

Chichester Harbour Conservancy Comments on planning applications (decided under officers' delegated powers)

The applicant's arguments are unconvincing and the Conservancy is concerned that the tree felling of non TPO trees may have occurred during the bird nesting season. This tree has grown for many years and appears to have peacefully co-existed with livestock for a great deal of that period. No documentary evidence - (despite this being alluded to in answer 7 on the submitted application form) - or veterinarian's report was submitted to justify felling the TPO tree, nor an arboricultural report submitted/placed on the council website, setting out the grading of the tree to be felled or its current state of health. The Conservancy is somewhat confused with the case officer report which at one turn talks about pruning, when the intent of the applicant is clear - to fell. Reference is made to removing an already damaged tree, when the impression given is that the applicant is seeking to fell an undamaged tree covered by the TPO. It is noted that the application has been determined and a replacement Oak tree sought. The Conservancy remains unconvinced about the applicant's justification and how much weight the council has given to that in reaching its decision. The amenity value of the tree ought to have prevailed and unless its health was failing, the Conservancy, for the record, opposes such felling, should further applications be received in the future.

Application No:	Site:	Application Details:	Recommendation:
APP/15/00196	LAND ADJACENT BARN CLOSE, HAVANT ROAD, EMSWORTH	FELL1NO. SYCAMORE TREE (T7) SUBJECT TO TPO 1922	The Local Planning Authority is advised that the Conservancy recommends refusal of this application.