

<b>Delegated Report</b>		<b>Analysis sheet</b>		<b>Expiry Date:</b>	19/10/2016
		N/A / attached		<b>Consultation Expiry Date:</b>	
<b>Officer</b>			<b>Application Number(s)</b>		
Nick Bell			2016/4896/T		
<b>Application Address</b>			<b>Drawing Numbers</b>		
8 Highgate West Hill London N6 6JR					
<b>PO 3/4</b>	<b>Area Team Signature</b>	<b>C&amp;UD</b>	<b>Authorised Officer Signature</b>		
<b>Proposal(s)</b>					
REAR GARDEN: 2 x Poplars - Fell to ground level					
<b>Recommendation(s):</b>					
<b>Application Type:</b>		Notification of Intended Works to Tree(s) in a Conservation Area			

Conditions or Reasons for Refusal:	Refer to Draft Decision Notice					
Informatives:						
<b>Consultations</b>						
Adjoining Occupiers:	No. notified	<b>43</b>	No. of responses	<b>3</b>	No. of objections	<b>03</b>
			No. electronic	<b>00</b>		
Summary of consultation responses:	<p>The Council received three objections which can be summarised as:</p> <p>Objection 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The trees form an important part of the landscape and of considerable amenity value</li> <li>• The trees offer screening from pollution and traffic noise</li> <li>• Many trees have recently been lost from the area</li> <li>• Can the trees be pruned instead to allow for the required resurfacing?</li> </ul> <p>Objection 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The trees provide privacy and screening from traffic noise</li> <li>• The trees provide habitat for birds</li> <li>• Many trees have recently been lost in the area</li> </ul> <p>Objection 3</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Have alternatives to felling been explored?</li> <li>• The tree provide screening from traffic noise</li> <li>• Could the tree be pruned instead of removed?</li> </ul>					
CAAC/Local groups* comments: *Please Specify	None received					

<b>Site Description</b>
<b>Relevant History</b>

## Relevant policies

### LDF Core Strategy and Development Policies

## Assessment

The s.211 notification relates to the proposed removal of two large Lombardy poplars situated in the rear garden of no. 8 Highgate West Hill, a residential property within the Highgate Village Conservation Area. The two trees are of a similar age and form and are in close proximity to each other which has resulted in the crowns of the two trees forming one sail area.

The trees are considered to be of low visibility from the public realm. The trees are large in size but as they are at the back of a long rear garden they are only just visible from the public realm at Highgate West Hill. The trees are not considered to provide a significant level of visual amenity to the public.

The trees have been pruned heavily in past and given this genera's poor decay resistance it is considered highly likely that decay has formed in the upper crown, close to historic pruning wounds. Large diameter decayed/dead branches are visible from ground level in the tree to the east.

The trees are close to the boundary of the property and are both adjacent to an area of tarmac which forms the surfacing of a driveway/garage access area at West Hill Court, a neighbouring property to the west. Major structural roots from the two trees are encroaching on to the driveway causing significant damage to the tarmac which is considered to be an actionable nuisance. The large diameter, shallow encroaching roots are coming through the tarmac to such an extent that should the owners of West Hill Court decide to resurface the driveway it would not be possible without causing significant root damage due to the roots breaking through the tarmac. The encroaching roots are considered to be of such a diameter that their severance would be likely to adversely affect the trees. Poplars are considered not to tolerate root severance well due to the species inability to defend itself effectively from wood decay-causing fungi. Pruning as an alternative to removal is not considered to mitigate the harm caused by root severance.

The trees do provide some degree screening to some of the residents of West Hill Court, a neighbouring residential block to the west. It is considered that there are other large trees in close proximity to and between the block and the two trees proposed for removal which will continue to provide screening. The loss of screening the trees provide is not considered sufficient justification for The Council to object to the proposed works and serve a tree preservation order.

For the reasons above it is not considered expedient for The Council to serve a tree preservation order to protect the trees. Due to the low visibility from the public realm and the other trees in close proximity, the proposed works are considered not to be harmful to the character of this part of the conservation area. As such, The Council does not wish to object to the proposed works.