
Site Address:	Trees rear of 24-40 Monterey Drive, Havant, PO9 5TQ		
Proposal:	Fell row of 8No. Macaracarpa; all trees within G2 of TPO 1499.		
Application No:	APP/14/00457	Expiry Date:	28/07/2014
Applicant:	Mr S Rajchel	Team:	Team 1
Agent:		Case Officer:	Jamie Gargett
Ward:	Bondfields		

Recommendation: **REFUSE TPO CONSENT**

1 Site Description

A linea planting of mature Macrocarpa that run behind a row of two story residential dwellings.

2 Planning History

There is extant permission for reduction works to some of these trees.

3 Proposal

Fell row of 8No. Macaracarpa; all trees within G2 of TPO 1499.

4 Policy Considerations

Core Strategies 2011 forming part of the HBLDF
DM8 (Conservation, Protection and Enhancement of Existing Natural Features)

Listed Building Grade: Not applicable.

Conservation Area: Not applicable.

5 Statutory and Non Statutory Consultations

Planning Officer Consultation response: I consider that the trees to the rear of 14-24 Monterey Drive are important to the visual amenities of the streetscene, providing an attractive green back drop the built form. However, I also consider that there is a good degree of overbearing to the gardens and rear windows of the semi-detached dwellings to the west of the cul-de-sac, as the trees within this section are at their most dense.

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: 25

Number of site notices: 1

Statutory advertisement: Not applicable.

Number of representations received:

Summary: These properties are owned/managed by Guinness Hermitage. They have a history of requesting the felling of trees with TPO's on their land. The trees in this application are neither diseased nor causing damage, they are just deemed by GH to be a nuisance to the garden amenity.

Comment: Noted

Summary: These trees appear not to have been managed at all by Guinness Hermitage and so allowed to grow that they now overshadow the back gardens. Guinness then seeks, as a solution to lack of duty, to fell the whole row of eight trees.

Comment: Noted

Summary: May I suggest a less drastic solution of a severe pruning/lopping. Or, very worse case scenario, felling every other tree and severe pruning/lopping of the remaining trees.

Comment: The proposal is noted, GH are not open to discussion regarding alternative works.

Summary: We purchased our property in front of these trees with the understanding that they were PROTECTED and could not be felled. They were one of the main attractions in buying this property due to not only the privacy but the abundant nature that is in this area.

Comment: 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:

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 trees 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 application are large mature Macrocarpa with dead wood present throughout their canopies and offering high public amenity value to the street scene and surrounding area.

The Macrocarpa are very large trees in their location and will impact negatively on the useability of some of the garden areas of Monterey Drive, however not all gardens are affected by the presence of the trees, due to location and distance from the trees. Rather than felling the entire row causing a detrimental impact on the local landscape other options were explored with the applicant Hermitage Housing Association such as additional reduction works and/or selective thinning (felling) of the stand. These alternatives were rejected by Hermitage.

It is acknowledged that the trees require maintenance works to alleviate some of the

problems highlighted in this application - shading and needle drop so that the residents can have greater enjoyment of their gardens, however the large scale felling applied for is considered excessive in this instance and due to the fact that a reduction to lesser works is not agreeable by Hermitage there is no other option in this case but to recommend refusal.

There has not been any reference made in the application relating to the condition of the trees or any concerns raised relating to safety.

8 Conclusion

Recommend refusal.

9 RECOMMENDATION:

That the Executive Head of Planning and Built Environment be authorised to **REFUSE TPO CONSENT** for application APP/14/00457

(A)

(B) for the following reasons/subject to the following reasons

- 1 The trees are significant features in the local landscape and appear to be in adequately sound and healthy condition. Their proposed felling would result in undue loss and detriment to the visual amenities of the locality. [A more appropriate course of action would be through management of the trees' size and impact through a scheme of approved surgery.] It is therefore contrary to policy DM8 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011 and the National Planning Policy Framework 2012.