2.0 THE APPEAL SITE AND PROPOSAL

2.1 This is an appeal for an outline proposal for residential development of up to 11 dwellings on 1.1 hectares of land on the north side of Trent Road in Stone.

2.2 The site is located outside, although adjacent to on three sides, to the settlement boundary for Stone. The site is not allocated for housing or any other development within The Plan for Stafford Borough. See plan attached at Appendix 1.

2.2 The site is green field which has trees and hedgerow along its boundaries. It is proposed to access the site via Trent Road. Trent Road runs between the A34 and Newcastle Road, it is rural in character with no footpath. The immediate surrounding area is predominantly residential. Immediately north west of the site is housing situated on Hartley Close and to the north east is housing on Newcastle Road. There is a footpath which runs along the north east boundary which runs to
9.2 The Plan for Stafford Borough was adopted as recently as 19th June 2014. It underwent a thorough public examination where the Inspector addressed issues around the distribution of housing between Stafford, Stone, the key service villages and the rest of the borough. Again this has been "tested" more recently as part of the Examination into the Plan for Stafford Borough Part 2.

9.3 In line with the government's localism agenda residents have a right to expect that development takes place in accordance with the development plan in which they have been engaged.

9.4 It is clear that although the use of greenfield land is required to meet the Council's housing objectives there are sufficient sites identified through the plan making process and in existing commitments to deliver the housing requirements for Stafford Borough and therefore there is no requirement to release this Greenfield site.

9.5 Although the area has been subject to urbanising influences, it is a green field site outside of the settlement boundary which is not required given the provision of a 5 year housing land supply.

9.6 In consideration of the Ashflats Lane appeal the Inspector considered that the fact as to whether or not a development is plan led was 'an important facet of sustainability' (para 109 Appendix 5). The Inspector also stated at para 112 of his decision letter that whilst the Framework's intention was to 'significantly boost the supply of housing, as presented at paragraph 47, read in the context not only of the Framework as a whole, but also within the confines of the paragraph itself, it is plain that, whenever the development plan is up-to-date in this respect, the primary intention is for such a boost to be delivered through the plan-led system.'

9.7 It is the Council's contention that the same situation occurs with the current appeal site and that as the proposal in question does not accord with the development plan in force it should be dismissed.

10.0 OTHER ISSUES

10.1 Arboricultural & Biodiversity considerations

10.2 There are a number of trees on site however none of these trees are protected. A Tree Preservation Order made was not ever confirmed

10.3 The Biodiversity Officer makes several recommendations including the retention of hedgerows and trees where possible and, the provision of bat boxes and bird boxes. He also notes that the site is in close proximity to Stone Meadows Local Nature Reserve (LNR), currently being managed to restore its floral diversity as a floodplain meadow. He also recommends that the proposed attenuation pond is designed to support the suggested ecological enhancements and that efforts
should be made to reduce and remove Himalayan balsam from the site. A management plan is recommended.

Highway considerations

10.4 The Highway Authority does not raise any objections on highway grounds to the proposed development subject to conditions requiring the provision of visibility splays and a Construction Method Statement.

11.0. PLANNING OBLIGATIONS

11.1 The applicant has confirmed a willingness to complete a S106 agreement to provide affordable housing in addition to an education contribution and open space provision.

11.2 Education
The Education Authority commented on the planning application stating that they would seek an Education Contribution for 1 Middle School place (1 x £13,827 = £13,827) and 1 High School place (1 x £16,622 = £16,622). This gives a total request of £30,449

11.3 Affordable housing
This development of 11 dwellings is outside the settlement boundary for Stone therefore it is required to deliver 30% affordable housing, which equates to 3 affordable homes.

11.4 Open Space, Recreation and Sports Provision
In accordance with the financial contributions guide for new development provision of Open Space and commuted sums, the contribution required for this development should be a capital investment of £9,941.64. This does not include any maintenance costs.

12.0 CONCLUSIONS

12.1 This statement demonstrates that the appeal proposal would represent a disproportionate amount of housing provision at a lower level in the sustainable settlement hierarchy. This would undermine the objective of Spatial Principle 4 to deliver the majority of housing at Stafford town and undermine the plan – led approach set out in paragraph 17 of the NPPF.

12.2 It is the Council’s contention that the proposal does not accord with the development plan and therefore request that the appeal be dismissed.

12.3 Without prejudice to the position of the Local Planning Authority, if the Inspector is minded to allow the appeal, then it is requested that the conditions attached at Appendix 8 are attached to any permission.
Application: 15/23033/OUT  
Date Registered: 14 December 2015  
Address: Land North of Trent Road, Stone  
Proposal: Outline consent for residential development of up to 11 dwellings (including access and layout)  
Applicant: Mr Chris Jaram and James Preston  
Recommendation: Refuse  
Case Officer: Sian Wright  
Target Decision Date: 17 July 2015  
Ward: St Michael's and Stonefield  
Parish: Stone Town

REASON FOR REFERRAL TO COMMITTEE

This application has been called in by Councillor G Collier (Ward Member for St Michael's and Stonefield) for the following reasons:

"Sustainable development in an accepted growth area. Town development boundary not yet taken on".

This application was deferred by Committee on 11 May 2016 in order for additional information relating to drainage to be considered.

Additionally, only access is now being considered under this outline application. Layout was previously included for consideration but has been removed following an objection from the Tree Officer.

The applicant has also confirmed that they are willing to enter into a legal agreement to provide affordable housing in addition to an education contribution and open space provision.

Context

The site is approximately 1.1 hectares in size and is situated to the north of Trent Road. The site is located outside, although adjacent to on three sides, the proposed settlement boundary for Stone and is not allocated for housing or any other development within The Plan for Stafford Borough.

The site is green field which accommodates trees and hedgerow to the boundaries. It is proposed to access the site via Trent Road. Trent Road runs between the A34 and Newcastle Road, it is rural in character with no footpath. The immediate surrounding area is predominantly residential. Immediately north west of the site is housing situated on Hartley Close and to the north east is housing on Newcastle Road. There is a footpath
which runs along the north east boundary which runs to the rear of dwellings on Newcastle Road and links housing on Hartley Close to Trent Road.

It is also noted that the site on the opposite side of Trent Road to the south east is currently being developed for residential use (application 14/21338/FUL for 33 dwellings). These adjacent sites do however fall within the proposed settlement boundary.

The application is an outline proposal for 11 x 2-storey dwellings with either 4 or 5 bedrooms. The application includes details of access only. All other matters (appearance, scale, layout and landscaping) are reserved.

An attenuation pond is proposed in the south-western part of the site however, this is shown outside the red edge site boundary.

The submission includes:
Design and Access Statement
Planning Statement
Ecological Assessment
Arboricultural Report
Flood Risk assessment
Phase 1 Geo-Environmental Report

Two appeal decisions also accompany the application which aim to highlight the fact that the ability to demonstrate a five year supply of housing does not constitute an upper limit to the delivery of new housing.

**Officer Assessment – Key Considerations**

1. **Principle of Development**

The proposed development is on a greenfield site on the edge of Stone. The development of the site for housing would, therefore, need to be in line with Spatial Principle 7 of the Plan for Stafford Borough. Paragraph 49 of the NPPF states:-

“Housing applications should be considered in the context of the presumption of sustainable development. Relevant policies for the supply of housing should not be considered up-to-date if the local planning authority cannot demonstrate a five year supply of deliverable housing sites.”

The Council has to show a five year + housing supply to meet the requirements of the NPPF which is set out by the housing provision within the Plan for Stafford Borough. The Council can currently demonstrate a 5 year supply of housing land, including a 20% buffer in the context of the Plan for Stafford Borough.

Stone is identified in the Plan for Stafford Borough to accommodate 10% of the overall housing requirements for the Borough over the Plan period totalling 1,000 new houses and as of 31 March 2015 Stone had commitments totalling 1,105. The majority of which will be delivered by the Strategic Development Location to the west of Stone at Walton, although it is recognised that an element of provision will occur on brownfield sites within the urban area. Furthermore SP7 states that ‘development proposals should maximise the
use of brownfield redevelopment sites within the towns and villages to reduce the need for greenfield sites. Only where insufficient sites of previously developed land, in sustainable locations, are available to meet new development requirements should greenfield sites be released.

At this stage no further development on greenfield land is required to meet the Plan’s housing requirement for Stone. The Council accepts that the provision of 10,000 units over the Plan period is not a maximum, but considers that any growth above this figure must be delivered in proportion with the development strategy set out in Spatial Principle 4 (i.e. 10% of development to take place in Stone).

It is vital that new development in the lower levels of the hierarchy is not allowed to significantly exceed the proportional split as this would significantly distort the intended growth pattern seriously undermining the recently adopted Local Plan. It could also have a detrimental impact on the delivery of the Strategic Development Locations.

Whilst the NPPF supports sustainable development, the development proposed would lead to an unsustainable growth pattern which is contrary to the objectives set out in the NPPF and if the application was to be approved would undermine the strategy.

It is considered that the proposed development would undermine Spatial Principle 4 and the development strategy of the Plan for Stafford Borough.

This site was allocated for housing in the previous 2001 Local Plan however, as development of the site did not come forward during the plan period, the site was excluded from the settlement boundary for Stone in the Plan for Stafford Borough.

The applicant raised an objection to the exclusion of his site from the settlement boundary. The response given to this objection by the Council’s Forward Planning section was as follows:-

“The adopted Plan for Stafford Borough (PfSB) establishes the development strategy for the borough, with the majority of future development delivered through Sustainable Settlement Hierarchy based on the following areas: Stafford, Stone and the Key Service Villages (KSV).

The Council is monitoring housing delivery on an annual basis, based on the proportions set out in adopted policy SP3 and SP4 of the PfSB, as well as the overall housing numbers.

The scale of development is not required and releasing this land for development would undermine the Sustainable Settlement Hierarchy in the context of completions and existing commitments already exceeded in Stafford, Stone and the Key Service Villages”

Policies and Guidance:-

National Planning Policy Framework:
Paragraph 9 (Achieving Sustainable Development)
Paragraphs 11-14 (Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development)
Paragraph 17 - Core Planning Principles
Paragraph 49 - Delivering a Wide Choice of High Quality Homes
Plan for Stafford Borough:
SP1 Presumption in favour of sustainable development
SP2 Stafford Borough Housing and Employment Requirements
SP3 Stafford Borough Sustainable Settlement Hierarchy
SP4 Stafford Borough Housing Growth Distribution
SP7 Supporting the Location of New Development
Stone 1 Stone Town
Plan for Stafford Borough Part 2 – Stone Inset Plan

2. Residential Amenity

This application is outline only and does not now include consideration of layout.

The illustrative layout suggests that SAD can be adequately achieved subject to detailed design.

Policies and Guidance:-

National Planning Policy Framework:
Paragraph 17 - Core Planning Principles

Plan for Stafford Borough:
SP7 Supporting the location of new development
T1 Transport
N1 Design

Supplementary Planning Guidance:
Space about Dwellings

3. Highways

It is proposed to access the site from Trent Road. A section of hedgerow will need to be removed to facilitate this. The proposed plans show visibility splay of 40m in both directions and a section of footpath along the site frontage.

The Highway Authority has raised no objections subject to conditions.

Policies and Guidance:-

National Planning Policy Framework:
Paragraph 32 (Promoting Sustainable Transport)

Plan for Stafford Borough:
T1 Transport
T2 Parking and manoeuvring facilities
Appendix B: Car parking standards
4. Flood Risk

The majority of the site falls within Flood Zone 1 however the south western corner of the site is located in Flood Zone 3.

