

Councillor Narinder Bains - Cowplain

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
This tree sits squarely across the boundary of 45 and 47 Longwood Avenue. No problem with reducing height by 3m to 13m and crown lift to 4m from the ground. We measure the spread to be nearer 20m (at least 10-11 metres on 47 Longwood Avenue side alone) so we are questioning the measurement that says the crown spread will be reduced by 2.5m leaving a spread of 8.5m. We are comfortable with the crown spread being reduced overall by 2.5, up to 1.5m on 47 Longwood Avenue side. What we will not accept is the the overall crown being 8.5m. We wonder whether this is a mistake and it should read 18.5m.	

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. This application relates to the proposed crown reduction reduce and raise to a tree subject to a Tree Preservation Order. The specimen is a large beech which highly visible in the street scene, and in good condition as viewed from Longwood Avenue. No compelling reason has been provided and the reduction work can only reduce the amenity value that this tree offers.

8 **Conclusion**

Refuse

9 **RECOMMENDATION:**

That the Head of Neighbourhood Support be authorised to **REFUSE TPO CONSENT** for the following reasons

- 1 The tree is a significant feature in the local landscape and appears to be in adequately sound and healthy condition. The tree surgery proposed in the deposited application would result in excessive reduction of the tree's landscape impact and undue 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.