
Site Address:	40 Bath Road, Emsworth, PO10 7ER		
Proposal:	Fell 8No. Leylandii within Conservation Area of Emsworth.		
Application No:	APP/15/00028	Expiry Date:	04/02/2015
Applicant:	Mr P Colin	Team:	Team 2
Agent:	Mr J Bream	Case Officer:	Jamie Gargett
Ward:	Emsworth		

Recommendation: **RAISE NO OBJECTION**

1 Site Description

Rear garden to a residential dwelling.

2 Planning History

None relevant

3 Proposal

Fell 8No. Leylandii within Conservation Area of Emsworth.

4 Policy Considerations

Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) March 2011

DM8 (Conservation, Protection and Enhancement of Existing Natural Features)

Listed Building Grade: Not applicable.

Conservation Area: Emsworth

5 Statutory and Non Statutory Consultations

Conservation Officer: None received.

Chichester Harbour Conservancy: None received.

Landscape Team - 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: 2

Summary: We would be pleased to see the works proceed as this would enable more light to enter our house. I therefore have no objection to the proposal.

Comment: Noted.

Summary: Item 7 states the reason for felling the trees is 'to prevent further damage to the garage'. It is not clear which garage this refers to but presumably it is the one for number 40. Item 8 asks whether the reasons for the proposed works include alleged damage to property. This has been answered as No which contradicts Item 7. Item 10 asks that evidence is provided in support of the 'stated reasons'. This has been answered by ticking the relevant items to indicate that it has but no further evidence has been provided.

In conclusion I ask that the application is refused on the basis that no evidence has been provided to demonstrate the damage to the garage which is the reason stated for felling the trees.

Comment: The sections of supporting evidence for tree related damage is concerned with technical reports where by a tree is causing indirect damage. In this instance no indirect or technical damage has been noted. In addition the trees are not quality specimens and do not meet the TEMPO criteria for a TPO.

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:

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.

The trees subject of this Section 211 Notification are semi-mature Leyland Cypress offering no public amenity value due to their position being a double storey garage and residential dwelling. The trees are sandwiched between these built structures: 3m from the garage and 4m from the dwelling.

The trees/hedge do not meet the criteria for a TPO and as such the Council must raise No objection to the works as it is neither defensible or in the public interest to make a TPO.

8 Conclusion

Raise No Objection.

9 RECOMMENDATION:

That the Executive Head of Planning and Built Environment be authorised to **RAISE NO OBJECTION** for application APP/15/00028.

