

Comments for Planning Application 20/00067/TPO

Application Summary

Application Number: 20/00067/TPO

Address: Marlhill Copse Mansbridge Road Southampton

Proposal: Tree Works

Case Officer: Gary Claydon-Bone

Customer Details

Name: Mr Keith Brown

Address: [REDACTED] Cleveland Road, Southampton SO18 [REDACTED]

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Other

Stance: Customer made comments in support of the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

- In keeping with Conservation Area
- Too near/affecting Boundary

Comment: The conservation of this wood land is paramount for everyone which includes safety issues.

This also includes residents who actually live on the boundaries of the woodland. Be they new or old to the area.

I have walked the woodland many times and have seen what happens when these trees are blown over or uprooted due water saturation of the ground or larger branches break away from the tree as the branches can no longer be supported by the tree.

I have walked the path recently and also walked around to the properties as best I can to see for myself how this impacts on the residents and I can see both sides of the argument.

There is a safety issue here for residents and walkers who use the woods.

I am happy for these trees to be felled and new trees planted to replace them and the woodland to be tidied up for public use.

Because if managed correctly this will be come a jewel that

ever-body can benefit from. There are some lovely trees lower down the slope for people to enjoy.

This is not just about 5 trees but about the future of the whole woodland for the use of future generations. So be sensible deal with it, plant new trees as even trees do not last for ever.

We might loose 5 trees but will gain newly planted trees for the future generation to come, and help the environment in future years. Your children will thank-you for our foresight and not the damage caused by our life styles.

Comments for Planning Application 20/00067/TPO

Application Summary

Application Number: 20/00067/TPO

Address: Marlhill Copse Mansbridge Road Southampton

Proposal: Tree Works

Case Officer: Gary Claydon-Bone

Customer Details

Name: Mr Darren Nield

Address: [REDACTED] Highlands Way, Dibden Purlieu, Southampton SO45 [REDACTED]

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Other

Stance: Customer made comments in support of the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: Fully support this application

Comments for Planning Application 20/00067/TPO

Application Summary

Application Number: 20/00067/TPO

Address: Marlhill Copse Mansbridge Road Southampton

Proposal: Tree Works

Case Officer: Gary Claydon-Bone

Customer Details

Name: Mrs Emma Hawkins

Address: [REDACTED] Boardwalk Way, marchwood, Southampton SO40 [REDACTED]

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Other

Stance: Customer made comments in support of the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

- In keeping with Conservation Area

Comment: I support this work.

The owner of the wood should be able to manage it. These trees are old and just like humans they die. When they die they lose strength and cause a risk of falling branches or whole tree. These trees will be replanted with more suitable trees for the space. Forestry commissions all over the country are managing woods in this way and no one objects. Sense needs to be seen so that those living under these huge trees can feel safe and the wood can be enhanced for local people to enjoy.

Comments for Planning Application 20/00067/TPO

Application Summary

Application Number: 20/00067/TPO

Address: Marhill Copse Mansbridge Road Southampton

Proposal: Tree Works

Case Officer: Gary Claydon-Bone

Customer Details

Name: Mrs Sue Griffiths

Address: [REDACTED] Rossington Avenue, Southampton SO18 [REDACTED]

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer made comments in support of the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment:

Comments for Planning Application 20/00067/TPO

Application Summary

Application Number: 20/00067/TPO

Address: Marlhill Copse Mansbridge Road Southampton

Proposal: Tree Works

Case Officer: Gary Claydon-Bone

Customer Details

Name: Mr James Stewart

Address: [REDACTED] Lyndhurst SO43 [REDACTED]

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Other

Stance: Customer made comments in support of the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

- Affecting Conservation Area

Comment: On balance the right thing to be doing, managing the land

Comments for Planning Application 20/00067/TPO

Application Summary

Application Number: 20/00067/TPO

Address: Marlhill Copse Mansbridge Road Southampton

Proposal: Tree Works

Case Officer: Gary Claydon-Bone

Customer Details

Name: Miss Natasha Longley

Address: [REDACTED] Chafen Road, Southampton SO18 [REDACTED]

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Other

Stance: Customer made comments in support of the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

- Good Design
- In keeping with Conservation Area
- Loss of Trees

Comment: I support the works taking place in Marlhill Copse as a number of trees have been identified as dangerous and could pose a threat to the public if there are strong winds. As the owner of the land, Southampton Airport have a duty to ensure that the health and safety of any and all people who use/pass through the area.

