

---

<b>APPLICATION NO.</b>	
<b>APPLICATION TYPE</b>	Tree Preservation Order
<b>REGISTERED</b>	
<b>PARISH</b>	Abingdon
<b>WARD MEMBER(S)</b>	Pat Lonergan and Peter Jones
<b>APPLICANT</b>	
<b>SITE</b>	Chandlers Close, Abingdon.
<b>PROPOSAL</b>	
<b>AMENDMENTS</b>	
<b>GRID REFERENCE</b>	SU511984

---

## 1.0 INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 This council was contacted in January 2011 by Mrs Bennett of 21 Chandlers Close, Abingdon regarding the status of 4 lime trees situated in the garage area adjacent to the properties in Chandlers Close. Mrs Bennett indicated she would like to remove the tree and replace them with something smaller. The trees were inspected and, due to their high degree of public amenity, it was decided to protect them with a Tree Preservation Order (TPO). It was initially thought that the piece of land on which the trees stood belonged entirely to 21 Chandlers Close and the order was issued reflecting this but it was pointed out by Mrs Bennett that this was not the case. When it was examined it was found that the rectangle of land in question belonged to five different landowners so, because of the complex land ownership, a new TPO was issued to reflect this.
- 1.2 A location plan is **attached** at appendix 1.

## 2.0 PROPOSAL

- 2.1 To confirm Tree Preservation Order 10 – 2011.
- 2.2 A copy of the order is attached as appendix 2.

## 3.0 CONSULTATIONS & REPRESENTATIONS

We received objections to the order from Mrs Bennett of 21 Chandlers Close, Abingdon and Mr and Mrs Standhaft of 20 Chandlers Close, Abingdon.

The objections were that;

1. The parking space directly adjacent to the tree was unusable due to the overgrowth and debris produced by the trees.
2. The trees could cause damage to the garages.
3. The order was served only after Mrs Bennett had made an enquiry about the trees protection status.
4. The trees have little amenity value.

## 4.0 POLICY & GUIDANCE

- 4.1 Regarding the first objection it must be stressed that a TPO does not prevent any work being carried out to the trees but it gives the local authority a degree of control over such works. In this case if an application was made to crown reduce the trees by 20%, lift the branches over the parking space and remove the deadwood then it is unlikely it would be refused and the parking space would be usable again. The issue of honeydew, falling from aphids feeding on the tree, is an enduring one but not a reason to remove trees.

With regard to the trees possibly damaging the garages this is purely down to conjecture as no evidence was submitted. It is not known how the garages were

constructed, what the underlying soil type is and if the roots are able to penetrate the underlying ground conditions. Care needs to be taken when considering the removal of significant trees because of what they might do.

Regarding the third point this authority generally only issues TPOs on trees that are under threat so Mrs Bennett's enquiry prompted the TPO in this case.

The amenity value of the trees was established as part of the appraisal in preparation for the order and is attached as appendix 3.

**5.0 RECOMMENDATION**  
**To confirm TPO 10-2011.**

Author / Officer: George Reade Arboricultural Officer  
Contact number: 01235 540504  
Email address: [george.reade@southandvale.gov.uk](mailto:george.reade@southandvale.gov.uk)