Delegated Report		Analysis sheet		Expiry Date: 01/01/2021			
		A / attach	hed	Consultation Expiry Date:			
Officer			Application Nu				
Nick Bell			2020/5408/T				
Application Address 108 Haverstock Hill London NW3 2BD			Drawing Numb	ers			
PO 3/4 Area Tea	m Signature	C&UD	Authorised Off	icer Si	gnature		
Proposal(s)							
REAR GARDEN: 1 x Sweet Cherry (Prunus Avium) - Fell to ground level and poison.							
Recommendation(s):	No objection to notification of intended works to tree(s) in a conservation area.						
Application Type:	Notification of Intended Works to Tree(s) in a Conservation Area						
Conditions or Reasons for Refusal:	Refer to Draft Decision Notice						
Informatives:							
Consultations							
Adjoining Occupiers:	No. notified	00	No. of responses	02	No. of ol	ojections	02
			No. electronic	00			
Summary of consultation responses:	 The Council received three consultation responses which are summerised below: The tree is not damaging the wall The tree has been there since before 1975 and provides screening The tree should be pruned instead of felled Trees help to combat air pollution We have not been notified of tree works whereas we have in the past The tree at the front of 106 Haverstock Hill was damaging a wall and was saved 						
	We need to save as many trees as possibleThe plan is out of date						
CAAC/Local groups*	None received		n dato				

*Please Specify

Assessment

The s.211 notification is for the removal of a cherry tree from the rear garden of a residential property that is situated with the Parkhill Conservation Area. Two site notices were put up as opposed to sending consultation letters.

The tree is of low visibility from the public realm and is not considered to significantly contribute to the character and appearance of the conservation area.

The tree is not of a rare species and is not a noteworthy example of its species. The tree is of no know cultural or historic value.

The holm oak tree in the front garden of 106 Haverstock Hill that is referred to in an objection is far a more prominent, significant specimen than the tree in question which justified its retention. All trees remove some degree of airborne particulate pollution but this is not robust enough justification for the Council to object to the proposed works.

It is not expedient for the Council to serve a tree preservation order to protect the tree.

The Council does not object to the proposed works.