
Site Address:	2A Royal Way, Waterlooville, PO7 8JE		
Proposal:	Fell 1No Oak. Tree subject to TPO 1196.		
Application Type:	Works to TPO Tree		
Application No:	APP/23/00927	Expiry Date:	22/12/2023
Applicant:	Mr Winder		
Agent:	Mr Kaye	Case Officer:	Peter Slegg
	Blendworth Tree Care		
Ward:	Waterloo		

Recommendation: **REFUSE TPO CONSENT**

1 Site Description

2A Royal Way, Waterlooville, PO7 8JE

2 Planning History

93/58076/000 - Demolish existing double garage & rebuild detached double garage fronting Mey Cl
ose., PERM,
GEN/17/00065 - COPY DOC 2 - TPO 1196 dated 3rd september request, ,17/01/2017 15:52:13
GEN/17/00130 - COPY DOC , ,08/02/2017
APP/17/00686 - Crown reduce 1No. Oak to leave finished height of 13m and width of 8m; crown reduce 2No. Oaks (grown together) to leave finished height of 12m and width of 5.5m. Within A1 of TPO 1196., PERM,22/08/2017
GEN/19/00841 - Dangerous and dead tree. Replacement tree., UNK,

3 Proposal

Fell 1No Oak. Tree subject to TPO 1196.

4 Policy Considerations

National Planning Policy Framework

Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) March 2011
DM8 (Conservation, Protection and Enhancement of Existing Natural Features)

Havant Borough Local Plan (Allocations) July 2014

Listed Building Grade: Not applicable.
Conservation Area: Not applicable.

5 Statutory and Non Statutory Consultations

Councillor Gwen Robinson

Councillor Mike Seal

Councillor Peter Wade

6 Community Involvement

This application was publicised in accordance with the Council's Code of Practice for Publicity of Planning Applications approved at minute 207/6/92 (as amended), as a result of which the following publicity was undertaken:

Number of neighbour notification letters sent: 7

Number of site notices: Not applicable.

Statutory advertisement: Not applicable.

Number of representations received: 1

Comment	Officer Comment

7 Planning Considerations

7.1 Having regard to the relevant policies of the development plan it is considered that the main issues arising from this application are:

- Whether the degree of pruning works requested would undermine the amenity value of these trees and whether this could also be harmful to their ongoing health and vitality.

7.2 The report relates specifically to assessing the proposed works drawing upon the information submitted with the application.

7.3 When considering the application the local authority is guided by the national guidance 'Tree Preservation Orders and trees in conservation areas'.

7.4 The national guidance that advises authorities when determining an application to protected trees to consider a range of criteria, which include the amenity value of

the tree and the likely impact of the proposal on the amenity of the area; whether the proposal is justified, having regard to the reasons and information put forward in support of the application and potential loss or damage likely to arise if consent is refused.

7.5 The application is for works to a mature oak tree subject to TPO 1196. The tree is clearly visible from the surrounding public areas and forms part of a group that make a positive contribution to the amenity of the local area.

7.6 The government guidance advises that the higher the amenity value of a tree and the greater any negative impact of the proposed works on amenity, the stronger the reasons needed before consent is granted.

7.7 The reasons to remove the tree, is to due to potential movement that has damaged a raised bed around the base of the tree and is resting on a fence post. Th applicant intends to plant a smaller growing native tree as a replacement.

7.8 The British Standard for Tree Work BS3998:2010 advises that 'While tree work can be desirable to accommodate people's requirements from the tree and the land around it, any work that exposes the woody tissues is a form of damage that can be detrimental to the tree in the long term'. On this basis the approach to determining if tree works are appropriate must be based upon reasons, which on balance, would not unnecessarily increase the stress and risk of infection leading to potential adverse impact to the tree and its amenity value.

7.9 The tree has been subject to a previous application to manage the tree (APP/17/00686) which referenced movement of the retaining wall at the base of the tree, but no signs of poor basal condition. There has been no evidence submitted that raise concerns of the health and condition of the tree.

7.10 Government guidance for the application of tree works subject to a Tree Preservation Order makes refence of the need to submit technical evidence by a relevant engineer, building/drainage surveyor or other appropriate expert where structural damage has taken place to structures such as garden walls, drains, paving and drive surfaces.

7.11 It is common to adjust boundary walls and fences to preserve a tree. If it was not possible to retain the tree, the applicant/agent would be expected to provide details explaining why it would be necessary to remove the tree and why alternative options have been discounted.

7.12 Whilst there are other mature trees within the vicinity, the proposed work would have a detrimental impact on the amenity value of the area. No technical evidence has been submitted to support the reasons to remove the tree. The removal of the tree would not be in accordance with Policy DM8 of the Core Strategy (2011).

8 Conclusion

It is recommended that the works to the tree should be refused consent.

9 RECOMMENDATION:

That the Executive Head of Place be authorised to **REFUSE TPO CONSENT** for application APP/23/00927 for the following reason:

- 1 The tree is an important feature in the local landscape and appears to be in adequately sound and healthy condition. The proposed works would result in a detrimental impact to the visual amenity of the locality. It is therefore contrary to policy DM8 of the Havant Borough Core Strategy 2011 and the National Planning Policy Framework.