



SHEFFIELD CITY COUNCIL

Planning & Highways Committee Report

Report of: Director of Regeneration & Development Services

Date: 22nd December 2015

Subject: Tree Preservation Order No. 404,
7 Gladstone Road, Sheffield, S10 3GT

Author of Report: Andrew Conwill, Urban and Environmental Design Team

Summary: To report objections to Tree Preservation Order No. 404

Reasons for Recommendation

To protect trees of visual amenity value to the locality

Recommendation Tree Preservation Order No. 404 should be confirmed unmodified.

Background Papers: A) Tree Preservation Order No. 404 and map attached.
B) Objection letters attached.

Category of Report: OPEN

REGENERATION & DEVELOPMENT SERVICES

REPORT TO PLANNING & HIGHWAYS COMMITTEE

22ND DECEMBER 2015

TREE PRESERVATION ORDER NO. 404

7 GLADSTONE ROAD, SHEFFIELD, S10 3GT

1.0 PURPOSE

1.1 To seek confirmation of Tree Preservation Order No. 404.

2.0 BACKGROUND

2.1 Tree Preservation Order No.404 was made on 21st July 2015 to protect two mature pine trees in the front garden of 7 Gladstone Road. A copy of the order with its accompanying map is attached as Appendix A.

2.2 7 Gladstone Road is located within the Ranmoor Conservation Area and on the 18th May 2015 a notice (15/01788/TCA) was received to remove two mature pine trees located next to the highway frontage to either side of the vehicular drive entrance.

2.3 The reason given in the notice for the trees removal was that both pine trees have outgrown their position and need felling.

2.4 The visual amenity value of the two pine trees was assessed by a landscape planning officer. The trees were found to be visually prominent when viewed from Gladstone Road and were considered suitable for protection because they contribute to the amenity value and tree lined character of Gladstone Road and the Ranmoor Conservation Area.

2.5 A condition inspection of the two pine trees has been carried out by a Sheffield City Council, Community Tree Officer who confirmed that the trees were of suitably good condition for protection. The trees are considered to have a long useful life expectancy and no obvious health and safety reasons for removing the trees could be found.

3.0 OBJECTIONS TO TREE PRESERVATION ORDER

3.1 Objections to the tree preservation order have been received from Mr A P Heywood the owner of the trees and Mr P Anson of neighbouring property 408 Fulwood Road, S10 3GG. A copy of the objections is attached as Appendix B.

4.0 MR A P HEYWOOD'S GROUNDS FOR OBJECTION AND OFFICER RESPONSE

4.1 *Both trees are over 60 metres tall and have indeed outgrown their location.*

- 4.2 The trees are not considered to be excessively large and are considered of appropriate size for their location. There is no reason to suspect that the trees rooting environment is limited as discussed with Mrs Heywood during site inspection as there is sufficient space for the pine trees roots to grow.
- 4.3 *The trees are visually prominent – as are any trees of this size, but not in a “handsome” manner that contributes to the visual amenity of Ranmoor. In fact most people consider them an “eyesore”*
- 4.4 The trees are considered to be a feature of the street scene and add to the visual amenity value of the locality.
- 4.5 *The trees are the first trees going up Gladstone Road. The wind tunnel effect could easily blow these trees over.*
- 4.6 A condition inspection of the two pine trees has been carried out by a Sheffield City Council, Community Tree Officer and no obvious health and safety reasons for removing the trees could be found.
- 4.7 *The trees have grown in a very unsymmetrical manner, so that few branches grow towards the road side. This makes the trees look ugly but also are side heavy and “lopsided” so have a far greater chance of being blown over.*
- 4.8 Whilst it is noted that the trees are unsymmetrical and one sided their shape and form is not considered to be a factor as to their stability particularly as no obvious health and safety reasons for removing the trees could be found.
- 4.9 *The trees are growing close to the large lime tree which is a magnificent native example and would be far more visible with the removal of the pine trees.*
- 4.10 The lime tree is growing next to the road frontage in the front garden of 7 Gladstone Road approximately 7 metres away from Pine tree T2. The removal of the two pine trees to improve the visibility of the lime tree is considered inappropriate as the lime is presently visible from the public highway and there is adequate space to retain all three trees.
- 4.11 *There is ivy growing up the full height of one tree (T1) which is a natural occurrence. If the trees are to stay this adds to the green impact of the area and the environment. Yet in your letter (Decision notice 15/01788/TCA) you state “Ivy be removed from the two pine trees to lessen the sail area” – which goes to prove that you do in fact have a concern about the stability and safety of the trees.*
- 4.12 The removal of ivy from trees is seen as standard maintenance and was recommended as a precautionary measure to lessen the sail area of Pine tree T1.

