

Recommendation: **RAISE NO OBJECTION**

DM8 (Conservation, Protection and Enhancement of Existing Natural Features)

Havant Borough Local Plan (Allocations) July 2014

Havant Borough Pre Submission Local Plan 2036

Emsworth Neighbourhood Plan Post Examination Version 2020

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

5 Statutory and Non Statutory Consultations

Chichester Harbour Conservancy

Conservation Officer

Councillor D Guest - St Faith's

Councillor J Branson - St Faiths

Councillor T Pike - St Faith's

Landscape Team, Havant Borough Council

Planning Application APP/20/01158 Wade Court Cottage, Wade Lane, Havant, PO9 2TB

Reduce height on 1No. Pittosporum (T1) by 3m and side by 0.5m back to previous pruning points, reduce height on 1No. Bay (T2) by 3m and side by 0.5m back to previous pruning points, reduce height on 2No. Holm Oaks (T3 & T4)) by 3 m and side by 1m back to previous pruning points, reduce height on 1No. Bay (T5) by 3 m and side by 1 m back to previous pruning points, reduce height on 1No. Pittosporum (T6) by 4m and side by 0.5m back to previous pruning points. All trees within Conservation Area of Wade Court.

From a landscape perspective we have no adverse comments in relation to this application.

Kind regards,

Harry Mitchell CMLI
Landscape Architect
Havant Borough Council

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: 6

Number of site notices: 1

Statutory advertisement: Not applicable.

Number of representations received: 1

Comment	Officer Comment
Letter dated 8 January 2021	

Summary:

Comment:

7 Planning Considerations

7.1 This notice of intent to undertake relate to work to trees within a Conservation Area. One public objection has been received. The essence of the objection is that the owner of the trees is proposing to take off less than the person objecting was hoping for and felt was necessary. The objection also queries whether previous pruning or biennial maintenance has been carried out – the application is for pruning “to previous pruning points”

We are only able to consider if the work that’s been applied for is appropriate in terms of arboricultural good practice and effect on amenity, unfortunately we are unable to take into account the fact that a neighbour considers the work to be insufficient. If a neighbour was of the view that too much was being taken off, that could be taken into account if the Planning Authority considered that the pruning was too hard in terms of effect on the tree or in terms of visual impact/loss of amenity value.

Regarding previous pruning points, all the species listed are evergreen and if they had been previously pruned this may not be visible unless the pruning was very recent. The person objecting may of course be in a position to know for sure that no previous pruning or biennial maintenance has ever been carried out.

I am unable to make site visits for the time being and there is no immediate prospect of site visiting being resumed. This is because of Coronavirus travel and working restrictions, my comments are therefore based on the information provided within the Application.

I feel that the work applied for is not unreasonable, given that the species Pittosporum and Holm Oak generally tolerate pruning extremely well. In this case whether any have been previously pruned, or whether biennial maintenance is being or is proposed to be carried out, is in my view not a material consideration

8 Conclusion

No objection

9 RECOMMENDATION:

That the Head of Neighbourhood Support be authorised to **RAISE NO OBJECTION** for application APP/20/01158