I also wholeheartedly support the Airport's decision to plant more trees in the place of the unsafe and unhealthy ones that will be felled.

Comments for Planning Application 20/00067/TPO

Application Summary

Application Number: 20/00067/TPO

Address: Marlhill Copse Mansbridge Road Southampton

Proposal: Tree Works

Case Officer: Gary Claydon-Bone

Customer Details

Name: Ms M Bonnel

Address: [REDACTED] Oaktree Road, Southampton SO18 [REDACTED]

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

- Loss of Trees

Comment: It has been surprising to see that our small local piece of ancient woodland has become something of a celebrity place with processions of new visitors walking through what is normally a quiet and peaceful area. There is clearly more at stake here for some, than the loss of the trees. Could we please have an independent assessment of these trees so that they are not removed from our woodland unnecessarily?

Comments for Planning Application 20/00067/TPO

Application Summary

Application Number: 20/00067/TPO

Address: Marhill Copse Mansbridge Road Southampton

Proposal: Tree Works

Case Officer: Gary Claydon-Bone

Customer Details

Name: Ms Sien van der Plank

Address: Albany Road, Southampton SO15

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Other

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

- Affect on Wildlife
- Loss of Trees

Comment: The evidence for felling the trees is unclear at best. Please delay a decision regarding Marhill Copse until a proper full independent assessment has been conducted, published with open access, and reviewed by all parties.

Comments for Planning Application 20/00067/TPO

Application Summary

Application Number: 20/00067/TPO

Address: Marhill Copse Mansbridge Road Southampton

Proposal: Tree Works

Case Officer: Gary Claydon-Bone

Customer Details

Name: Mrs Amanda Grinyer

Address: [REDACTED] Orchard Grove Portchester, Fareham po16 [REDACTED]

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Other

Stance: Customer made comments in support of the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: Fully support the works

Comments for Planning Application 20/00067/TPO

Application Summary

Application Number: 20/00067/TPO

Address: Marlhill Copse Mansbridge Road Southampton

Proposal: Tree Works

Case Officer: Gary Claydon-Bone

Customer Details

Name: Mrs Sue Oliver

Address: [REDACTED] Hook Crescent, Romsey SO51 [REDACTED]

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Other

Stance: Customer made comments in support of the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment:

RICHARD BUXTON SOLICITORS

ENVIRONMENTAL, PLANNING & PUBLIC LAW

Victoria Street
Cambridge

www.richardbuxton.co.uk
law@richardbuxton.co.uk

Southampton City Council
Civic Centre
Southampton SO14 7LY

Attn: Democratic Support Officer - ed.grimshaw@southampton.gov.uk

**Please pass Members of the Planning and Rights of Way Committee
For meeting on 23 June 2020**

21 June 2020

Dear Sirs

Marriott Copse - 20190067/TPO

We have been advising residents in relation to this which, following judicial review proceedings where it was accepted that the officer decision was unlawful, has resulted in the matter coming before committee. Our client and others are only interested in seeing a fair, lawful, decision made.

A tree expert Mark Carter has been instructed to review the papers and (although – remarkably, see DR Appendix J – not allowed by the airport to conduct a close inspection of the trees) he has reached unequivocal conclusions: agreeing with the Council's tree officer that T119 should be felled, but that T120 and T124 should not be felled on a "need" basis.

Your officer has now shifted his recommendation away from need (let alone urgency) to fell, to "good forestry practice" concluding that "the works do not fall to secure the maintenance of the special character of the woodland or the woodland character of the area". Our expert Mr Carter indeed concludes that permission to fell trees T120 and T124 could be given as part of "good forestry practice" eg. with the normal cycle of replacement planting. However, here it is surely the case that the Monterey pines are critical to "the special character" of this woodland. Your officer gives mixed messages about this, for example, paragraphs 95 and 97 of his report are at odds with his conclusion. We also note that this forestry justification was never suggested by the Airport's experts.

So, members must decide (a) who is right about the need to fell these trees (forestry practice notwithstanding) and (b) if there is (as Mr Carter advises) no need in relation to T120 and T124, how the trees fit with the special character of this woodland and whether that outweighs good forestry practice.

If Members are concerned about need to fell and have any technical doubts as to how the competing information is to be assessed, they must deliberate and take independent advice in order to take a lawful decision. We respectfully remind members that this is something that must be grappled with. We just cannot see how "good forestry" could rationally trump the significance of the trees in question to the special character of this woodland.

Yours faithfully,


Richard Buxton Solicitors
Environmental, Planning & Public Law