

| | | | | |
|---|----------------------------|--|-------------------------------------|------------|
| Delegated Report | | Analysis sheet | Expiry Date: | 09/09/2021 |
| | | N/A / attached | Consultation Expiry Date: | |
| Officer | | | Application Number(s) | |
| Nick Bell | | | 2021/2926/T | |
| Application Address | | | Drawing Numbers | |
| Elm Village (comprising Barker Drive, Rossendale Way, St Pancras Way, Bergholt Mews & Blakeney Close) London NW1 | | | | |
| PO 3/4 | Area Team Signature | C&UD | Authorised Officer Signature | |
| | | | | |
| Proposal(s) | | | | |
| <p>COMMUNAL AREAS: 1 x Ash (T1) - Crown reduction by up to 2m. 1 x Robinia (T2) - Remove dead rose growing in crown and prune to clear building by 2m - 3m 1 x Field Maple (T3) - Prune to clear building by 2m - 3m. 1 x Field Maple (T4) - Crown reduction by up to 2m. 1 x Field Maple (T5) - Prune to clear building by 2m - 3m. 1 x Norway Maple (T6) - Crown reduction by 2m - 3m. 1 x Ash (T7) - Remove epicormic growth. 1 x Field Maple (T8) - Crown reduction by up to 3m. 1 x Field Maple (T9) - Crown reduction by up to 3m.. 1 x Robinia (T10) - Crown reduction by up up to 3m. 1 x Silver Birch (T11) - Crown reduction by up to 3m 1 x Norway Maple (T12) - Crown reduction by 2m - 3m. 1 x Robinia (T13) - Crown raise over gardens by 2m - 3m. 1 x Norway Maple (T14) - Crown reduction by 3m - 4m. 7 x Whitebeams (G1) - Prune to clear building by 2m and crown raise 2.5m.</p> | | | | |
| Recommendation(s): | | Approve application for works to tree(s) covered by a TPO. | | |
| Application Type: | | Application for Works to Tree(s) covered by a TPO | | |

| | | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------------|-----------|------------------|-----------|-------------------|-----------|
| Conditions or Reasons for Refusal: | Refer to Draft Decision Notice | | | | | |
| Informatives: | | | | | | |
| Consultations | | | | | | |
| Adjoining Occupiers: | No. notified | 14 | No. of responses | 39 | No. of objections | 02 |
| Summary of consultation responses: | | | No. electronic | 00 | | |
| <p>The council received 39 consultation responses which are summarised as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I support most of the proposed tree works. The trees must be maintained to keep them healthy and prevent the loss of any others. However, I am against the felling of The Ash (T1), especially as Ash dieback will kill around 80% of ash trees across the UK. • T8 and T9 have been progressively damaging the retaining wall beside the house. • Two trees failed recently at Elm Village • I believe these works will make our street safer and more beautiful • Some of the tree sway in the wind so are unsafe • All works to these trees are necessary and overdue. Many of the trees have been allowed to grow too large risking damage to adjacent properties, roads and pavements due to extensive roots exacerbated by a lack of maintenance and unchecked growth • It is important to maintain the character and beauty of the neighbourhood, though good maintenance of local trees and replacement where necessary many of the forest trees planted forty years ago are now far too big and in some cases have become a hazard • Tree management in urban areas is important, including pruning and replacing and should be done according to the recommendations of experts such as gardeners and arborists. • Elm Village was built on what was an old British Railways goods yards and workshops, so the forest trees that were planted on completion are sending roots down into old industrial site, rather than a rich forest floor. They are all probably unable to secure their roots in good deep soil, hence we are seeing them come down at an alarming rate. • Are the trees diseased or causing structural damage? The answer is no. Expressing fears that trees blow in the wind and are really scary...what sort of argument is that for overturning a TPO? • Elm Village has a deeply disliked residents association and in my experience, these are a vocal minority who like to speak as if for the whole estate. • I have been particularly alarmed over the past year about the danger these trees pose since the collapse of a large elm with a 25+ metre spread on a very windy day • How is it possible in this day and age, in the midst of a climate crisis for anyone to ask for trees to be cut down? The silver birch tree on the felling list is a beautiful tree and I pass it daily on my walks. • I can see no good reasons for the request to fell these trees and I ask for a full explanation. Who has asked? Why have they asked? • I am emailing you to put in a plea to not cut down the Ash next to no:1 Rossendale Way (T1). T1 is still the runt of the litter but who says everything has to be perfect and it is what kicked off the protection of the other trees. I would be so sad to see it cut down. Please help if | | | | | | |

| | |
|--|--|
| | <p>you can.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The council need to be reminded that all trees in Elm Village are protected by Tree Preservation Orders. They should continue to refuse the attempts to fell trees on our estate. • What possible justification can there be to destroy the integrity of our environment in this way? The application states that the trees are not diseased or causing structural damage to property. Trees improve air quality and create a pleasant environment for the community. |
| <p>CAAC/Local groups* comments: *Please Specify</p> | <p>None received.</p> |

Assessment

The TPO tree works application was for the felling and pruning of various trees within Elm Village. The trees are situated within the communal areas of the residential estate. The site is not situated within a conservation area. As such, the TPO which covers many of the trees on the estate is the only statutory protection the afforded to the trees.

There are many trees on site which contribute to the verdant character of Elm Village and provide amenity to residents. Many trees require pruning and are overdue maintenance works, particularly where they are overhanging structures and where they are in contact with or soon to be in contact with structures.

When the application was first submitted it included the proposed felling of six trees, T1 ash, T4 field maple, T8 field maple, T9 field maple, T10 Robinia, and T11 birch. The justification for the felling of the trees was not considered robust enough to justify the proposed works. No evidence of defects, decay, pest or diseases was included with the submission. The robustness of the justification for works to TPO trees should be proportionate to the severity of the works. In addition, the proposed replacement planting was not considered sufficient to mitigate the loss of canopy cover proposed.

A number of supporters of the application refer to two trees that failed on site. In view of these two trees failing it is understandable that residents have concerns, however this does not automatically mean other trees are hazardous and does not form justification for felling other trees. There appears to be a collective perception that the trees pose an unacceptable level of risk, however no evidence has been submitted to support this. As such, it was recommended to the applicant that the proposed works be amended to pruning works only. This will allow for the amenity the trees provide to be retained and address the trees in close contact with structures.

The applicant may wish to submit a further application for the removal of trees with evidence as to why it is required.

It is recommended that the amended application be approved.