

**CITY OF LEEDS TREE PRESERVATION ORDER (NO.10) 2018  
(WOODLAND TO THE REAR OF 16 -18 NETHERFIELD DRIVE, GUISELEY)**

**1. BACKGROUND**

The making of the Order initially stemmed from the contacting of Landscape Team by Councillor Wadsworth and a local resident, with a request to serve a TPO on a tree located adjacent to Parkinson Park Guiseley.

Whilst the original request was to protect a single tree, Councillor Wadsworth subsequently requested that additional trees in the vicinity be protected as a collective. Concern had been raised that the trees might be at risk for being felled.

Councillor Wadsworth advised that public interest came for the Order was supported by a local resident and but also the Friends of Parkinson Park.

Once resources permitted, the site was visited by a Tree Officer who observed a visually prominent woodland block of mixed deciduous trees on land to the rear of 16 & 18 Netherfield Drive.

Following the continued interest of Councillor Wadsworth in respect of additional trees in the vicinity and members of the public, the site was again visited. The Tree Officer concurred with a colleague that the trees formed a highly prominent woodland collective and should be protected for their collective, rather than individual, amenity value. It was noted that several trees throughout the block had been subject to poor, historic work.

A provisional TPO was, therefore, made and served on 5th June 2018, in respect of woodland block of mixed deciduous trees

**2. OBJECTION**

One objection to the TPO was subsequently received from the owners of 18 Netherfield Drive

The initial points raised by the Objectors may be summarised as follows:

1. The trees in her ownership are part of an ongoing management plan for the last few years which is currently on hold due to nesting birds / available resources, but due to start again in Aug/Sept.
2. The Owner fully understands the amenity value of their trees and is very attached to them, however, considers that they cannot be allowed to grow unchecked
3. A large branch fell on the lawn last year, resulting in the tree being felled.

### **3. TREE WORKS APPLICATION**

Following the serving of the provisional Order, the Objectors submitted a Tree works application, proposing to fell one tree considered to be dangerous and to thin several others. The Objectors made additional points in the context of their application.

4. The tree proposed for removal is dangerous and needs expediting
5. The trees should not be classified as a woodland, but as individual trees
6. Sycamore are known commonly as weeds as so may not need any protection in reality
7. Notwithstanding approval of their application, they would like the objection to the Order itself remain to indicate her formal displeasure at the role played by the Councillor.

The application was viewed and the works approved. Based on the approval, the objectors were asked to consider withdrawing the objection but declined to do so.

### **4. COMMENTS OF THE TREE OFFICER IN RELATION TO THE OBJECTION**

1. It is appreciated that the Objectors have a management plan for their trees, and in this regard applications for sensible and considered management would be supported
2. It is also appreciated that the Objectors recognise that their trees have significant amenity value, being located on top of a hill and backing onto / forming part of the Park boundary. The purpose of the Order is not to allow them to grow unchecked, but simply to ensure that any works required are undertaken sensitively.
3. Any application for necessary works to a tree that has become dangerous would be supported.
4. The application to remove a particular tree has been approved as it contained historic basal damage which has been in that condition for a long time. Whilst not imminently dangerous, the application has on balance been supported.
5. Because of its collective nature, it is proper to categorise the block of trees as a small woodland.
6. Sycamore are not weeds and are considered as being an important species and one of the few that will be able to withstand climate change .The Forestry Commission have also re-classified the species to recognise its importance.
7. The fact that the Objectors consider that they have been caught up in a neighbour dispute and that it would not have been necessary to include their

trees in the Order if Councillor Wadsworth had approached them directly, is not something that can be properly taken into account in assessing the merits of whether to confirm the Order.

Notwithstanding the history of this matter, the fact remains that the Landscape Team were asked to make site visits by a concerned Ward Member, and in doing so a block of trees was observed, that possessed sufficient amenity value to justify their protection.

## **5. CONCLUSION**

The Order is warranted on the grounds of amenity and expediency and, therefore, its imposition is appropriate.

## **6. RECOMMENDATION**

That the Order be confirmed as initially served.