

Supplementary Planning Information

HAVANT BOROUGH COUNCIL
DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE
10 December 2020

I am now able to enclose, for consideration by the Development Management Committee on 10 December 2020, the following supplementary planning information that was unavailable when the agenda was printed.

Agenda No	Item	
6	WITHDRAWN FROM MEETING APP/20/00696 - 162 Stakes Hill Road, Waterlooville	1 - 8
	Proposal: Sub-division of existing house to form 1No. 2bed and 2No. 1bed apartments and erection of a two-storey side extension to form 2No. 2bed apartments with provision of car and cycle parking and bin storage. (Revised).	
	This item has been withdrawn from the agenda at the request of the applicant.	
7	APP/20/00757 - Southleigh Park House, Eastleigh Road, Havant, PO9 2PE	9 - 26
	Proposal: Felling of trees as shown in schedule accompanying plan 20122-BT1 (agreed under Planning Permission APP/17/00863). Subject to TPO 1068.	

This page is intentionally left blank

Agenda Item 6

Submission to the meeting of the Development Management Committee on 10 December 2020

Agenda Item 6: -

APP/20/00696 | Sub-division of existing house to form 1No. 2bed and 2No. 1bed apartments and erection of a two storey side extension to form 2No. 2bed apartments with provision of car and cycle parking and bin storage. (Revised). | 162 Stakes Hill Road, Waterlooville, PO7 7BS

04/12/2020

I urge the members of the Development Management Committee to vote to reject this planning application. It is an overdevelopment of this small site, which also has an awkwardly positioned and potentially dangerous access.

There is no private outside amenity space for residents, and the communal garden is too small for five households. The only access to it is from the car park, by squeezing between parked vehicles. It will be inaccessible for wheelchair users.

The plans show that the vehicle access is to be widened by extending it northwards. The result is that vehicles will exit the site at an angle, reducing the drivers' visibility to the north along the footpath/cycleway.

The car park is small, and is unlikely to have enough parking spaces for all of the residents and their visitors. Manoeuvring will be difficult from some of the parking spaces. Drivers will find it easier to reverse out onto the stub in the road, which will become the default turning area. The prospect of vehicles reversing across the shared footpath/cycleway is a particular concern.

This is a poor scheme, with too many compromises. It has been designed to generate the maximum profit for the developer, with little regard for the residents and neighbours, or for the safety of passing cyclists and pedestrians.

Yours faithfully,

P Briston

This page is intentionally left blank

Dear County Councillors.

I have lived in Durham Gardens a cul-de-sac road for many years. It is positioned on the edge of a very fast three way roundabout. The pathway that runs across the entrance of 162 Stakes Hill Road is the only way people can get from one end of the road to the other. As it is the only path, it is used all the time.

You already know all the dangerous reasons about the entrance of 162 Stakes Hill Road so if more cars are in and out of it daily it will only get worse.

The people that have rented this house over the years have hardly ever parked in the grounds as it is easier to park outside in Durham Gardens.

Because the two roads either side of Durham Gardens have yellow lines we are the only road that allows other people to park in it. The resident's vehicles in our road at night are 1 large Dodge caravan, 1 lorry, 11 large and small vans and 81 cars. In the day we have all the parents delivering and collecting their children from the schools.

We also have people that go to the dentist parking their vehicles in our road. When the pub gets back to normal people that go there will also park in our road. This new building could have 16 people living in it and only has 7 parking spaces. Where will they park their cars or vans, in Durham Gardens just like the people that have lived in this house for years?

If you allow this building to be built we will have even worse problem with cars than we have at present.

Kind regards

Roger Longmore

This page is intentionally left blank

I am Cllr Diana Patrick and I am one of the Councillors representing Stakes Ward. Thank you for letting me give this deputation this afternoon.

I am here today to speak for the residents of Durham Gardens.

This application has been put forward several times and initially refused permission by the officers, and then on redesign and reapplication has been Red Carded by myself.

This is a chalet bungalow that has already been extended in the past and had its rear garden sold off in order to build four houses, in its rear garden, Nos 36/38 being the closest. The bungalow is very much in keeping with the properties that run along the front of Durham Gardens parallel to Stakes Hill Road, and that continue in style along Stakes Hill Road. However, the current proposal is to extend the original house further and to add a 2 story extension to the side. This proposal would be totally out of keeping with the area.

