

Sunday 30<sup>th</sup> January, 2022

Havant Borough Council,  
Civic Centre Road,  
Havant,  
Hampshire,  
PO9 2AX

For attention of the person responsible for the handling of applications to fell trees (formerly Mr Gargett) /now Ms. M. Stewart

**Dear Sirs,**

**RE: (i) The Town and Country Planning Act 1990 &  
(ii) The Town and Country Planning (Tree Preservation Order) Regulations  
2012  
(iii) Site address: Norfolk House, 1, Oaklands Road, Havant PO9 2RD,  
(iv) subject tree (the "Tree") is positioned in Connaught Road  
(v) Tree subject to TPO 1122  
(vi) Proposed "Development": felling of a beautiful, double stemmed, rare  
mature *Chamaecyparis lawsoniana* (Lawson's Cypress)**

I write with reference to a letter dated 19<sup>th</sup> January, 2022, **reference APP/21/01429** (the "Application") made to Havant Borough Council ("HBC").

The Application is a mirror image of one made in respect of the same TPO'd Tree, by the same applicant ("Applicant") on 14<sup>th</sup> July, 2014.

For ease of reference, HBC gave the 2014 application **REF: APP/14/00720**. That application was also to fell the Tree: it failed as there were no proper grounds for felling a beautiful, healthy, double - stemmed specimen, the subject of a TPO.

I expressly note that the Application is made by the management company of Norfolk House (via Flat 1, Oaklands Road (in which the manager of the block - an employee of the Company – lives). The Applicant's name is Grange Property Management, which, being a corporation, does not live on site and will not be affected by the ruination of the environment if the Tree were lost.

I note also that no details of any advice provided by an LPA officer have been provided in the Application and neither has any offer has been made to replace the Tree with any other tree, let alone one of the size and interest of the Tree.

I note further that the reasons given for the felling of the Tree are,  
*"Fell as pushing wall out and lifting tarmac".*

I'll deal with each reason in turn.

These two reasons given are the same as were advanced in the 2014 application. They were not accepted as valid then by HBC and should not be accepted now as there has been no material change to either the pavement or wall in question.

I have lived in Connaught Road for thirteen years. I walk past the Tree and the wall and on the pavement in question very regularly and can state categorically the following.

There are numbers of cracks in the pavement up and down Connaught Road. None are trip hazards. Further, the very badly photographed small crack near the Tree upon which the Application predicates is not the responsibility of the Applicant in any event. And it causes no harm / presents no trip hazard to anyone. It is a non-issue.

Further, said hair crack has not changed in the entire time I have lived in Connaught Road.

I note that the poor quality photograph evidences other cracks nearby which are also old, but do not constitute trip hazards and are not preyed in aid/relied upon. To rely on one small crack in a pavement, which is not even the responsibility of the applicant, to justify the felling of this beautiful TPO'd Tree is ludicrous. To do that would be to justify the felling of every mature tree in Havant where there were any small cracks in any pavement, whether the subject of a TPO or not. Such a suggestion is ludicrous.

The other reason given by the Applicant is that there is cracking to the wall.

Yes, there is, but this has been present for a long while and was present back in 2014 when the first application was made. The cracking is modest, not unsightly and certainly not dangerous. Further, I walk past it regularly and can state that it has not increased, or become materially worse, since the 2014 Application was made. Furthermore, HBC must be aware that the Tree was the subject of a successful application in 2016 by the Management Company as follows.

The 2016 application, (**HBC reference: APP/16/01138**), was for the "*Reduction of the crown of a Lawson Cypress tree ("the Tree") by 3m / 9 ¾ ft and perimeter by 0.5m (just under 2ft) subject to TPO 1122.*"

The 2016 application was not advised to me in writing as it should have been, so I had no chance to make any representations before any cutting began. Indeed, I only found out about the works to the Tree as the tree surgeons were in the process of cutting it.

So in November 2016, a mere five years ago, HBC permitted the **severe** reduction and **severe** crown lifting of the Tree for the express purpose of retarding the Tree's growth, which the works have achieved. The Tree has not grown back or at all. It will never grow back branches to the lower portion of its crown because, unlike say *Taxus baccata* (Yew), this species *Chamaecyparis lawsoniana* it is incapable of growing back branches once cut). It does not possess nearly as beautiful a tear drop shape as it used to, but is still most attractive. It's felling would be a huge loss to the environment, would constitute a form of aesthetic vandalism and would remove the roosting site for many small garden birds. Plus, there is no need.

There are numbers of approaches that should be considered to remediate the modest cracking to the wall, none of which necessitate the felling of the Tree. Every possible alternative option should be tried before the Tree is cut down.

Every tree is important. Indeed, I note that on its website, HBC has the following language:

*Protected trees*

*Havant's trees and woodlands are an important feature of our landscape and townscape, making our borough a greener, healthier and more prosperous place to live and work. Local Planning Authorities such as Havant Borough Council - have statutory planning powers allowing a degree of protection of trees which are of high amenity value.*

If HBC means what it states in the above words, then it should not contemplate the Application and should not permit the destruction of the Tree.

I should be desperately sad to see this beautiful specimen be felled simply because less than a metre of wall at most needs to be remediated. I understand that most of the residents in Connaught Road feel likewise: no doubt they will make their own representations.

The overarching point is that there is no need to destroy the Tree and thereby reduce the attractiveness of the surrounding area, remove an important nesting / roosting site for many small garden birds and to reduce the attractiveness of the road /the value of each house in the road.

Surely it is not beyond the wit of man to come up with a neat, alternative solution rather than simply resorting to the chopping down of such a beautiful specimen? Some repointing and the application of two or three large iron staples would more than suffice. Or a very most portion of wall could simply be removed.

To recap, the Tree is a beautiful, mature specimen, provides a great deal of interest to Connaught Road and surrounding roads (for residents and visitors) and its felling would be a major loss to the surrounding environment. The Tree is the largest and most attention grabbing tree in Connaught Road and its loss would be to the aesthetic detriment of all who live in the surrounding roads. There is no good reason for it to be felled and furthermore, if it can be felled, then no tree with a TPO attaching is safe.

Finally, the two photographs attached to the application (both of which are exceptionally poor quality and do not present a clear, fair picture) do not support the felling of the Tree.

Yours faithfully,

A solid black rectangular box used to redact the signature of the sender.