

Recommendation: **REFUSE TPO CONSENT**

3 Proposal

Remove 2No. Sycamores. Subject to G1 of TPO 1779.

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 Gary Robinson

Councillor Kenneth Smith

Councillor Mark Inkster

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: 10

Number of site notices: 1

Statutory advertisement: Not applicable.

Number of representations received: 4

Comment	Officer Comment
My husband and I wholeheartedly support the request for the two sycamore trees to be removed - indeed I do not understand why they were granted TPO status in the first place, as neither have any visual amenity at all. I do remember that the TPO was requested by our neighbours at 13 Lodge Road when they got wind of the proposed development of the land at	Noted

the bottom of our gardens (affecting 13, 15, 17 and 19 Lodge Road). Although I cannot remember the detail of the TPO application (and am not sure how to find it on your website), I am fairly sure that it included a number of more interesting and unusual trees, including walnut, but all of these were cut down regardless, leaving just the two sycamores. The people at 13 Lodge Road, who submitted the original TPO did this with the sole purpose of trying to prevent the development of the land at the bottom of our gardens. Several trees were cut down anyway, the development went ahead and the couple at 13 Lodge Road have now passed away. To my knowledge, none of my immediate neighbours are in favour of the two sycamores remaining - they cast huge shadows over our gardens in the summer, drop vast numbers of seedlings in our garden which sprout at an alarming rate and surely they are too big for the gardens and too close to the houses at 41-41B Bedhampton Hill - in fact if they were to come down in our direction in a storm, they could cause a significant detrimental impact to our garden. They have no visual benefits to anyone in the immediate vicinity so I do not understand why previous requests by the applicants to remove these two trees keeps being rejected. There are still plenty of trees in the surrounding gardens, so I do not believe the removal of the two sycamores will have an adverse visual effect. I understand that the applicants propose replacing the sycamores and we would also welcome this. Please can this application be approved.	
I live at (Redacted) and am writing to you regarding the planning applications put in by 41b Bedhampton Hill regarding the felling of or cutting back	Noted

of the two sycamore trees which are under a TPO. I wish to oppose the felling of these two trees as they are an essential part of nature and believe this will have a detrimental effect to the wildlife that currently inhabit these trees. I have no issues with the planning application to cut back these trees however.	
Dear sir/madam I have received notification of the proposal to remove the 2 Sycamores 41 -41B Bedhampton hill Havant While I realise the need to crown these trees I most certainly would hate to see them removed. These trees are the only two left after many trees including an old Oak tree were felled between the visit from the council who expressed the intention to place a TPO on all of them and the owners receiving the TPO in the post 3 days later .To remove these remaining 2 trees would have a significant impact on local wildlife as there are very few large trees left in this area I welcome the opportunity to make my comments thank you .	Noted
Dear Sir My apologies for the direct email but I am unable to access my objection through your website. I am the owner of (redacted), Havant and am totally opposed to the removal of the 2 Sycamore trees in question. Kind regards	Noted
absolutely not happy with the second proposal made which is the complete removal of these 2 protected trees. It would first kill off so much wildlife it would then leave us exposed and overlooked by them which we do not want	Noted

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 My inspection related specifically to assessing the proposed works rather than generally inspecting the tree's health and condition in any great detail. I visually inspected the tree from ground level and the following report deals with the relevant issues that have been raised on site, in the application form and from my site observations.

7.3 This application to undertake works to trees protected by a Tree Preservation Order relates to the proposed felling of one Sycamore in the garden of 41A Bedhampton Hill and one Sycamore in the garden of 41B Bedhampton Hill.

The applicant has applied to fell the trees for the following reasons:

1. Loss of light in the home
2. Adversely affect solar panels
3. Forever digging out self seeded saplings
4. Leaf litter
5. Ongoing cost of trimming the trees
6. Paths at the front of the house are being moved by the roots and causing fence problems.

Along with the application, supporting documentation in the form of photos showing the trees trimmed previously, a report from MJC tree services dated November 2011 and a letter from a neighbour dated May 2015 has been submitted. This is all noted however the report and letter from a neighbour cannot be taken into consideration given the time which has passed since being written.

The Arboricultural Officer comments that both trees are mature and have been managed over the years with cyclical pruning. They now have a significant amount of re-growth. Although they are set back off the road they still offer public amenity value in the street scene, for example from Bedhampton Hill and Lodge Road to the rear.

The trees are located on the south west boundary of the property. They may cause some shading at times to the house and solar panels but not of a sufficient amount of hours to warrant their removal.

Self set saplings and leaf litter are again not sufficient reason in arboricultural terms to warrant the felling of these trees.

While there is a cost implication should the applicant wish to prune the trees again (subject to the relevant permission being sought), this is the applicant's choice and it is not sufficient reason to fell.

During the site visit no significant movement of paths was noted and no report has been submitted with the application to justify and support this reason for removing the trees.

In conjunction with this application the applicant has also submitted an application to crown reduce the trees back to the previous pruning points and this is being dealt with under APP/21/00381.

8 Conclusion

The trees appear to be healthy and offer public amenity value in the street scene. The concerns of the applicant are noted, however insufficient arboricultural justification has been provided to support the felling of the trees therefore permission should be refused.

9 RECOMMENDATION:

That the Head of Neighbourhood Support be authorised to **REFUSE TPO CONSENT** for application APP/21/00375

(A)

(B) for the following reasons/subject to the following conditions

- 1 The trees are significant features in the local landscape and appear to be in adequately sound and healthy condition. Their proposed felling would result in undue loss and detriment to the visual amenities of the locality. It is therefore contrary to policy DM8 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011 and the National Planning Policy Framework.