The residents of Durham Gardens already have to endure the traffic that parks along its entire length every morning and afternoon, whilst parents drop off and pick up their children from the three schools along Stakes Hill Road. There is no further room for any more vehicles, and the parking on site will not be adequate for 7 apartments. I have experienced the chaos myself as my two granddaughters both go to St Peters School. There is a pedestrian crossing right by the entrance to Durham Gardens, which is almost opposite the entrance to the school and that comes shortly after the large roundabout at the junction with Frenstaple Road with fast approaching traffic which blocks the road and causes large tailbacks. This is a problem already and a severe safety issue for the children.

I therefore ask you to refuse planning permission based on the following:-

R26. The proposal would result in development at a 2- storey height across (virtually) the whole width of the plot, resulting in a loss of space about the building to the detriment of the visual amenities and special characteristics of the street scene. The proposal is therefore contrary to policy CS16 of the Havant Borough Core Strategy 2011 who forms part of the Local Development Framework and Planning Policy Statement 1

R28. The proposed development would result in an excessive building bulk adjacent to an existing property, detrimental to the visual outlook and amenities of the occupier of this property. The proposal is therefore contrary to policy CS16 of the Havant Borough Core Strategy 2011 which forms part of the Local Development Framework and Planning Policy Statement 1

R30. The proposed development by reason of its bulk, height, and prominent position would be an incongruous feature within the street scene to the visual amenities of the area. The proposal is therefore contrary to policy CS16 of the Havant Borough Core Strategy 2011 which forms part of the Local Development Framework and Planning Policy Statement 1

R164 Any development on this site without adequate provision for rear loading and parking facilities would be likely to interfere with the free flow of traffic on Durham Gardens to the danger of road users. The proposal is therefore contrary to policies CS16, CS19, CS20, and DM13/DM14 of the Havant Borough Core Strategy 2011 which forms part of the Local Development Framework and Planning Policy Statement 1 and Planning Policy Guidance 13

In the interest of all the residents of Durham Gardens and surrounding area, and in the regard of o the congestion and safety issues already evident I ask you to refuse this application.

Thank you.

This page is intentionally left blank

Dear Sirs,

As per your letter inviting a written deputation in respect to the meeting on the 10th December 2020, please see below my statement as below:

As a Durham Gardens resident, I am strongly opposed to the development of the aforementioned. Having lived here now for 3 years, during school hours and beyond, the street is inundated with traffic from drop offs and pick ups as well as the walking children and parents using the road entrance to cross. This becomes particularly busy at school times.

Due to this, the traffic on the street as well as cars going in and out of the street (from Stakes Hill Road onto Durham Gardens and back) is crowded and dangerous. It is one of the few roads with no yellow lines and on a number of occasions, I have encountered near misses when it comes to school children and parents nearly being hit by vehicles. The road is currently unpleasant to live on during these times, having myself being blocked into my own drive.

Adding additional housing directly on the corner which is currently extremely dangerous would simply add to the issue and it would be irresponsible and dangerous to allow this development to go ahead without putting double yellow lines on both Stakes Hill Road and Durham Gardens. It would be a violation of public safety.

Adding to this, the ingress and egress of the development would be directly onto the road which currently hosts a blind corner for traffic coming out and into Durham Gardens and therefore adding an additional way onto the road again would be highly dangerous. This development has been turned down numerous times before and for good reason the last time in respect to a rejection by the Highways Agency which in itself should give you a good perspective on how dangerous this would be.

On top of this please see below additional points and my key points which I believe should stand against the development:

1. The design and look of the building would not compliment or align with the current surroundings
2. As the building would be 2-storey, this would result in a loss of space and would be of detriment to the street view and visuals
3. The proposed development is of bulk and with a residential property directly opposite, would impede on the view
4. The proposed development would be an ugly addition
5. The proposed development does not have satisfactory proposed parking or access and egress and therefore would be dangerous to road users and pedestrians

Please note, I welcome positive change within the area, however I see no positives at all to this development proceeding on the plot suggested.

I hope my concerns will be considered within the decision made.

Regards,
Michelle Snowden

This page is intentionally left blank



Deputation in support of APP/20/00757 – Southleigh Park House Development Management Committee 10th December 2020

Good evening Chair and Members

Thank you for allowing me the opportunity to speak to you this evening in support of our tree works application.

