

**NORTH LINCOLNSHIRE COUNCIL**

**PLANNING COMMITTEE**

**TREE PRESERVATION ORDER CONFIRMATION  
2 HIGH STREET, WINTERTON**

**1. OBJECT AND KEY POINTS IN THIS REPORT**

- 1.1 To make a decision whether to confirm a Tree Preservation order made on 2 trees at 2 High Street, Winterton

**2. BACKGROUND INFORMATION**

- 2.1 A Section 211 Notice of intention to fell 2 Sycamores in a Conservation Area was received, giving 6 weeks notice to allow the Council time to decide whether or not to put a TPO on these trees.
- 2.2 The Council representative when visiting the site, was only able to view the trees from public vantage points and could not gain access to the site to examine the trees. A decision to make a TPO was made as Sycamore trees had been identified as key trees for Winterton and they had some visual amenity in the area, but with the intention that the trees would require proper inspection within the 6 month period given to gain information for any decision to confirm the order.
- 2.3 The owner of the trees placed an objection (see appendix) on the making of this Tree Preservation Order and necessitates the Confirmation being decided at Planning Committee.

**3. OPTIONS FOR CONSIDERATION**

- 3.1 The options to be considered are whether this Tree Preservation Order should be confirmed, taking into account the location and condition of the trees.
- 3.2 A Tree officer inspected the trees when access to the site was available.
- 3.3 T1 – was noted as being a tight forked multi stemmed large tree of some 5/6 stems extending from close to the base. With some inclusion already present within some of these stems, and the density of the

stems it was considered that this tree had structural defects that would compromise the tree and cause branch break out as these stems grew.

- 3.4 T2 – was also noted as a tight forked multi stemmed tree, with potential for branch failure, as the stems thicken through nature growth. This tree was on a higher level than the property buildings and close to them.

#### **4. ANALYSIS OF OPTIONS**

- 4.1 The trees have some visual amenity within the Conservation Area of Winterton, and are considered to be significant key trees within the location.
- 4.2 The trees due to their tight forked multi stemmed habit, together with included unions suggests these trees have structural defects that would increase the likelihood of branch break out as the trees continue to grow.

#### **5. RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS (FINANCIAL, STAFFING, PROPERTY, IT)**

##### **5.1 Financial**

- 5.1.1 None

##### **5.2 Staffing**

- 5.2.1 None

##### **5.3 Property**

- 5.3.1 None

##### **5.4 IT**

- 5.4.1 None

#### **6. OTHER IMPLICATIONS (STATUTORY, ENVIRONMENTAL, DIVERSITY, SECTION 17 – CRIME AND DISORDER, RISK AND OTHER)**

##### **6.1 Statutory**

- 6.1.1

##### **6.2 Environmental**

- 6.2.1 Potential loss of 2 large trees within the Conservation Area of Winterton.

##### **6.3 Diversity**

- 6.3.1

6.4 **Section 17 – Crime and Disorder**

6.4.1

6.5 **Risk**

6.5.1

6.6 **Other**

6.6.1

**7. OUTCOMES OF CONSULTATION**

7.1 The consultation for the Conservation Area application had no response either for or against the intended works. Following the making of the tree preservation order the owner of the trees made an objection to the order citing close presence of trees to outbuildings.

**8. RECOMMENDATIONS**

8.1 It is recommended that although the trees have some visual amenity within the Conservation Area of Winterton, the structural defects be such that it would not be expedient to confirm this Tree Preservation Order.

**HEAD OF PLANNING**

Church Square House  
SCUNTHORPE  
North Lincolnshire  
DN15 6XQ

Author: Andrea Brocklebank

Date: 5<sup>th</sup> November 2010

**Background Papers used in the preparation of this report**

Mrs J Dodson  
The Legal section  
North Lincolnshire Council  
Pitwood House  
Ashby Road  
Scunthorpe  
DN16 1AB

21/09/2010.

Re; TPO 2, High Street Winterton 2010

Dear Sirs;

Both the above Trees are on the boundaries of my land at 2 High Street Winterton and I wish to appeal against this order on the following grounds.

Tree 2 on your Drg: on the Western Boundary .

When we bought the property (2002) we were warned by the Structural Engineers that this tree was too close to the property and would likely cause problems with the foundations. If we don't take appropriate action then future costs could escalate as the problem can only get worse.

Tree 1 on your Drg: on the rear boundary

This tree has already brought the boundary wall down once and we have had to rebuild the section and it is clearly going to do it again.

With regard to both trees.

The Sycamores are not particularly attractive trees and are prolific – we have to pull up from the garden between 150 and 200 saplings per year.

We do feel that as only the very tops of the trees can be seen from public land then the amenity of the people would not be adversely affected.

In conclusion, although the trees are a nuisance our major concern is structural damage to the property and we are informed, particularly in the case of Tree 2 that the matter could become quite urgent.

Yours faithfully,



Richard Watkins Victoria House 2 High Street Winterton.

