

RESOLVED -

- (1) That in the first case the matter be reviewed in six months time;
- (2) That in the second case the Officers be authorised to take appropriate action including the issue of the necessary enforcement notices required to secure compliance with planning control; and
- (3) That in the third case the matter be deferred for further investigations

11. TREE PRESERVATION

The Chief Planning Officer referred to proposals for a tree preservation order on the land at No.22 Lakewood Road, Chandlers Ford shown on the plan produced to the Sub-Committee.

RESOLVED -

That a tree preservation order be made to cover the trees at No.22 Lakewood Road, Chandlers Ford.

DEVELOPMENT CONTROL SUB-COMMITTEE

30th July, 1985

(2.00 p.m. - 6.35 p.m.)

PRESENT: Councillor Molyneux (Chairman); Councillors Buckingham, Davis, Mrs.Duffy, Felton, Horne, Howe-Piper, Irish, Mrs.Neal, Perry, Raymond, Spearey and Underdown.

1. MINUTES.

RESOLVED -

That the minutes of the meeting held on 9th July, 1985 be signed by the Chairman as a correct record.

2. PLANNING APPEALS.

The Director of Administration reported:

(a) that the following appeals had been lodged:-

- (i) T.E.Hobbs - Enforcement Notice on land adjoining 20A High Street, Botley;
- (ii) B.G.Saunders - Felling of oak tree at Pantiles, 39, Gordon Road, Chandlers Ford;
- (iii) 15906/1 - Mr.B.Christie - conversion of pig sty to greyhound kennels at Westview, Winchester Road, Botley;

RESOLVED -

That the officers be instructed to discuss the future of the building with the owners as a matter of urgency and report further.

6. PROPOSED CHURCH AT CRESTWOOD SCHOOL SITE, SHAKESPEARE ROAD, EASTLEIGH.

The Director of Planning and Development reported on the proposals which had been put forward for the erection of a church at Crestwood School.

RESOLVED -

That the proposal be agreed in principle and that an application be requested showing adequate parking on site within the existing landscape, and the detailed design of the building.

7. TREE PRESERVATION ORDER No.93 - LAND AT WILDERN, HEDGE END.

The Director of Planning and Development introduced his Report on the objections which had been received to the Tree Preservation Order covering the land at Wildern, Hedge End. The Report listed the nine objections which had been received and gave his comments on each. In the case of Representation No.2 relating to the nine scots pines listed as Group 15, he was recommending that the group should be excluded from the Order.

RESOLVED -

That Tree Preservation Order No.93 (land at Wildern, Hedge End) be confirmed subject to a modification to delete Group 15 from the Order.

8. GOODS VEHICLE OPERATOR'S LICENCE - 111, MONARCH WAY, WEST END.

The Director of Planning and Development reported on the outcome of the hearing by the Licencing Authority which had decided to grant a Vehicle Operator's Licence in this case. He pointed out that the use of the site for the parking of the goods vehicle was in breach of planning control and that if the Council wished to control this, it would be necessary to institute enforcement proceedings.

RESOLVED -

That Officers be authorised to take appropriate action including the issue of any necessary enforcement action required to secure compliance with planning control at this site, and to report back in due course on the functioning of the Goods Vehicle (Operators' Licences Qualifications and Fees) Regulations 1984.

9. 47, VALLEY ROAD, CHANDLERS FORD.

The Director of Planning and Development referred to the proposals from the Winchester Health Authority for the conversion of 47, Valley Road, Chandlers Ford, to a Unit for Mentally Handicapped Persons. He outlined the detailed proposals for the extension of

Obj 6.

Your Ref: PD/DCA/6/5/68

Borough of Eastleigh,
Civic Offices,
Leigh Rd.,
Eastleigh,
Hants, SO5 4EN

M.J. Robinson,
33, Upper Northam Rd.,
Hedge End,
Nr, Southampton,
Hants, SO3 4EA.

17th May, 1985

Dear Sir,

Re: Tree Preservation Order No. 93
Garden of 33, Upper Northam Rd.,
Hedge End.

I am in receipt of your notification dated 24th April.


I should like to state that I object to this order in view of the fact that this will inhibit any future development of my land.

