

**CITY OF LEEDS TREE PRESERVATION ORDER (NO.1) 2020
(BRADFORD GOLF CLUB, HAWKSWORTH LANE GUISELEY)**

1. BACKGROUND

A Conservation Area Notification (Ref: 19/07300/TR), was submitted on behalf of Bradford Golf Club Ltd to fell 3 mature trees; 2 Sycamore and 1 Chestnut; validated on 25 November 2019.

The site was visited by the Tree officer and the trees were found to be attractive, highly prominent, apparently healthy specimens.

A Tree Preservation Order ("TPO") was, therefore, made and served on the Golf Club on 17 January 2020.

2. OBJECTION

One objection to the TPO was subsequently submitted by the Golf Club, dated 5 February 2020.

The points of objection may be summarised as follows:

1. The Chestnut drops conkers which are a slip hazard.
2. The "Root ball" of the Chestnut is too big and may cause damage to drains and foundations.
3. The Chestnut Tree is located too close to the Club House.

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

1. Horse Chestnut trees do produce and naturally shed conkers in autumn. This is not a valid reason to fell the tree. Retention of a mature, apparently pathogen free Chestnut is all the more important in view of In the light of the Climate Change Emergency recently declared by the Council.

The value of existing trees must be recognised, in terms of carbon storage and their year on year carbon sequestration (in addition to public amenity and bio-diversity value). The retention of existing trees wherever possible, is a positive factor in combatting climate change (as well as contributing to the improvement of Biodiversity in Leeds). By way of comparison, it will take at least 30 years for newly planted trees planting to make a similar contribution

2. In very rare situations, roots can cause subsidence in circumstances where heavy shrinkage clay is present. Where any works are proposed to a tree in a Conservation Area (or protected by a TPO), a fact based and evidence based

application would need to be submitted in support, as indicated at Sections 8.1 and 8.2 of the Conservation Area Notification form.

In addition, trees do not have the capacity to physically damage drains in a good state of repair. They may, however, exploit defects, cracks or holes in drains. Simple repair and lining works to make drains water tight will ordinarily rectify such an issue, without the need to remove a tree.

3. The trees are not considered by the Tree Officer to be situated too close to the building as suggested.

The Tree Contractor who initially inspected the trees and submitted the Notification, clearly indicated in section 8.1 of the standard form that all of the trees were healthy and not a risk. It was also stated at section 8.2 of the form that the trees were not causing damage to buildings; thereby contradicting the letter of objection.

The Tree Officer conducted a site visit in response to the Notification, and concurred with the Tree contractor as to the good health of the trees. No obvious signs of issues to the structure of any of the trees was observed, in line with the opinion of the Tree Contractor.

In addition it is noted that in relation to a previous Planning application (Ref: 11/04361/FU), which sought approval to extend the Club House together with external alteration; the applicant did not consider this to be an issue. A negative response was given in response to question 15 of the application, which asked whether there were any trees or hedges on the proposed development site.

4. CONCLUSION

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

5. RECOMMENDATION

That the Order be confirmed as initially served.