

Delegated Report

Officer	Application Number(s)
Tom Little	2019/6192/T

Application Address	
o/s 37 - 80 Langbourne Mansions Langbourne Avenue Holly Lodge Estate London N6 6PR	

Proposal(s)
OUTSIDE FRONT: 4 x Leyland Cypress (T1, T2, T3 & T4) - Fell to ground level.

Recommendation(s):	Refuse works to trees covered by a TPO
---------------------------	--

Application Type:	Application for works to trees covered by a TPO
--------------------------	---

Consultations

Adjoining Occupiers:	No. notified	65	No. of responses	36	No. of objections	17
<p>Summary of consultation responses:</p>	<p>Objections:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The trees reduce local pollution and improve air quality, leyland cypress is particularly good for this 2. The trees help to stabilise the slope by reducing ground water 3. They provide habitat for birds bats and insects and outperform native trees in providing nesting and support large invertebrate populations and are used by bats for navigation 4. They provide visual amenity and make a positive contribution to the character of the conservation area 5. The management of the estate is partly funded by Camden Council and therefore the removal of the trees represents an additional cost to the Council 6. They are lovely big trees that support a variety of birds and bats, I would be very sad if they were cut down 7. The allegations that the trees are damaging roads and footpaths are far from true as there is damage visible where there are no trees and it seems that slope movement or poor re-surfacing is responsible 8. Replacing them is a nice idea but nothing will grow where a cypress has been removed 9. The avenue would not same without them 10. The one they have already removed has not been replaced 11. She trees provide shade to the adjacent houses in the summer 12. They provide privacy and enable a peaceful home life 13. Shade to the flats is caused by the orientation of the flats which are north facing more than the trees. 14. There is no sign of disease in the retained trees 15. If trees were felled due to the presence of utilities and roads then there would be very few trees left in the city. Infrastructure can be repaired in such a way as to reduce/eradicate the effect of nearby trees 16. The trees could be raised slightly to provide more clearance above cars 17. The trees absorb noise 18. <p>Supports:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The trees are diseased and nearing the end of their life 2. They are causing damage to pavements and drains 3. They block light to flats and views out 4. The trees are huge and only going to get bigger 5. The area could be used for cycle parking instead 6. Smaller prettier trees could be planted and would be more in keeping with the estate 7. We are concerned about the structural damage they could cause if they are not removed 8. There is permanent from bird droppings and leaf litter making paths slippery and filthy 9. Nothing else will grow in the vicinity of the trees as they absorb all of the moisture and light making the verge scruffy 10. There are security fears because of the dark areas caused by the trees which are sometimes used for antisocial behaviour 					

	<ol style="list-style-type: none">11. These are not natural trees and their removal will be beneficial to wildlife and other trees12. If the trees were to break in adverse weather condition then there could be serious damage to property and/or injury/fatalities13. The trees are dark and overbearing14. Adjacent flats require lights to be switched on during daylight hours15. In the event of a fire they could restrict access to emergency services16. There are fears regarding the stability of these trees
CAAC/Local groups* comments: *Please Specify	None

Assessment

The cypresses are highly visible from the public realm, they are considered to provide visual amenity and to make a positive contribution to the character of the conservation area. They provide habitat to wildlife and contribute to pollution reduction and the urban forest canopy and mitigation against the effects of climate change.

The application states shading of nearby flats and parking spaces, their overbearing presence as well as damage to local infrastructure including the road, footpaths, verge embankments and collapsed drains as reasons for removal. Additionally that the trees are beginning to show signs of decline due to Phytophthora.

It is accepted that the trees are beginning to show signs of Phytophthora infection, however this is still relatively minor and not yet considered to have significantly impacted on the visual amenity the trees provide or to have caused the trees to become a health and safety issue.

The damage to the road and footpath is not considered to be a sufficient reason to justify the removal of trees that are protected by a TPO and could be repaired in such a way as to reduce the future impact the trees.

The damage to the drains requires repair, where drains are repaired with modern materials it is unlikely that such damage would reoccur.

The issues of shading or trees being overbearing are not considered to be sufficient justification for removing trees that are protected by a TPO. The issues of leaf litter and bird droppings are considered to be maintenance issues and are likewise not sufficient reasons to justify removal of protected trees.

On balance, it is considered that the trees are still worthy of retention at the present time and that the reasons given are not sufficient to justify their removal. It is recommended that the application should be refused to protect the visual amenity the trees provide, preserve the character of the conservation area and maintain their contribution to the urban forest canopy and local environment.