There is now an unfenced public right of way on the land bordering my property and I do not feel it is my responsibility to replace any trees which may be damaged, in relation to the above order.

Therefore, should you wish to maintain this order, I hereby apply for compensation.

Please acknowledge this objection before the 24th of this month.

Yours faithfully,



M.J. Robinson



copy c/o
Ack. P.C. 20/5/85

Obj 8.

EASTLEIGH BOROUGH COUNCIL
TOWN & COUNTRY PLANNING ACT 1971
TOWN & COUNTRY PLANNING (TREE PRESERVATION ORDER) REGULATIONS 1969.
TOWN & COUNTRY PLANNING (TREE PRESERVATION ORDER)(AMENDMENT)
REGULATIONS 1981.


TO: EASTLEIGH BOROUGH COUNCIL

RE. MESSRS. JAMES HERBERT HENRY & GEORGE ARTHUR HICKMAN.

TAKE NOTICE that on behalf of the above named we HEREBY OBJECT to the Tree Preservation Order Number 93.

1. The grounds of such objection are :-
 - (i) If made final the Order will prevent the effective development of the objectors' land.
 - (ii) The proposed Order is not, as it stands, necessary for the protection or proper protection of the amenities of the area in which the land is situated.
2. This objection applies to the making of the Order in respect of all trees groups of trees and woodlands in respect of which the Order is made.
3. The Notice of making of the Order was served on the 27th day of April 1985.

DATED this 22nd day of May 1985.

.....
SHENTON PITT WALSH & MOSS
82 HIGH STREET
WINCHESTER SO23 9AD

EASTLEIGH BOROUGH COUNCIL
TOWN & COUNTRY PLANNING ACT 1971
TOWN & COUNTRY PLANNING (TREE PRESERVATION ORDER) REGULATIONS 1969.
TOWN & COUNTRY PLANNING (TREE PRESERVATION ORDER)(AMENDMENT)
REGULATIONS 1981.

TO: EASTLEIGH BOROUGH COUNCIL

RE. MRS. FRANCES KATE REED

TAKE NOTICE that on behalf of the above named we HEREBY OBJECT to the Tree Preservation Order Number 93.

1. The grounds of such objection are :-
 - (i) If made final the Order will prevent the effective development of the objector's land.
 - (ii) The proposed Order is not, as it stands, necessary for the protection or proper protection of the amenities of the area in which the land is situated.
2. This objection applies to the making of the Order in respect of all trees groups of trees and woodlands in respect of which the Order is made.
3. The Notice of making of the Order was served on the 27th day of April 1985.

DATED this 22nd day of May 1985.



SHENTON PITT WALSH & MOSS
82 HIGH STREET
WINCHESTER SO23 9AD

Now Confirmed

DEVELOPMENT CONTROL SUB-COMMITTEE

D

30th July, 1985

TREE PRESERVATION ORDERS
LAND WEST OF SHAMBLEHURST LANE (NO.94)
LAND AT WILDERN, HEDGE END (NO. 93)

Report of the Director of Planning and Development on Objections

BACKGROUND

1. Following work on the Hedge End, West End and Botley Local Plan this Committee resolved, at its meeting on 14th August 1984, that Tree Preservation Orders be made on land proposed for development west of Shamblehurst Lane and at Wildern, Hedge End. These were then prepared and served on 7th March 1985 (T.P.O. No. 94, Shamblehurst West) and 24th April 1985 (T.P.O. No. 93 Wildern).

OBJECTIONS

2. No official objections, under regulation 7 of the Town and Country Planning (Tree Preservation Order) Regulations, have been received relating to the Order on land west of Shamblehurst Lane and I therefore propose that this order be confirmed unchanged. There have however been several objections and comments on the Order relating to the land at Wildern. These have been set out in detail in the attached schedule with my comments and specific recommendations. In all but one small area I have recommended that the Order be confirmed as it stands.
3. The Tree Preservation Orders were served with two intentions:-
 - (i) to protect the present amenities of the area; and
 - (ii) safeguard those trees in the development areas which may be under threat and could form an important part of any landscaping proposals. (Some trees already having been removed in one area following publication of the local plan).

