
Site Address: 200 Park Avenue, Waterlooville, PO7 5EZ
Proposal: Fell 1.no Alder tree, fell 1 no. sycamore tree, removal of lowest lateral limb on south of 1no. Beech tree subject to TPO Group 1511.
Application No: APP/21/00441 Expiry Date: 27/05/2021
Applicant: Mr James Eyre
Agent: Mr David Farrington Case Officer: Maria Stewart
Sycamore Tree Surgeons
Ward: St Faiths

Recommendation: **REFUSE TPO CONSENT**

1 Site Description

200 Park Avenue, Waterlooville, PO7 5EZ

2 Planning History

92/57702/000 - Outline application for the erection of an attached 3 bedroom house to side and replacement garage to front o 200 Park Avenue., PERM,15/10/1992
07/57702/001 - Tree works., UNK,
08/57702/002 - Construction of 1No. semi-detached 3 bed house., REF,28/04/2008
09/57702/003 - Construction of 1No. 4 bed semi-detached dwelling., NPW,30/06/2011
GEN/10/00545 - Proposed tree work, ,28/09/2010
APP/10/00689 - Pollard 1No. Ash tree to 3m. Crown reduce by 30% 4No. Sycamore trees. All subject to TPO 1511., PERM,15/12/2010
APP/16/00324 - Two storey rear extension, alteration and extension of roof to create habitable accommodation to include new front gable and replacement chimney., REF,17/06/2016
APP/16/00669 - Two storey and single storey rear extension, alteration and extension of roof to create habitable accommodation to include barn hip to front and rear; replacement chimney., PERM,23/08/2016
GEN/18/00053 - Four semi detached dwellings., ,14/02/2018 15:00:44
APP/18/01184 - Demolition of existing dwelling and garage, erection of 2No.semi-detached 2 bed dwellings and 1No.3 bed detached chalet style bungalow, all with onsite allocated parking, access from Park Avenue. , REF,15/01/2019
APP/19/00391 - Demolition of existing dwelling and garage, erection of 2No.semi-detached 2 bed dwellings and 1No.3 bed detached chalet style bungalow, all with onsite allocated parking, access from Park Avenue. (Revised application)., REF,12/06/2019
APP/19/00702 - Two storey front and single storey rear and side canopy; render and cladding; fenestration alterations., PERM,24/12/2019

APP/21/00511 - Reduction in height of rear single storey extension from pitched roof to flat roof with parapet wall. Removal of three windows on North East elevation. Additional two windows (with obscure glass) in North East elevation dormer. Redesign of dormer on South West elevation to match length of North East Elevation. Overall reduction in area of windows from approx. 45m2 to 30m2. Addition of 4no. roof lights to flat roofs. Materials External Walls - Brickwork - Crest Harewood Blend / Render - Painted white Windows and External Doors - Velfac Aluminium - Anthracite Grey Pitched Roof & Dormer Cladding - Catnic SSR? roof system - Anthracite Grey Fascia, Soffits, Gutters, Downpipes - Aluminium - Anthracite Grey, INV,

3 Proposal

Fell 1.no Alder tree, fell 1 no. sycamore tree, removal of lowest lateral limb on south of 1no. Beech tree subject to TPO Group 1511.

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: 16

Number of site notices: 1

Statutory advertisement: Not applicable.

Number of representations received: 4

Comment	Officer Comment
I am the owner occupier of a property adjoining the site of the proposed works and fully support this application. The enormous elder and sycamore trees have zero amenity value, are overcrowded, unkempt and are far too large for an urban garden. They reduce the amount of natural daylight inside my home and have a detrimental effect on the outlook from the property. They cause severe shading and damage to footpaths and fencing. They should be felled immediately. The beech tree is also far too large for an urban garden and reduces the amount of natural daylight inside my home and has an additional detrimental effect on the outlook from the property. The removal of the lowest lateral limb should be permitted. It should be noted that one of this group of sycamore trees has already blown down; falling across my garden, demolishing a garden shed, wrecking an apple tree and causing minor damage to a greenhouse.	Comments noted.
I am the owner occupier of a property adjoining the site of the proposed works and fully support this application. The enormous elder and sycamore trees have zero amenity value, are overcrowded, unkempt and are far too large for an urban garden. They reduce the amount of natural daylight inside my home and have a detrimental effect on the outlook from the property. They cause severe shading and damage to footpaths and fencing. They should be felled immediately.	Duplicate

