
Site Address: 57 Silverdale Drive, Waterloooville, PO7 6DN
Proposal: Fell 1No Oak (ref 1). 1No. Oak (ref 2) Reduce crown height by 3 metres, leaving crown height of 12 metres and reduce crown spread by 5 metres leaving crown spread of 7 metres. Subject to TPO 1578.
Application Type: Works to TPO Tree
Application No: APP/23/00309 Expiry Date: 30/06/2023
Applicant: Ms B Cornelius
Agent: Case Officer: Peter Slegg
Ward: Hart Plain

Recommendation: **REFUSE TPO CONSENT**

1 Site Description

57 Silverdale Drive, Waterloooville, PO7 6DN

2 Planning History

90/55075/000 - Construction of dormers to front and rear elevations, PERM,
APP/12/00376 - Remove existing conservatory. Construction of single storey rear extension and new conservatory to rear., PERM,31/05/2012
APP/14/00041 - Crown reduction of 3m to the SE aspect and 2m reduction in height to Oak subject to TPO 1578., PERM,17/02/2014
56/04551 - for the erection of 123 houses and bungalows, UNK,11/09/1956

3 Proposal

Fell 1No Oak (ref 1). 1No. Oak (ref 2) Reduce crown height by 3 metres, leaving crown height of 12 metres and reduce crown spread by 5 metres leaving crown spread of 7 metres. Subject to TPO 1578.

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 Carly Scannell - Hart Plain

Councillor David Jenner

Councillor E Shimbart - Hart Plain

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: 5

Number of site notices: 1

Statutory advertisement: Not applicable.

Number of representations received: 2

Comment	Officer Comment
I strongly oppose felling a beautiful and healthy oak tree that is in a line of trees under preservation. It also acts as a screen to hide from our view a huge pylon. We are trying to keep our trees not chop them down for no reason. I welcome you to my property to view these trees	The comments received are welcomed and considered within the planning considerations.
We have sent a letter but in case it does not arrive we strongly oppose the felling of the oak tree at 57 Silverdale Drive. It is under preservation order. It also hides a ugly pylon from our view. It is in perfect condition and I urge you please to come to my property (Redacted) Silverdale Drive to see the devastating affect on our outlook. This application has been previously refused before they are in a complete row all healthy, thank you	The comments received are welcomed and considered within the planning considerations.
See representation under documents tab rcvd 23.05.23	

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 Policy DM8 of the Core Strategy (2011) seeks to protect natural features of amenity importance and would permit development where these features are

protected and enhanced.

- 7.4 When considering the application the local authority is guided by the national guidance 'Tree Preservation Orders and trees in conservation areas'.
- 7.5 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
- 7.6 The trees are a pair of mature oaks trees that form part of a historic hedgerow, which make an important contribution to the character and appearance of the area. The collective nature of the trees as part of a group, their size and age, result in the trees having a significant impact on the amenity of the area. Whilst there are other mature trees within the vicinity of the trees in question, the removal of one tree and reduction of the other would have a detrimental impact on the amenity of the area and therefore, in accordance with national guidance the higher the amenity value of the tree the stronger the reasons needed before consent for works should be granted.
- 7.7 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.
- 7.8 There is no supporting information to indicate either tree is suffering from ill health and the trees are not directly interfering with an adjacent structure, but T1 is growing towards the owners property. When considering the proposed works the local authority should consider the amenity value of the tree in question, how the amenity value would be affected by the proposed work and the reasons given for the application.
- 7.9 T1 and T2 have a high amenity value to the area, as noted in the two objections received, and therefore the reasons for works to each tree would need to be justified based on sound arboricultural reasons. The proposed works to reduce the crown of T2 are not considered acceptable and there are no clear reasons to undertake the works. Equally, the proposed works to remove T1 due to the tree being compromised by T2 and growing towards the house are not reasonable reasons to remove the tree.
- 7.10 The proposed works would have a detrimental impact on the amenity value of the area, result in a loss of wildlife habitat and would not be in accordance with Policy CS11, CS16 and DM8 of the Core Strategy (2011).

8 **Conclusion**

Refuse

9 **RECOMMENDATION:**

That the Executive Head of Place be authorised to **REFUSE TPO CONSENT** for application APP/23/00309 subject to the following conditions

- 1 The tree is a significant feature in the local landscape and appears to be in adequately sound and healthy condition. Its proposed felling would result in undue loss and detriment to the visual amenities of the locality. [A more appropriate course of action would be through management of the tree's size and impact through a scheme of approved surgery.] It is therefore contrary to policy DM8 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011 and the National Planning Policy Framework.