
Site Address: 24 Southleigh Road, Havant, PO9 2RS
Proposal: Crown raise 1No. Oak (T1) by 4m; crown reduction of 2m overhanging road and path, 3m over driveway and to height, subject to TPO 2033.
Application No: APP/15/00560 Expiry Date: 16/07/2015
Applicant: Ms Nicola Hussey Team: Team 1
Agent: Mr Steve Wilson Case Officer: Jamie Gargett
All Seasons Tree Surgeons
Ward: St Faiths

Recommendation: **REFUSE TPO CONSENT**

1 Site Description

The tree is located within the front garden of the residential property.

2 Planning History

None relevant.

3 Proposal

Crown raise 1No. Oak (T1) by 4m; crown reduction of 2m overhanging road and path, 3m over driveway and to height, subject to TPO 2033.

4 Policy Considerations

National Planning Policy Framework

Listed Building Grade: Not applicable.

Conservation Area: Not applicable.

5 Statutory and Non Statutory Consultations

None

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: 6

Number of site notices: 1

Statutory advertisement: Not applicable.

Number of representations received: 1 Objection.

Summary:

1. No valid reason has been given for this work other than that the tree overhangs the road and path. This tree has done this for several decades; I do not see why this work is required now.

2. Reasons for the proposed work do not relate to the tree's condition, alleged subsidence or other structural damage.

3. The proposal is excessive and detrimental - it is not in accordance with industry best practice nor BS3998:2010. The excessive reduction proposed would render the oak as a 'lollipop' and as the tree tries to compensate for all the lost leafing area and stored reserves, it would end up looking like a mass of 'shaving brushes' as each cut branch sprouts numerous growths. It could result in die-back and entry by pathogens.

4. This tree is very prominent in the street scene and has high visual amenity value. This would be drastically affected by the current proposal.

Comment:

1. The reason given for the tree works is detailed enough to allow for validation of the application.

2. This is not required for the submission of a tree work application. Crown reduction, crown lifting operations are not viewed as a successful remedy for subsidence.

3. Noted and agreed.

4. Noted and agreed.

7 Planning Considerations

Having regard to the relevant policies of the development plan it is considered that the main issues arising from this application are:

My inspection related specifically to assessing the proposed works rather than generally inspecting the trees 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.

The tree is a large sized Oak and appears to be presenting normal vigour and vitality and contributes well to the street scene.

The proposed works outlined within this application are considered to be excessive in relation to the impact on the tree's visual amenity value and also the health of the tree, it can be argued that works applied for are not in line with industry best practice or BS3998:2010 and as such a refusal is recommended.

The Oak could be crown lifted (under application), which would not be detrimental to the health of the tree or impact negatively on the public amenity offered by it.

8 Conclusion

Refuse Permission.

9 RECOMMENDATION:

That the Executive Head of Planning and Built Environment be authorised to **REFUSE TPO CONSENT** for application APP/15/00560, for the following reasons:

- 1 The tree is a significant feature in the local landscape and appears to be in adequately sound and healthy condition. The tree surgery proposed in the deposited application would result in excessive reduction of the tree's landscape impact and undue 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 2012.