The beech tree is also far too large for an urban garden and reduces the amount of natural daylight inside my home and has an additional detrimental effect on the outlook from the property. The removal of the lowest lateral limb should be permitted. It should be noted that one of this group of sycamore trees has already blown down; falling across my garden, demolishing a garden shed, wrecking an apple tree and causing minor damage to a greenhouse.	
Ms. M Stewart. I received your letter on the 14th May 2021, dated 6th May 2021, however the letter states that the consultation period on this matter expires on the 23rd April 2021. I would appreciate it if you would confirm to me that this is a mistake and that the consultation period in fact will expire on the 23rd May 2021. If that is the case then please accept the following objections to this application. I wish to express my total objection to the proposed felling of 1 Alder tree and 1 Sycamore tree at 200 Park Avenue, Waterlooville, PO7 5EZ. The removal of said trees in my opinion would add to the increased risk of flooding to my and my neighbours gardens and property because the trees naturally consume water which obviously would not be consumed if the trees were removed. Surface water already accumulates in our gardens from time to time since the large willow tree which was on 200 Park Avenues property was removed by the owners, I understand that ,that also had a TPO order on it and yet that disappeared.	Comments noted

I am also unhappy about the impact that the removal of these trees would have on the local wildlife population, I thought that the current thinking was all about ' green ' issues, protecting and preserving more of the local habitat. If the trees were removed due to disease or some other issue, would they be replaced like for like? If not then is the owner planning on even more development of his land which would explain why he wants the trees removed, which would further increase the risk of flooding to our properties, which then takes us on to the issues of selling our properties and potential house price devaluation in the future? The number of trees etc; in my local area was also one of the considerations which encouraged us to buy our property in this location in the first place.	
It is not clear exactly what trees are wanting to be felled or the reason why this is being sought, but our major concern, in an area already prone to be very wet, is the risk of greater flooding in our back garden if further trees are removed, especially if these are large mature trees. We understand that Alder trees grow in wet areas so assume the one in question is helping the ground water situation in the area? Our back garden in wet weather already floods which was made worse some years ago when a very large willow tree was removed from the rear garden at 200 Park Avenue.	Comments noted

We assume your own experts will be assessing the area and trees yourself and can provide assurance that there is no increased risk to existing flooding problems if this planning application is agreed. There is also the wildlife and conservation aspect to removing trees which we are passionate about and trust features in your consideration. Thank you.	
---	--

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 Alder, one Sycamore and the pruning of one Beech. The trees grow as part of a group of trees in the rear garden of the property, in the north eastern corner.

The reasons given for the application are to let more light into the garden, the trees are one sided and not serving any purpose.

The Arboricultural Officer comments that given the location of the trees they are unlikely to be causing a significant light reduction to the garden or property. The trees are one sided as they are growing as a group. From a limited inspection (due to brambles and building work) they appeared to be adequately healthy.

The trees can be viewed from Park Avenue and also Alameda Road and form a green backdrop to the properties, therefore they are considered to have public amenity value.

The Beech tree has a low limb growing over the garden area which the applicant has applied to remove.

8 **Conclusion**

The works as a whole will have a negative impact on the street scene if carried out and there has been insufficient justification provided to allow these trees to be felled, therefore permission should be refused.

If the applicant wishes to submit a fresh application for the removal of the low limb on the Beech they entitled to do so.

9 **RECOMMENDATION:**

That the Head of Neighbourhood Support be authorised to **REFUSE TPO CONSENT** for application APP/21/00441 for the following reasons

- 1 The trees are significant features in the local landscape and appear to be in adequately sound and healthy condition and no evidence has been submitted to suggest otherwise. Their proposed felling 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.