The submitted FRA confirms that the proposed development is categorised as ‘More Vulnerable’ and in accordance with Table 3 of the PPG, the Flood Risk Vulnerability and Flood Zone Compatibility table, the development is considered appropriate;

The FRA also states that in accordance with EA requirements, the proposed development will be restricted to land in Flood Zones 2 and 1. The proposed finished floor levels are to be set to a minimum of 87.44m AOD (providing 600mm freeboard above the modelled 1% annual probability (1 in 100 year) plus climate change flood level for the site). Safe, dry access is provided onto Trent Road even in the 0.1% annual probability (1 in 1,000 year) flood event.

It is anticipated that the final surface water management strategy will comprise an attenuation basin in the south western corner of the site, to store storm water runoff from the site before discharging to the River Trent to the west of the site, but this is not within the application site area. A pumping station is shown at the south-west end of the site.

The Environment Agency do not raise any objections.

The Lead Local Flood Authority has made the following comments to the additional drainage information:

The Flood Risk Assessment and further information submitted subsequently demonstrate that an acceptable drainage design could be achieved within the proposed development. The additional information has confirmed that at this outline stage the proposed attenuation pond will provide sufficient volume in a worst case scenario where no infiltration is feasible. However infiltration testing will be undertaken and the SuDS hierarchy revisited at detailed design stage. The detailed drainage design should be in accordance with the drainage strategy and design parameters established in the submitted documents, taking into account the results of further site investigations.

A condition is recommended for a detailed surface water drainage scheme to be submitted for consideration.

A condition attached to any grant of consent would therefore need to be a Grampian style condition as the attenuation pond is located outside the red edge but within the blue edge on land owned by the applicant.

Policies and Guidance:-

National Planning Policy Framework:
Section 10: Meeting the challenge of climate change, flooding and coastal change

The Plan for Stafford Borough:
SP7 Supporting the Location of New Development
N2 Climate Change
5. Trees and Biodiversity/Environmental

There are numerous trees on site, some of which are protected by Tree Preservation Orders (TPO). The Tree Officer supports the removal of some of the trees on site in accordance with the submitted arboricultural report but has raised an objection on the grounds that the proposed layout will adversely impact upon some TPO trees to be retained. Layout is no longer under consideration as part of this outline application and would be dealt with by a reserved matters application.

The submitted ecology assessment concludes that on the basis of the surveys completed the site has limited opportunities for protected species. It states however that the removal of habitats should be completed in a manner to avoid potential harm. The Council’s Biodiversity Officer has considered the proposal, including the submitted ecological assessment and does not raise any objections subject to conditions.

A Phase 1 Geo-Environmental Report also supports the application. This report concludes that there are no issues relating to ground contamination and that the site can be safely developed for residential use. The Environmental Health Officer does not raise any objections subject to a condition.

The submitted topographical survey and tree constraints plan show that levels across the site vary with the lower levels (up to 7m) being situated more centrally in the site. It is likely that some levelling works may be required in this area which, may possibly impact upon some of the retained TPO trees. The ground level of Hartley Close is shown to be slightly higher than the application site which is considered an acceptable relationship between the existing and proposed dwellings. The ground levels of the adjacent dwelling Seefeld are however not shown. Seefeld is also accessed from Trent Road and whilst it is well distanced from the proposed dwellings, it is unclear how this dwelling relates to the proposed site in terms of ground levels.

As proposed levels are not shown, it is not possible to assess the impact of such works on the site and the retained trees.

Policies and Guidance:

National Planning Policy Framework:
Paragraph 118 - Conserving and Enhancing the Natural Environment
Paragraph 103 - Meeting the Challenge of Climate Change, Flooding and Coastal Change
Paragraph 118 - Conserving and Enhancing the Natural Environment

Plan for Stafford Borough
N1 Design
N2 Climate Change
N4 The Natural Environment and Green Infrastructure
N8 Landscape Character
6. Obligations

Open Space, Recreation and Sports Provision
In accordance with the financial contributions guide for new development provision of Open Space and commuted sums, the contribution required for this development should be a capital investment of £9,941.64. This does not include any maintenance costs.

Affordable Housing
This development of 11 dwellings is outside the settlement boundary for Stone and is therefore required to deliver 30% affordable housing, which equates to 3 affordable homes.

Education Provision
An Education Contribution for 1 Middle School place (1 x £13,827 = £13,827) and 1 High School place (1 x £16,622 = £16,622) is required. This gives a total request of £30,449.

The applicants have agreed to pay the contributions detailed above which can be dealt with via a legal agreement.

Policies and Guidance:-

Plan for Stafford Borough
I1 Infrastructure Delivery Policy

Conclusion

The proposed development is on a green field site adjacent to Stone. The Council can demonstrate a 5 year supply of housing land, including a 20% buffer. The Plan for Stafford Borough has demonstrated that for the plan period objectively assessed need can be fully met.

Although a proportion of the Borough’s housing provision is required at Stone (10%) the amount of housing currently committed at this level of the hierarchy has exceeded this proportion.

The proposal would lead to a disproportionate amount of development taking place at a lower level of the sustainable settlement hierarchy. This will undermine the development strategy set out in Spatial Principle 4 of the Plan for Stafford Borough.

Consultations

Parish Council:
Members object to this application due to the removal of trees, the area floods, highways issues (the access road is narrow and already very busy), the green area should be protected, and the site is outside of the settlement boundary

Forward Planning:
The Plan for Stafford Borough Part 2 will be submitted to the Secretary of State at the end of April 2016, and the application site falls outside the proposed Settlement Boundary for Stone.
The proposed development is on a greenfield site on the edge of Stone. The development of the site for housing would, therefore, need to be in line with Spatial Principle 7 of the Plan for Stafford Borough. Paragraph 49 of the NPPF states ‘Housing applications should be considered in the context of sustainable development. Relevant policies for the supply of housing should not be considered up-to-date if the local planning authority cannot demonstrate a five year supply of deliverable housing sites’. The Council has to show a five year + housing supply to meet the requirements of the NPPF which is set out by the housing provision within the Plan for Stafford Borough. The Council can currently demonstrate a 5 year supply of housing land, including a 20% buffer in the context of the Plan for Stafford Borough.

Stone is identified in the Plan for Stafford Borough to accommodate 10% of the overall housing requirements for the Borough over the Plan period totalling 1,000 new houses and as of 31st March 2015 stone had 1,105 commitments. The majority of which will be delivered by the Strategic Development Location to the west of Stone at Walton, although it is recognised that an element of provision will occur on brownfield sites within the urban area. Furthermore SP7 states that ‘development proposals should maximise the use of brownfield redevelopment sites within the towns and villages to reduce the need for greenfield sites. Only where insufficient sites of previously developed land, in sustainable locations, are available to meet new development requirements should greenfield sites be released’.

Highway Authority:
There are no objections on Highway grounds to the proposed development subject to the conditions, requiring provision of visibility splays and a Construction Method Statement.

Biodiversity Officer:
No protected species were found on site however there are some recommended precautionary measures.
Lighting - should be designed to avoid light spill into the stream corridor, new pond and hedgerow boundaries.
Bats - Four bat bricks should be included within the new buildings – to provide permanent roosting features. Final locations should be decided by the ecologist and indicated in the plans.
Nest Birds - Four bird boxes should be installed in appropriate places. The final locations should be decided by an ecologist and indicated in the plans.
Badgers - Any trenches or excavations left open overnight should be provided with a means of escape.
Reptiles/Amphibians/Small mammals - The area to be developed should be cleared from the centre outwards and if necessary, a short sward maintained prior to works commencing.
Habitat enhancements - The proposed development site is in close proximity to the Stone Meadows Local Nature Reserve, currently being managed to restore its floral diversity as a floodplain meadow.
The Ecology Solutions survey indicates that remnant floodplain meadow flora still survives on the development site particularly in the southern zone and therefore it is fitting to maintain and enhance this. A brief management plan should be submitted that must include an annual hay cut with all arisings removed. Additionally, a further grass-cut should be taken in late summer.
The report recommends a Construction Method Statement is prepared to ensure that the LNR is not affected by any potential pollution from the development.

Hedgerows and trees should be retained where possible and appropriate native species used to fill any gaps. Where hedgerows are lost, new hedges should be planted in compensation. It is recommended that these are managed on a three-year rotation for wildlife value.

The new attenuation pond is recommended to be designed to support the suggested ecological enhancements. The stream corridor should also be enhanced for ecological functionality. Log piles should provide good habitat for invertebrates. Finally, efforts should be made to reduce and remove Himalayan balsam from the site.

All the above should be included within a site management plan.

Housing Policy and Research Officer:
This development of 11 dwellings is outside the settlement boundary for Stone therefore it is required to deliver 30% affordable housing, which equates to 3 affordable homes.

Tree Officer:
The structural quality of the following Tree Preservation Order trees are in such a condition that removal will be required with any change of use of the land:

TPO T2 (T92 – Beech – Failed main leader with major squirrel damage on the remaining main scaffold limbs in the upper crown).
TPO T3 (T91 – Horse chestnut – Bacterial canker, included bark unions, decay present on main stem and dieback noted in the crown).
TPO T4 (T55 – Norway maple – heavily included main limbs with structural movement evident).
TPO T6 (T1 – Horse chestnut – declining rapidly with bacterial canker).
TPO T9 (T51 – Weeping willow – Major failed limbs in the canopy, resulting in a tree that requires major arboricultural works to be retained in a safe condition if the land use changes.

It is disappointing to note the general structural condition of these aforementioned trees, which will essentially be required to be removed with any change of use of the land. However these trees can be compensated for within a submitted landscape scheme.

The trees with the highest degree of visual amenity, as can be viewed from a considerable distance from the site are the linear feature of screening planting of the single species of Hybrid Black Poplar; however this cannot be classified as a woodland area. These trees also form a visual buffer to the new properties located on Hartley Close. However I have to concur with the submitted Arboricultural Survey (Tree Heritage – 16th September 2015), the trees are in general decline with large amounts of deadwood in the crowns and a degree of die-back evident. There are also many trees with structural issues (weak forks, heavily leaning). These trees in their current condition with the aforementioned structural and physiological issues would not be suitable for retention within any proposed scheme. The trees have been categorised as ‘U’ (those trees in such a condition that they cannot realistically be retained as living trees in the context of the current land use for longer than
Therefore it would be required that substantial boundary planting is created within a landscaping scheme to compensate for the loss of these trees if planning permission is granted.

The proposed layout in the vicinity of Plot 4 has made no allowance for any potential growth of the relatively young tree (T65 – Red oak). This tree will attain a substantial size and allowances should be made in the layout to reflect this. This will prevent continuous arboricultural operations being performed on the tree as it matures.

The proposed layout in the vicinity of Plot 8 has made no allowance for any potential growth of T127 – Copper beech. This tree will also attain a substantial size and allowances should be made in the layout to reflect this to prevent continuous arboricultural operations being performed on the tree as it matures. Root disturbance on this species of tree should be avoided if possible and the location of Plot 8 suggests that the layout could be altered to achieve a greater separation distance.

The proposed layout in the vicinity of T49 (Copper beech) will have a minor impact on the Root Protection Area of this aforementioned tree. As the canopy of the tree is low spreading the layout should make allowances for this root area and canopy to remain undisturbed.

T15 – Beech is in serious decline with major bark removal present on the main stem (possibly from squirrels). Therefore the tree should be removed if land use changes.

The indicative layout of the lake area impacts upon the Root Protection Area of TPO T8 (T13 – Beech) therefore allowances should be made to prevent any detrimental impact on this Root Protection Area. It is accepted that the location of the lake may be indicative at this point.

