
Site Address: 204 Park Avenue, Waterloooville, PO7 5EZ
Proposal: 1 No. Beech (T1) crown height reduction of 3.5 metres, crown width reduction by 2.5 metres to leave a remaining height of 12 metres and width of 6 metres.
Application Type: Works to TPO Tree
Application No: APP/24/00425 Expiry Date: 29/07/2024
Applicant: Ms Christine Morten
Agent: Mr Simon Jordan Case Officer: Tree Officer
Ward: Purbrook

Recommendation: **REFUSE TPO CONSENT**

1 Site Description

204 Park Avenue, Waterloooville, PO7 5EZ

2 Planning History

03/65842/000 - Application to crown raise to 8m on northern sector an Ash tree, and to crown reduce lower limb by 3-4m of another Ash tree (within woodland W1) subject to TPO 0685, PERM,06/03/2003
07/65842/001 - Tree works., UNK,
07/65842/002 - Crown reduce by 30% and remove 3 lower limbs to a Beech tree on the eastern sector subject to TPO 0685. , PERM,28/09/2007
07/65842/003 - Fell 2No. Sycamore trees, a Beech tree and 2No. Beech saplings Remove lower limb of an Oak tree and boundary prune, all within Area 1 Subject to TPO 0685., PERM,18/12/2007
GEN/11/00528 - Dangerous tree, NPW,22/02/2012
APP/14/01022 - Reduction of overhanging limbs of 3No. Sycamore (to rear of 48 Stakes Road) and 1No. Ash (to rear of 50 Stakes Road) by 4m back to boundary within A1 of TPO 0685., PERM,13/11/2014
GEN/17/00974 - Maintenance of trees., ,15/08/2017
APP/22/01156 - Fell 1No. Beech tree (T1) within Area A1, subject to TPO 0685., REF,06/02/2023
APP/23/00071 - Reduce 1No. Ash tree by 2m all over leaving crown width of 5m and crown height of 10m, cut back south and east sectors by 2m, reduce east sector 1No. Oak tree by 3m leaving crown width of 5m and crown height of 14m, remove limb 1No. Sycamore tree hanging over garden and cut back to garden boundary by 4m 2No. Beech trees. All trees within Area A1, subject to TPO 0685., PERM,05/04/2023
APP/23/00200 - Crown reduce 1No. Beech tree (T1) by 3m overall to previous pruning points, leaving crown height of 19.8 m (65ft) and crown spread of 9.1 m (30ft)., PERM,28/04/2023
GEN/23/00482 - Copy docs - TPOs documents , ,01/06/2023

3 Proposal

1 No. Beech (T1) crown height reduction of 3.5 metres, crown width reduction by 2.5 metres to leave a remaining height of 12 metres and width of 6 metres.

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

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: 13

Number of site notices: Not applicable.

Statutory advertisement: Not applicable.

Number of representations received: 1

Comment	Officer Comment
I fully support this application as the trees within this copse at 204 Park Avenue have had minimal maintenance in the last 30 years. Maintenance has only occurred because neighbouring properties have requested crown reductions. The copse belonging to 204 Park Avenue (property recently sold) has a blanket TPO on it, which means that as the trees have not been maintained and kept at a reasonable height, they are causing issues for local residents.	Your comments are noted and duly considered as part of the assessment of this application. I am unable to comment on earlier decisions. Resources are not currently available to meet the request for a site meeting: this may change in the coming months.

On a personal level, I want to question why the trees on the southern boundary, adjacent to the bungalows on Alameda Rd, have been granted permission to virtually pollard these trees. The trees on the north east corner have been granted minimal reduction yet are much closer to properties and overhang public pavements, highways and street furniture. I would like to request a site visit to assess the whole copse please. Since living here for 29 years, the trees are at least a third higher and wider than when we moved in. There are also many trees (sycamores and holly) that have self set and are between 5 and 10 metres high (some sycamores exceed this!) since the blanket TPO was granted. I welcome your response.	
---	--

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 this tree and whether this could also be harmful to its 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 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 tree is a mature beech which is part of a copse that grows as a central 'hub' for multiple properties in the area. The copse is visible from Park Avenue, Alameda Road, Alameda Way and less Stakes Road, and offers a degree of separation that benefits multiple properties. The individual beech is visible from the rear gardens of neighbouring properties and is a substantial landscape feature behind and between the low-level bungalows that are typical of the housing in this area.

7.5. The beech is on third party land, beyond the boundary of the applicant address and many metres from the actual dwelling.

7.6 The reason cited for the works is overhang to an outhouse and 'rebalancing of the crown'. The works stated will not offer a long-term solution to the perceived problem: the regrowth from reduction points is generally less well attached and the operation would potentially need to be done repeatedly. If this management is not maintained, then there is potential for the owner of the tree to be exposed to an increased level of risk if the regrowth were allowed to grow large.

7.7 There are no concerns expressed over the condition or stability of the tree. No reports of damage are cited.

7.8 A reduction on a beech is not considered to be good arboricultural practice: some species of tree do not respond well to pruning. The British Standard for tree works cites birch in particular: 'Species of *Betula* [birch] which generally have particularly weak defences against the development of decay, should be pruned as sparingly as possible and without exposing heartwood or ripe wood.'

The above guidance for *Betula* should be observed for any other species or cultivars known to have similarly weak defences'. Though not as weak as birch, beech is known to respond poorly to pruning so the potential for higher degree of failure is present post-reduction.

7.9 The reduction of the beech would reduce the public amenity of the tree and, being on the south of the copse, has the potential to expose inner trees to unaccustomed forces, resulting in an increased risk of failure to these trees.

7.8 A more permanent (and arguably aesthetically pleasing as the amenity will be less impacted) solution may be afforded by crown lifting to increase clearance above gardens, outhouses etc, but this is not proposed so cannot be considered under this application.

7.11 In conclusion, there appears no concerns of the health and condition of the tree and insufficient justification for the works has been provided.

7.12 The proposed works would have a detrimental impact on the amenity value of the area, and wildlife, and would not be in accordance with Policy CS11 and 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/24/00425 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 undue loss and detriment to the visual amenities of the locality and local wildlife. It is therefore contrary to policy CS11 and DM8 of the Havant Borough Core Strategy 2011 and the National Planning Policy Framework