Delegated Report		Analysis sheet N/A / attached		Expiry	Date:	30/10/2023		
				Consu Expiry	Itation Date:			
Officer			Application Nu					
Nick Bell			2023/3887/T	2023/3887/T				
Application Address			Drawing Numb	Drawing Numbers				
15 Woodchurch Road London NW6 3PL								
PO 3/4 Area Team Signature C&UD Authorised Officer Signature								
Proposal(s)								
FRONT GARDEN: 1 x A 2 x Alder & 2 x Maple (G	· · ·	•		ion.				
REAR GARDEN: 1 x Pear (T2) - Remove weak limbs to suitable growth points.								
1 x Ash (T3) - Reduce by 2m - 3m from height. 1 x Ash (T4) - Reduce by 2m - 3m from height.								
No objection to notification of intended works to tree(s) in a								
Recommendation(s):								
Application Type:	Notification of Intended Works to Tree(s) in a Conservation Area							
			. ,					
Conditions or Reasons for Refusal:								
	Refer to Draft Decision Notice							
Informatives:								
Consultations								
Adjoining Occupiers:	No. notified	07	No. of responses	01	No. of o	objections	00	
			No. electronic	00				
Summary of consultation	The council received one consultation response:							
	The reason for the tree set to be felled is 'T1 Elder: Fell Storm damage a symmetrical' Isial. As best as I can determine from the							
	damage, a symmetrical' [sic]. As best as I can determine from the photos provided, I cannot see how the tree is 'asymmetrical'. Surely							
-	-							
responses:	photos felling	s provided is too dra	, I cannot see how the stic an option for this.	e tree is Why c	s 'asymn an't the f	netrical'. Su tree be resh	irely	
-	photos felling trimme	s provided is too dra ed or prun	, I cannot see how the stic an option for this. ed in some way? It a	e tree is Why c ppears	s 'asymn an't the f to be ve	netrical'. Su tree be resh ery healthy	irely naped,	
-	photos felling trimme as bes	s provided is too dras ed or prun st as I can	, I cannot see how the stic an option for this.	e tree is Why c ppears Iling of	s 'asymn an't the t to be ve this tree	netrical'. Su tree be resh ery healthy as it seems	irely naped, s yet	
-	photos felling trimme as bes again enviro	s provided is too dras ed or prun st as I can unnecess nmental, v	, I cannot see how the stic an option for this. ed in some way? It a tell. I object to the fe	e tree is Why c ppears Iling of mporta	s 'asymn an't the t to be ve this tree ant asset	netrical'. Su tree be resh ery healthy as it seems	irely naped, s yet	
responses:	photos felling trimme as bes again	s provided is too dras ed or prun st as I can unnecess nmental, v	, I cannot see how the stic an option for this. ed in some way? It a tell. I object to the fe ary destruction of an i	e tree is Why c ppears Iling of mporta	s 'asymn an't the t to be ve this tree ant asset	netrical'. Su tree be resh ery healthy as it seems	irely naped, s yet	
-	photos felling trimme as bes again enviro	s provided is too dras ed or prun st as I can unnecess nmental, v	, I cannot see how the stic an option for this. ed in some way? It a tell. I object to the fe ary destruction of an i	e tree is Why c ppears Iling of mporta	s 'asymn an't the t to be ve this tree ant asset	netrical'. Su tree be resh ery healthy as it seems	irely naped, s yet	

## Assessment

The s.211 notification is for the removal of an alder tree and pruning works of two ash trees, two maple trees, an alder and a pear tree in the communal front and rear gardens of a residential block that is situated with the South Hampstead Conservation Area.

The alder tree in the front garden is highly visible from the public realm and contributes to the character and appearance of the conservation area. However, the tree has exposed cambium at the base and areas of decay/dysfunction which is considered to reduce the safe useful life expectancy of the tree.

The pruning elements of the proposed works are considered to either of an acceptable level, minor in nature or repeat works.

The consultation response states that the alder (incorrectly referred to as an elder) appears to be healthy. The necrosis described is not visible in the documents submitted and was discovered upon visiting the site.

It is not expedient for the council to serve a tree preservation order to protect the trees.

The council does not object to the proposed works.