

<b>Delegated Report</b>		<b>Analysis sheet</b>		<b>Expiry Date:</b>		<b>22/06/2020</b>	
		N/A / attached		<b>Consultation Expiry Date:</b>			
<b>Officer</b>				<b>Application Number(s)</b>			
Nick Bell				2020/1836/T			
<b>Application Address</b>				<b>Drawing Numbers</b>			
36 West Hill Park London N6 6ND							
<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: 1 x Silver Birch (T1) - Reduction of this tree by 2 to 3m in line with annotated photo and the rest trimmed and shaped to tidy.							
<b>Recommendation(s):</b>		Refuse application for works to tree(s) covered by a TPO					
<b>Application Type:</b>		Application for Works to Tree(s) covered by a TPO					
<b>Conditions or Reasons for Refusal:</b>		Refer to Draft Decision Notice					
<b>Informatives:</b>							
<b>Consultations</b>							
<b>Adjoining Occupiers:</b>		No. notified	<b>00</b>	No. of responses	<b>02</b>	No. of objections	<b>02</b>
				No. electronic	<b>00</b>		
<b>Summary of consultation responses:</b>		The Council received two objections: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This birch tree is a beautiful and healthy tree, highly visible in the West Hill Park estate. The proposal for a 75% crown reduction would decimate it, and fundamentally alter its appearance and character. At the moment it makes a positive contribution to the amenity and the character of the conservation area. The proposal would stop all that. The tree has limited effect on the amount of light reaching 36 West Hill Park, and no evidence has been provided that there is any danger of instability.</li> <li>This is a stunning and mature silver birch tree that has very light foliage and is not blocking the light to the principle south east elevation of the property concerned. This tree makes an important contribution to the overall character of this beautiful estate. The proposal to remove the top half of the tree will probably kill the tree but if it survives the remaining part of the tree will look butchered and it will look dreadful spoiling the character of the estate for many years to come. I strongly object to the application.</li> </ul>					
<b>CAAC/Local groups* comments:</b> *Please Specify		None received.					

## Assessment

The application is for a crown reduction of a birch tree in line with an annotated photo that was included with submission. The works proposed on the application form are a 3-4m crown reduction. The tree is in the rear garden of a residential property that is situated within the Highgate Village Conservation Area.

The birch tree is considered to significantly contribute to the character and appearance of this part of the conservation area and provide a high level of visual amenity to the residents of West Hill Park.

The tree is considered to be a good example of its species and is of pleasing form. The tree appears to be in at least fair condition structurally and physiologically based on the photo submitted.

The wording on the application form is for “a reduction of this tree by 3/4 from the crown” which The Council interpreted as 75%. The agent has since clarified that 3-4m was the intended pruning specification. The annotated photo shows a line where the tree is proposed to be reduced to. The tree has dual leaders in the upper crown, the application seeks to remove both of these. Birch trees do not tolerate heavy pruning well. The proposed works are considered harmful to the long-term health of the tree and the visual amenity the tree provides.

The justification for the proposed works is “*This will help to reduce light blockage and also make the tree more suitable for the tight space that it occupies. It has a lot of height and when in full bloom, it blocks a lot of height and causes anxiety to the residents in high winds.*”

No further details have been submitted. The justification for the works is not considered proportionate to the level of harm the pruning would cause to the tree and what it provides to residents.

It is recommended that the application be refused to protect the visual amenity the tree provides and the character and appearance of this part of the conservation area.