The removal to allow pavements and visibility splays on the boundary of the site adjacent to Trent Road is regrettable as all hedgerows provide essential ecological corridors. However the plans do indicate that there will be replacement hedging along the frontage of the site to compensate for this loss. The quantity of tree removal associated with this development is high; however a vast majority of these removals are on arboricultural grounds.

Therefore as the planning permission includes layout, I would raise an objection to the current application.

Latest response from the Tree Officer following the removal of layout as a consideration:

I have no objections to the proposal in principle as the matter of layout has now been withdrawn from the application. Any further submission in relation to layout should take the retained trees ultimate size into consideration; this is to prevent any unnecessary arboricultural operations resulting from post development pressure.

Environment Agency: No objections subject to conditions
Lead Local Flood Authority:
I have reviewed the drainage strategy in the FRA and the principles and design parameters for the surface water drainage look acceptable.

The issue is whether the details specified in the FRA are consistent with the Site Layout Plan and red line boundary – on the Layout Plan the attenuation pond is outside the red line boundary, and the exact size and location of the pond in relation to the flood zone are not clear.
If the layout is to be agreed at this stage, then more detailed drainage info would be needed to show that a suitably sized attenuation pond will fit within the proposed layout, given the constraints of flood zone 3, pond maintenance buffer zone, side slopes, freeboard, main river easement etc.

To show that the measures specified in the FRA are consistent with the proposed layout, we would need:
Infiltration rate testing to determine whether this is a feasible method of surface water discharge in accordance with the drainage hierarchy;
Detailed drainage design and calculations to confirm the size of attenuation pond required;
Site plan showing extent of Flood Zone 3, 10m maintenance buffer from the River Trent, area for attenuation pond (with 1 in 3 side slopes, freeboard and 5m maintenance buffer).

Without this information it is not possible to confirm that the proposed layout is acceptable.

Latest response following the submission of additional information:

The Flood Risk Assessment (Project Ref: 30230/4002, December 2014) and further information submitted subsequently (by email, 10 May 2016) demonstrate that an acceptable drainage design could be achieved within the proposed development. The additional information has confirmed that at this outline stage the proposed attenuation pond will provide sufficient volume in a worst case scenario where no infiltration is feasible. However infiltration testing will be undertaken and the SuDS hierarchy revisited at detailed design stage. The detailed drainage design should be in accordance with the drainage strategy and design parameters established in the submitted documents, taking into account the results of further site investigations.

A condition has been recommended for a detailed surface water drainage scheme to be submitted for consideration.

Environmental Health Officer:
No objections subject to conditions including a condition that the recommendations of the phase one report detailed in chapter 3.2.3 should be carried out before development commences.

SCC Environmental Team:
It is considered that archaeological mitigation would not be appropriate in this instance.
The County Council’s Definitive Map of Public Rights of Way shows that no rights of way cross the proposed application site.
Leisure Services:
Sports pitch provision and built associated facilities within the area fall short of national standards as identified within the Open Space, Sport and Recreation Facilities Strategy 2009 Assessment and are in need of refurbishment to address significant quality deficiencies. This has been supported by the draft revised 2013 assessment.

The National Planning Policy Framework, (NPPF) supports the Council current policy by ensuring that all developments are designed to be sustainable both now and in the future. Paragraph 7 states that sustainable developments must support health, social and cultural well-being and contribute to protecting and enhancing the natural environment.

Paragraph 69 states planning policies should promote accessible developments with high quality public open space, which encourage the active and continual use of public areas.

Paragraph 70 requires planning policies and decisions to plan positively for the provision and use of shared space, community facilities, (such as meeting places and sports venues), to enhance the sustainability of communities and residential environments.

The Council's policy reflects this by ensuring that new developments contribute to enhancing or providing green space.

Contributions towards open space
Due to the size of this development the Council is reasonably entitled to request a quantitative provision of 30.81m² per person of open space provision under its current policy. Given the outline nature of the development it is not possible at this stage to provide a full break down in terms of capital investment nor the area of POS required as part of this proposal.

In accordance with the financial contributions guide for new development provision of Open Space and commuted sums, the contribution required for this development should be a capital investment of £9,941.64. This does not include any maintenance costs.

In order for developers to calculate the open space requirements, the cost of open space per dwelling is set out below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1: Open Space requirement per dwelling</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Open space required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per person (m²)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.84</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sports Provision
Due to the size of the development we will not be seeking a contribution towards sports provision.

Adoption of footpaths and cycle ways and associated lighting.
Leisure Services will not be seeking the adoption of any footpath or cycle way and associated infrastructure including lighting as part of this development. These paths should be adopted by the County Council who are the Highways authority for the Borough.
Flood Attenuation/Sustainable Drainage Systems.
Leisure and Culture inform the applicant that Stafford Borough Council will not adopt any land forming part of a flood attenuation scheme as a result the Council will not be seeking adoption of any of the open space upon site and alternative management methods must be secured. This should be discussed with Severn Trent Water as we are aware they will be unlikely to adopt the drainage system on the development site.

Site planting.
All trees should be native to the UK. Sycamore should not be planted under any circumstances.
Where trees are planted adjacent to footpaths or hard standing, trees should be planted in tree pits and liner pavement protection should be installed.

County Education:
In response to the above planning application the School Organisation Team has the following comments:

This development falls within the catchments of Christ Church CE (VC) First School, Christ Church Academy and Alleyne’s Academy, Stone.

The development is scheduled to provide 11 dwellings. A development of this size could add 2 First School aged pupils, 1 Middle School aged pupil, High School aged pupil and no Sixth Form pupils.

There is limited availability of places at first school level, which is deemed sufficient to accommodate the pupils from this development. The middle and high schools are projected to be full for the foreseeable future. We will therefore be requesting a contribution towards Middle School and Secondary School provision.

We would seek an Education Contribution for 1 Middle School place (1 x £13,827 = £13,827) and 1 High School place (1 x £16,622 = £16,622). This gives a total request of £30,449.

The contribution is based on 2008/09 cost multipliers and if numbers vary the contribution would be adjusted accordingly.

Staffordshire Police Architectural Liaison Officer:
Recommends the use of Secure By Design standards.

Neighbours:
(60 consulted)
25 letters of objection received from 16 addresses. The issues raised are summarised as follows:
The site is outside the development boundary
Contrary to the NPPF
Flood risk
Impact upon natural drainage
Impact upon existing infrastructure: impact upon schools and doctors surgeries
Traffic congestion
Additional ecology reports are required
Impact upon protected species
Highway safety
Unsuitability of Trent Road to accommodate further traffic
Danger to pedestrians – footpath should be constructed
Traffic calming is required
Impact upon residential amenity
Noise
Loss of light
Impact upon trees and the landscape
Protected trees should be considered in the layout
Trees form an important and significant part of the landscape
Trees provide a natural screen
Loss of amenity
Loss of privacy

2 letters of support raising the following points:
Sustainable location
Site is suitable for residential development
EA has no objections
Additional housing is required

Relevant Planning History

01/41093/FUL - Erection Of 34 New Dwellings – refused

01/41092/FUL - Erection Of 34 New Dwellings – refused

91/27035/FUL - Construction Of 11 Detached 4 Or 5 Bedroom Houses With Separate
Double Garages – S106 not signed.

90/26033/FUL - New Build Housing Development 16 Two Storey Terraced Houses and 12
Flats – S106 not signed

89/24130/OUT - Residential Development (Outline) - refused

78/06848/OUT - 3 Dwelling Houses (Outline) - refused

Recommendation – Refuse, for the following reasons:-

1. The proposed development is on a green field site adjacent to Stone. The Council
can demonstrate a 5 year supply of housing land, including a 20% buffer. The Plan
for Stafford Borough has demonstrated that for the plan period objectively
assessed need can be fully met. Although a proportion of the Borough's housing
provision is required at Stone (10%) the amount of housing currently committed at
this level of the hierarchy has exceeded this proportion. Approval of this
application, therefore, would contribute towards a disproportionate amount of
development taking place at this level of the sustainable settlement hierarchy. This
would conflict with and undermine the development strategy set out in Spatial
Principle 4 of the Plan for Stafford Borough and would not be in accordance with
the genuinely plan-led approach advocated in paragraph 17 of the National Planning Policy Framework.
15/23033/OUT
Land North of Trent Road
Stone
NOW DEVELOPED

Woodland Fields - 11 no. detached dwellings.

Visibility Lines for 30mph Road
40m shown clear from obstruction

Visibility Lines for 30mph Road
40m shown clear from obstruction

Woodland Court -
3 Storey Sustainable Affordable Starter Homes Development.
Ground floor parking: 1st & 2nd floor: mix of 1, 2 & 1 bed affordable apartments.

Proposed Highway
Junction Improvements

As stated in the Planning Statement - where dwellings are proposed that have 4 or more bedrooms, a minimum of 3 parking spaces will be provided.

Hewitt & Carr Architects

Site Location Plan 1:2500

Proposed Residential Development on
Land off Trent Road, Hailsham, East Sussex
Dear Sir,

STAFFORD BOROUGH COUNCIL TREE PRESERVATION ORDER NO 234-2000
TREES AT NORTH SIDE OF TRENT ROAD, STONE

The Borough Council has today made the above mentioned Order in respect of trees on land at the north side of Trent Road, Stone.

I enclose a notice which I am required to serve on anyone having an interest in the land. A copy of the Order is also enclosed. I should point out that under Section 201 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 the Order takes effect immediately as detailed in paragraph 3 of the Order.

Also enclosed is a requisition for information which I shall be grateful if you will complete and return to me as soon as possible.

If you have any queries regarding this matter please do not hesitate to contact me.

Yours faithfully

A R Welch LLB (Hons) Solicitor
Head of Law and Administration
TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING ACT 1990

TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING (TREE PRESERVATION ORDER) REGULATIONS 1969

TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING (TREE PRESERVATION ORDER)(AMENDMENT) REGULATIONS 1981

To:

TAKE NOTICE that the Stafford Borough Council in pursuance of their powers as Local Planning Authority under Section 198 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, has this day made a Tree Preservation Order (a copy thereof together with the map included therein is enclosed herewith) in respect of:-

Trees on land at north side of Trent Road, Stone

The said order contains a direction under section 201 of the Act, the effect of which is explained overleaf.

The grounds for making the said order are as follows:-

The trees make a significant contribution to the amenities of the area.

A certified copy of the Order and the map included therein may be inspected without charge at the Civic Centre, Riverside, Stafford ST16 3AQ between the hours of 8.30 am to 5.00 pm Mondays to Thursdays and between 8.30 am to 4.30 pm on Fridays.

Should you wish to raise any objections or make any representations with respect to the Order they should be made in accordance with Regulation 7 of the Town and Country Planning (Tree Preservation Order) (Amendment) Regulations 1981. (reproduced overleaf).

If no objections or representations are duly made, or if any so made are withdrawn, then not less than 42 days from the date of the service of this notice, the order may be confirmed (but without any modification) as an unopposed order by the above-named authority.

Signed: Head of Law and Administration

Date: 22 September 2000
Objections and representations.

7. - (1) Every objection or representation with respect to an order shall be made in writing to the Head of Law and Administration, Stafford Borough Council, Civic Centre, Riverside, Stafford ST16 3AQ and shall state the grounds thereof and specify the particular trees, group of trees, or woodlands in respect of which it is made.

(2) An objection or representation shall be duly made if it complies with paragraph (1) of this regulation and is received by the Head of Law and Administration within 28 days from the date of the service of the notice of the making of the order.