As your Officers have correctly identified, the extent of the tree removal required was agreed and, is defined by, the approved landscape and tree removal plans listed within the hybrid decision notice. At the time of granting the original planning permission your Officers advised

*“Whilst it is very regrettable that the proposal would require significantly more tree loss than anticipated, this must be weighed with the facts that the scheme would meet the majority of the requirements as set in the draft policy for the site and **would contribute to the Borough's pressing housing need numbers.***

*Moreover, it would **secure the long-term protection and maintenance of the group of important heritage assets within the site, whilst protecting the setting of the main house.** Therefore, the proposal has been through a thorough assessment of whether the scheme represents sustainable development. Very much on balance, **it considered that the loss of trees on the site is outweighed [by] the benefits the scheme would bring to the Borough and as such can be recommended for planning permission, subject to the completion of a S106 agreement.**”*

[Bold text our emphasis. Extract from Executive Summary of Officer Report to Committee, 5th April 2018]

The site will be vacant from tomorrow and we are committed to ensuring that the listed buildings within the site are protected and enhanced. We have significant concerns that a vacant site will attract anti-social behaviour and vandalism which will be to the detriment of these important heritage assets.

Our investment in ensuring the future of these listed buildings is guaranteed forever through their conversion works and restoration, is in the region of seven million pounds. We will implement the conversion ahead of any of the timescales listed in the legal agreement accompanying the existing planning permission. We are only able to do this because of the significant financial backing and ethos of our Parent Company, Vivid (a registered charity and Housing Association), who own over 1,200 homes in Havant and 30,000 throughout Hampshire.

In relation to the new build element, which will be the subject of a separate Reserved Matters Application, we will also seek to voluntarily deliver twenty percent of those new build homes as affordable, where none was proposed as part of the original permission. It must be appreciated that commercially efficient and timely delivery of the new build element financially underpins the cost of works to the listed buildings and delivery of the proposed affordable housing units.

In order to do this however, we need to undertake a significant amount of site preparation in order to deliver this complex scheme. The original permission, largely in outline form, could not have envisaged the scale and complexity of the pre-implementation works. As a regional high-quality developer, owned by a Housing Association, this will take a significant mobilisation of our resources to deliver. The details of these early site works are detailed in paragraph 7.4 of your Officers Report.

The principal constraint to the timely delivery of the site is bird nesting season. As a responsible developer we can only fell these trees until the end of February 2021. If we are not able to fell these trees in this timescale this will delay the project by a further twelve months, with a consequent risk to the listed building because it will remain vacant during this time as

we will not be able to mobilise on site until we know we have consent to fell these trees.

We appreciate that at the time of granting the original permission the end developer was not known and that the Council wanted to retain a high degree of control given the sensitivities of the listed buildings.

I hope that despite the brevity of this deputation, you are re-assured that we are committed to delivering a high quality development and we look forward to working with Officers and Members over the coming months to deliver a high quality development.

Thank you for listening and I would urge you to endorse your Officers recommendation and grant permission for these tree works which will enable us to deliver above and beyond the requirements of the existing permission.

Thank you Chair and Members

Paul Thomas MRTPI

Head of Planning

Bargate Homes

This page is intentionally left blank

I wish to object to planning application APP/20/00757 concerning TPO trees at Southleigh Park House, Eastleigh Road, Havant.

In my expert opinion, this site is of national importance for bat conservation. There are very few areas in the United Kingdom where so many rare species of bat have been recorded. All these rare species are totally dependent on the presence of mature trees of a range of species for their roost sites, feeding resources and commuting routes.

This application needs to be seen in the context of other very damaging development proposals in the immediate area. The cumulative effect is likely to render some of the bat populations no longer viable in this area. Any reduction of the broad band of trees currently standing in the area shown on the site plans is likely to cause increase in light pollution around the remaining trees, adversely affecting the behaviour of these light-adverse nocturnal mammals.

There are 17 breeding species of bats in the UK and 14 of those have been recorded on this application site or the immediate surroundings. These include the Bechstein's bat (which is subject to special consideration in the latest draft of the Havant Local Plan 2036) and western barbastelle, both given the highest level of protection under Annex II of the Habitats Directive. Another exceptionally rare species, the alcaholic bat, has been recorded on the adjacent crematorium site and has only been found in a handful of sites in this country since its first discovery in 2010.

