

Public comments

Support:

A well balanced approach to ensure aviation safety whilst maintaining the natural beauty of the copse.

Objection:

This application to reduce the height of protected trees is absolutely shocking and will add to the already added noise and pollution of the area.

1. Reducing the height of so many trees which have effects on wildlife in the area.
2. Will affect the conservation of these tree, of which all have tpo for their protection.
3. Will have effect on noise, making the area even more noisier.
4. Loss of trees, as a reduction in height to the extreme which the Airport which to make, could have permanently damage on these trees.
5. Plans are of very poor design.

I am sure and I am sure, there are ways for this airport expansion to proceed without this destruction of protected trees, which we have seen many times before, protected trees are not protected.

My objection is to stop these plans.

Objection:

1. The application document says that "This request is to reduce the height of 23 trees within Marlhill Copse" but the supporting document lists 25 trees.
2. It is not clear what impact the work will have on the health of the trees. For example, it is proposed that one oak tree will be cut back by over 13 metres.
3. Such radical reduction in the height of the trees will, at the very least, have a severe detrimental impact on the appearance of the trees.
4. Given that the runway at Southampton Airport has been extended to the North presumably aircraft can take off further north so it is unclear why this work is necessary.

Objection:

It would be a bit hypocritical that, after objecting to the runway extension, the council should now give in to allowing this action which will facilitate the airports intentions of increasing air traffic along with more emissions over Southampton as they take off. So much for a "greener" city.

Objection:

The stated reason for these crown reductions is aviation safety. However, these are mature trees which will have been much the same height for many years. In particular, oak 533 is to have 12.1m removed! Oaks are slow growing, which means this tree must have been protruding into the safety surface for years if not decades. During all this time the the airport has successfully, as it is required to do, "managed" these obstacles. Nothing has changed, as the airport stated during the Eastleigh planning process that the runway extension makes no difference to any need for tree felling in Marlhill Copse.

The large amounts of proposed crown reduction will cause harm to the conservation area. Loss of this amount of crown canopy will reduce the amount of habitat for wildlife within the individual trees and make significant changes to the environment beneath them.

The work would cause harm to other trees within the conservation area, which may be exposed to more light, and in the case of the trees higher up the slope, more wind. (The claimed justification in Feb 2023 for crown reducing tree 533 was "phototrophic limbs which are newly wind exposed following failure of the large adjacent tree" - removing even more canopy as per the current application could lead to a domino effect where successive waves of trees need to be felled.)

The works will cause harm to the individual trees - some of the proposed 'crown reductions' are so great as to threaten their viability. An application to crown reduce oak 533 by just 4m was refused in Feb 2023 (23/00037/TPO) on grounds that it would harm the tree's growth. The present application is for 12.1m crown reduction which would harm this tree even more.

The works are inconsistent with the aim in the airport's Woodland management plan to "increase age and height diversity of the trees" - this cannot be done by reducing the height of the tallest trees.

There is a lack of clarity in the application. It states that it is for crown reduction of 23 trees, but 25 trees are listed. I was unable to find cedar 563, at least in the location marked on the OLS map.

Objection:

This will harm local wildlife and the conservation area. Why can't the airport continue to manage these slow-growing trees in the way it has successfully done before, instead of this?

This would cause harm to the individual trees from the huge 'crown reductions'.

It would cause harm to other trees within the wood resulting from so much removal of vegetation, exposing them to wind and more light.

Aviation safety' requires the Airport to 'manage' obstacles. It has been doing this successfully for years during which these slow growing, mature trees must have been more or less the same height, so it can continue to 'manage' them.

Objection:

This would cause harm to the individual trees from the huge 'crown reductions' and harm to other trees within the wood resulting from so much removal of vegetation, exposing them to wind and more light.

Aviation safety' requires the Airport to 'manage' obstacles. It has been doing this successfully for years during which these slow growing, mature trees must have been more or less the same height, so it can continue to 'manage' them.

Objection:

Please don't cut these beautiful trees back further, as they are an important oasis for wildlife and people, and also help protect the houses and other trees near them from strong winds. One of the listed trees is an oak and the application requests a large amount to be chopped off, why is this necessary now? Oak trees should be protected.

Objection:

The application to crown reduce oak tree 533 by 4 metres was rejected previously in 2023. This application includes crown reduce of the same oak tree 533 by 12 metres, which makes no sense and presumably is either incompetence or time wasting by the applicant.

Crown reducing so many mature trees will completely change the character of the woodland, which is the grounds on which the Inspector refused removal of the canopy in compartment 1(a) in an appeal in 2023.

There is a risk of crown reduction on such a scale increasing the wind pressure on the trees on the opposite higher bank.

The airport refused to say that their previous application to remove the trees in compartment 1(a) was for "aviation safety" and claimed it was solely for "woodland management". It follows, therefore, that such massive crown reductions are not necessary in the current application, either for aviation safety or woodland management, as no public path goes anywhere near them.

I object strongly to this application because of its threat to the character of the woodland, to the amenity value it gives to both humans and wildlife, and because of the danger of such extreme crown reduction to the viability of the trees.