Town and Country Planning Act 1990

Section 201 (2) of the above Act provides that notwithstanding section 199(1) of this Act, an order which contains a direction under section 201 of the Act shall take effect provisionally on such date as may be specified therein and shall continue in force by virtue of the said section 201 until -

(a) the expiration of a period of six months beginning with the date on which the order was made; or

(b) the date on which the order is confirmed.

whichever first occurs.

Any objection or representation in respect of this Order shall be made to:

Head of Law and Administration
Stafford Borough Council
Civic Centre
Riverside
Stafford
ST16 3AQ
TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING ACT 1990

TREE PRESERVATION ORDER, 234  2000

The STAFFORD BOROUGH COUNCIL in exercise of the powers conferred on them by sections 198 [and 201(4)] and 300 [and 303(4)] of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, (and with the consent of the Council Name of appropriate authority) hereby make the following Order:—

Citation

1. This Order may be cited as STAFFORD BOROUGH COUNCIL TREE PRESERVATION ORDER NO 234.2000

Interpretation

2. In this Order "the authority" means the STAFFORD BOROUGH COUNCIL and unless the context otherwise requires, any reference in this Order to a numbered section is a reference to the section so numbered in the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

Application of section 201

3. The authority hereby direct that section 201 (provisional tree preservation orders) shall apply to this Order and, accordingly, this Order shall take effect provisionally on 23 SEPTEMBER 2000

Prohibited acts in relation to trees

4. Without prejudice to subsections (6) and (7) of section 198 (power to make tree preservation orders) [or subsection (3) of section 200 (orders affecting land where Forestry Commissioners interested)], and subject to article 5, no person shall—

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

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

any tree specified in Schedule I to this Order or comprised in a group of trees or in a woodland so specified, except with the consent of the authority and, where such consent is given subject to conditions, in accordance with those conditions.

Exemptions

5. (1) Nothing in article 4 shall prevent—

(a) the cutting down, topping, lopping or uprooting of a tree by or at the request of a statutory undertaker, where the land on which the tree is situated is operational land of the statutory undertaker and the work is necessary—

(a) Under section 198(1), tree preservation orders generally do not take effect until confirmed, but a direction may be given under section 201 for an order to take provisional effect immediately.

(b) Where the Order is to be made under the sections cited and section 300 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, all those provisions should be cited, as should the fact of the consent of the appropriate authority. As to the circumstances in which the consent of the Forestry Commission is required (and should be cited) see section 200(1) of that Act.

(c) Subsection (6) of section 198 exempts from the application of tree preservation orders the cutting down, uprooting, topping or lopping of trees which are dying, dead or have become dangerous, or the undertaking of those acts in compliance with obligations imposed by or under an Act of Parliament or so far as may be necessary for the prevention or abatement of a nuisance. Subsection (7) of that section makes section 198 subject to section 39(2) of the Housing and Planning Act 1986 (c.63) (saving for effect of section 2(4) of the Opencast Coal Act 1958 on land affected by a tree preservation order despite its repeal) and section 15 of the Forestry Act 1967 (c.10) (licences under that Act to fell trees comprised in a tree preservation order).

(d) See section 263 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

(e) S.I. 1995/418.
(i) in the interests of the safe operation of the undertaking;
(ii) in connection with the inspection, repair or renewal of any sewers, mains, pipes, cables or other apparatus of the statutory undertaker; or
(iii) to enable the statutory undertaker to carry out development permitted by or under the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995(o);

(b) the cutting down, topping, lopping or uprooting of a tree cultivated for the production of fruit in the course of a business or trade where such work is in the interests of that business or trade;

(c) the pruning, in accordance with good horticultural practice, of any tree cultivated for the production of fruit;

(d) the cutting down, topping, lopping or uprooting of a tree where that work is required to enable a person to implement a planning permission (other than an outline planning permission or, without prejudice to paragraph (a)(iii), a permission granted by or under the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995) granted on an application under Part III of the Act, or deemed to have been granted (whether for the purposes of that Part or otherwise);

(e) the cutting down, topping, lopping or uprooting of a tree by or at the request of the Environment Agency to enable the Agency to carry out development permitted by or under the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995;

(f) the cutting down, topping, lopping or uprooting of a tree by or at the request of a drainage body where that tree interferes, or is likely to interfere, with the exercise of any of the functions of that body in relation to the maintenance, improvement or construction of watercourses or of drainage works, and for this purpose "drainage body" and "drainage" have the same meanings as in the Land Drainage Act 1991(s); or

(g) without prejudice to section 198(6)(b), the felling or lopping of a tree or the cutting back of its roots by or at the request of, or in accordance with a notice served by, a licence holder under paragraph 9 of Schedule 4 to the Electricity Act 1989(t).

(2) In paragraph (1), "statutory undertaker" means any of the following —

a person authorised by any enactment to carry on any railway, light railway, tramway, road transport, water transport, canal, inland navigation, dock, harbour pier or lighthouse undertaking, or any undertaking for the supply of hydraulic power;

a relevant airport operator (within the meaning of Part V of the Airports Act 1986)(v),

the holder of a licence under section 6 of the Electricity Act 1989,

a public gas transporter,

the holder of a licence under section 7 of the Telecommunications Act 1984(w) to whom the telecommunications code (within the meaning of that Act) is applied,

a water or sewerage undertaking,

the Civil Aviation Authority or a body acting on behalf of that Authority,

the Post Office.

Applications for consent under the Order

6. An application for consent for the cutting down, topping, lopping or uprooting of any tree in respect of which his Order is for the time being in force shall be made in writing to the authority and shall—

(a) identify the tree or trees to which it relates (if necessary, by reference to a plan);

(b) specify the work for which consent is sought; and

(c) contain a statement of the applicant's reasons for making the application.

Application of provisions of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990

7. (1) The provisions of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 relating to registers, applications, permissions and appeals mentioned in column (1) of Part I of Schedule 2 to this Order shall have effect, in relation to consents under this Order and applications for such consent, subject to the adaptations and modifications mentioned in column (2)

(a) 1991 c.59. see section 72.
(b) 1989 c.29.
(c) 1986 c.31.
(d) 1984 c.12.
(2) The provisions referred to in paragraph (1), as so adapted and modified, are set out in Part II of that Schedule.

Directions as to replanting

8. (1) Where consent is granted under this Order for the felling in the course of forestry operations of any part of a woodland area, the authority may give to the owner of the land on which that part is situated ("the relevant land") a direction in writing specifying the manner in which and the time within which he shall replant the relevant land.

(2) Where a direction is given under paragraph (1) and trees on the relevant land are felled (pursuant to the consent), the owner of that land shall replant it in accordance with the direction.

(3) A direction under paragraph (1) may include requirements as to--

(a) species;
(b) number of trees per hectare;
(c) the preparation of the relevant land prior to the replanting; and
(d) the erection of fencing necessary for the protection of the newly planted trees.

Compensation

9. (1) If, on a claim under this article, a person establishes that loss or damage has been caused or incurred in consequence of--

(a) the refusal of any consent required under this Order; or
(b) the grant of any such consent subject to conditions,

he shall, subject to paragraphs (3) and (4), be entitled to compensation from the authority.

(2) No claim, other than a claim made under paragraph (3), may be made under this article--

(a) if more than 12 months have elapsed since the date of the authority's decision or, where such a decision is the subject of an appeal to the Secretary of State, the date of the final determination of the appeal; or
(b) if the amount in respect of which the claim would otherwise have been made is less than £500.

(3) Where the authority refuse consent under this Order for the felling in the course of forestry operations of any part of a woodland area, they shall not be required to pay compensation to any person other than the owner of the land and such compensation shall be limited to an amount equal to any depreciation in the value of the trees which is attributable to deterioration in the quality of the timber in consequence of the refusal.

(4) In any other case, no compensation shall be payable to a person--

(a) for loss of development value or other diminution in the value of the land;
(b) for loss or damage which, having regard to the statement of reasons submitted in accordance with article 6(c) and any documents or other evidence submitted in support of any such statement, was not reasonably foreseeable when consent was refused or was granted subject to conditions;
(c) for loss or damage reasonably foreseeable by that person and attributable to his failure to take reasonable steps to avert the loss or damage or to mitigate its extent; or
(d) for costs incurred in appealing to the Secretary of State against the refusal of any consent required under this Order or the grant of any such consent subject to conditions.

(5) Subsections (3) to (5) of section 11 (terms of compensation on refusal of licence) of the Forestry Act 1967 shall apply to the assessment of compensation under paragraph (3) as it applies to the assessment of compensation where a felling licence is refused under section 10 (application for felling licence and decision of Commissioners thereon) of that Act as if for any reference to a felling licence there were substituted a reference to a consent required under this Order and for the reference to the Commissioners there were substituted a reference to the authority.

(6) In this article--

"development value" means an increase in value attributable to the prospect of development; and, in relation to any land, the development of it shall include the clearing of it; and

"owner" has the meaning given to it by section 34 of the Forestry Act 1967.
Application to trees to be planted pursuant to a condition

10. In relation to the tree[s] identified in the first column of Schedule 1 by the letter "C", being [a tree] [trees] to be planted pursuant to a condition (being 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 [that tree is planted] [those trees are planted].

[Orders made by virtue of section 300]

11. This Order takes effect in accordance with subsection (3) of section 300 (tree preservation orders in anticipation of disposal of Crown land).

Dated this 22 day of SEPTEMBER 2000

(month and year)

(The Common Seal of the (name of Council) STAFFORD BOROUGH COUNCIL was hereunto affixed in the presence of-


Legal Services Manager

(month and year)

(Signed on behalf of the (name of Council) STAFFORD BOROUGH COUNCIL)

Authorised by the Council to sign in that behalf]

[CONFIRMATION OF ORDER]

(This Order was confirmed by the (name of Council) without modification on the day of (month and year) OR

(This Order was confirmed by the (name of Council) subject to the modifications indicated by (state how indicated) on the day of (month and year)

(month and year)

Authorised by the Council to sign in that behalf]

[DECISION NOT TO CONFIRM ORDER]

A decision not to confirm this Order was taken by the (name of Council) on the day of (month and year)

(month and year)

Authorised by the Council to sign in that behalf]

[VARIATION OF ORDER]

This Order was varied by the (name of Council) on the day of (month and year) under the reference number

(month and year)

Authorised by the Council to sign in that behalf]

[REVOCATION OF ORDER]

This Order was revoked by the (name of Council) on the day of (month and year) under the reference number

(month and year)

Authorised by the Council to sign in that behalf]
Stafford Borough Council

Tree Preservation Order No. 234 - 2000
Trees at off Trent Road, Stone

First Schedule

Note: All trees, groups of trees and woodlands described in this Schedule are situated in the Borough of Stafford on Ordnance Survey Sheet SJ.8934 (1:1250)

**TREES SPECIFIED INDIVIDUALLY**

(encircled in black on the map)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. on Map</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Situation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T1</td>
<td>Horse Chestnut</td>
<td>Land off Trent Road, Stone.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T2</td>
<td>Copper Beech</td>
<td>Land off Trent Road, Stone.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T3</td>
<td>Horse Chestnut</td>
<td>Land off Trent Road, Stone.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T4</td>
<td>Purple Sycamore</td>
<td>Land off Trent Road, Stone.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T5</td>
<td>Copper Beech</td>
<td>Land off Trent Road, Stone.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T6</td>
<td>Horse Chestnut</td>
<td>Land off Trent Road, Stone.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T7</td>
<td>Horse Chestnut</td>
<td>Land off Trent Road, Stone.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T8</td>
<td>Beech</td>
<td>Land off Trent Road, Stone.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T9</td>
<td>Willow</td>
<td>Land off Trent Road, Stone.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T10</td>
<td>Copper Beech</td>
<td>Land off Trent Road, Stone.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TREES SPECIFIED BY REFERENCE TO AN AREA**

(within a dotted black line on map)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. on Map</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Situation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-NONE-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**GROUP OF TREES**

(within a broken black line on the map)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. on Map</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Situation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>G1</td>
<td>White Willows</td>
<td>Land off Trent Road, Stone.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Land off Trent Road, Stone

We have carried out 2 separate surveys of the trees on this land to ascertain their condition in relation to BS 5837:2012.

