

Delegated Report		Analysis sheet		Expiry Date:		16/11/2016	
		N/A / attached		Consultation Expiry Date:			
Officer				Application Number(s)			
Nick Bell				2016/5177/T			
Application Address				Drawing Numbers			
54 Compayne Gardens London NW6 3RY							
PO 3/4		Area Team Signature		C&UD		Authorised Officer Signature	
Proposal(s)							
(TPO REF. C735 2007) FRONT GARDEN: 4 x Limes (T1 to 4): fell to ground level and treat stump.							
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	14	No. of responses	02	No. of objections	02
				No. electronic	00		
Summary of consultation responses:		<p>The Council received one objection that can be summarised as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The house suffers from subsidence I love the trees and what their presence Pruning as opposed to full removal should be explored as an option 					
CAAC/Local groups* comments: <small>*Please Specify</small>		<p>The Council received one objection from C.R.A.S.H. (Combined Residents Association of South Hampstead) which can be summarised as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The trees are subject to TPOs and form an important part of the landscape The reports indicate only minor/moderate movement which could be caused by factors other than the trees The trees could be pruned or only two removed as an alternative to removing all four trees 					

Site Description

Relevant History

Relevant policies

LDF Core Strategy and Development Policies

Assessment

The application is for the removal of four lime trees as a result of alleged vegetation related property damage. The trees are in the front garden of a residential property situated within the South Hampstead Conservation Area. The trees are of relative uniformity in both size and age standing approx. 12m in height. The trees are close to the boundary of the front of the property which abuts the highway.

All four trees are highly visible from the public realm, are considered to provide a high level of visual amenity and to add to the character of this part of the conservation area.

An application to reduce the crown of the trees back to the previous points of reduction was approved in 2012 under application ref. 2012/2206/T dated 27/04/2012. The engineering appraisal report submitted with the 2016 application state that the property damage was first noticed in August 2015, some years since the trees were last pruned.

It is considered that the documents submitted with the application do not demonstrate that alternative solutions other than the full removal of all four trees have been explored. The arboricultural assessment report submitted with the application states in section 5.2 that:

“Where felling has been proposed, this will be on the basis that the vegetation in question would not respond well to a severe reduction in leaf area that would inevitably lead to decay, the development of potential hazards, and an annual or other on-going management commitment and cost. If pruning is recommended, the specification will be designed to allow continual ease of re-pruning with a reasonable prospect of a reduction in soil water use.”

The Council does not share this view. Lime trees are well known for their strong genetic vigour and their ability to tolerate heavy pruning. Heavy pruning is not considered to “inevitably lead to decay” or to develop potential hazards by default.

It is considered that all four trees could be heavily reduced in size to approx. 4m in height and maintained at this size as part of a biennial pruning regime as low pollards. This would hugely reduce the area of foliage each tree produces thus controlling the volume of water each tree removes from the soil. The trees would continue to contribute to the character of this part of the conservation area and the damage would be controlled. The cost of the ongoing pruning is not considered to be overly

onerous due to the small scale of the operation required to maintain the trees at 4m in height. Level monitoring could continue for another year to assess which the pruning has the desired effect.

The pruning regime referred to above (reduce to 4m in height as low pollards, to be repeated every other year for for the next ten years) was put forward to the agents as an alternative method to control the damage instead of the full removal of all four trees. The agent chose not to amend the application.

The Council received an objection from two people identifying themselves as freeholders of the property which requested that pruning was explored as an alternative solution and was preferable to full removal of all four trees. The Council also received an objection from C.R.A.S.H. (Combined Residents Association of South Hampstead) which also requested that pruning as opposed to full removal of all four trees is explored as a solution.

It is recommended that the application is refused to protect the visual amenity the trees provide and the character of this part of the conservation area