We know from the bat surveys by national experts working in Havant and East Hampshire that Bechstein's bats particularly favour crevices in old oak and yew trees for their roosts. Thus, it is of grave concern that destruction of mature specimens of those species is being requested.

I note that the county ecologist has not been given an opportunity to comment on this current application, despite his known concern for the conservation of rare bats in this area. In his comments on the previous application, he drew particular attention to the rare species actually recorded within the grounds of Southleigh Park House and the issue of light pollution.

The applicant admits in the application form that these trees are not dangerous or causing subsidence. The applicant refers back to the decision made to the previous planning application APP/17/00863. In the Council's decision notice dated 30th January 2019, conditions 13 and 19 require development to proceed in strict accordance with the ecological mitigation, compensation and enhancement measures detailed within the Ecological Assessment (ECOSA, March 2018). Since that report by ecological consultants was written, further knowledge has been gained about the importance of this site for rare bat species.

We are most fortunate in the Havant Borough to have such an exceptional hotspot of bat diversity. It is impossible to see how any net biodiversity gain can be achieved if TPO status is removed from these trees.

Mr N Knight, MA, CBiol, MRSB
Hampshire County Bat Recorder

This page is intentionally left blank

Deputation by Havant Borough Tree Wardens regarding

Southleigh Park House, Havant application 20/00757

“ Heritage Assets and Designed Settings

Southleigh House is Grade II listed mid-Victorian in a landscaped setting appropriate to its historic context;

- Trees and other plants were chosen as objects of art, and
- Grouped to achieve open stretches of lawn with trees and shrubs planted either as single specimens, or
- Grouped to contrast with each other in colour, shape and texture.

- The boundaries were planted with masses of trees, arranged in informal flowing lines that disguised the boundary, and
- Emphasised features such as ponds or statues etc.

The site plan confirms this style of landscaping and inclusion of dark evergreens to set off the colours of beech and oak.

This planting is intrinsic to the setting of the house, and its importance lies in

- What it contributes to the significance of the heritage asset,
- The ability to appreciate that significance.

As the house has a setting designed to enhance its presence and visual interest, the designed setting may be regarded as heritage assets in its own right.
(Historic England; ‘The Setting of Heritage Assets’ second edition 2017)

“Aboretum Standard” Trees and TPOs

Of the more than 100 trees proposed for felling, many are exceptional and dramatic species – Monkey Puzzle, Irish Yew, Lawson Cypress and Giant Redwood. Also at least 10 oaks and 6 Yew.

The Application notes the trees are not diseased, nor damaging property structures.

This is simply a clearance for additional property development. In other words, short term profit at the cost of the loss of long-term historic, cultural, and biodiversity assets.

The loss of any TPO’d tree should usually require the replacement of another of the same species – clearly there is scant room for compliance in this case.

Failure to assess Heritage status of the trees

- There is no published assessment of the condition of the trees on this private site, and so
- There has been no survey of their status as potential Veteran, Ancient or Notable trees carried out.
- NPPF Nov 2018 describes Ancient and veteran trees as “*valuable*” and “*irreplaceable*”, and directs that “*You should make decisions on planning applications in line with paragraph 175C of the [NPPF](#).*”

- *You should refuse planning permission if development will result in the loss or deterioration of ancient woodland, ancient trees and veteran trees unless: there are wholly exceptional reason, and there's a suitable compensation strategy in place"*

The application to mass fell cannot be approved prior to surveys of Ancient and Veteran status has been carried out, and that status verified using the Ancient Tree Forum/Woodland Trust recognized criteria."

For the DMC Meeting 10th December 2020 re. Felling of trees at Southleigh Park House

This application to consider the felling of trees (TPO 1068) around this Grade II listed house does not appear to be following the staged approach to decision making required in matters relating to a listed building and its historic setting. There is no valid argument that can be made for examining the viability of trees for felling when they are such an important and critical part of the historic setting of the designated property.

Decisions cannot be made in isolation without reference to the original intentions of the landscape design to be a critical part of the environment of the house: views of the house within its immediate landscape and views from the house of its grounds complement each other.

There are very few period houses of this size and quality that have their original landscaping of trees, nor such a fine collection of specimen trees. Monkey Puzzle, Giant Redwoods, and Irish Yew are typical of the quality of mid-Victorian planting chosen to enhance a fine new building.

