# ARBORICULTURAL REPORT

### Summary Report for Cumberland Council

Prepared by Alistair Hearn

**Reference:** 4/24/2054/TPO

Location: 105 QUEEN STREET, WHITEHAVEN.

Officer: Chloe Wootton

Date: 27 February 2024

## **CONSULTANTS REPORT**

#### **DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSAL**

| APPLICATION TREE NO. | SPECIES | PROPOSED WORKS  |  |  |  |
|----------------------|---------|---|--|--|--|
| T1                   | Holly   | Application to fell a mature Holly tree situated within a CONSERVATION AREA and eco plug the stump. |  |  |  |
| REASON               |         |   |  |  |  |

<sup>&#</sup>x27;T1 - Fell mature Holly tree in the rear garden and eco plug the stump.

The tree is large covering all 3 storeys of the building, the tree is extremely close to the building and in time will cause damage to the property. Currently no maintenance can be carried out to the property. The tree is now spanning into neighbouring properties which is causing regular complaint.'

#### DISCUSSION

The tree is in the mature age category and show signs of normal vitality.

From the Cumberland Council website, the site falls within the Whitehaven Town Centre Conservation Area. A Tree Preservation Order (TPO) does not protect the trees.

We consider the work detailed in the application reasonable to prevent the trees becoming a nuisance.

Our TEMPO assessment (page 2) shows a TPO is indefensible for this tree.

#### **RECOMMENDATIONS**

Inform the applicant they can carry out the work in the notification or wait for the sixweek determination period to lapse.

# ARBORICULTURAL REPORT

## Summary Report for Cumberland Council

## Prepared by Alistair Hearn

| TEMPO Assessment   |  |         |  |   |         |  |  |
|--|--|---------|--|---|---------|--|--|
| Part 1: Amenity Assessment   |  |         |  |   |         |  |  |
| a)<br>Condition &<br>Suitability:  | 5-Good = Highly Suitable 3-Fair/Satisfactory = Suitable 1-Poor = Unlikely to be suitable 0-Dead/dying/dangerous = Unsuitable   | T1<br>1 | b)<br>Retention span<br>(in years) &<br>suitability for<br>TPO:  | 5-100+ = Highly Suitable<br>4-40-100 = Very suitable<br>2-20-40 = Suitable<br>1-10-20 = Just suitable<br>0-<10 = Unsuitable   | T1<br>2 |  |  |
| c)<br>Relative public visibility &<br>suitability for TPO:   | 5-Very large with some visibility, or prominent large trees = Highly Suitable 4-Large trees, or medium trees clearly visible to the public = Suitable 3-Medium trees, or large trees with limited view only = Suitable 2-Young, small, or medium/large trees visible only with difficulty = Barely suitable 1-Trees not visible to the public, regardless of size = Unsuitable | 2       | d) Other factors — trees must have accrued 7 or more points (with no zero score) to qualify:                                     | 5-Principal components of formal arboricultural features, or veteran trees 4-Tree groups, or principal members of groups important for their cohesion 3-Trees with identifiable historic, commemorative or habitat importance 2-Trees of particularly good form, especially if rare or unusual 1-Trees with none of the above additional redeeming features (inc. those of indifferent form) -1-Trees with poor form or which are generally unsuitable for their location | 0       |  |  |
| Part 2: Expediency Assessment trees must have accrued 10 or more points to qualify:  |  | ts to   | to Part 3: Decision guide  |   |         |  |  |
| 5-Immediate threat to tree inc. s.211 Notice 3-Foreseeable threat to tree 2- Perceived threat to tree 1-Precautionary only |  | T1<br>0 | Any 0 = Do not apply TPO  1-6 = TPO indefensible  7-11 = Does not merit TPO  12-15 = TPO defensible  16+ = Definitely merits TPO |   |         |  |  |