The first survey was done in November 2013 and then repeated again this September 2019. It is noted that many of the trees have deteriorated and some have actually failed over the last 6 years. The majority of the failed trees are Poplars which are very fast growing and have a relatively short life span before they start to shed limbs or fail.

At the time of the first survey we were told that some of the trees were protected by a Tree Preservation Order and these were identified on our drawing THL-0127-2. None of the Poplars were included in the Tree Preservation Order. This survey was used as part of the submission for the 2015 Planning Application. During this application the Stafford Borough Tree Officer was consulted, and he made no objections to the removal of most of the Poplars within the site as he agreed that their retention so close to the existing and proposed buildings was risky.

The report to the planning officer in 2015 also clearly stated that The Tree Officer suggested that the removal of some of the trees would be necessary because of their overall poor condition. It is clear that none of these trees have improved in their condition and that in fact most are now in worse condition.

Our recent survey shows the trees that are present at this moment in time. These are listed in our schedule and shown on our drawing THL-0799. The survey has been undertaken using the guidelines laid out in BS 5837:2012.

We believe that a Tree Preservation Order should only be used to protect trees that have at least 20 years of useful life and clearly our survey backed up by the comments made in 2015 by the Stafford Borough Tree Officer suggest that few of these trees meet that criteria.

Our survey found only T49 a Copper Beech (T5 of the original TPO) to have at least 40 years of useful life to be worthy of being Categorised as A within BS 5837. We also found T96 Small Leaved Lime and T127 Copper Beech to be good enough to be put into Category B and have potentially at least 20 years of useful life. The rest of the trees were put into either Category C having potentially around 10 years useful life or Category U having less than 10 years useful life.

Whilst we understand that, from a distance, these trees do form an impressive feature but at the present time their overall poor condition means that they will deteriorate over the next 10 years. Close inspection found that many are failing and that as each tree fails it damages adjacent trees making them more likely to fail. As gaps appear this allows the wind in and this is very likely to cause the loss of further trees through windthrow.
The owner of the site planted these trees and will ensure that any proposal will retain all the good trees and carry out some management to retain at least some of the Poplars in one form or another until new trees can be planted to replace those that have to be removed as part of any proposed development of the site. Clearly it is not viable to manage these trees without obtaining permission to develop the site in the near future.

2nd October 2019

Hugh Williams Managing Director Tree Heritage Ltd
Ben Williams BSc (Hons) Arb. M.Arbor.A Technical Director Tree Heritage Ltd
### APPENDIX A: TREE SURVEY SCHEDULE

**KEY:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measurements</th>
<th>Life Stage</th>
<th>Physiological Condition</th>
<th>Category Grading</th>
<th>Symbols</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Height - Metres</td>
<td>Y - Young</td>
<td>G - Good</td>
<td>A - High (green)</td>
<td>&lt; - Less than</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stem Diameter - Millimetres at 1.5m above ground level</td>
<td>SM - Semi-Mature</td>
<td>F - Fair</td>
<td>B - Moderate (blue)</td>
<td>~ - Approximately</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Branch Spread - Metres (North, South, East and West)</td>
<td>EM - Early Mature</td>
<td>P - Poor</td>
<td>C - Low (grey)</td>
<td>&gt; - Greater than</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crown Clearance - Metres</td>
<td>M - Mature</td>
<td>D - Dead</td>
<td>U - Poor/Trees for removal (red)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RPA Radius - Metres</td>
<td>OM - Over-Mature</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated Remaining Contribution - Years</td>
<td>V - Veteran</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FSB - First Significant Branch - Metres</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