These reasons are still valid and although much of the land is being assembled by developers who appreciate the value of retaining existing trees, I feel it is still important to confirm the orders to ensure that adequate consideration is taken in the preparation of development briefs and landscape proposals. This is of particular importance as the developers themselves may be preparing most of these.

4. It is accepted that in some cases the removal of a few protected trees will be required to provide access and facilitate rational development. This does not, I believe, override the need for comprehensive protection prior to the identification of these areas. Indeed it is likely to be some time before the development proposals are finalised in sufficient detail to achieve this. In the meantime trees of significant landscape and amenity importance would remain under threat.

RECOMMENDATION

5. Subject to the deletion of those trees identified in T.P.O. No. 93 under Group 15, the Tree Preservation Orders for land west of Shamblehurst Lane (T.P.O. No. 94) and land at Wildern, Hedge End (T.P.O. No. 93) be confirmed.

E.S. Benefield,
DIRECTOR OF PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT

CJB/AMM/5/2/6
19.7.85.

Enc.

SCHEDULE OF OBJECTIONS/COMMENTS - T.P.O. NO. 93 LAND WEST OF SHAMBLEHURST LANE

OBJECTOR	INTEREST IN LAND	OBJECTIONS/COMMENTS	CHIEF PLANNING OFFICERS COMMENTS	RECOMMENDATION
No. 1 John Hunt Construction Group Ltd.	Purchasing and taking options on areas of land covered by order proposed for a Business Park in the Hedge End, West End and Botley Local Plan.	a) Premature "blanket coverage" without regard to planning brief. b) Areas covered by order would prevent development and access.	a) The order is intended to protect trees prior to an agreed planning brief and landscaping scheme being adopted. b) It is not intended that all the trees covered by the order will be retained, only that adequate consideration is given to their retention where possible.	a) No change. b) No change.
No. 2 Gutteridge Woodford and Chambers.	Represent owner of group on land covered by order proposed for industry in the Hedge End, West End and Botley Local Plan.	Object to the inclusion of nine 'Scots Pines' (Group 15) as their retention would prejudice future development of land.	These trees are only of limited amenity value being the result of an overgrown hedge (not Scots Pines) and are in poor deteriorating condition. They are not required as part of the landscaping for the proposed industry.	Group 15 be deleted

No. 3 Mr. D.F. Cox.	Owner of No. 9 Park View, Hedge End.	a) Requested lopping of tree adjoining garden. b) Indicated for information trees thought not to be covered by present order.	a) Not responsibility of Local Authority. b) It is not appropriate for these trees to be covered by this order.	a) No change. b) No change.
No. 4 Mr. D.J.C. Pateman.	Owner of No. 37 Upper Northam Road, Hedge End.	a) Order is detrimental and prejudicial to future development of land. b) Impractical and un- reasonable for private ratepayer to be responsible for replace- ment of trees as Parish Council have created public walk on unfenced land adjoining his property.	a) Area of trees is outside urban edge as defined in draft Hedge End, West End and Botley Local Plan and would be contrary to the plans policies. b) As owner he is responsible for trees and fencing own boundary.	a) No change. a) No change.
No. 5 Mr. Taylor.	Owner of No. 35 Upper Northam Road.	As above.	As above.	No change.
No. 6 Mr. Robinson.	Owner of No. 33 Upper Northam Road.	As above.	As above.	No change.

No. 7	Clients own land covered by order adjoining Willdern Squash Club proposed for housing and community use in the Hedge End, West End and Botley Local Plan.	Order may be detrimental to a scheme for the development of the land.	The order is intended to protect trees prior to an agreed planning brief and landscape scheme being adopted. It is not intended that all the trees covered by the order will be retained, only that adequate consideration is given to their retention where possible.	No change.
No. 8	Clients own land covered by order proposed for a Business Park in Hedge End, West End and Botley Local Plan.	a) Order will prevent effective development of land. b) Order is not as it stands b) necessary for proper protection of the amenities of the area.	a) As above. b) Already some trees that may have been included in a landscaping scheme have been removed and the further loss of trees could seriously reduce the present amenities of the area.	No change.
No. 9	Client own two areas of land adjoining the A334 covered by the order proposed for a Business Park and Housing in the Hedge End, West End and Botley Local Plan.	As above.	As above.	No change.