

Planning Application T/24/97542

30 VALLEY ROAD, CHANDLER'S FORD, EASTLEIGH, SO53 1GP

Representee	Address	Comments
Deborah Layton	3 NEILSON CLOSE CHANDLER'S FORD EASTLEIGH SO53 1GR	The applicant is submitting a new variant of a failed planning application under the disguise to remove three trees which were identified as needing to be removed under that application. The application here claims that the trees are causing damage to two garages. Those garages have been unused for many years and owner has failed to properly maintain them; this is clear from the photos and the report. The issue here is not to replace the garage but ultimately remove them altogether. There is evidence that the garages are built deep into the woodland area bank. The rationale for why the surrounding bank on all sides is so much higher than ground level of garages is unclear. The owners have themselves in the past 2 months cleared the land around the garages and dug out large volumes of dirt adding to the instability of root system , some of which have been freshly exposed (as seen from the photos). Removal of the three trees will not resolve this issue but actually add to the issue of instability of the surrounding area including the bank on the other side of the garage. We have already had feedback from the environmental agency and water agency for the previous planning application by the owners that the whole area is extremely sensitive to risk of flood. This proposal provides no additional risk mitigation or solutions to this issue. Furthermore no proposals have been offered on the impact of removal of the three trees subject to preservation order and bank on one side to the likely erosion of the soil bank and trees that will occur on the other side closest to my property and the stream that runs across the surface in that area. The question also remains why the trees were not subject to pruning to maintain safety- an obligation by the land owner not fulfilled. Until a full and comprehensive environmental assessment can be made, this application should not be approved . Further guarantees that a change of permission of the garages to living accommodation should also be insisted upon else this would simply be a mechanism that circumnavigates the previously denied application by the owners.
Linda Christie	4 BROWNHILL CLOSE CHANDLER'S FORD EASTLEIGH SO53 2QH	There are very many reasons for this objection, the first being that these trees have been growing for decades before the garages were built. It is the garages that have been planted unreasonably close to the trees and not the other way around. The garages have also been neglected for years and have fallen into ill repair. I have lived here for 12 years now and they have not been used during this time nor maintained. The trees provide a haven for wildlife. There is a vast variety of bird species that rely on these well established trees as do other forms of wild life. The removal of the trees would interfere with the water table having a detrimental effect on the surrounding land. They provide a cover to reduce noise pollution . They are instrumental in maintaining the reputation of the area as a desirable leafy part of the wider Eastleigh borough. These trees have always had a TPO attached to them as they are an indigenous hard wood species and should not be removed. It is far better to remove the garages and move them within the site . It would take a matter of weeks whereas it would it take hundreds of years for such trees to grow again.
Kevin Cornmell	19 FOREST ROAD CHANDLER'S FORD EASTLEIGH SO53 1NA	If the TPO trees existed before the garage then Eastleigh BC should not support their destruction. If the house has changed hands - this would have been highlighted by the surveyors.

Trish Turnbull	6 BROWNHILL CLOSE CHANDLER'S FORD EASTLEIGH SO53 2QH	We would not support the removal of the protected trees. I does seem that root exposure that has been mentioned, does seem to have been aggravated by the clearance of the embankment right too and beneath the trees. So much so that if the trees and roots were to be removed it would endanger the higher ground which provides a residents right of way footpath which is used often. In our opinion, the trees should be managed thus protecting the trees and right of way on the higher ground. Further to protect the embankment from further erosion, the whole exposed area needs metal and concrete reinforcement for future protection thus protection.
Deborah Layton	3 NEILSON CLOSE CHANDLER'S FORD EASTLEIGH SO53 1GR	This comment follows that I submitted previously. I understand from local residents that have been in this close since the buildings were built that the builder that originally owned the area in question in 1960s was reported to dump building waste within this site. This partially explains why the plot of land has such a high 'bank' surrounding the garages and which has resulted in the higher aspect compared to surrounding gardens . It was also reported that this dumping of waste included building materials that could, potential include asbestos waste as this was dumped before the regulations for strict asbestos removal came in place. We therefore recommend that the appropriate checks be made- not only for safety of applicants who continue to dig out the area but also for the safety of local residents that live in surrounding properties.
Nik Holden-Brown	36 VALLEY ROAD CHANDLER'S FORD EASTLEIGH SO53 1GP	Response to Planning Application T/24/97542: • The three trees mentioned in the application are all subject to Tree Preservation Orders. • The Oak tree mentioned in the application, identified in the Pre-development Arboricultural Survey for Planning application T/23/95474 as T7, is 'of high quality and value' (Section 4.2) and 'Notable landscape and historical tree' (Section 3.3). • The two Scots pines mentioned in the application, identified by the survey as T5 and T6, both show evidence of badger activity with a possible badger sett according to the survey (Section 3.3 and 4.4). • Recent retaining wall activity appears to have further exposed roots of the Oak tree (image00001.jpg of the current application). This current activity is within the Root Protection Zone of the Oak tree (T7), where the survey states that 'Where possible all development, including new hard landscaping, shall be situated outside of the retained trees designated Root Protection Areas' (Section 5.3). • The garages referred to in the application as requiring the removal of these trees has been unmaintained for some extensive period of time and are in poor repair. • The supporting documents indicate that the current intention expressed to the professional is to repair these garages. • These garages were previously part of the aforementioned application for demolition and replacement with a house. • The application does not contain any reference to the impact on flooding by the removal of these trees, nor to the stability of the bank upon which they are growing. We would question if the intention of this application is to facilitate re-building the garages, given the previous application T/23/95474 to demolish them in order to develop this site for three houses. The garages have not, to our knowledge, been used in the 14 years we have lived at our present address, and have not been maintained, as evidenced by their poor condition described in the structural and tree reports accompanying the application. The oak tree in particular has previously been assessed as healthy and high quality and is an important feature of the locality, supporting ecology and contributing to the visual amenity of the area. It appears that the application is a veiled attempt to remove

