

<b>Delegated Report</b>		<b>Analysis sheet</b>		<b>Expiry Date:</b>		16/08/2021	
		N/A / attached		<b>Consultation Expiry Date:</b>			
<b>Officer</b>				<b>Application Number(s)</b>			
Nick Bell				2021/3247/T			
<b>Application Address</b>				<b>Drawing Numbers</b>			
50 Patshull Road London NW5 2LD							
<b>PO 3/4</b>		<b>Area Team Signature</b>		<b>C&amp;UD</b>		<b>Authorised Officer Signature</b>	
<b>Proposal(s)</b>							
FRONT GARDEN: 1 x Acacia (T1) - Fell to ground level. 1 x Acer (T2) – Crown reduce by up to 1.5m							
<b>Recommendation(s):</b>		No objection to notification of intended works to trees in a conservation area.					
<b>Application Type:</b>		Notification of Intended Works to Tree(s) in a Conservation Area					
<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>10</b>	No. of responses	<b>01</b>	No. of objections	<b>01</b>
				No. electronic	<b>00</b>		
<b>Summary of consultation responses:</b>		<p>The council received one consultation response which is summarised below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The report has identified the trees incorrectly</li> <li>• The climbing Hydrangea has not been considered as a contributing factor</li> <li>• There is insufficient evidence to implicate the trees as the cause of the damage</li> <li>• Pruning the trees may be of benefit to them</li> <li>• The trees add to the streetscape and the biodiversity of the area</li> <li>• I am confident the Hydrangea is responsible for the damage</li> </ul>					
<b>CAAC/Local groups* comments:</b> *Please Specify		None received.					

## Assessment

The s.211 notification is for the removal of a Robinia tree and crown reduction of an Acer by up to 1.5m. The notification originally included the Acer to be removed but the agent agreed to an amendment of the proposed works.

Both trees are highly visible from the public realm and contribute to the character and appearance of the conservation area. Both trees are in close proximity to the front elevation of the property.

The semi/early mature Robinia tree has been pruned poorly historically. There is a wound at the base of the tree with exposed heartwood and some degree of associated decay. There is also an area of necrosis/decay on the main stem at approx. 4m above ground level. It is likely self-sown, while this does not automatically devalue a tree it has in this instance resulted in the tree growing in an inappropriate position. The tree is still relatively young and is to yet achieve its ultimate size and form. Given the potential ultimate size of this cultivar and the proximity of the tree to the property it is not afforded sufficient space to do so. If retained the tree will be under regular pruning pressure and this species does not tolerate pruning particularly well. The tree does not have a long-term future given its location, species and condition. The tree is of no known cultural or historical significance and is not of a rare species. The tree is not considered a noteworthy example of its species and has limited future potential as an amenity.

The Acer tree is also in close proximity to the front elevation but is smaller and slower growing than the Robinia tree, making it more manageable in term of future pruning pressure. The agent revised the proposed works to allow for the Acer to be retained at the request of the council. The proposed pruning works are considered acceptable, the tree has been pruned to a similar degree historically.

The evidence submitted is not considered sufficient to implicate the trees as the cause of the damage.

The council does not object to the proposed works.