

Planning Committee: 06 January 2004
Reference No: TPO 246

Principal Item Number: 9

Town/Parish Council: Warwick

Case Officer: Mike Duffett
01926 456520 planning_appeals@warwickdc.gov.uk

104 BRIDGE END, WARWICK

Provisional Tree Preservation Order: 2 Silver Birch Trees (TPO246).

SUMMARY OF REPRESENTATIONS

The Tree Preservation Order took effect, on a provisional basis, on 11 July 2003 and continues in force on this basis for a further six months or until the Order is confirmed by the Council whichever first occurs. Before the Council can decide whether the Order should be confirmed, the people living in the vicinity of the Order have a right to make representations.

No.102 Bridge End – SUPPORT because interested in the landscaping of Bridge End for many years.

No.104 Bridge End – Request permission to remove one of the silver birch trees to allow sufficient light into the north facing rooms of the side extension, the subject of planning permission W20030440

RELEVANT HISTORY

In March 2003 a planning application was made for a pitched roof side extension to the dormer bungalow in place of the flat roof garage. The application was approved in April 2003. (W20030440)

In June 2003 in view of the location of the property within the Warwick Conservation Area prior notification was received to carry out the removal of a row of conifers along the eastern site boundary adjacent to the drive serving the garage, and the removal of one of the two silver birch trees. The reason for the removal of the silver birch was given as to make a feature of the remaining tree.

Although no objection has been raised to the removal of the conifers the two silver birch trees have been inspected by the Council's Arboricultural Officer and considered worthy of being the subject of a Tree Preservation Order.

KEY ISSUES

The location of the trees

The two mature Silver Birch trees are located in close proximity to each other in a prominent position near the carriageway adjacent to the southern bend of Bridge End and within the narrow garden area to the side of the driveway serving the residential property. The gated access to the farmland within Warwick Castle Park is immediately adjacent to the trees. The front garden of no.104 Bridge end is mainly lawned with no fence or hedge along the street frontage.

There are other individual mature trees in the area, including a large oak tree in the centre of the front garden of no.104 Bridge End, but there is some distance between the trees

Assessment

The two Silver Birch trees have an attractive shape and form and their combined canopy is well developed. They are especially dominant in the street scene because by reason of their forward position they dominate the forward view when travelling along Bridge End from the southern Banbury Road entrance. Both trees are of a good condition and shape and both individually and as a group make a significant positive contribution to the amenity of the area. The trees are approximately 13 metres high, and have a spread of about 6 metres.

With regard to the request made by the property owners to remove the silver birch tree (T2) the Council's Arboricultural Officer is of the opinion that this is perhaps the better of the two specimens. In addition to the alleged justification to remove to make a feature of the remaining silver birch tree, the owners concern is that with the two trees present the north facing rooms in the new extension will not receive sufficient light.

It is considered that the removal of tree (T2) would not be in the interests of the amenity of this part of the Conservation Area. The work, if approved would adversely affect the canopy depth and shape which currently exists with the two trees close together. The rooms in the new extension which face towards the trees are a ground floor playroom and a small first floor bedroom. The side extension is set back from the existing projecting front wing so there is some distance between the new extension and the trees. In view of the disposition of the new work to the two trees it is not considered that the daylight issue is of such significance to justify the removal of either of the trees.

The impact upon daylight was not raised as a reason to remove one of the trees back in June 2003, and if the allegation was accepted then only by the removal of both trees would the daylight situation significantly change because of the close proximity of the two trees of similar age and size.

RECOMMENDATION

That TPO246 be confirmed in its present form, and that permission be refused for the removal of silver birch tree T2 on the grounds that its loss would adversely affect the amenity of this part of the Conservation Area and the reasons for the work are not justified.