

Delegated Report		Analysis sheet	Expiry Date:	06/04/2016
		N/A / attached	Consultation Expiry Date:	
Officer			Application Number(s)	
Nick Bell			2016/0779/T	
Application Address			Drawing Numbers	
34 Christchurch Hill London NW3 1JL				
PO 3/4	Area Team Signature	C&UD	Authorised Officer Signature	
Proposal(s)				
(TPO ref. C1136 2015) REAR GARDEN: 1 x Horse Chestnut - Fell				
Recommendation(s):				
Application Type:	Application for Works to Tree(s) covered by a TPO			

Conditions or Reasons for Refusal:	Refer to Draft Decision Notice					
Informatives:						
Consultations						
Adjoining Occupiers:	No. notified	10	No. of responses	02	No. of objections	02
			No. electronic	00		
Summary of consultation responses:	<p>The council received two objections which can be summarised as:</p> <p>Objection 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If the tree is dangerous it should be removed and replacement tree planted • The report states that there are damaged roots but it cannot see the them as the photos in the report are in black and white • The report does not confirm the presence of honey fungus • The reports refers to areas of decay but does not establish which fungal organism is the cause of the decay • The report states that pruning could reduce the immediate risk of the tree failing but I think the tree does not need further pruning since it was heavily reduced in 2012 • Adequate evidence to justify removing the tree has not been submitted <p>Objection 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The presence of honey fungus has not been confirmed • A replacement tree of a similar species and decent size should be planted if the tree is to be removed • The replacement tree should become subject to a tree preservation order • Adequate evidence to justify removing the tree has not been submitted 					
CAAC/Local groups* comments: *Please Specify	None received					

Site Description

[Click [here](#) and type]

Relevant History

[Click [here](#) and type]

Relevant policies

LDF Core Strategy and Development Policies

Assessment

The tree preservation order was served to protect the horse chestnut tree following the submission of a s211 notice to remove the tree in December 2015. The TPO has not been confirmed.

The tree is rooted in what is essentially a large raised planter in the rear garden of the property and is exposed to south westerly winds. It is considered that further pruning could reduce the forces exerted upon the crown of the tree which could reduce the likelihood of failure of the tree. However, as the tree is already in a heavily reduced state, it is considered that further crown reduction works would remove the visual amenity the tree preservation order was served in order to protect and reduce the degree to which the tree is visible from the public realm. In addition, further pruning works may further diminish the energy reserves of what is already a heavily reduced tree.

The arboricultural report submitted with the application contains results from a resistograph investigation. The results are considered to demonstrate that there are significant areas of dysfunctional tissue in varying stages of decay in the base of the tree which reduces the safe useful life expectancy of the tree. It is the presence of the decay as opposed to the cause of the decay that is of relevance; the decay is present whether or not honey fungus is the cause.

As such, the arboricultural report is considered sufficient to demonstrate that the safe useful life expectancy of the tree is reduced to a point where the council should not refuse the application to remove the tree and that it is not expedient for the council to confirm the tree preservation order.

It is recommended that the application to remove the tree is approved and a replacement tree secured via a condition.