

Comments for Planning Application APP/20/00385

Application Summary

Application Number: APP/20/00385

Address: 25 Summerhill Road, Waterloooville, PO8 8XD

Proposal: Crown reduce 1No.Oak tree height and spread by 2-3m leaving a height of 32-33m and spread of 27-28m, removing any deadwood, subject to TPO 1724.

Case Officer: Maria Stewart

Customer Details

Name: Not Available

Address: Not Available

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Complainant

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment:1. As owners of [REDACTED] & therefore owners of the tree in question, we do not require any reduction in the size of this tree & will not permit any work to be undertaken on any part of our property. We will actively seek the prosecution of anyone entering or impinging upon our property in order to carry out any work on this tree not authorised by ourselves. The information provided by Mr Bloor as to the tree's ownership is incorrect, as is his drawing indicating its location. Mr Bloor has never been granted access to our garden, therefore any sketch which he has provided as to the location of the tree is conjecture & clearly intended to add weight to his application. We have documentary evidence from prior to the building of houses in Summerhill Road, to prove ownership of the tree. A previous Tree Officer at HBC 'has' accessed our property & concluded that while the tree straddles the boundary 'the weight is clearly on this [Durley] side'. The current Tree Officer is welcome to visit us in order to ascertain this for themselves.

2. The tree in question is a magnificent healthy oak. Crown reduction is unnecessary as the tree, including canopy, does not impinge upon any building. Crown reduction would also change the tree's character & impact upon its aesthetic appeal. Partial reduction to the Northern aspect would have significant adverse aesthetic impact.

3. It has only been three years since Mr Bloor previously applied to remove 2m of growth on the north side. That application was denied. Since a previous successful application by Mr Bloor to (in our view) deform the tree, it has grown very little & certainly nowhere near 2-3 metres. Mr Bloor has stated to us that he wishes to reduce the size of the tree in order to allow more light onto his patio. Should this be his desired intention, it is illogical to continually seek to cut back one sector of the tree, thus thickening the canopy in that area. Consequently, we believe that his continued

submission of applications to remove growth from our tree is being done with the intention of unbalancing the tree in small steps in the hope that HBC Planning Department may in future accept a much larger size reduction due to the tree becoming unsafe.

4. With this in mind, we note that Mr Bloor's original application was for "a Crown Reduction of 4 meters" "to leave a well balanced shape" & "Crown Thinning by 30% to remove secondary branches to allow more light through the canopy". This has subsequently, following correspondence with HBC, been amended to Crown reduction of 2-3 metres. We would also like to point out that as we will not be allowing any work on any part of the tree on our property, it will not be possible to achieve a "well balanced shape" by cutting 2-3 metres off the northern aspect.

5. We also note that in his original application Mr Bloor indicated that the tree was damaged, diseased or likely to fall, but that he apparently (no documents appear in relation to the application) failed to provide the required evidence from 'an appropriate expert'. This reinforces our belief noted in para. 3.

6. If the current application is granted only in respect of the northern aspect, we strongly urge & request that a qualified representative of HBC is present on site throughout the work to ensure that the terms of the approval are entirely & completely complied with. We unfortunately have to make this request due to an incident occurring when work was previously being undertaken on the tree.

7. An English Oak tree in the upper part of Durley Avenue, also subject to a TPO, has been felled. An Oak tree located to the rear of 30 Durley Avenue has been the subject of a severe reduction, which has entirely ruined its aesthetic appeal & has affected its environmental benefit for at least the immediate future. This tree now looks like a gobstopper on a stick, bearing no resemblance to an English Oak. This, or felling, has been the fate of most of the other oaks which once lined Durley, sadly subject to the attentions of so-called tree surgeons who are essentially cowboys with chainsaws. The tree located at our property is the last virgin Oak tree in the upper part of the avenue & it is consequently increasingly important for the tree to remain undisturbed in order to maintain its importance to the local ecosystem, not least in its contribution to mitigating the negative effects of traffic pollution. It contributes significantly to soaking up water from the clay soil & provides an environment supporting over thirty five species of birds including treecreeper, three species of woodpecker & owls. Bats are resident, as confirmed by a Hampshire Constabulary Wildlife Officer.

8. We seek quiet enjoyment of our property. Mr Bloor again seeks to disturb that quiet enjoyment in order to achieve a greater evening light-fall on his patio; a patio shaded by the tree at the time he purchased his house: a circumstances of which he was well aware.