RPA - Root protection area (equivalent to a circle with a radius 12x the stem diameter measured at 1.5m above ground level)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tree Ref.</th>
<th>Species</th>
<th>Height</th>
<th>Stem Diameter</th>
<th>Branch Spread</th>
<th>Crown Clearance</th>
<th>FSB Height + Direction</th>
<th>Life Stage</th>
<th>Phys. Condition</th>
<th>Structural Condition</th>
<th>Recommendations</th>
<th>Estimated Remaining Contribution</th>
<th>Category Grading</th>
<th>RPA Radius</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T1</td>
<td>Aesculus hippocastanum (Horse Chestnut)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>510</td>
<td>5 5 5 5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>2(NW)</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Declining. Bacterial canker on stem. Decay present on stem.</td>
<td>Remove tree.</td>
<td>&lt;10</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>6.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T2</td>
<td>Acer platanoides (Norway Maple)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>2 2 2 2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2(NE)</td>
<td>SM</td>
<td>Dead</td>
<td>Dead. Tree missing.</td>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;10</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>Error</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T3</td>
<td>Sorbus aucuparia (Rowan)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>3.5 3.5 3.5 3.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2(W)</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Ivy on stem. Branches encroaching on service line. Low branches over road/footpath.</td>
<td>Sever Ivy. Crown lift to 4m. Prune clear of service wires.</td>
<td>10+</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td>3.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T4</td>
<td>Aesculus hippocastanum (Horse Chestnut)</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>6 6 6 6</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>2(N)</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Branches encroaching on service line. Low branches over road/footpath.</td>
<td>Crown lift to 5m. Prune clear of service wires.</td>
<td>10+</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T5</td>
<td>Salix X chrysocoma (Weeping Willow)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>0 4.5 0 4.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.5(S)</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Major deadwood in crown. Crown distorted due to group pressure.</td>
<td>No work required.</td>
<td>10+</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td>3.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T6</td>
<td>Salix X chrysocoma (Weeping Willow)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>460</td>
<td>3 6 2 6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4(N)</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Major deadwood in crown. Crown distorted due to group pressure.</td>
<td>No work required.</td>
<td>10+</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td>5.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T7</td>
<td>Salix X chrysocoma (Weeping Willow)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>452</td>
<td>1 4 2 1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>3(N)</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Dead</td>
<td>Dead.</td>
<td>Remove tree.</td>
<td>&lt;10</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>5.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tree Ref.</td>
<td>Species</td>
<td>Height</td>
<td>Stem Diameter</td>
<td>Branch Spread</td>
<td>Crown Clearance</td>
<td>FSB Height + Direction</td>
<td>Life Stage</td>
<td>Phys. Condition</td>
<td>Structural Condition</td>
<td>Recommendations</td>
<td>Estimated Remaining Contribution</td>
<td>Category Grading</td>
<td>RPA Radius</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T8</td>
<td>Salix X chrysocoma (Weeping Willow)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>370</td>
<td>3 6 2 6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.5(S)</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Major deadwood in crown. Crown distorted due to group pressure.</td>
<td>No work required.</td>
<td>10+</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td>4.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T9</td>
<td>Salix X chrysocoma (Weeping Willow)</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>380</td>
<td>6 4 3 6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.5(N)</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Major deadwood in crown. Crown distorted due to group pressure.</td>
<td>No work required.</td>
<td>10+</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td>4.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T10</td>
<td>Salix X chrysocoma (Weeping Willow)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>480</td>
<td>6 4 3 6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.5(N)</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Major deadwood in crown. Crown distorted due to group pressure.</td>
<td>No work required.</td>
<td>10+</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td>5.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T11</td>
<td>Salix X chrysocoma (Weeping Willow)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>2 3 0 6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4(W)</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Major bark wounding on stem. Major deadwood in crown. Broken branches in crown. Top failed.</td>
<td>Pollard.</td>
<td>&lt;10</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T12</td>
<td>Populus serotina (Hybrid Black Poplar)</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1070</td>
<td>7 8 8 8</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>2(SW)</td>
<td>OM</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Declining. Dieback in crown. Major deadwood in crown. Decay present on stem. Close proximity to road and electric wires.</td>
<td>Fell tree on grounds of safety.</td>
<td>&lt;10</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>12.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T13</td>
<td>Fagus sylvatica 'Purpurea' (Copper Beech)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>5 5 5 5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>2(N)</td>
<td>EM</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Weak fork. Included bark present in main fork.</td>
<td>Monitor weak fork.</td>
<td>10+</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td>3.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tree Ref.</td>
<td>Species</td>
<td>Height</td>
<td>Stem Diameter</td>
<td>Branch Spread</td>
<td>Crown Clearance</td>
<td>FSB Height + Direction</td>
<td>Life Stage</td>
<td>Phys. Condition</td>
<td>Structural Condition</td>
<td>Recommendations</td>
<td>Estimated Remaining Contribution</td>
<td>Category Grading</td>
<td>RPA Radius</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T14</td>
<td>Populus serotina (Hybrid Black Poplar)</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1010</td>
<td>7 8 8 8</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>2(SW)</td>
<td>OM</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Declining. Dieback in crown. Major deadwood in crown. Decay present on stem. Close proximity to road and electric wires. Fell tree on grounds of safety.</td>
<td>&lt;10</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>12.12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T15</td>
<td>Fagus sylvatica (Beech)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>6 6 6 6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.5(S)</td>
<td>EM</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Dieback in crown. Squirrel damage in crown. No work required.</td>
<td>&lt;10</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T16</td>
<td>Populus serotina (Hybrid Black Poplar)</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>980</td>
<td>4 6 5 5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.5(S)</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Weak fork. Dieback in crown. Major deadwood in crown.</td>
<td>&lt;10</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>11.76</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T17</td>
<td>Populus serotina (Hybrid Black Poplar)</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>670</td>
<td>5 5 5 5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3(S)</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Dieback in crown. Major deadwood in crown.</td>
<td>&lt;10</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>8.04</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T18</td>
<td>Fraxinus excelsior (Ash)</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>5 5 2 6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.5(N)</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Ivy on stem. Poor pruning cuts. Major deadwood in crown. Unbalanced crown shape. Broken branches in crown. Remove tree.</td>
<td>&lt;10</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T19</td>
<td>Pinus nigra 'maritima' (Corsican Pine)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>2 2 2 2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.5(S)</td>
<td>EM</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>No work required.</td>
<td>10+</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td>2.64</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T20</td>
<td>Populus serotina (Hybrid Black Poplar)</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>5 2 3 5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4(N)</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Weak fork. Major deadwood in crown. Fell tree on grounds of safety.</td>
<td>&lt;10</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tree Ref.</td>
<td>Species</td>
<td>Height</td>
<td>Stem Diameter</td>
<td>Branch Spread N</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>Crown Clearance</td>
<td>FSB Height + Direction</td>
<td>Life Stage</td>
<td>Phys. Condition</td>
<td>Structural Condition</td>
<td>Recommendations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T21</td>
<td>Populus serotina (Hybrid Black Poplar)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2(E)</td>
<td>EM</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Major deadwood in crown.</td>
<td>Major deadwood in crown.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T22</td>
<td>Populus serotina (Hybrid Black Poplar)</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8(S)</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Dieback in crown. Major deadwood in crown.</td>
<td>&lt;10 U 4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T23</td>
<td>Populus serotina (Hybrid Black Poplar)</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8(S)</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Leaning North-West. Dieback in crown. Major deadwood in crown. Fell tree on grounds of safety.</td>
<td>&lt;10 U 3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T24</td>
<td>Populus serotina (Hybrid Black Poplar)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2(E)</td>
<td>EM</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Major deadwood in crown. Tree missing.</td>
<td>&lt;10 U Error</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T25</td>
<td>Populus serotina (Hybrid Black Poplar)</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>630</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3(S)</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Dieback in crown. Major deadwood in crown.</td>
<td>&lt;10 U 7.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T26</td>
<td>Populus serotina (Hybrid Black Poplar)</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>780</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3(S)</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Dieback in crown. Major deadwood in crown. Unbalanced crown shape.</td>
<td>&lt;10 U 9.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tree Ref.</td>
<td>Species</td>
<td>Height</td>
<td>Stem Diameter</td>
<td>Branch Spread</td>
<td>Crown Clearance</td>
<td>FSB Height + Direction</td>
<td>Life Stage</td>
<td>Phys. Condition</td>
<td>Structural Condition</td>
<td>Recommendations</td>
<td>Estimated Remaining Contribution</td>
<td>Category Grading</td>
<td>RPA Radius</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T28</td>
<td>Populus serotina (Hybrid Black Poplar)</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>480</td>
<td>2 5 4 3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.5(S)</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Dieback in crown. Major deadwood in crown. Unbalanced crown shape. Satellite dishes on stem.</td>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;10 U 5.76</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T29</td>
<td>Quercus robur (Common Oak)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>440</td>
<td>5 5 5 1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2(S)</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Poor pruning cuts. Unbalanced crown shape. Bark damage to limb on north side.</td>
<td>Remove stumps. Remove north limb.</td>
<td>10+ C1 5.28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T30</td>
<td>Populus serotina (Hybrid Black Poplar)</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>370</td>
<td>3 3 3 3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5(N)</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Dieback in crown. Major deadwood in crown.</td>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;10 U 4.44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T31</td>
<td>Populus serotina (Hybrid Black Poplar)</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>440</td>
<td>4 3 3 3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5(N)</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Dieback in crown. Major deadwood in crown.</td>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;10 U 5.28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T32</td>
<td>Populus serotina (Hybrid Black Poplar)</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>560</td>
<td>4 6 4 5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5(N)</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Dieback in crown. Major deadwood in crown.</td>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;10 U 6.72</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T33</td>
<td>Populus serotina (Hybrid Black Poplar)</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>480</td>
<td>5.5 4 4 4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5(N)</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Dieback in crown. Major deadwood in crown.</td>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;10 U 5.76</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T34</td>
<td>Populus serotina (Hybrid Black Poplar)</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>780</td>
<td>5 5.5 5.5 5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5(S)</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Weak fork. Dieback in crown. Major deadwood in crown.</td>
<td>Fell tree on grounds of safety.</td>
<td>&lt;10 U 9.36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tree Ref.</td>
<td>Species</td>
<td>Height</td>
<td>Stem Diameter</td>
<td>Branch Spread</td>
<td>Crown Clearance</td>
<td>FSB Height + Direction</td>
<td>Life Stage</td>
<td>Phys. Condition</td>
<td>Structural Condition</td>
<td>Recommendations</td>
<td>Estimated Remaining Contribution</td>
<td>Category Grading</td>
<td>RPA Radius</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T35</td>
<td>Chamaecyparis lawsoniana (Lawson Cypress)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>3 3 3 3</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.5(N)</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td></td>
<td>No work required.</td>
<td>10+</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td>1.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T36</td>
<td>Pinus contorta var.latifolia (Lodgepole Pine)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>1.5 1.5 1.5 1.5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3(S)</td>
<td>EM</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Declining. Dieback in crown, Major deadwood in crown.</td>
<td>Remove tree.</td>
<td>&lt;10</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>3.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T37</td>
<td>Picea abies (Norway Spruce)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>3 3 3 3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1(S)</td>
<td>SM</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Declining. Dieback in crown.</td>
<td>Remove tree.</td>
<td>&lt;10</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T38</td>
<td>Picea abies (Norway Spruce)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>3 3 3 3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1(S)</td>
<td>EM</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Ivy on stem.</td>
<td>No work required.</td>
<td>10+</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td>2.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T39</td>
<td>Populus serotina (Hybrid Black Poplar)</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>790</td>
<td>5 6 5 6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.5(S)</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Ivy on stem. Dieback in crown. Major deadwood in crown.</td>
<td>&lt;10</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>9.48</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T40</td>
<td>Populus serotina (Hybrid Black Poplar)</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>620</td>
<td>3 3 2 6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6(W)</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Leaning West. Dieback in crown. Major deadwood in crown.</td>
<td>&lt;10</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>7.44</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T41</td>
<td>Populus serotina (Hybrid Black Poplar)</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>4 5.5 5.5 4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6(SE)</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Ivy on stem. Dieback in crown. Major deadwood in crown.</td>
<td>&lt;10</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T42</td>
<td>Populus serotina (Hybrid Black Poplar)</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>540</td>
<td>3 3 3 3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8(N)</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Dieback in crown. Major deadwood in crown.Broken branches in crown.</td>
<td>&lt;10</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>6.48</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T43</td>
<td>Populus serotina (Hybrid Black Poplar)</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>810</td>
<td>3 5.5 5 3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4(SE)</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Leaning East. Dieback in crown. Major deadwood in crown.</td>
<td>&lt;10</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>9.72</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tree Ref.</td>
<td>Species</td>
<td>Height</td>
<td>Stem Diameter</td>
<td>Branch Spread</td>
<td>Crown Clearance</td>
<td>FSB Height + Direction</td>
<td>Life Stage</td>
<td>Phys. Condition</td>
<td>Structural Condition</td>
<td>Recommendations</td>
<td>Estimated Remaining Contribution</td>
<td>Category Grading</td>
<td>RPA Radius</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T44</td>
<td>Populus serotina (Hybrid Black Poplar)</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>4 2 3 3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8(N)</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Dieback in crown. Major deadwood in crown.</td>
<td>&lt;10</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T45</td>
<td>Ulmus glabra (Wych Elm)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>3.5 3.5 3.5 3.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1(S)</td>
<td>EM</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>No work required.</td>
<td>10+</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td>2.16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T46</td>
<td>Tilia cordata (Small-leaved Lime)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>2 2 2 2</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>1.5(N)</td>
<td>EM</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>No work required.</td>
<td>10+</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td>2.64</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T47</td>
<td>Populus serotina (Hybrid Black Poplar)</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>5 5.5 5.5 4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3(SE)</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Dieback in crown. Major deadwood in crown.</td>
<td>&lt;10</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T48</td>
<td>Salix caprea (Goat Willow)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>5 5 5 5 0.5</td>
<td>.5(S)</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Decay present at base. Major deadwood in crown. Decay present on stem. Broken branches in crown. Collapsed tree.</td>
<td>Remove tree.</td>
<td>&lt;10</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T49</td>
<td>Fagus sylvatica 'Purpurea' (Copper Beech)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>710</td>
<td>9 9 10 9.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.5(NW)</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Good condition.</td>
<td>40+</td>
<td>A1</td>
<td>8.52</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T50</td>
<td>Salix X chrysocoma (Weeping Willow)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>6 6 6 6 6</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>1.5(N)</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Plotted by eye on plan. Dieback in crown. Presence of Anthracnose of Willow.</td>
<td>No work required.</td>
<td>10+</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tree Ref.</td>
<td>Species</td>
<td>Height</td>
<td>Stem Diameter</td>
<td>Branch Spread</td>