- 5.0 MR P ANSON'S GROUNDS FOR OBJECTION AND OFFICER RESPONSE WITH RESPECT TO PINE TREE T1 GROWING NEAR TO MR P ANSON'S REAR GARDEN BOUNDARY
- 5.1 *The tree is very large (and ugly). It is far too big both in width and height for a residential area.*
- 5.2 The tree is not considered to be excessively large and is of appropriate size for its location. Whilst it is noted the tree is somewhat one sided it is considered to be visually prominent and of amenity value to the locality and Ranmoor Conservation Area.
- 5.3 *It detracts from the view of other trees in the vicinity.*
- 5.4 It is considered that the tree adds to the visual amenity value of the locality and does not detract from the view of other trees in the vicinity.
- 5.5 *It blocks out the sunlight and makes the corner of our garden gloomy.*
- 5.6 This is considered insufficient reason to remove the tree as the garden is particularly large and the tree is located towards the far rear corner.
- 5.7 *Its canopy overhangs and trespasses into our garden.*
- 5.8 This is consistent with trees growing near to boundaries and is not considered grounds for removal.
- 5.9 *Pine cones and branches regularly fall into our garden. Last year a branch fell and hit my wife (without injury) whilst she was gardening.*
- 5.10 Falling pine cones are a natural consequence of pine trees and is insufficient reason for removal. The risk of branch fall can be minimised by the removal of deadwood and standard maintenance pruning.
- 5.11 *Pine cones and pine needles make it difficult to garden this area.*
- 5.12 This is considered insufficient reason to remove a tree that contributes to the visual amenity value of the locality and Ranmoor Conservation Area.
- 5.13 *The tree is covered with ivy which is likely to damage the health of the tree.*
- 5.14 Only in trees naturally thin-crowned or rendered so by disease or disorder will ivy pose a threat to its host's health, by smothering the tree's foliage with its own in time.
- 5.15 *If the tree were to fall it would cause substantial damage to our property, given its size both in height and width, this is a significant hazard.*

5.16 A condition inspection of the pine tree has been carried out by a Sheffield City Council, Community Tree Officer and no obvious health and safety reasons for removing the tree could be found.

6.0 EQUAL OPPORTUNITIES IMPLICATIONS

6.1 There are no equal opportunities implications.

7.0 ENVIRONMENTAL AND PROPERTY IMPLICATIONS

7.1 There are no property implications.

7.2 Protection of trees detailed in Tree Preservation Order No. 404 will benefit the visual amenity of the local environment.

8.0 FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

8.1 There are no financial implications.

9.0 LEGAL IMPLICATIONS

9.1 A local authority may make a Tree Preservation Order (TPO) where it appears that it is expedient in the interests of amenity to make provision for the preservation of trees or woodlands in their area (section 198, Town and Country Planning Act 1990).

9.2 A TPO may prohibit the cutting, topping, lopping or uprooting of the trees which are the subject of the order. It may also prohibit the wilful damage or destruction of those trees. Any person who contravenes a TPO shall be guilty of an offence and liable to receive a fine of up to £20,000.

9.3 A local authority may choose to confirm a TPO it has made. If an order is confirmed, it will continue to have legal effect until such point as it is revoked. If an order is not confirmed, it will expire and cease to have effect 6 months after it was originally made.

9.4 A local authority may only confirm an order after considering any representations made in respect of that order. Two representations have been received which object to the confirmation of Tree Preservation Order No.400. They are covered within this report.

10.0 RECOMMENDATION

10.1 Following consideration of the objections reported it is recommended Tree Preservation Order No. 404 at 7 Gladstone Road, S10 3GT should be confirmed unmodified.

Maria Duffy
Interim Head of Planning

22nd December 2015

This page is intentionally left blank