

Recommendation: **REFUSE TPO CONSENT**

1No Beech (T1) 12 meter North and South facing branch lengths to each side to be reduced by 1.3 meters from each side, leaving North and South facing branch lengths 10.5 meters each way. 9 meter East and West Facing branch lengths toward clients and rear neighbours house, limbs reduced by 1.2 meters. Leaving 7.8 meter East and West facing branch lengths. Reduce height from 20 meters by 2 meters to leave a height of 18 meters. Subject to TPO 0091.

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 Gillian Harris

Councillor Imogen Payter

Councillor Phil Munday - St Faiths

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: 7

Number of site notices: Not applicable.

Statutory advertisement: Not applicable.

Number of representations received: 0

Comment	Officer Comment

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 this tree and whether this could also be harmful to its ongoing health and vitality. .2 The report relates specifically to assessing the proposed works drawing upon the information submitted with the application.

7.3 When considering the application the local authority is guided by the national guidance 'Tree Preservation Orders and trees in conservation areas'.

7.4 The national guidance advises authorities when determining an application to protected trees to consider a range of criteria, which include the amenity value of the tree and the likely impact of the proposal on the amenity of the area; whether the proposal is justified, having regard to the reasons and information put forward in support of the application and potential loss or damage likely to arise if consent is refused.

7.5 The tree is a mature copper beech in the rear garden of the property address. It is not particularly visible from Langstone Road, but is highly visible from Longmead Gardens and the public footpath that runs to the north of the property.

7.6 The reason cited for the works is overhang to neighbouring gardens. No reports of damage or concerns over its safety are cited. The amounts recommended for removal as relatively small but will still result in loss of amenity, photosynthetic mass and will introduce multiple pruning wounds.

7.7 Beech are known for their poor response to pruning, and the regrowth will be less well attached and the works will need to be repeated at regular intervals.

7.8 A more permanent and aesthetically pleasing solution may be afforded by crown lifting to increase clearance above gardens etc, but this is not proposed.

7.11 In conclusion, there appears no concerns of the health and condition of the tree and insufficient justification for the works has been provided.

7.12 The proposed works would have a detrimental impact on the amenity value of the area, and wildlife, and would not be in accordance with Policy CS11 and DM8 of the Core Strategy (2011).

8 Conclusion

It is recommended that the works to the tree should be refused consent.

9 RECOMMENDATION:

That the Executive Head of Place be authorised to **REFUSE TPO CONSENT** for application APP/23/01055

(A)

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

- 1 The tree is an important feature in the local landscape and appears to be in adequately sound and healthy condition. The proposed works would result in undue loss and detriment to the visual amenities of the locality and local wildlife. It is therefore contrary to policy CS11 and DM8 of the Havant Borough Core Strategy 2011 and the National Planning Policy Framework.