<td>Crown Clearance</td>
<td>FSB Height + Direction</td>
<td>Life Stage</td>
<td>Phys. Condition</td>
<td>Structural Condition</td>
<td>Recommendations</td>
<td>Estimated Remaining Contribution</td>
<td>Category Grading</td>
<td>RPA Radius</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T51</td>
<td>Salix X chrysocoma (Weeping Willow)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>550</td>
<td></td>
<td>4 6 6 6 6</td>
<td>0.5 1.5(N)</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Plotted by eye on plan. Major deadwood in crown. Unbalanced crown shape. Broken branches in crown. Top of tree has failed.</td>
<td>Remove tree.</td>
<td>10+</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T52</td>
<td>Sambucus nigra (Elder)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>220</td>
<td></td>
<td>0 2 2 2 2</td>
<td>0 .5(N)</td>
<td>OM</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Declining. Dieback in crown. Major deadwood in crown.</td>
<td>Remove tree.</td>
<td>&lt;10</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>2.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T53</td>
<td>Sambucus nigra (Elder)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>220</td>
<td></td>
<td>0 2 2 2 2</td>
<td>0 .5(N)</td>
<td>OM</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Declining. Dieback in crown. Major deadwood in crown.</td>
<td>Remove tree.</td>
<td>&lt;10</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>2.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T54</td>
<td>Sambucus nigra (Elder)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>220</td>
<td></td>
<td>0 2 2 2 2</td>
<td>0 .5(N)</td>
<td>OM</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Declining. Dieback in crown. Major deadwood in crown.</td>
<td>Remove tree.</td>
<td>&lt;10</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>2.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T55</td>
<td>Acer platanoides 'Crimson King' (Norway Maple 'Crimson King')</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>550</td>
<td></td>
<td>5 5 5 5 5</td>
<td>0.5 1(E)</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Included bark present in main fork.</td>
<td>Monitor weak fork.</td>
<td>10+</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T56</td>
<td>Salix X chrysocoma (Weeping Willow)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>500</td>
<td></td>
<td>3 6 5 3 3</td>
<td>0.5 2(N)</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Storm damage in crown. Major deadwood in crown. Crown distorted due to group pressure.</td>
<td>Remove tree.</td>
<td>&lt;10</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T57</td>
<td>Populus serotina (Hybrid Black Poplar)</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>460</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 3 2 2 2</td>
<td>4 4(S)</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Leaning South. Major deadwood in crown.</td>
<td>Remove tree.</td>
<td>&lt;10</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>5.52</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Site: Trent Road, Stone
Surveyed by: Hugh and Ben Williams BSc (Hons) Arb. M.Arbor.A
Date: 25/09/2019
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tree Ref.</th>
<th>Species</th>
<th>Height</th>
<th>Stem Diameter</th>
<th>Branch Spread</th>
<th>Crown Clearance</th>
<th>FSB Height + Direction</th>
<th>Life Stage</th>
<th>Phys. Condition</th>
<th>Structural Condition</th>
<th>Estimated Remaining Contribution</th>
<th>Category Grading</th>
<th>RPA Radius</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T58</td>
<td>Salix X chrysocoma (Weeping Willow)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>2 12 3 2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2(N)</td>
<td>SM</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Leaning South. Tree fallen into pond.</td>
<td>Remove tree.</td>
<td>&lt;10</td>
<td>U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T59</td>
<td>Populus serotina (Hybrid Black Poplar)</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>1 3 2 2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3(S)</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Ivy on stem. Dieback in crown. Major deadwood in crown.</td>
<td>&lt;10</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T60</td>
<td>Populus serotina (Hybrid Black Poplar)</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>520</td>
<td>3.5 2 3 2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4(N)</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Ivy on stem. Dieback in crown. Major deadwood in crown.</td>
<td>&lt;10</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>6.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T61</td>
<td>Populus serotina (Hybrid Black Poplar)</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>910</td>
<td>3 7 5 4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2(S)</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Ivy on stem. Dieback in crown. Major deadwood in crown. Broken branches in crown.</td>
<td>&lt;10</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>10.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T62</td>
<td>Salix X chrysocoma (Weeping Willow)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>1 8 3.5 3</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>3(S)</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Leaning South. Ivy on stem. Unbalanced crown shape.</td>
<td>&lt;10</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T63</td>
<td>Populus serotina (Hybrid Black Poplar)</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>840</td>
<td>3 6 6 3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.5(S)</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Dieback in crown. Major deadwood in crown. Broken branches in crown.</td>
<td>&lt;10</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>10.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T64</td>
<td>Populus serotina (Hybrid Black Poplar)</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>470</td>
<td>3 3 3 3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6(N)</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Dieback in crown. Major deadwood in crown. Broken branches in crown.</td>
<td>&lt;10</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>5.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T65</td>
<td>Quercus rubra (Red Oak)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>4 4 4 4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3(S)</td>
<td>EM</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Ivy on stem. Sever Ivy.</td>
<td>10+</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td>2.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tree Ref.</td>
<td>Species</td>
<td>Height</td>
<td>Stem Diameter</td>
<td>Branch Spread</td>
<td>Crown Clearance</td>
<td>FSB Height + Direction</td>
<td>Life Stage</td>
<td>Phys. Condition</td>
<td>Structural Condition</td>
<td>Recommendations</td>
<td>Estimated Remaining Contribution</td>
<td>Category Grading</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T66</td>
<td>Populus serotina (Hybrid Black Poplar)</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>420</td>
<td>3 3 3 3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6(N)</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Dieback in crown. Major deadwood in crown. Broken branches in crown.</td>
<td>&lt;10</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>5.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T67</td>
<td>Acer platanoides (Norway Maple)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>2 4.5 3 3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2(E)</td>
<td>EM</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Ivy on stem. Unbalanced crown shape. Crown distorted due to group pressure.</td>
<td>&lt;10</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>2.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T68</td>
<td>Populus serotina (Hybrid Black Poplar)</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>2 2 2 2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8(N)</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Dieback in crown. Major deadwood in crown. Broken branches in crown.</td>
<td>&lt;10</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>3.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T69</td>
<td>Populus serotina (Hybrid Black Poplar)</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>2 2 2 2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8(N)</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Dieback in crown. Major deadwood in crown. Broken branches in crown.</td>
<td>&lt;10</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>2.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T70</td>
<td>Populus serotina (Hybrid Black Poplar)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>510</td>
<td>3.5 3.5 3.5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8(N)</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Major failure of stem at 7m.</td>
<td>Remove tree.</td>
<td>&lt;10</td>
<td>U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T71</td>
<td>Populus serotina (Hybrid Black Poplar)</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>620</td>
<td>3.5 3.5 3.5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8(N)</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Storm damage in crown. Dieback in crown. Major deadwood in crown. Broken branches in crown.</td>
<td>&lt;10</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>7.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tree Ref.</td>
<td>Species</td>
<td>Height</td>
<td>Stem Diameter</td>
<td>Branch Spread</td>
<td>Crown Clearance</td>
<td>FSB Height + Direction</td>
<td>Life Stage</td>
<td>Phys. Condition</td>
<td>Structural Condition</td>
<td>Recommendations</td>
<td>Estimated Remaining Contribution</td>
<td>Category Grading</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T72</td>
<td>Populus serotina (Hybrid Black Poplar)</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>3 5 4.5 3</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3(SE)</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Dieback in crown. Major deadwood in crown. Broken branches in crown.</td>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;10</td>
<td>U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T73</td>
<td>Aesculus hippocastanum (Horse Chestnut)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>2.5 2.5 2.5 2.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2(N)</td>
<td>SM</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Major deadwood in crown. Broken branches in crown.</td>
<td>Remove tree.</td>
<td>&lt;10</td>
<td>U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T74</td>
<td>Populus serotina (Hybrid Black Poplar)</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>2.5 2.5 2.5 2.5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8(N)</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Dieback in crown. Major deadwood in crown. Broken branches in crown.</td>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;10</td>
<td>U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T75</td>
<td>Populus serotina (Hybrid Black Poplar)</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>2.5 2.5 2.5 2.5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8(N)</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Dieback in crown. Major deadwood in crown. Broken branches in crown.</td>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;10</td>
<td>U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T76</td>
<td>Populus serotina (Hybrid Black Poplar)</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>2.5 2.5 2.5 2.5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8(N)</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Dieback in crown. Major deadwood in crown. Broken branches in crown.</td>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;10</td>
<td>U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T77</td>
<td>Populus serotina (Hybrid Black Poplar)</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>460</td>
<td>2.5 4 4 2.5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8(N)</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Dieback in crown. Major deadwood in crown. Broken branches in crown.</td>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;10</td>
<td>U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tree Ref.</td>
<td>Species</td>
<td>Height</td>
<td>Stem Diameter</td>
<td>Branch Spread</td>
<td>Crown Clearance</td>
<td>FSB Height + Direction</td>
<td>Life Stage</td>
<td>Phys. Condition</td>
<td>Structural Condition</td>
<td>Recommendations</td>
<td>Estimated Remaining Contribution</td>
<td>Category Grading</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T78</td>
<td>Populus serotina (Hybrid Black Poplar)</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>490</td>
<td>2.5 4 4 2.5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9(SE)</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Dieback in crown. Major deadwood in crown. Broken branches in crown.</td>
<td>&lt;10</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>5.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T79</td>
<td>Populus serotina (Hybrid Black Poplar)</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>380</td>
<td>3 3 3 3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7(S)</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Dieback in crown. Major deadwood in crown. Broken branches in crown.</td>
<td>&lt;10</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>4.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T80</td>
<td>Populus serotina (Hybrid Black Poplar)</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>3 5 3 3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7(S)</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Dieback in crown. Major deadwood in crown. Broken branches in crown. Crack in stem.</td>
<td>&lt;10</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>4.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T81</td>
<td>Populus serotina (Hybrid Black Poplar)</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>2 2 2 2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0(N)</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Dead</td>
<td>Leaning East. Tree failed and hanging in neighboring tree. Fell tree on grounds of safety.</td>
<td>&lt;10</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>3.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T82</td>
<td>Populus serotina (Hybrid Black Poplar)</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>620</td>
<td>6 3 6 6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10(W)</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Plotted by eye on plan. Major deadwood in crown. Broken branches in crown.</td>
<td>&lt;10</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>7.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T83</td>
<td>Aesculus carnea (Red Horse Chestnut)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>3.5 3.5 3.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3(N)</td>
<td>EM</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Bacterial canker on stem.</td>
<td>No work required.</td>
<td>&lt;10</td>
<td>U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T84</td>
<td>Populus serotina (Hybrid Black Poplar)</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>670</td>
<td>3 5.5 5.5 3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6(SE)</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Dieback in crown. Major deadwood in crown. Broken branches in crown.</td>
<td>&lt;10</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>8.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tree Ref.</td>
<td>Species</td>
<td>Height</td>
<td>Stem Diameter</td>
<td>Branch Spread</td>
<td>Crown Clearance</td>
<td>FSB Height + Direction</td>
<td>Life Stage</td>
<td>Phys. Condition</td>
<td>Structural Condition</td>
<td>Recommendations</td>
<td>Estimated Remaining Contribution</td>
<td>Category Grading</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T85</td>
<td>Populus serotina (Hybrid Black Poplar)</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>440</td>
<td>3 3 3 3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7(N)</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Dieback in crown. Major deadwood in crown. Top of tree has now failed.</td>
<td>Fell tree on grounds of safety.</td>
<td>&lt;10</td>
<td>U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T86</td>
<td>Populus serotina (Hybrid Black Poplar)</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>470</td>
<td>3.5 3 3.5 3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8(N)</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Dieback in crown. Major deadwood in crown. Broken branches in crown. Top of tree failed due to failure of T85.</td>
<td>&lt;10</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>5.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T87</td>
<td>Populus serotina (Hybrid Black Poplar)</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3 3 3 3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4(N)</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Tree missing.</td>
<td>Tree missing</td>
<td>&lt;10</td>
<td>U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T88</td>
<td>Populus serotina (Hybrid Black Poplar)</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5 7 0 3</td>
<td>6(E)</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Tree missing.</td>
<td>Tree missing</td>
<td>Tree missing</td>
<td>&lt;10</td>
<td>U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T90</td>
<td>Populus serotina (Hybrid Black Poplar)</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3 3 3 3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4(N)</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Tree missing</td>
<td>Tree missing</td>
<td>&lt;10</td>
<td>U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tree Ref.</td>
<td>Species</td>
<td>Height</td>
<td>Stem Diameter</td>
<td>Branch Spread</td>
<td>Crown Clearance</td>
<td>FSB Height + Direction</td>
<td>Life Stage</td>
<td>Phys. Condition</td>
<td>Structural Condition</td>
<td>Recommendations</td>
<td>Estimated Remaining Contribution</td>
<td>Category Grading</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T91</td>
<td>Aesculus hippocastanum (Horse Chestnut)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>650</td>
<td>4 6 5 5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>2(S)</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Exudation on stem. Weak fork. Dieback in crown. Major deadwood in crown. Decay present on stem. Included bark present in main fork. Broken branches in crown.</td>
<td>Remove tree.</td>
<td>&lt;10</td>
<td>U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T92</td>
<td>Fagus sylvatica 'Purpurea' (Copper Beech)</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>570</td>
<td>4.5 4.5 4.5 4.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2(NE)</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Major deadwood in crown. Squirrel damage in crown. Broken branches in crown.</td>
<td>Remove tree.</td>
<td>&lt;10</td>
<td>U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T93</td>
<td>Salix fragilis (Crack Willow)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>7 2 4 3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.5(N)</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Decay present at base. Unbalanced crown shape. Decay present on stem.</td>
<td>Remove tree.</td>
<td>&lt;10</td>
<td>U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T94</td>
<td>Pinus contorta var.latifolia (Lodgepole Pine)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>1.5 1.5 1.5 1.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2(N)</td>
<td>EM</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Ivy on tree. Ivy on stem.</td>
<td>No work required.</td>
<td>&lt;10</td>
<td>U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T95</td>
<td>Populus nigra 'Italica' (Lombardy Poplar)</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>1 1 1 1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2(N)</td>
<td>EM</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>No work required.</td>
<td>No work required.</td>
<td>10+</td>
<td>C1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T96</td>
<td>Tilia cordata (Small-leaved Lime)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>3.5 3.5 3.5 3.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>1(S)</td>
<td>EM</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>No work required.</td>
<td>No work required.</td>
<td>20+</td>
<td>B1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T97</td>
<td>Pinus contorta var.latifolia (Lodgepole Pine)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>2 2 2 2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5(N)</td>
<td>EM</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Low bud/leaf density. Crown distorted due to group pressure.</td>
<td>Remove tree.</td>
<td>&lt;10</td>
<td>U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tree Ref.</td>
<td>Species</td>
<td>Height</td>
<td>Stem Diameter</td>
<td>Branch Spread</td>
<td>Crown Clearance</td>
<td>FSB Height + Direction</td>
<td>Life Stage</td>
<td>Phys. Condition</td>
<td>Structural Condition</td>
<td>Recommendations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T100</td>
<td>Populus serotina (Hybrid Black Poplar)</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>440</td>
<td>2 6 4 2 5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3(S)</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Dieback in crown. Major deadwood in crown. Unbalanced crown shape. Broken branches in crown.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T101</td>
<td>Populus serotina (Hybrid Black Poplar)</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>770</td>
<td>6 6 6 6 2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3(S)</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Dieback in crown. Major deadwood in crown. Broken branches in crown.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Tree Heritage Ltd, 100 North St, Leek, Staffs, ST13 8DQ
T: 01538 384019  E: info@treeheritage.co.uk

