

APPLICATION NUMBER: 24/00340/WTTP0

DELEGATED DECISION CHECKLIST AND REPORT

APPLICATION NO.

24/00340/WTTP0

CASE OFFICER

Sam Yuen

DETERMINATION DATE 11.06.2024 EXT OF TIME

Address: 5 Dean Bank Drive, Rochdale, OL16 4RW

Proposal: Application for works to 2 Sycamore trees (T25 and T26 of Tree Preservation Order No. 180) - crown reduce both trees by 1/2 metres or prune both trees back to the boundary line

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

GRANT SUBJECT TO CONDITIONS

CHECKED AND SIGNED OFF BY: RK

DATE: 05/07/2024

SITE

The application relates to two Sycamore trees (T25 and T26) of Tree Preservation Order No. 180 sited to the front curtilage of Dean Bank, Dean Bank Drive in Balderstone.

PROPOSAL

The proposal seeks consent for both Sycamore trees to be pruned either by crown reduction of 1/2m or pruned back to the boundary line of Dean Bank. The application form states the trees are currently encroaching into the adjacent curtilage of no. 5 Dean Bank Drive and resulting in excessive bird excrements onto the vehicles and driveway of no. 5.

RELEVANT PLANNING POLICY

National Guidance

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)
National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG)

Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan (PfE)

The Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan was adopted and became part of the statutory development plan for each of the 9 authorities covered by the plan on 21st March 2024. The following policies are relevant:

Policy JP-G6: Urban Green Space
Policy JP-G7: Trees and Woodland
Policy JP-G8: A Net Enhancement of Biodiversity and Geodiversity

Adopted Rochdale Core Strategy (CS):

G6 Enhancing green infrastructure
G7 Increasing the value of biodiversity and geodiversity

RELEVANT SITE HISTORY

N/A

CONSULTATION RESPONSES

Tree Officer

The Tree Officer would be minded to recommend the proposed crown reduction, together with removal of Ivy and further inspection of the trees. Ivy which is this

dense and which is encroaching into the crown can sometimes be an indication of wider tree decline, and the Ivy can hide structural defects or signs of disease. This option would therefore be in the interests of the owner of the tree as well as the applicant. It would therefore be a more long-term option and would leave the trees with better shapes.

If the owner is not co-operative, then the Officer would not object to the pruning to the boundary line; this option will not lead the trees to be too unbalanced, and the trees should withstand this level of pruning.

Both options are justified in terms of good arboricultural management, and the Tree Officer would raise no objections to either option.

REPRESENTATIONS

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

ANALYSIS

In considering applications for works to protected trees, Government advice in paragraph 90 of the NPPG states:

“When considering an application the authority is advised to:

- ① assess the amenity value of the tree or woodland and the likely impact of the proposal on the amenity of the area;*
- ② consider, in the light of this assessment, whether or not the proposal is justified, having regard to the reasons and additional information put forward in support of it;*
- ③ consider whether any loss or damage is likely to arise if consent is refused or granted subject to conditions;*
- ④ consider whether any requirements apply in regard to protected species;*
- ⑤ consider other material considerations, including development plan policies where relevant; and*
- ⑥ ensure that appropriate expertise informs its decision.”*

In considering whether there has to be an arboricultural need for proposed works to a TPO, paragraph 91 of the NPPG states:

“In general terms, it follows that the higher the amenity value of the tree or woodland and the greater any negative impact of proposed works on amenity, the stronger the reasons needed before consent is granted. However, if the amenity value is lower and the impact is likely to be negligible, it may be appropriate to grant consent even if the authority believes there is no particular arboricultural need for the work.”

With regard to the above, the main considerations in respect of this application are whether the proposal for works to the tree is justified in light of the assessment of the amenity value of the tree and whether the reasons for works are of sufficient standing to warrant the granting of consent.

To assess the acceptability of the proposal against the above considerations, the Council's Tree Officer has been consulted. The Tree Officer has raised no objection to both options of the proposed works on arboricultural grounds, and the works are justified in the interests of good arboricultural management.

Subject to the suggested conditions, the application proposal is therefore considered to be compliant with the guidance contained within the NPPG noted above, and the application is recommended for approval.

GMEU standing advice on tree works and protected species will be attached to the decision notice and therefore the obligations in respect of protected species will have been met.

RECOMMENDATION

GRANT subject to two standard conditions

Notes for Applicant:

For the avoidance of doubt, this Decision Notice relates to the following drawings / document(s):-

- Indicative Location Plan – received 17/04/2024
- Photo of trees subject to proposed works – received 07/02/2024

Report Author Sam Yuen