

DELEGATED OFFICER REPORT

Site Address: 18 & 18a Latchmore Forest Grove, Waterlooville, PO8 8XG
Proposal: Fell 2 No Common Oak. Trees subject to TPO Group 0927.
Application Type: Works to TPO Tree
Application No: APP/24/00672 Expiry Date: 18/11/2024
Applicant: Miss L McBride
Agent: Case Officer: Tree Officer
Ward: Cowplain

Recommendation: **REFUSE TPO CONSENT**

1 **Site Description**

18 & 18a Latchmore Forest Grove, Waterlooville, PO8 8XG

2 **Planning History**

APP/11/01306 - Reduce canopy to north and south by 1m, remove crossing limbs and deadwood, 1No. Oak tree. Crown raise to 2.5m, remove limb over garage and reduce canopy to west and south by 2m, 1No. Oak tree. Both trees within Group 1 of TPO 0927., PERM,21/09/2011

GEN/15/00135 - Proposed porch., UNK,

APP/20/00954 - Reduce crown spread on 1No. Oak tree (T1) by 4.5m leaving a crown spread of 9.5m. Reduce crown spread on 1No. Oak tree (T2) over neighbouring garden by 4.5m leaving a crown spread of 12.5m, within Group G1, subject to TPO 0927., PERM,29/01/2021

3 **Proposal**

Fell 2 No Common Oak. Trees subject to TPO Group 0927.

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 Andrew Briggs

Councillor D Keast - Cowplain

Councillor Neil Bowdell - 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: 17

Number of site notices: Not applicable.

Statutory advertisement: Not applicable.

Number of representations received: 5

Comment	Officer Comment
I wish to strongly object to the above application on the grounds that removing these trees will have a very serious impact on my privacy. There will also be a negative environmental impact on the habitat of many different and varied species of wildlife..	Noted
I vehemently disapprove of the felling of any of the trees under the above application and there is a Tree Preservation Order in place for a very good reason. Not only is it something that I personally feel strongly about and I enjoy the sheer beauty and magnificence of the trees, I also feel strongly about the importance of them. They house so many insects, animals and birds and provide shade for plants and hedgerows etc. These trees should be saved at all cost and more needs to be planted rather than have any more removed especially in our dangerous climate changes. Surely we have learned enough by now to know better than to make such monstrous decisions.	Noted

<p>I strongly object to the felling of these two mature oak trees, remnants of the ancient Forest of Bere.</p> <p>They will be supporting an abundance of insects, for birds and for foraging bats. Oak trees in particular are suitable habitat for bats, and they need mature trees to roost and to hibernate in, for shelter and protection. These two trees will be helping to form their commuting route needed to forage for insects.</p> <p>The reasons given to fell these trees are very slight:</p> <p>[redacted]</p>	<p>Noted</p>
<p>?To The Tree manager</p> <p>Reference to APP/24/00672</p> <p>If this application is approved, are the people who applied for this prepared to pay for the cost of felling the trees, also these TPO have been in place for at least 50 yrs ago by havant council this has prevented us from taking down these trees years ago at a much smaller cost.</p> <p>So believe havant council should bear some response ability and should bear some of the cost to fell these trees.</p> <p>Also the application is wrong the trees are not on 18a land and the other thing one of the trees shown is not on 18 property but on 16b property.</p>	
<p>.These beautiful mature oak trees contribute greatly to the amenity value of adjacent properties and nearby public spaces. They are a haven for wildlife and have been a significant feature of the landscape since long before the applicants moved in, indeed since long before their house was built.</p> <p>The location of the trees, beyond the very end of the garden, is much too far from the house for the roots to affect the foundations, and the applicants have not established that the perceived damage to the path, patio shed,</p>	<p>Noted</p>

and fence is related to the presence of the trees.

In fact it is questionable whether any damage has actually occurred. The photographs show a fence that is very old and dilapidated; some cracks in a piece of low quality concrete with no context - they could be anywhere - and a shed whose roof appears to be mossy, but intact. I've never before heard of a dog being injured by falling branches. If this has indeed happened it is an extraordinary freak occurrence which is extremely unlikely to recur.

But even if there is real damage, and even if it can be all be blamed on the trees, this is still insufficient reason to fell them. These are all insubstantial structures with short design lives, which can easily be repaired or replaced - unlike the trees, which could take a century or more to grow back to their current stature.

In fact if damage has really occurred, removing such large mature trees is likely to make things worse, owing to the ground heave that will result from shrinkage of the dead roots.

As for the shade being "excessive", this is entirely subjective. If the applicants don't like mature trees, the wildlife they harbour, and the dappled shade they provide, they shouldn't have moved into this house!

Please refuse this application, and save our trees!

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 The trees subject to this application form an attractive row and contribute to the local area, the damage reported has not been substantiated by a surveyor and as such should not be considered as a reasonable reason to remove the trees. If the trees are of a concern then the home owner has the option to contact their building insurer and make representation. In addition the applicant has the option to contact a tree surgeon and request that any dead branches are removed.

8 **Conclusion**

Refuse

9 **RECOMMENDATION:**

That the Executive Head of Place be authorised to **REFUSE TPO CONSENT** for application APP/24/00672 for the following reasons

- 1 The trees are 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. It is therefore contrary to policy DM8 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011 and the National Planning Policy Framework.
- 2 The trees are significant features in the local landscape It is therefore contrary to policy DM8 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011 and the National Planning Policy Framework.