

Argles James

From: Planning Support
Subject: FW: CON/2022/0267 23 Denewood Road N6 4AQ

Sent: 24 July 2022 11:54

Subject: CON/2022/0267 23 Denewood Road N6 4AQ

CON/2022/0267 23 Denewood Road N6 4AQ

This applications asks for the further removal of trees

T1: Beech Remove and replace: The tree is dying back and is in decline and is not a great amenity specimen

T2: Ash Remove and replace: this is not a great amenity specimen.

T3: Horse Chestnut Remove and replace: The tree is very close to the house and has been reduced historically and is not a great amenity specimen

T1 T2 T3 T4 T5 T12 T11 T6 T7 T8 T9 T10 T1-T3 The request is that 6 matching replacement trees would be planted in their place. Possibly 6 Quercus rubra or similar that can be regularly pruned to contain their size

T4: Poplar To pollard to previous most recent reduction points for general maintenance

T5: Poplar To pollard to previous most recent reduction points for general maintenance

T6: Oak Dying Oak Remove and replace

T7: Ash To thin by 20% and remove dead wood

T8: Poplar To pollard to previous most recent reduction points for general maintenance

T9: Sycamore 20% Thin and removal of dead wood for general maintenance

T10: Sycamore 20% Thin and removal of dead wood for general maintenance

T11: Yew Dying, remove and replace

T12: Sycamore 20% Thin and removal of dead wood for general maintenance

As can be seen from the applications shown below, over the past few years at least 23 trees have been removed from this once fine, mature leafy garden, and that does not include the trees removed as part of the planning permissions given to partially demolish and rebuild the house.

CON/2017/0192 G35 Lawson cypress: Remove T38 Apple:

Remove;

2 tr

ees

CON/2018/0172 removal of Part of G13 Lawson cypress and Holly, T16 oak, T17 Ash, T19 Lawson Cypress, T30 Sycamore, T 31 Laburnam, T32 Apples, G39 Sycamores 10+ trees

(HNF wrote a comment attached to this application decrying the carnage in the back garden)

CON/2019/0252 Lawson cypress (T12) removal of Lawson cypresses (G13) Sycamore (T15) Lawson cypresses (G35) 10 + trees

CON/2020/0200 T2: Sycamore:

remove

1 tree

The removal of the trees at the front of the house will further erode the leafy aspect of this part of Denewood Road and the view of this property from View Road.

T1 Beech Object See our comments at HGY/2022/1771

T2 Ash Object

The Arboricultural Report attached to HGY/2015/0540 states:-

T2 Ash Twin stem at 4 metres with slightly unbalanced crown

Occasional pruning wounds due to crown lifting. No action required.

There is no reason to fell this tree.

T3 Horse Chestnut Object

The Arboricultural Report attached to HGY/2015/0540 states:-

T5 Horse Chestnut Twin stemmed at 3m with a slightly unbalanced crown. Occasional pruning wounds due to crown reduction. Significant tear wound and decay at 9m over boundary. Good formation of wound wood to compensate.

Remove epicormic shoots to 8m. Closely inspect tear wound at 9 m.

There is no evidence of structural damage to the house. We imagine that any potential problem would have been addressed at the application stage to rebuild the house.

T2 and T3 together make a significant contribution to the visual amenity of the area, softening the view from both View Road and up and down Denewood Road. They are worthy of a TPO, fulfilling all the TEMPO evaluation factors.

T6 Oak Object

The Arboricultural Report attached to HGY/2015/0540 states:-

T23 Oak Single stemmed and vertical with unbalanced crown (suppressed) No evidence significant pruning. No significant defects. No action required.

It is odd that the tree should be dying at this point and there is no evidence to support the assertion. We can only hope it wasn't damaged during construction works.

T12 Yew Object

The Arboricultural Report attached to HGY/2015/0540 states:-

T29 Yew Twin stemmed at 0.5 metres with a compact crown

Occasional pruning wounds due to crown lifting. No action required. No evidence of significant pruning. No significant defects. No action required.

Again it is odd that the tree should be dying at this point and there is no evidence to support the assertion. Once again, we can only hope it wasn't damaged during construction works.

T4, T5, T7, T8, T9, T10 and T12, No Objection.

This application involves a significant removal of trees and much work to the remaining trees, We would like the Tree Officer to make a site visit, with a view to

1. putting a TPO on trees where possible,
2. assessing the appropriate nature of the works proposed
3. firming up which variety of replacement trees are to be planted and where in the garden and what maintenance regime will be put in place.

Louise Lewis

Highgate Neighbourhood Forum

Subject: Dr con





23 Denewood Road July 2022