

APPLICATION NUMBER: 24/00939/WTCA

## DELEGATED DECISION CHECKLIST AND REPORT

APPLICATION NO.

24/00939/WTCA

CASE OFFICER

Rosalind Gralton

DETERMINATION DATE 30.10.2024 EXT OF TIME

Address: 21 Norwich Avenue Rochdale OL11 5JZ

**Proposal:** Application to remove one Sycamore Tree identified as T13 within and subject to Tree Preservation Order TPO046 and also within a Conservation Area (Moorgate Avenue CA). Replace with a more suitable small garden tree such as Amelanchier

|           |                            |     |                       |     |
|-----------|----------------------------|-----|-----------------------|-----|
| PUBLICITY | Weekly list expired?       | N/A | Site notice expired?  | N/A |
|           | Neighbour letters expired? | N/A | Press Notice expired? | N/A |

|            |                                                             |   |                                        |   |
|------------|-------------------------------------------------------------|---|----------------------------------------|---|
| DELEGATION | Significant departure from local plan?                      | N | Contrary to national policy?           | N |
|            | Applicant a Council Member or officer?                      | N | Contrary to previous decision?         | N |
|            | Major with 10 or more objections and recommending approval? | N | Called in or Planning Panel objection? | N |

|          |                                   |   |
|----------|-----------------------------------|---|
| COMMENTS | Planning Panel comments received? | N |
|          | Neighbour comments received?      | N |

|     |                                                  |   |
|-----|--------------------------------------------------|---|
| EIA | Screening opinion completed and saved to Onbase? | N |
|-----|--------------------------------------------------|---|

|            |                                                                      |     |
|------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|
| CONDITIONS | Pre-commencement conditions proposed?                                | N   |
|            | Pre-commencement conditions agreed (or notification period expired)? | N/A |

RECOMMENDATION

NO OBJECTION

CHECKED AND SIGNED OFF BY: LA

DATE: 14.11.24

---

## **SITE**

The application relates to remove one Sycamore Tree identified as T13, protected under TPO ref TPO046, within the Moorgate Avenue Conservation Area.

## **PROPOSAL**

The application relates to remove one Sycamore Tree identified as T13, within and subject to Tree Preservation Order TPO046 and also within a Conservation Area (Moorgate Avenue CA). Replace with a more suitable small garden tree such as Amelanchier.

## **RELEVANT PLANNING POLICY**

### **National Guidance**

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG)

### **Places for Everyone (PfE) JDP (2024):**

JP-G7 Trees and Woodlands

### **Adopted Rochdale Core Strategy (CS):**

G6 Enhancing green infrastructure

G7 Increasing the value of biodiversity and geodiversity

## **RELEVANT SITE HISTORY**

Not application

## **CONSULTATION RESPONSES**

### **Tree Officer**

*Although Sycamores do tend to shed bark as part of a normal growth process, in this case I believe that the bark loss close to the union, together with the new cracking, are real causes for concern, even though there is little significant die back in the crown. Bark loss close to the union could be sign of increased flexing close to the union, in addition to being a sign of underlying disease. In addition, there is evident damage being caused to the boundary.*

*I have considered whether a crown reduction would be effective, but I do not believe that pruning would help to mitigate the risk of main stem failure in this case, and pruning would not mitigate the damage being caused to the boundary.*

*Given the proximity of the tree to residential property and the public footpath, with a consequent risk to safety and property damage, I would (somewhat reluctantly) agree that the most prudent course of action would be to permit the tree to be removed.*

*I would prefer re-planting with Silver Birch rather than Amelanchier. Although it's an attractive tree I would not consider that Amelanchier would make a substantive contribution to the local treescape.*

*Works must be carried out by a suitably qualified and insured Arborist.*

## **REPRESENTATIONS**

In accordance with council policy on neighbour notification for this type of application, no letters of notification were sent to neighbouring properties.

## **ANALYSIS**

The Tree Officer raised no objection to the removal of the tree as set out in their response above.

In light of the above assessment, the proposal is therefore considered to be compliant with the guidance contained within the NPPG and the LPA accordingly raises no objection.

## **RECOMMENDATION No Objection**

### **Notes for Applicant:**

1. Plans  
For the avoidance of doubt, this Decision Notice relates to the following drawings / document(s):-
  - Location plan
  - Site photos
  - Application form
2. Replacement planting  
The Council's arboriculturist has recommended replanting with Silver Birch trees.

Report Author Rosalind Gralton