

APP/16/00954 - Reduce by 3.5m overall to reshape 1No. Cherry Plum; reduce by 2m overall and remove 1 constricted central stem 1No. Cherry; remove dead, crossing or epicormic branches as necessary from all trees, all within Conservation Area of St Peters.

, RNO,

3 Proposal

Reduce by 3m overall 1No. Multi Stem Bay; remove to ground level 1No. Hawthorn; reduce to leave a standing height of 4m and width of 3m 1No. Holly; reduce to leave a standing height of 4.5m and width of 3m 1No. Holly; reduce to leave a standing height of 4.5m and total width of 3m group of multi stem Bay Trees, all within Conservation Area of St Peters.

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: St Peters

5 Statutory and Non Statutory Consultations

Conservation Officer

FAO Landscape Team, Technical Services - No 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: 5

Number of site notices: 1

Statutory advertisement: Not applicable.

Number of representations received: 0

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.

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.

Multi Stem Bay (T1): This mature Bay tree appears normal in vigour and vitality. It is located to the rear of the back garden of the property at a distance from the street scene and possesses little amenity value. A reduction of 3m overall would be of a level suitable to maintain it's presence without damaging it's health.

Hawthorn (T2): The Hawthorn is in the middle of the property's rear garden and lack any amenity value. A reduction down to ground level would be acceptable due to it's aggressive growth habit without causing detriment to it's health.

Holly (T3): This Holly is situated in the middle of the rear garden of the property next to the Hawthorn and does not provide much, if any, amenity value. The mature specimen in this application appears normal in vigour and vitality meaning a reduction in height to 4m and width to 3m would not cause any detriment to the health of the tree.

Holly (T4): This specimen is located next to the property and near the street scene therefore has high amenity value. The tree appears to be in an unhealthy condition and possibly dying. A maintenance pruning that would leave a standing height of 4.5m and a width of 3m would not add any detriment to the existing tree health as it is.

Multi Stem Bay (T5): The location of this Bay tree brings a high amenity value due to it's close proximity to the edge of the street scene. It is a mature specimen that appears in normal vigour and vitality. The crown reduction to a standing height of 4.5m and a overall width reduction to 3m is a reasonable level of maintenance work.

8 **Conclusion**

Raise No Objection

9 **RECOMMENDATION:**

That the Head of Neighbourhood Support be authorised to **RAISE NO OBJECTION** for application APP/16/00956

(A)

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

