

Planning application no.	21/00165/TR	
Site	6 Church Hill Drive, Wolverhampton, WV6 9AS	
Proposal	06/00467/TPO (A14) - T1 - Horse Chestnut - Crown reduce via the 'drop-crotching' method to reduce the Height and Northeast - Southwest spread of the tree by no more than 2.5 metres. T2 - Oak - Crown reduce via the 'drop-crotching' method to reduce the Height and spread of the tree by no more than 1.5 metres. T3 - Sycamore - Crown reduce via the 'drop-crotching' method to reduce the Height and spread of the tree by no more than 2.5 metres. T4 - Sycamore - Crown reduce via the 'drop-crotching' method to reduce the Height and spread of the tree by no more than 2.5 metres.	
Ward	Tettenhall Regis;	
Applicant	Miss Rebecca Thorne	
Cabinet member with lead responsibility	Councillor Stephen Simkins Cabinet Member for City Economy	
Accountable Director	Richard Lawrence, Director of Regeneration	
Originating service	Planning	
Accountable employee	James Dunn	Tree Officer
	Tel	07976750934
	Email	James.dunn@wolverhampton.gov.uk

1.0 Summary recommendation

1.1 Approve with conditions.

2.0 Application site

2.1 The four trees subject to this application are situated within the garden of 6 Church Hill Drive, close to the boundary with the properties of 2 and 3 Redacres and 1 The Orchard. The property of 6 Church Hill Drive is elevated above the general level of the adjacent properties. Due to the elevated positions the trees are visible above and between the surrounding properties from Redacres.

2.2 The trees subject to this application are protected by virtue of being located within Area 14 of The Wolverhampton, Tettenhall Urban District No.4, Tree Preservation Order 1963 [02/2/023], and within the Tettenhall Greens Conservation Area.

3.0 Application details

3.1 The applicant who is the occupier of the adjacent property at 2 Redacres has proposed to crown reduce the trees by between 1.5 and 2.5 metres in order to limit the shading and overbearing impact of the trees on the rear garden. The works are a repetition of similar works that have been previously approved and undertaken.

4.0 Relevant policy documents

4.1 None

5.0 Publicity

5.1 No comments received.

6.0 Consultees

6.1 No officer consultation

7.0 Legal implications

7.1 There are no legal implications arising from this report KR/11032021/D.

8.0 Appraisal

8.1 The proposed pruning is essentially a repeat of previously approved works that were last undertaken in 2017.

8.2 The trees subject to the application are well formed and apparently healthy trees with no obvious signs of impaired vitality or structural defect. The proposed works are considered to be a reasonable and appropriate form of management for the trees and will maintain them at an appropriate size for their location.

8.3 The proposed works will not have any significant impact on the health or amenity value of the trees, and they are in accordance with good arboricultural practice.

9.0 Conclusion

9.1 The proposed pruning of the four trees, is justified and appropriate for the trees given their location, size, species and condition. There will not be any detrimental impact on the health of the trees or their amenity value, and therefore the works are in accordance with good arboricultural practice.

10.0 Detail recommendation

10.1 Approve subject to standard conditions.

