
Site Address: 64B Stakes Road, Waterlooville, PO7 5NU
Proposal: Fell 1no.Beech T1 subject to TPO 2091. Pollard 1no. Beech T2 to a height of 4 metres subject to TPO 2091.
Application No: APP/21/00512 Expiry Date: 16/07/2021
Applicant: Mr Jonathan Clucas
Agent: Case Officer: Maria Stewart
Ward: Purbrook

Recommendation: **REFUSE TPO CONSENT**

1 Site Description

64B Stakes Road, Waterlooville, PO7 5NU

2 Planning History

APP/19/00719 - Tree works, UNK,
APP/19/00920 - Part first floor side extension incorporating roof alterations, part single storey rear extension; garage door to front elevation of existing attached garage., PERM,22/11/2019
APP/19/00927 - TPO 2091, UNK,
APP/19/01182 - Tree works., INV,
GEN/20/00520 - Tree works response from Maria Stewart, ,20/07/2020
APP/20/00961 - Crown reduction to 1No. Beech (T1) and 1No. Beech (T2). Subject to TPO 2091., UNK,
APP/20/01193 - Crown reduce 2No. Beech (T1 and T2) by 2m, and crown raise over road to 7m and crown raise over garden and footpath to 4m, to leave a crown height of 18m and crown spread of 17m. Subject to TPO 2091., PERM,23/02/2021
APP/21/00528 - Tree works, UNK,

3 Proposal

Fell 1no.Beech T1 subject to TPO 2091. Pollard 1no. Beech T2 to a height of 4 metres subject to TPO 2091.

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 Gary Hughes

Councillor Husky Patel

Councillor Ms C Howard - Purbrook Ward

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: 4

Comment	Officer Comment
We support this application on safety grounds. We had our beech tree removed on safety worries due to shallow roots and the fact of dropping large branches. We would support the application as it would take a great worry off our shoulders.	Noted
In Oct 2018, I presented a deputation to the DMC, who were considering applying a TPO to what were (at the time) the two unprotected trees at the above address. I was arguing against the proposed TPO. An extract from that Deputation: The temporary TPO decision has, by its nature had a significant, arguably pecuniary impact on that property. In the current climate, under permitted development rights, a resident can extend upwards, outwards, sideways with almost no prior permission.	Noted

However, if these TPO's are approved any person now considering purchasing this property cannot even widen the driveway for 'fear' of damage to a very large tree that has clearly outgrown its site and that was never protected. We all know that cars are getting bigger and no longer fit in the garages and driveways of older properties without some accommodation. This property has been in the same family for 50 years. Access to this site is potentially hazardous, egress is even more so as the tree at the front of the property blocks the view onto a main road. It is less of a problem at the rear. The tree at the front of the property is large. Its roots are well established and while the officers report indicate only minor possible damage to the surrounding area, the resident has reported internal cracks being evident and in every likelihood that given time, related damage will occur to the property given its close proximity. However, the TPO was implemented. To see an application coming forward as indicated is unsurprising. I believe that the proposed works are minimal and it is hoped that the tree at the rear of the property will look far better than the unprotected tree on the adjacent plot that has been subjected to extreme pruning.	
The trees have provided shelter, food and home for a variety of insects and birdlife for decades. They give valuable shade and privacy to local houses and gardens. We should be planting trees to help the environment and reduce carbon emissions not cutting them down.	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 works to trees protected by a Tree Preservation Order relates to the proposed felling of one Beech numbered T1 and Pollarding to 4m of one Beech numbered T2.

7.4. The Beech tree identified as T1 is located in the front garden of the property, and contained within a brick built wall. Upon inspection, as far as it was reasonable to see the tree appeared to be healthy and structurally sound. The tree has recently been crown reduced and crown lifted as per permission APP/20/01193 which was granted on the 23/2/21.

7.5 The Beech tree identified as T2 is located at the rear of the property, adjacent to the driveway entrance and adjacent to Fir Copse Road. As far as it was reasonable to see the tree appeared to be healthy and structurally sound. It stands adjacent to the driveway entrance. The tree has recently been crown reduced and crown lifted as per permission APP/20/01193 which was granted on the 23/2/21.

The applicant wishes to fell Beech tree T1 in the front garden for the following reasons:

- Concern about branches dropping into garden and road and causing damage/injury
- Damage to the driveway from the roots (trip hazard)
- No natural light into the property
- Received a letter/complaint from a concerned neighbour.

The application wishes to pollard to 4m Beech tree T2 in the rear garden for the following reasons:

- Concern about branches dropping into garden and road and causing damage/injury
- No natural light into the property

The applicant has provided photographs showing the trees (prior to the pruning having been carried out) and various branches which have fallen from the trees, along with photos of the driveway cracks. He has also supplied a report from a company called Mi Building Surveyors dated October 2020 and a tree condition inspection from Forget-me-not rail (no qualifications provided).

The Arboricultural Officer comments that while it is noted that branches may have fallen at times, the trees have since had a 2m crown reduction undertaken and this will certainly reduce the amount of branches that may fall. No evidence has been provided to suggest the trees are structurally compromised and nothing was noted during the site visit.

Trees can sometimes shed small branches during inclement weather conditions and it is important that the trees are regularly inspected by a suitably qualified person.

The cracks in the driveway at the front of the property were noted and considered to be fairly minor movement. The driveway could be re-layed (in a tree friendly way) to help rectify this and without involving the removal of the Beech T1.

The applicant mentions loss of light however both trees have recently been reduced and lifted, therefore more light will now enter the property.

The building report noted the uneven surface at the front of the property but states nothing about the trees other than the tree at the front of the property being within falling distance of the house and that its roots could reach the foundations.

The tree condition inspection states nothing about the structural integrity of the trees being compromised.

For T1 it states:

"Tree is dropping branches into the driveway, public footpath and a busy road. Tree roots damaged the driveway and possibly the foundations of the building. In case of windy weather conditions there is a high possibility of the tree breaking off and damaging the property mentioned above as well as it may be in direct danger to the pedestrians or other road users".

For T2 it states:

"the tree is dropping branches into the garden as well as the driveway, public footpath and the road. The roots have caused a damage to the back driveway. The tree's crown shades most of the garden. In case of windy conditions there is a real danger of the tree seriously damaging the property as well as falling into the pathway of moving vehicles and pedestrians".

Again, the driveways could be rectified by re-surfacing, in a way that does not damage the tree roots. The risk of falling branches has been reduced by the trees having now been reduced and lifted. No evidence has been provided to suggest that the roots are causing damage to foundations.

During the site visit it was noted that a large outbuilding has been erected beneath the canopy of T2 and which is to be investigated.

8 Conclusion

The two trees subject of this application are extremely significant specimens within the street scene and therefore have significant public amenity value, the felling of Beech T1 and Pollarding of Beech T2 would be a significant loss of amenity. No substantive evidence has been provided allow these two important trees to be removed and pollarded, therefore this application should be refused.

9 RECOMMENDATION:

That the Head of Neighbourhood Support be authorised to **REFUSE TPO CONSENT** for application APP/21/00512 for the following reason

- 1 The trees are significant features in the local landscape and appear to be in adequately sound and healthy condition. The proposed felling of T1 and pollarding of T2 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.