		trees that would permit future development of the site, rather than renovation of the garages as has been stated to both professionals providing reports in the application. Given previous concerns expressed in the officer decision report for application F/23/95474, that citing a house where the garages are currently located would lead to further requests to the council to remove more trees, this appears to be the start of that process. Removal of these trees will inevitably precipitate a further application to develop the plot, and further pressure on the council to prune or fell more trees. Our objection to this planning application is not 'nimbyism' but arises from a desire to protect local environment and the character of the area. Trees are a characteristic feature of Chandlers Ford and have a significant amenity value in urban settings, but also an importance within Chandlers Ford's relatively recent history. The removal of trees may affect the water retention in the immediate area but in the particular situation of the three trees referred to in the application, the stability of a steep bank with potential impact for neighbouring properties. With the ownership of a plot with extensive tree cover comes the responsibility to maintain and preserve that for the local area and for future generations and should be regarded as such, rather than simply an obstacle to development. We respect the desire to develop this plot but it should not be at the expense of the quality of the local area. We therefore object to this application on the grounds stated above. Nik Holden-Brown & Helen Long
Pauline Macey	2 NEILSON CLOSE CHANDLER'S FORD EASTLEIGH SO53 1GR	To whom it may concern I would like to bring to your attention several issues relating to the land in the aforementioned planning application (T/24/97542) the land in question and in particular the garage buildings have remained derelict and overgrown for many years . This latest application appears to most neighbouring residents as an attempt to remove the trees in preparation for a future attempt to gain planning permission for the previously rejected application (F/23/95474) . We believe there will be on attempt made to refurbish the garages. Another point to bring to your attention is the recent excavation work the owners have been undertaking in last couple of months,it has been noticed that digging has been taking place close to the trees which has exposed roots and caused damage to them. We are also concerns relating to the water drainage from the land and the effect any construction will have on the network of underground streams that crisscross the whole area around us.
Simon & Tracy Palmer	34 VALLEY ROAD CHANDLER'S FORD EASTLEIGH SO53 1GP	From a previous application from the same applicant I am led to believe that the 3 trees in question all have TPO's on them with one in particular being listed as "high quality and value. The 2 pine trees both show badger activity with the possibility of an active set. The applicant has carried out recent work to the site to erect a retaining wall, although I'm unsure of what engineering calculations were obtained to confirm this wall as being adequate. But this work has exposed roots of the oak tree. Our property backs on to the piece of land on which the 3 trees are situated and we have lived here for 13 years. The garages which appear to be the centre of this current application have been in a state of disrepair during our time here. It would appear that the applicant deems it necessary to remove these trees to enable refurbishment of these garages. Yet in a previous refused application these garages were due for demolition to make way for the build of three new houses. The application makes no mention of any potential flooding to the area should the removal of these trees go ahead. Nor any mention of some risk to the bank upon which they are growing. I'm afraid that given the previous unsuccessful application

		T/23/95474 i seriously doubt the integrity of the reason given as wanting to maintain the garages. These garages have never been utilised in the time we have lived here. I see no reason why reasons for refusal of previous applications would not apply in this case. I believe that if successful this would lead to further applications to remove trees, which would be difficult to refuse given the precedent this may set. In summary we object to this application on the basis of the outcome of a previous application, the potential disruption to wildlife, the unknown consequences of potential flooding and the fact that it will set a precedent for further applications to remove other trees from the land.
Nik Holden-Brown	36 VALLEY ROAD CHANDLER'S FORD EASTLEIGH SO53 1GP	The trees referred to in this application represent an obstacle to further development of this plot and also the potential that other trees on the plot may be subject to future requests if this application is granted and the work carried out. If this application is granted, does the council limit any further development of the garages affected by these trees to that which is stated in the application, i.e. refurbishment of the garages rather than demolition and replacement with a house? Also, given that any of the neighbours of this plot will confirm that bat activity is significant on any warm summer evening, does the council place any restrictions on any works to the trees or garages? Are any of these three trees host to bats? Will a comprehensive bat survey be required before any future work on these trees or the garages commences?