

DELEGATED OFFICER REPORT

Site 32 King Street, Emsworth, PO10 7AZ

Address:

Proposal: 1No. Conifer (marked as T1 on the plan) cut back to the boundary line.

3No. Leylandii trees (marked as T2, T3 and T4 on the plan) cut back to the boundary line.

1No. Elder (marked as T5 on the plan) cut back to the boundary line.

2No. Leylandii (marked as T6 and T7 on the plan) cut back to the boundary line.

1No. Yew tree (marked as T8 on the plan) cut back to the boundary line.

1No. UKS (marked as T9 on the plan) cut back to the boundary line.

2No. Rowan trees (marked as T10 and T11 on the plan) cut back to the boundary line.

1No. Macrocarpa (marked as T12 on the plan) 1.5m reduction from the canopy with no cut size wider than 3cm in diameter.

Application Type: Conservation Area Tree

Application No: APP/24/00715

Expiry Date: 18/11/2024

Applicant: Dr Taylor

Agent:

Case Officer: Tree Officer

Ward: Emsworth

Recommendation: **RAISE NO OBJECTION**

1 Site Description

32 King Street, Emsworth, PO10 7AZ

2 Planning History

09/70946/000 - Single storey side extension (north), removal of chimney and demolition of outbuilding., PERM,14/12/2009

09/70946/001 - Conservation Area Consent for the removal of chimney and demolition of outbuilding., PERM,14/12/2009

10/70946/002 - Replacement of all existing windows., UNK,

APP/15/01186 - Proposed orangery to east elevation., PERM,11/12/2015

GEN/17/00491 - History Search., ,10/05/2017 14:07:08

GEN/19/00963 - Fell 1No Crab Apple under DDD., UNK,11/12/2019

APP/21/00796 - Removal of dilapidated store, construction of porch to south west elevation, garage and store/summer room, windows blocked in on south east elevation, internal alterations., PERM,08/09/2021

APP/24/00101 - Proposed ramp and raised planters (retrospective application) ,
PERM,16/04/2024
APP/24/00102 - Listed Building Application for retention of access ramp and raised
planters., PERM,16/04/2024

3 Proposal

1No. Conifer (marked as T1 on the plan) cut back to the boundary line.
3No. Leylandii trees (marked as T2, T3 and T4 on the plan) cut back to the boundary line.
1No. Elder (marked as T5 on the plan) cut back to the boundary line.
2No. Leylandii (marked as T6 and T7 on the plan) cut back to the boundary line.
1No. Yew tree (marked as T8 on the plan) cut back to the boundary line.
1No. UKS (marked as T9 on the plan) cut back to the boundary line.
2No. Rowan trees (marked as T10 and T11 on the plan) cut back to the boundary line.
1No. Macrocarpa (marked as T12 on the plan) 1.5m reduction from the canopy with no cut
size wider than 3cm in diameter.

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: Emsworth

5 Statutory and Non Statutory Consultations

Chichester Harbour Conservancy

Conservation Officer

Councillor Charles Robert

Councillor Grainne Rason

Councillor Reuben Mychaleckyj

Landscape Team, Havant Borough Council
No landscape objection.

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: 18

Number of site notices: At least one site notice exists - check the number.

Statutory advertisement: Not applicable.

Number of representations received: 3

Comment	Officer Comment
<p>It is usual in an application dealing with the cutting of trees to specify exactly how much will be cut off from an individual tree. The applicant simply states 'cut back to the boundary line'. What is the precise definition of the boundary line? Is it their edge of the wall, the neighbour's edge of the wall or behind this? More precision would be appreciated.</p> <p>The health of the tree is surely the top priority. Some of the trees catalogued for cutting back are conifers. Often these do not recover from radical pruning. Is the fact that some debris might fall onto a neighbouring property sufficient cause to imperil a large established tree?</p> <p>It should be emphasised that the no debris must be put over the wall into the neighbouring garden where the trees are placed. This is the responsibility of the applicant to dispose of.</p> <p>A blanket request to cut back every tree on a border seems rather unorthodox. There are many trees belonging to municipalities that hang over neighbouring properties and many neighbours who share the same delight in a bordering tree.</p> <p>The macrocarpa is a joyous tree seen from those walking up King Street. Cutting this back to the boundary will surely endanger the tree and certainly the view. I object to the radical nature of this particular request.</p>	<p>Noted and discussion has taken place with the applicant</p>
<p>Hi there.</p>	<p>Noted - no the trees will not be felled and this has been discussed with the REPLET</p>

<p>The current planning documents for this proposal are very hard to see. I wish to see a clearer plan of the the trees being cut.</p> <p>Also it states that this is within a conservation area in which no trees or adverse effects to wild life should be allowed.</p> <p>Also the application states that the trees will be cut back to the boundary, what does this mean? Does this mean they will be felled completely?</p>	
<p>In the sketch plan provided, the contact name and address of an adjoining property is clearly stated. I have always been given to understand that an applicant should avoid identifying personal details of people in documents that are to be placed online in the public domain.</p>	<p>Noted</p>

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 is a S211 Notification and, following discussion with the applicant and a resubmission the S211, is now considered to be good practice in terms of tree management.

8 **Conclusion**

RNO

9 **RECOMMENDATION:**

That the Executive Head of Place be authorised to **RAISE NO OBJECTION** for application APP/24/00715

(A)

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

- 1 The tree works for which consent is hereby granted shall not be carried out otherwise than in full accordance with all relevant content of BS 3998 (2010).
Reason: In the interests of tree health and safety.

- 2 The tree works for which consent is hereby granted shall be carried out and completed no later than one year from the date of this decision notice.
Reason: To control the timing of the works