

PLANNING COMMITTEE**Date** **28 October 2025****Title** **TPO 02/2025 – 62 Church Street, Whittlesey****1. PURPOSE**

The purpose of this report is to advise members of the current situation in respect of confirmation of a Tree Preservation Order (TPO) at 62 Church Street, Whittlesey, and to determine an appropriate course of action.

2. SUMMARY

Matters relating to the issue and confirmation of a TPO are normally dealt with by delegated powers and confirmations are only referred to this Committee where objections to the Order are received. An objection to the TPO was received from the applicant of the recent application to carry out Works to Trees in a Conservation Area.

In October 2025 an Emergency TPO was imposed on 1x Lime, 1x Beech, 1x Copper Beech, 1x Yew, 1x Sycamore, 4x Silver Birch, 1x Norway Maple, 1x Holly and 4x Corsican Pine at 62 Church Street in Whittlesey. The Order was required to ensure the trees are protected as they are highly prominent trees located within the Whittlesey Conservation Area, which contributes to the amenity and character of the area.

The following list details the trees which form part of the TPO (15 no. trees are included).

- T1 – Lime
- T2 – Beech
- T3 – Copper Beech
- T4 – Yew
- T5 – Silver Birch
- T6 – Sycamore
- T7 – Silver Birch
- T8 – Norway Maple
- T9 – Silver Birch
- T10 – Silver Birch
- T11 – Holly
- T12 – Corsican Pine
- T13 – Corsican Pine
- T14 – Corsican Pine
- T15 - Corsican Pine

No consultation responses were received from neighbours, nor the town/parish council.

The Arboricultural Officer and Conservation Officer provided consultation comments to the TRCA submission objecting to the removal of the trees within the application.

The trees offer considerable levels of positive verdant amenity to the conservation area, street scene, nearby listed buildings and the host dwelling, which is considered to be a non-

designated heritage asset in its own right. The trees add to the character of the conservation area and building, where tree removal or harsh pruning works could impact on this. The trees are significant, and no suitable justification has been provided to remove them.

It is noted that additional trees have been included within the order compared with the trees submitted within the TRCA application. The Tree Officer confirms that this was undertaken on the grounds of expediency and completeness. As significant trees were already subject to an application for removal, it was considered prudent to assess other trees on site that may also meet the criteria for protection. This approach ensures that any trees of merit are afforded suitable safeguarding and reduces the risk of future inappropriate works being carried out.

3. RECOMMENDATION

It is therefore recommended that members confirm the TPO in respect of the 1x Lime, 1x Beech, 1x Copper Beech, 1x Yew, 1x Sycamore, 4x Silver Birch, 1x Norway Maple, 1x Holly and 4x Corsican Pine at 62 Church Street in Whittlesey.

Forward Plan Reference No. (if applicable)	Not applicable
Portfolio Holder(s)	Not applicable
Report Originator	Zoe Blake, Development Officer
Contact Officer(s)	Matthew Leigh, Head of Planning
Background Paper(s)	N/A

1. BACKGROUND

- 1.1 A TRCA application (a notification of proposed works to trees within a Conservation Area. Town and Country Planning Act 1990.) was received under reference F/YR25/0613/TRCA for the felling of 2 x Conifers, 2 x Silver Birch, 4 x Scotts Pine, 1 x Maple and 1 x Lime Tree within a conservation area.
- 1.2 The Arboricultural Officer completed an evaluation of all the trees at the site for a potential TPO using TEMPO (Tree Evaluation Method for Preservation Orders) and considered that the 1x Lime, 1x Beech, 1x Copper Beech, 1x Yew, 1x Sycamore, 4x Silver Birch, 1x Norway Maple, 1x Holly and 4x Corsican Pine warranted a TPO.
- 1.3 During the processing of the TPO an objection from the applicant was received resulting in the confirmation of the no. 15 trees to be presented to the Planning Committee.

2. ASSESSMENT

- 2.1 The Order, which encompasses the site at 62 Church Street in Whittlesey is detailed on the accompanying plan.
- 2.2 Matters relating to the issue and confirmation of a TPO are normally dealt with by delegated powers and confirmations are only referred to Committee where objections to an Order are received.
- 2.3 The placement of a TPO does not prevent tree works or even removal, but gives the Local Planning Authority control over 'inappropriate' works.
- 2.4 The applicant has objected to the placing of the TPO for the 1x Lime, 1x Beech, 1x Copper Beech, 1x Yew, 1x Sycamore, 4x Silver Birch, 1x Norway Maple, 1x Holly and 4x Corsican Pine at 62 Church Street in Whittlesey, where it was requested that the TPO be cancelled, on the understanding that the applicant remains fully engaged and committed to collaborative working with Fenland Council on any future tree management.. The applicant detailed their reasons for objecting to the TPO as the following:
 - Commitment to Compliance: The applicant states that they are working with a tree consultant who specialises in conservation area compliance. This ensures that any current or future tree works will be managed to the highest standards and in line with council requirements.
 - Willing Collaboration: The applicant states that they have no intention of removing or undertaking inappropriate works on these trees. Their goal is to manage them responsibly.
 - Duplication of Controls: The applicant considers that since the property is already within a designated conservation area, permission is required for most tree works. Adding a TPO provides little additional control but does create extra administrative burden.
 - Practical Timing Concerns: Due to limited availability from the tree consultant, the applicant raises concerns with their ability to respond fully.
 - Health and safety concerns: During the consideration of the TRCA application, the applicant detailed health and safety concerns, particularly of

pedestrians, road users, and the property opposite should one of the trees at the front fail. Regarding the tree at the rear, the applicant mentioned that the tree is extremely close to the building and poses a significant risk if it were to fail.

