

Delegated Report

Officer

Tom Little

Application Number(s)

2022/4062/T

Application Address

10 St Mark's Crescent
London
NW1 7TS

Proposal(s)

REAR GARDEN: 1 x Himalayan Birch (T1) - Fell to ground level and grind out stump.
To be carried out to standards outlined within BS8545.

Recommendation(s):**Objection to works to trees in a conservation area****Application Type:****Conservation area tree works notification****Consultations****Adjoining Occupiers:**

No. notified

2

No. of responses

0

No. of objections

Summary of consultation responses:

1. I object to the felling of this birch tree. Reputable tree surgeons have told me that whereas Camden is very strict about any pruning work to trees visible from the street, they permit almost anything to be done out of sight in a rear garden. However this particular 'rear' garden is by the canal. The tree is visible to the many passers by. Given the threats of climate change and the need to 'green' our cities, it should continue to live there.
2. i am against this tree being cut down to ground level. its is a beautiful tree for all to enjoy as we walk along the canal. all the trees in the area, especially with the Conservation area need to be protected and care for. We need our trees especially with such high Nox levels and the ongoing pollution coming from the HS2 works

CAAC/Local groups* comments:

*Please Specify

None

Assessment

The birch tree is highly visible from Regent's Canal providing visual amenity to those using the canal and the towpath. It is considered to make a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the conservation area forming part of a green corridor along this part of the canal. The tree would appear to have reasonably good form with no significant structural defects and contributes to the urban tree canopy, mitigating pollution and the climate emergency. It is considered that the tree is worthy of being brought under the protection of a tree preservation order.

The tree works notification gives the following reasons as justification for removing the tree:

- i) To provide replacement planting of a more appropriate species which does not require cyclical management and provides direct replacement of amenity value, canopy cover and biodiversity attributes
- ii) To provide a replacement planting which grows to its full potential at maturity to a scale within the landscape setting of a small rear garden with the important Willow tree remaining as the main feature tree
- iii) To enable the Weeping willow (sited on the canal bank to the north) to re- develop western crown; this tree is currently unbalanced due to suppression of the Himalayan birch; the removal will enable the Willow to improve in shape and form being the more appropriate tree for the canal bank setting
- iv) Delivery of a robust planting scheme with maintenance requirements to ensure successful establishment

The above reasons are not sufficient to justify the removal of a tree which is considered worthy of being brought under the protection of a tree preservation order, the tree is not dead or dangerous and there are no allegations or evidence of the tree causing damage to property.

It is recommended that a tree preservation order is served to preserve the visual amenity the tree provides and protect the character and appearance of the conservation area.