

DELEGATED OFFICER REPORT – TREE WORKS

PROPOSAL	T1 - Silver Birch - Reduce Height by 3m, Width by 2m. Crown Raise to 3.5m. Leaving a height of 10m and width of 6m. Tree subject to TPO 1222.
LOCATION:	2 Titus Gardens, Waterloooville, PO7 8JT
REFERENCE NO:	APP/26/00059
APPLICANT:	Mrs Spencer
CONSULTATION EXPIRY DATE:	19/02/2026
APPLICATION EXPIRY DATE:	26/03/2026
WARD:	Waterloo
SUMMARY RECOMMENDATION:	Refuse

1. Site Description

2 Titus Gardens, Waterloooville, PO7 8JT

2. Planning History

3. Proposal

T1 - Silver Birch - Reduce Height by 3m, Width by 2m. Crown Raise to 3.5m. Leaving a height of 10m and width of 6m.
Tree subject to TPO 1222.

4. Policy Considerations

National Planning Policy Framework

Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) March 2011

DM8 (Conservation, Protection and Enhancement of Existing Natural Features

Havant Borough Local Plan (Allocations) July 2014

5. Statutory and Non Statutory Consultations

6. Publicity and Community Involvement

This application was publicised in accordance with the Council's Local Code of Corporate Governance and the Statement of Community Involvement.

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:

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.

7.2 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.

7.3 The tree subject to this application is a mature Birch located within the front garden of a residential dwelling, it has reasonable form, however it has been previously 'topped' but recovered well from those works, the tree is stated to be affecting the residents insurance due to the distance it is from the dwelling – this is not a material consideration when determining a tree work application. They also state that they do not like the leaves of seeds that fall from the tree – this again is not a material constraint in this instance. The Birch offers high public amenity value to the area and no technical information has been submitted with this application to provide a reason for the reduction - the works applied for are excessive and would detriment the public amenity offered by the tree.

7.4 Comments received from a neighbour "*I have received a copy of the application form regarding the proposal of reducing a Silver Birch by height of 3m and Width by 2m*

I am very concerned about reducing this height of only 3m. All summer, I cannot open my windows without the seeds of the tree coming into my property and going all over my building and car. Also, I am concerned that the strong winds that we have will cause structural damage to my property with the amount of branches that this tree has."

"I would like to add another comment for the determination process. The tree has a gradual lean and I am really concerned that a very strong wind will cause the tree to collapse and render damage to my property and surrounding cars."

The residents comments are noted as part of the determination process, however the matter of seed fall from a tree is considered to be a natural occurrence and no evidence has been submitted to substantiate any potential for structural damage to a property. In addition to this the lean of the tree is considered historic and there is no mention of concern in the application submitted by the Tree Surgeon.

8 **Conclusion**

Recommend refusal.

9. **RECOMMENDATION:**

That the Executive Head of Place be authorised to Refuse application APP/26/00059

Conditions:

1	The tree is a significant feature in the local landscape and appears to be in adequately sound and healthy condition. Its proposed crown reduction would result in undue loss and detriment to the visual amenities of the locality. It is therefore contrary to policy DM8 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011 and the National Planning Policy Framework.
---	---