

**South Hams Planning**  
**Application to work on Trees subject to a Tree Preservation Order**  
**Officer Report, Assessment and Recommendation**

**Case Officer:** Lee Marshall

**Parish:** Salcombe **Ward:** Salcombe and Thurlestone

**Application No:** 3098/21/TPO

**Agent/Applicant:**

Aspect Tree Consultancy Ltd  
Unit F, Kach Business Park  
Pottery Rd  
Bovey Tracey  
TQ13 9TZ

**Applicant:**

Warren  
c/o agent

**Site Address:** Marhaba, Beadon Road, Salcombe, TQ8 8LU

**Proposed works:** T1: Sitka Spruce - Fell to provide space for construction vehicle access.

Site assessed by	: L Marshall
Date	: 31/08/2021

**Assessment**

1.

**Are the trees covered by a current TPO?**

Yes

2.

**Are some, or all, of the works exempt from the need for formal consent?**

No

3.

**Description of the tree(s) and location.**

T1 Sitka Spruce emerges towards the Northern edge of the woodland block, amongst a discrete group of 3 mature Sitka Spruces amongst the mature broadleaved and coniferous trees.

Retaining strong apical dominance and excurrent form typical for the species study of extension growth found normal seasonal growth and no indication of limiting biotic or abiotic factors that would prevent the tree emerging further into the visual landscape.

It is not agreed that the visual perception of T1 is low, when viewed in close proximity to the wood the edging mature trees do obscure it, but elevated locations within the wider landscape will have clear view of the upper crown which now prudes as a climax species from the further tree species of decurrent form below. As such it is an integral part of the woodland mosaic and its removal would be harmful to the sylvan character of the area, and the ensuing contribution to visual amenity therein.

The agent for the application noted the removal of T1 will allow larger constructional traffic to access the Sandnes development to the South East. As part of the planning submissions for the application a detailed CEMP supported by arboricultural survey work confirmed that the existing access was suitable for the passage of smaller sized plant to achieve the build.

This detailed survey work was studied in detail and agreement found that the build could be enacted without the need to fell trees, with this position being maintained

4.

**What is the amenity value of the tree(s)?**

Moderate to High

5.

**What impact will the works have on local amenity?**

High, readily appreciable and of long term detriment to the visual landscape

6.

**Do the proposed works accord with good arboricultural practice?**

No

7.

**Is any damage likely to arise if consent is refused?**

No – Based upon the information supporting the application

8.

**Assessment.** Give a succinct assessment of the application and appraisal of the proposed works considering the submitted justification.

Key points: See above

9.

**Decision**

Refusal

10.

Has the application been assessed in relation to Article 1, Protocol 1, Article 2 and Article 8 of the Human Rights Act. **Yes**

**11. Tree Condition and decision summary- assess and refer to submitted application report.**

Tree No.	Species	Height (m)	Spread (m)	Age Class	Life Expectancy	Condition	Assessment of Stated Reasons for Works
1							
2							
3							
4							
5							
6							
7							
8							

**Key:**

Species: Common name with botanical name in brackets where applicable

Height: Measured in metres (m) from ground-level. Where many trees are inspected, 1 in 10 trees are measured with the remainder estimated against the measured trees.

Spread: Measured in metres, the broadest diameter of the crown.

Age Class:

Life Expectancy:

Condition:

**Young** First 1/3 life expectancy **S** Short (<10 years) **Good** Free from significant defects with a healthy crown

**Middle Age** 1/3 to 2/3 life expectancy **M** Medium (10-40 years) **Fair** Some defects, generally healthy crown

**Mature** Final 1/3 life expectancy **L** Long (40 + years) **Poor** Structural defects, poor general health and vigour

Assessment of Stated Reasons for Works: Inspectors recommendation on whether the works should be REFUSED or APPROVED

**The above report has been checked and the plan numbers are correct in APP and the officers report. As Determining Officer I hereby clear this report and the decision can now be issued.**

**Name:** L Marshall

**Date:**17/11/2023