

Delegated Report

Officer

Tom Little

Application Number(s)

2020/2745/T

Application Address119 Torriano Avenue
London
NW5 2RX**Proposal(s)**

REAR GARDEN: 1 x Ash - Fell to ground level.

Recommendation(s):

Approve works to trees protected by a TPO

Application Type:

Application for works to trees protected by a TPO

Consultations**Adjoining Occupiers:**

No. notified

25

No. of responses

2

No. of objections

2**Summary of consultation responses:**

I sympathise with my neighbours and wish they can solve their problems. However, I wonder if it is necessary to remove the tree. Would a thorough pruning do the job? That was the option chosen for another ash tree at 23 Leighton Grove 4 years ago. The tree is covered with ivy and Russian vine, which probably aggravates the problem. It is a beautiful mature tree and it would be a pity to lose it. I wonder if hard pruning has been considered as a possible solution.

CAAC/Local groups* comments:

*Please Specify

Bartholomew Estate And Kentish Town CAAC object to the felling of this tree as we feel that it enhances the View along Joshua passage. The tree should have the ivy removed and be pruned to about 20 %. The value of trees to the environment cannot be underestimated. Please do not fell this tree.

Assessment

The evidence submitted contains evidence that roots emanating from an ash tree and desiccated, high plasticity clay soils are present beneath the foundations, level monitoring which demonstrates seasonal movement with the greatest movement at the point closest to the ash tree. The damage to the building has been given BRE category five where cracks are greater than 25mm.

While reducing trees can help to mitigate subsidence, the level of reduction required once subsidence is occurring would need to be over 50% of the crown volume. It is considered that this level of reduction would destroy the visual amenity the tree provides in the first instance. Research has shown that the reductions would need to be carried out approximately every two years in order to prevent further subsidence, which would cause a relatively rapid deterioration in the health of the tree, prevent it from regaining the level of visual amenity it currently provides and imply an overly onerous cost on the landowner.

On balance, it is considered that the evidence submitted is sufficient to demonstrate that, on the balance of probabilities, the tree is a material cause of the damage to the building and that it would not be expedient for the Council to refuse the application to remove the ash tree.

It is recommended that a replacement birch is required by condition.