A listed building needs to be maintained and appreciated in just the same way as the trees framing it. One needs to be aware of conservation and tree management that is aimed at the longevity of both the built and natural assets.

Tree felling, particularly trees of this standard, should be seen off for what it is, i.e. a Trojan Horse for an as yet unspecified development of one sort or another.

I would advise that, before any further discussion takes place about the role of these trees in the setting of the house, you become familiar with Historic Environment Good Practice Advice in Planning Note 3 (2nd edition), "The Setting of Heritage Assets", Historic England 2017.

This guidance is fully aligned with the NPPF, and will help the LPA explore alternative and more sensitive solutions of the building its setting and the current and future residents of the Borough. Specifically ways to maximise enhancement and avoid or minimise harm to historic and aesthetic assets.

Thomas Griffin

This page is intentionally left blank

Deputation by Cllr Dianne Lloyd against APP/20/00757 at a meeting of the Development Management Committee on 10th December 2020

H23 (part of KP5)

I recall visiting this site – H23 in the Local Plan 2036 - in relation to the earlier application, 17/00863. The wonder of the site, apart from the amazing craftsmanship of the build of the house, was the mature trees in the grounds of the buildings. The ones planted when the house was built in the mid-19th century, are certainly of an age, size, and species worthy of an arboretum, and they create the appropriate setting for this grade II listed property.

Historic England not only protects the historic environment of England by preserving and listing historic buildings, but it also designates and registers historic Parks and Gardens. The setting of the house at site H23, I believe is on Hampshire's register of historic Parks and Gardens, which proves that the setting – the grounds and the trees – are of significant historic interest and should be protected at all cost.

The value of just being able to see these mature trees cannot be dismissed. Studies have shown that exposure to all trees, but especially majestic trees such as these, is healing for both physical and mental health. And surely members, over the last 9 months, we have all learnt how important nature, and especially trees are to us humans.

Trees absorb CO₂, removing and storing carbon, while at the same time they release oxygen back into the air. Mature specimens with complex and deep root systems are the very **best** trees we could possibly have in the borough because they clean the air for us all. The amenity these trees are giving and will continue to give to the 2,100 families who come to live on the new estates in KP5 of the Local Plan, is invaluable.

Trees reduce the amount of runoff, and water is released more slowly into water bodies. These trees have been doing a fantastic job in this regard and should be retained at all cost so they can continue to perform as the asset they are to the house, and the adjacent area which is fast turning from water absorbing agricultural land to a hard surfaced housing estate.

Ironically, while this application seeks to fell mature trees, the government launched a £50 million scheme on 4th November 2020, to help boost tree-planting rates, in the fight against climate change. Felling mature, specimen trees at this time flies in the face of that initiative, and also in that of the Plant Britain campaign launched just over a week ago, which aims to get 750,000 new trees planted over the next two years, to inspire the nation to help protect the planet and fight against climate change.

In the Local Plan 2036, Policy E18 deals with trees. It states this policy is needed because:

(5.245) Trees are a valuable resource in terms of biodiversity, amenity and for climate change adaptation and mitigation.

(5.246) The Borough is home to a wide variety of trees both in terms of scale and species diversity. It is important that the benefits of protecting trees are considered in relation to the need for development, and where appropriate, are safeguarded.

E18 goes on to say that development affecting trees will only be permitted where it:

c. Will **not** result in the loss or deterioration of ancient or veteran trees.

E18 continues: The Council will **refuse** planning permission for proposals that threaten the retention of important trees unless the need for, and benefits of development in that location, clearly outweigh the impact of the proposal.

It is my view that the benefits of the development of up to 70 dwellings in the grounds of Southleigh House, do **not** outweigh the impact of the loss of these specimen trees.

I appreciate that in order to preserve this house and its associated period buildings, any developer wishing to convert it to homes may have to add more units in the grounds of the house to make the work on the listed building viable. But this must **not** be at the sacrifice of these majestic life enhancing trees.

So, that leads me to question if turning the house into dwellings is the correct course of action at all. Perhaps the listed building could become a unique hotel in its amazing setting, close to the attractive town centre of Emsworth, the coast and even closer to the private hospital, all that attract many visitors. Perhaps our Regeneration Team could take charge of this listed building and work to find a different solution for the good of the building, residents, and commerce in the area.