**Site: Trent Road, Stone**
**Surveyed by: Hugh and Ben Williams BSc (Hons) Arb. M.Arbor.A**
**Date: 25/09/2019**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tree Ref.</th>
<th>Species</th>
<th>Height</th>
<th>Stem Diameter</th>
<th>Branch Spread</th>
<th>Crown Clearance</th>
<th>FSB Height + Direction</th>
<th>Life Stage</th>
<th>Phys. Condition</th>
<th>Structural Condition</th>
<th>Recommendations</th>
<th>Estimated Remaining Contribution</th>
<th>Category Grading</th>
<th>RPA Radius</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T102</td>
<td><em>Populus serotina</em> (Hybrid Black Poplar)</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>690</td>
<td>6 6 6 6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3(S)</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Ivy on stem. Dieback in crown. Major deadwood in crown. Broken branches in crown.</td>
<td>&lt;10</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>8.28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T103</td>
<td><em>Populus serotina</em> (Hybrid Black Poplar)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 1 1 1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3(N)</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Dead</td>
<td>Tree missing.</td>
<td>&lt;10</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>Error</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T105</td>
<td><em>Acer platanoides</em> (Norway Maple)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>2 2 2 2</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.5(W)</td>
<td>EM</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>No work required.</td>
<td>10+</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td>2.16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T106</td>
<td><em>Populus serotina</em> (Hybrid Black Poplar)</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>670</td>
<td>3 6 5 4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2(E)</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Dieback in crown. Major deadwood in crown. Unbalanced crown shape. Broken branches in crown.</td>
<td>&lt;10</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>8.04</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T107</td>
<td><em>Populus serotina</em> (Hybrid Black Poplar)</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>510</td>
<td>3.5 3.5 3.5 3.5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5(W)</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Dieback in crown. Major deadwood in crown. Broken branches in crown.</td>
<td>&lt;10</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>6.12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tree Ref.</td>
<td>Species</td>
<td>Height</td>
<td>Stem Diameter</td>
<td>Branch Spread</td>
<td>Crown Clearance</td>
<td>FSB Height + Direction</td>
<td>Life Stage</td>
<td>Phys. Condition</td>
<td>Structural Condition</td>
<td>Recommendations</td>
<td>Estimated Remaining Contribution</td>
<td>Category Grading</td>
<td>RPA Radius</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T108</td>
<td>Populus serotina (Hybrid Black Poplar)</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>390</td>
<td>3.5 0 0 5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5(W)</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Dieback in crown. Major deadwood in crown. Unbalanced crown shape. Broken branches in crown.</td>
<td>&lt;10</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>4.68</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T109</td>
<td>Populus serotina (Hybrid Black Poplar)</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>410</td>
<td>3.5 3.5 3.5 3.5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5(W)</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Dieback in crown. Major deadwood in crown. Broken branches in crown.</td>
<td>&lt;10</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>4.92</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T110</td>
<td>Populus serotina (Hybrid Black Poplar)</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>680</td>
<td>3 6 5 4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2(E)</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Dieback in crown. Major deadwood in crown. Unbalanced crown shape. Broken branches in crown.</td>
<td>&lt;10</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>8.16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T111</td>
<td>Populus serotina (Hybrid Black Poplar)</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>3.5 3.5 3.5 3.5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5(W)</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Dieback in crown. Major deadwood in crown. Broken branches in crown.</td>
<td>&lt;10</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>4.08</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T112</td>
<td>Populus serotina (Hybrid Black Poplar)</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>580</td>
<td>4.5 3.5 3.5 4.5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5(W)</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Dieback in crown. Major deadwood in crown. Broken branches in crown.</td>
<td>&lt;10</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>6.96</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tree Ref.</td>
<td>Species</td>
<td>Height</td>
<td>Stem Diameter</td>
<td>Branch Spread</td>
<td>Crown Clearance</td>
<td>FSB Height + Direction</td>
<td>Life Stage</td>
<td>Phys. Condition</td>
<td>Structural Condition</td>
<td>Recommendations</td>
<td>Estimated Remaining Contribution</td>
<td>Category Grading</td>
<td>RPA Radius</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T113</td>
<td>Populus serotina (Hybrid Black Poplar)</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>420</td>
<td>3.5 3.5 3.5 3.5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5(W)</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Exudation on stem. Dieback in crown. Major deadwood in crown. Broken branches in crown. Crack in stem.</td>
<td>&lt;10</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>5.04</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T114</td>
<td>Populus serotina (Hybrid Black Poplar)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>4 0 1 1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3(N)</td>
<td>EM</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Dieback in crown. Major deadwood in crown. Unbalanced crown shape. Broken branches in crown.</td>
<td>&lt;10</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>2.16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T115</td>
<td>Pinus contorta var.latifolia (Lodgepole Pine)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>2 2 2 2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3(N)</td>
<td>EM</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Crown distorted due to group pressure.</td>
<td>&lt;10</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>2.04</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T116</td>
<td>Pinus contorta var.latifolia (Lodgepole Pine)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>2 2 2 2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3(N)</td>
<td>EM</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Ivy on stem. Crown distorted due to group pressure.</td>
<td>&lt;10</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>2.04</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T117</td>
<td>Pinus contorta var.latifolia (Lodgepole Pine)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>2 2 2 2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3(N)</td>
<td>EM</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Ivy on stem. Crown distorted due to group pressure.</td>
<td>&lt;10</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T118</td>
<td>Populus serotina (Hybrid Black Poplar)</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>2 2 2 2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5(N)</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Dieback in crown. Major deadwood in crown. Broken branches in crown.</td>
<td>&lt;10</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tree Ref.</td>
<td>Species</td>
<td>Height</td>
<td>Stem Diameter</td>
<td>Branch Spread</td>
<td>Crown Clearance</td>
<td>FSB Height + Direction</td>
<td>Life Stage</td>
<td>Phys. Condition</td>
<td>Structural Condition</td>
<td>Recommendations</td>
<td>Estimated Remaining Contribution</td>
<td>Category Grading</td>
<td>RPA Radius</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| T119     | Populus serotina  
(Hybrid Black Poplar) | 22     | 500           | 2 5 4 2            | 3               | 3(S)                  | M          | Poor            | Dieback in crown. Major deadwood in crown. Unbalanced crown shape. Broken branches in crown. | <10 U 6               |                               |                   |           |
| T120     | Populus serotina  
(Hybrid Black Poplar) | 22     | 580           | 2 5 6 2            | 3               | 3(S)                  | M          | Poor            | Dieback in crown. Major deadwood in crown. Unbalanced crown shape. Broken branches in crown. | <10 U 6.96            |                               |                   |           |
| T121     | Populus serotina  
(Hybrid Black Poplar) | 22     | 500           | 5 3.5 5 3.5        | 6               | 5(W)                  | M          | Poor            | Exudation on stem. Dieback in crown. Major deadwood in crown. Broken branches in crown. Crack in stem. | <10 U 6               |                               |                   |           |
| T122     | Populus serotina  
(Hybrid Black Poplar) | 22     | 480           | 4 4 6 3.5          | 6               | 5(W)                  | M          | Poor            | Exudation on stem. Dieback in crown. Major deadwood in crown. Broken branches in crown. Crack in stem. | <10 U 5.76            |                               |                   |           |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tree Ref.</th>
<th>Species</th>
<th>Height</th>
<th>Stem Diameter</th>
<th>Branch Spread</th>
<th>Crown Clearance</th>
<th>FSB Height + Direction</th>
<th>Life Stage</th>
<th>Phys. Condition</th>
<th>Structural Condition</th>
<th>Recommendations</th>
<th>Estimated Remaining Contribution</th>
<th>Category Grading</th>
<th>RPA Radius</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T124</td>
<td>Pinus contorta var. latifolia (Lodgepole Pine)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>3.5 2 2 2</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>3(S)</td>
<td>EM</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Leaning North. Ivy on stem.</td>
<td>&lt;10</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>2.64</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T125</td>
<td>Populus serotina (Hybrid Black Poplar)</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>380</td>
<td>4 0 7 0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.5(NE)</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Leaning North-East. Dieback in crown. Major deadwood in crown. Unbalanced crown shape. Broken branches in crown. Fell tree on grounds of safety.</td>
<td>&lt;10</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>4.56</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T126</td>
<td>Aesculus hippocastanum (Horse Chestnut)</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>520</td>
<td>4 4 4 4</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>2(E)</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Crown distorted due to group pressure. Presence of Horse Chestnut Bleeding Canker. Presence of Horse Chestnut Leaf Miner.</td>
<td>10+</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td>6.24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tree Ref.</td>
<td>Species</td>
<td>Height</td>
<td>Stem Diameter</td>
<td>Branch Spread</td>
<td>Crown Clearance</td>
<td>FSB Height + Direction</td>
<td>Life Stage</td>
<td>Phys. Condition</td>
<td>Structural Condition</td>
<td>Recommendations</td>
<td>Estimated Remaining Contribution</td>
<td>Category Grading</td>
<td>RPA Radius</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T127</td>
<td>Fagus sylvatica ‘Purpurea’ (Copper Beech)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>4 5 4 5.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>1(N)</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Squirrel damage in crown. Low crown over footpath.</td>
<td>Crown lift to 3m over footpath.</td>
<td>20+</td>
<td>B1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T128</td>
<td>Aesculus hippocastanum (Horse Chestnut)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>580</td>
<td>6 7 6 6</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>1(S)</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Major bark wounding on stem. Weak fork. Presence of Horse Chestnut Bleeding Canker. Included bark present in main fork. Broken branches in crown.</td>
<td>Fell tree on grounds of safety.</td>
<td>&lt;10</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>6.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T129</td>
<td>Crataegus monogyna (Hawthorn)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>2 2 2 3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2(S)</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>No work required.</td>
<td>No work required.</td>
<td>10+</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td>4.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T130</td>
<td>Betula utilis ‘jacquemontii’ (Himalayan Birch)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>390</td>
<td>4.5 4.5 4.5 4.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2(N)</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Good condition.</td>
<td>No work required.</td>
<td>20+</td>
<td>B1</td>
<td>4.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T131</td>
<td>Prunus avium (Wild Cherry)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>1 1 1 1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2(N)</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>No work required.</td>
<td>No work required.</td>
<td>&lt;10</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>1.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T132</td>
<td>Prunus avium (Wild Cherry)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>1 1 1 1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2(N)</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>No work required.</td>
<td>No work required.</td>
<td>&lt;10</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>1.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T133</td>
<td>Prunus avium (Wild Cherry)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>4 4 4 4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2(N)</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>No work required.</td>
<td>No work required.</td>
<td>&lt;10</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>3.24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PUBLIC APPEALS COMMITTEE - PROCEDURE

1 The local authority’s representative will state the authority’s case and may call witnesses.

2 The appellant or advocate may ask questions of the authority’s representative or any witness.

3 The members of the Committee may then ask questions of the authority’s representative, or any witness.

4 The appellant or advocate will state the appellant’s case, and may call witnesses.

5 The representative of the local authority may ask questions of the appellant or advocate, or any witness.

6 The members of the Committee may then ask questions of the appellant or advocate, or any witness.

7 Ward Members and interested parties will be invited to address the Committee. The local authority’s representative, the appellant or advocate and Members of the Council may ask questions.

8 The authority’s representative will then be invited to sum up; no new material may be introduced at this stage.

9 The appellant or advocate will then be invited to sum up; no new material may be introduced at this stage.

10 The parties will then withdraw whilst the Committee considers the case.

11 The Committee with the Officer appointed as Secretary to the Committee will deliberate in private only recalling the local authority’s representative and the appellant to clear points of uncertainty on evidence already given. If recall is necessary both parties will return notwithstanding only one is concerned with the point giving rise to doubt.

12 The Committee with authority to act will, announce if possible, the decision to the parties at the end of the hearing, the decision being confirmed in writing afterwards.