- 2.5 It is noted that additional trees have been included within the order compared with the trees submitted within the TRCA application. The Tree Officer confirms that this was undertaken on the grounds of expediency and completeness. As significant trees were already subject to an application for removal, it was considered prudent to assess other trees on site that may also meet the criteria for protection. This approach ensures that any trees of merit are afforded suitable safeguarding and reduces the risk of future inappropriate works being carried out

3 ARBORICULTURAL OFFICER'S ASSESSMENT

- 3.1 It is considered that the trees are of high amenity value within Whittlesey Conservation Area, especially where some of these being located to the front of the property.
- 3.2 The trees identified by the arboricultural officer which forms this TPO offer considerable levels of positive verdant amenity to the conservation area, street scene, nearby listed buildings and the host dwelling, which is considered to be a non-designated heritage asset in its own right. The trees add to the character of the conservation area and building, where tree removal or harsh pruning works could impact on this. The trees are significant, and no suitable justification has been provided to remove them.
- 3.3 It is considered expedient to place a TPO on the 1x Lime, 1x Beech, 1x Copper Beech, 1x Yew, 1x Sycamore, 4x Silver Birch, 1x Norway Maple, 1x Holly and 4x Corsican Pine to contribute to tree cover, amenity and biodiversity.
- 3.4 In light of the above considerations, it is considered that the placing of a TPO is the correct decision to ensure that the correct advice and guidance is obtained regarding protection of the tree population.

4 CONCLUSION

- 4.1 Due consideration has been given to the objection from the original applicant, however it is considered that the trees identified within the proposed TPO offer considerable levels of positive verdant amenity to the conservation area, street scene, nearby listed buildings and the host dwelling, which is considered to be a non-designated heritage asset in its own right. As such, the TPO should be in place to protect these significant trees.
- 4.2 It is therefore recommended that the TPO at 62 Church Street in Whittlesey is confirmed.



Created on: 10/09/2025

Scale = 1:1,000

© Crown Copyright and database
rights 2025 Ordnance Survey 10023778

TPO02/2025
Church Street, Whittlesey
Trees as per schedule





Created on: 28/10/2025

© Crown Copyright and database
rights 2025 Ordnance Survey 10023778

F/YR25/0613/TRCA

Scale = 1:1,250



TREE EVALUATION METHOD FOR PRESERVATION ORDERS - TEMPO

SURVEY DATA SHEET & DECISION GUIDE

Date: 9 th September 2025		Surveyor: Andrew Day	
Location: 62 Church Street, Whittlesey			
Tree ID/No.	Species		
T1	Lime		
T2	Beech		
T3	Copper Beech		
T4	Yew		
T5	Silver Birch		
T6	Sycamore		
T7	Silver Birch		
T8	Norway Maple		
T9	Silver Birch		
T10	Silver Birch		
T11	Holly		
T12	Corsican Pine		
T13	Corsican Pine		
T14	Corsican Pine		
T15	Corsican Pine		

Part 1: Amenity assessment

a) Condition & suitability for TPO

- | | |
|--------------------------|-------------------------|
| 5) Good | Highly suitable |
| 3) Fair/satisfactory | Suitable |
| 1) Poor | Unlikely to be suitable |
| 0) dead/dying/dangerous* | Unsuitable |

* Relates to existing context and is intended to apply to severe irremediable defects only

Score & Notes 5

b) Retention span (in years) & suitability for TPO

- 5) 100+ Highly suitable
- 4) 40-100 Very suitable
- 2) 20-40 Suitable
- 1) 10-20 Just suitable
- Unsuitable

Score & Notes 4

*Includes trees which are an existing or near future nuisance, including those clearly outgrowing their context, or which are significantly negating the potential of other trees of better quality

c) Relative public visibility & suitability for TPO

Consider realistic potential for future visibility with changed land use

- 5) Very large trees with some visibility, or prominent large trees Highly suitable
- 4) Large trees, or medium trees clearly visible to the public Suitable
- 3) Medium trees, or large trees with limited view only Suitable
- 2) Young, small, or medium/large trees visible only with difficulty Barely suitable
- 1) Trees not visible to the public, regardless of size Probably unsuitable

Score & Notes 4

d) Other factors

Trees must have accrued 7 or more points (with no zero score) to qualify

- 5) Principal components of formal arboricultural features, or veteran trees
- 4) Tree groups, or principal members of groups important for their cohesion
- 3) Trees with identifiable historic, commemorative or habitat importance
- 2) Trees of particularly good form, especially if rare or unusual
- 1) Trees with none of the above additional redeeming features (inc. those of indifferent form)
- 1) Trees with poor form or which are generally unsuitable for their location

Score & Notes 4

Part 2: Expediency assessment

Trees must have accrued 10 or more points to qualify

- 5) Immediate threat to tree inc. s.211 Notice
- 3) Foreseeable threat to tree
- 2) Perceived threat to tree
- 1) Precautionary only

Score & Notes 5

Part 3: Decision guide

- Any O Do not apply TPO 1-6
- 1 - 6 TPO indefensible
- 7-11 Does not merit TPO
- 12-15 TPO defensible
- 16 + Definitely merits TPO

Add Scores for total:

22

Decision:



Tree Location Plan

62 Church Street, Whittlesey,
Cambs