And members, please don't be bullied about the loss of some 14 affordable houses this development would bring. We all know that no **Havant** resident who is currently on the Hampshire Homes Choice list, will be able to actually *afford* any home on this site, because of the nature of the development it would warrant, that a developer such as Bargate could deliver.

And let's not forget site KP5, the area situated to the south and west, where 2,100 new homes will be built, adjacent to this relatively small but unique and significant site. Surely the amenity of the trees on this site should be retained.

We've all learnt to appreciate the need for trees as part of the combat against climate change, as homes and food for wildlife and for the physical and mental health of humans. And now we know the importance of these specific trees to the setting of the listed building as well.

What a tragedy it would be if you gave permission to fell these trees, and then the plans – once drawn up – were considered unviable anyway. I know I couldn't have that decision on my conscience.

I urge you all to think very carefully about one developer's profit versus these significant trees, what they give us, and what they add by way of setting to a grade II listed building, and vote against the application.

Thank you.

Members, it was my great privilege to be on the Site Viewing Working Party when this extraordinary House, Outbuildings, garden and land came to the DMC in 2018. We were given a tour of the house, the incongruous office block added in 1983 with its brick and glass corridor link to the main house, and the glorious garden and grounds that contain trees of heart stopping beauty. Outline Application was sought with all matters reserved for the demolition of the office block and the glass link, but what we were presented with was only an indicative plan of what was proposed. There was no doubt that some trees and overgrown undergrowth would have to be removed but the scale of this application and the resulting loss of 200 year old Oaks and unusual other specimens of great beauty and importance were part of a plan to remove over 100+ trees that could never be replaced. I have no objection to the development of the house which is listed and whose conversion will be under the guidance of the conservation officers, as will the historic outhouses, but this is not the site to build up to 70 houses on. This is probably one of the most prestigious site that the Borough has and every attempt should be made to lessen the build and preserve the grounds for the people of this Borough. Of course this is about business and making substantial profits and providing housing for our residents, but at what cost. The Council already declared that no trees must be cut down until all the tests required, and surveys required have been completed. This proposal is therefore far too premature to be considered and should at least be postponed until we have an All Matters Reserved Agenda in place.

I beg you all and Vivid and Bargate Homes not to destroy what can never be replaced.
Thank you.

This page is intentionally left blank

Southleigh Park House Tree Felling

As with all planning applications, our Council should be aiming towards granting requests for sustainable development, and refusing those that do not meet this bar. This application, which in essence decouples the felling of trees from the rest of the re-development of Southleigh Park House, does not appear to meet this test.

I am aware that in granting the application for the redevelopment of Southleigh Park House there were many concerns from residents, our officers and members of this committee about various aspects. But when looking at all aspects taken as a whole, the positive aspects of the application outweighed the negative – the planning balance – and therefore the application was permitted with some further conditions.

There are many examples of planning applications around the Borough where the planning balance was a difficult decision, and this application is one such site. In other examples, the Council has been very clear that we expect to see all aspects of the site progress simultaneously in order that sustainable development is achieved; so that the detrimental impacts do not take place without the assurance that the positive aspects are to quickly follow.

I would like to see Southleigh Park House redeveloped to contribute to our housing need, and particularly for the affordable housing it will provide, but this does not overrule the need for environmental concerns to be taken fully into account. There has been much press in recent years about the importance of trees to our natural environment, and a full landscape strategy was approved, in order to ensure replanting took place to counterbalance the felling needed. I believe that we need to see that strategy delivered, rather than separating out the felling element.

In summary, in order to maintain a sustainable development on this site, I believe all aspects need to remain as a package, and therefore this application should be refused at this time. The applicant should be encouraged to bring forward a reserved matters application that meets the NPPF and Local Plan policies, and demonstrates how the development will balance environment with commercial concerns. I will expand on these points during my verbal deputation to the committee.

This page is intentionally left blank

I wish to object to planning application APP/20/00757 concerning TPO trees at Southleigh Park House, Eastleigh Road, Havant.

According to the report provided by the applicant, the majority of trees do not require any work.

These are good examples and if that was not the case then TPOs would not have been issued.

Havant Borough has a low tree canopy cover and we need more trees. We should certainly not fell the best trees just so a developer can make more profit.

If TPO trees are felled they are supposed to be replaced. There would be no space for genuine replacements which in any case would take decades to mature.

To cancel the TPOs would make a mockery of the whole TPO system.

Kind regards

Terry Smith

This page is intentionally left blank