

Site Address: Mulberry Lodge, 26 New Brighton Road, Emsworth, PO10
7EW

Proposal: 1No.Acer Pseudoplatanus (Sycamore) (T1 on plan) Crown reduce by
5m leaving a height of 8-10m and canopy 3-4m or to suitable pruning points to allow
clear signals to reach existing transmission unit. Subject to TPO 1019.

Application No: APP/21/01044 **Expiry Date:** 01/12/2021

Applicant: Mr Alsford-Reed
Ground Control Ltd

Agent: Mr Alsford-Reed **Case Officer:** Maria Stewart
Ground Control Ltd

Ward: Emsworth

1 Site Description

2 Planning History

, UNK,

GEN/13/00880 - Removal of deadwood from trees at Mulberry Lodge covered by TPO., 09/10/2013

APP/16/01305 - Remove lowest south-west facing limb of 1No. Pine (T2); crown raise 1No. Pine (T5) to give 1.5m clearance ; remove two south-east facing limbs of 1No. Giant Redwood (T6). All trees subject to TPO 1844., PERM.20/01/2017

3 Proposal

1No.Acer Pseudoplatanus (Sycamore) (T1 on plan) Crown reduce by 5m leaving a height of 8-10m and canopy 3-4m or to suitable pruning points to allow clear signals to reach existing transmission unit. Subject to TPO 1019.

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 Julie Thain-Smith

Councillor Lulu Bowerman

Councillor R Kennett

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: 62

Number of site notices: 1

Statutory advertisement: Not applicable.

Number of representations received: 1

Comment	Officer Comment
The reason for the proposal is declared as 'to allow clear signals to reach existing transmission unit' however, probably Hants CC Highways, removed the transmission unit over a year ago as it related to an over-height vehicle warning system with a second post across the road and a sophisticated warning sign with warning amber flashing lights. It was removed after several years of problems with false alarms, failures to reset and has been replaced by a simple non-illuminated sign. The removed poles, both sides of the road were about 4 metres high, so cutting back to 5 metres does not sound like a solution to a problem that no longer exists. The freeholder of Aubrey Lodge should be quite aware of this as the fence had been built around the power and control unit at pavement level and the gap has been blocked off. There may be good safety reasons for the freeholder to review all the TPO'd trees on the development and take pruning action to prevent damage or injury from falling branches but with the increasing environmental emphasis on healthy trees I see no justification in the application as published to receive approval. The Site address cannot be 'Flat 26', that is just one of the many leasehold properties comprising Aubrey Lodge and surely should have come from the freeholder, Churchill Homes. [some additional text redacted for Data Protection/GDPR purposes]	Noted

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 application to undertake work to a tree protected by a Tree Preservation Order relates to the proposed crown reduction of one mature Lime tree located at the front of the property and one of a row of Limes and other trees along the frontage.

The application has listed the tree as a Sycamore however this would appear to be incorrect as it looks to be a Lime in the location shown on the plan provided with the application. The reason provided for the works is to allow clear signals to reach an existing transmission unit. Upon inspection there appears to be no transmission unit present nor has the agent provided any further correspondence to clarify this following my visit.

A detailed inspection of the tree was not undertaken however the Lime appeared to have good vigour and vitality for its age and species. It was historically pollarded but has put on extensive and mature regrowth. The owners of the property are also unaware of any transmission unit.

8 Conclusion

Insufficient information has been provided to justify the reduction proposed and a reduction of this extent would reduce the trees amenity value, therefore based on lack of supporting information this application should be refused.

9 RECOMMENDATION:

That the Head of Neighbourhood Support be authorised to **REFUSE TPO CONSENT** for application APP/21/01044 for the following reasons

- 1 This tree is a significant feature in the street scene and insufficient information has been supplied with the application or provided following enquiries to the agent to justify the work proposed.