## Report to Area Plans Sub-Committee 'B'

# Date of meeting: 22 June 2005.



Subject: Confirmation Of Tree Preservation Order EPF/31/04 – 66A Bower Hill Epping.

Officer contact for further information: Barry Land (01992 – 56 4110).

Democratic Services Officer: Gary Woodhall (01992 - 56 4470).

#### Recommendation:

That Tree Preservation Order EPF/31/04 be confirmed.

#### Report:

- 1. Tree Preservation Order EPF/31/04 was made to protect three trees at 66A Bower Hill: a Red Horse Chestnut; and two Yews.
- 2. The Tree Preservation Order (TPO) was made as a result of information, which placed the trees under threat from potential redevelopment of the site. These trees were considered important landscape features in the area and contribute significantly in greening and tree lined character of this part of Bower Hill.

#### **Objection to the Tree Preservation Order:**

- 3. An objection to the Order has been received from the owner of 66A Bower Hill in respect of the Red Horse Chestnut only. The grounds of the objection are as follows:
  - (a) The tree appears not to be in good health;
  - (b) Branches are shed onto the pavement and road, which pose a risk to property and persons; and
  - (c) The tree stands on raised ground, which is unsightly and prevents the easy erection of a boundary wall or fence.

#### **Head of Planning Services Comments:**

- 4. The detailed response to the grounds of objection is listed below:
  - (a) The tree is of a hybrid form of the species; prone to unsightly stem swellings. This tree has this typical deformation of the stem and is flawed as such, but is not, in my view, in serious decline. This judgement has been reached by a visual assessment of its general crown vigour, which is normal;
  - (b) Branch damage is a problem suffered by this type of tree but can be reasonably managed by pruning; and
  - (c) The raised ground in which the tree is rooted should not necessarily be considered unsightly, since the property is sited on a hill with several other graded mounds and inclines in the immediate locality. Similarly, it would be possible to install

a wooden fence along the front boundary to 1m in height but perhaps a better alternative solution would be to establish a natural barrier in the form of a suitable hedge.

### **Conclusions:**

5. Landscaping policy requires that adequate provision be made for the retention of trees in these situations. This is an important and much appreciated tree that, were it not for the TPO, would be likely to be felled in the course of redevelopment of the site. The TPO allows the Council to ensure the presence of highly visible trees along the frontage into the future. Confirmation of the order is recommended.