

**CITY OF LEEDS TREE PRESERVATION ORDER (No.21) 2014
(LAND AT 55 RODLEY LANE & LAND TO THE REAR OF 22-33 HAWTHORN
GROVE RODLEY LS13 1HN)**

1. BACKGROUND

The Council received a request from a member of the public and Ward Councillor to make a TPO on the above land, situated south of Oaklands Car Wash. It is understood that the land was formerly allotments and had come up for sale. The information conveyed was that the trees were considered to be under imminent threat.

Following a site visit by a former Tree Officer of the Council, the trees on the former allotment land and adjacent Olive Tree restaurant were considered to provide significant visual amenity value to the surrounding area and an Area TPO was, therefore, served on 8 September 2014.

2. OBJECTION AND SUPPORT

One objection to the TPO was subsequently received from the owner of Oaklands Hand Car Wash in relation to those trees situated on former allotment land. The objection was accompanied by a report from Treescapes Consultancy Ltd.

No objection has been received from The Olive Tree Restaurant in respect of those situated on land adjacent the restaurant.

Support to the order has been indicated by Ward Councillor and a member of the Public.

The points raised by the objector can be summarised as follows:

1. The trees do not have sufficient amenity value and that their removal would not have a significant impact on the local area
2. Whilst many of the trees are prominent, they have numerous structural issues and characteristics that would preclude inclusion within a TPO
3. If the hawthorn hedge bordering the site is include in the Order then it should not be included.

3. COMMENTS OF THE TREE OFFICER IN RELATION TO THE OBJECTION

Following a further visit to the site taking into account the content of the consultancy report accompanying the objection, it was observed that some of the tree planting (referred to as 'Group 4' in the report) consisted of fruit trees, planted as a crop during the former allotment usage. It is accepted on re-

inspection that these trees have limited life expectancy and amenity value and it is proposed to remove them from the Order. In addition it is also considered that the sycamore trees referred to as 'Tree 2' and 'Tree 3', together with the group of ash trees referred to as 'Group 5' were considered on re-inspection to have insufficient amenity value to justify continued protection given their form and condition.

The area of trees referred to in the tree report as 'Area 1', however, are of better quality. This belt of trees is readily visible from numerous public vantage points; converging from the roundabout and the trees are considered to collectively provide both visual amenities to the site, together with a partial screening effect to the commercial premises.

Whilst it is accepted that the trees do contain a number of minor issues, these are not considered insurmountable and could be addressed through future, considered applications for tree work. Where trees are proposed for removal, such applications would be considered, subject to the requirement appropriate replacement planting

The Hawthorn hedge by its nature cannot be included in a Tree Preservation Order and it was never the intention to do so.

4. CONCLUSION

The Order is considered to be warranted on the grounds of amenity and expediency, subject to modification of the Order Plan to reduce the scope of the Order to those trees possessing sufficient amenity value. The imposition of the Order is appropriate on this basis.

The Council would consider any future tree works application on its merits.

5. RECOMMENDATION

That the Order be confirmed subject to modification of the Order Plan for the reasons referred to above.