

CAMBRIDGE CITY COUNCIL

---

REPORT OF: Arboricultural Officer  
TO: Planning Committee  
WARD: Newnham

17/06/2014

**TREE WORKS APPLICATION 14/032/TTPO  
APPLICATION TO FELL TWO TREES AND PRUNE ONE TREE AT ST MARKS  
VICARGE, BARTON ROAD**

---

**1.0 INTRODUCTION**

- 1.1 A tree work application has been received to remove two trees and pollard a third, all of which are located in the rear garden of the Vicarge.
- 1.2 The item is brought before Members because objections have been received to the proposed works.

**2.0 RECOMMENDATION**

- 2.1 Allow the trees, removal subject to appropriate replacement planting and allow the pollarding of the third tree.

**3.0 BACKGROUND**

- 3.1 There are 10 trees in the rear garden of the Vicarage that are protected by TPO and a number of smaller trees that are not protected. Following a tree condition survey, the applicant's agent recommended the removal of T1, a Horse Chestnut and T2, a Sycamore and the pollarding of an additional Sycamore, T3, because the trees have significant defects that could result in structural failure.

**4.0 CONSULTATIONS**

- 4.1 Residents of Hardwick Street and The Cenacle were consulted and a Site Notice was issued for display.
- 4.2 Three objections to the works have been received from residents in Hardwick Street.

**5.0 CONSIDERATIONS**

- 5.1. Is the TPO still appropriate

Amenity

Does the tree still make a significant contribution to the character and appearance of the area

Condition

Has the tree's condition deteriorated sufficiently to make it exempt from the TPO

Justification for Removal

Are there sound practical or arboricultural reasons to remove trees or carry out tree works.

- What is the justification
- Is there a financial consideration
- Is there a health and safety consideration
- Does the nuisance out way the benefit of retention

## 5.2 The Arboricultural Officer's assessment of the tree.

### Amenity

All the trees in the rear garden of the Vicarge are reletively secluded and make limited contribution to visual amenity. The trees do however contribute to environmental and ecological amenity. The three trees that are the subject of this application are realtively young and less significant in statutre than other trees in the garden.

### Condition

All three trees have significant defects that will compromise their structural integrity. With regard to T1 and T2 these defects are sufficient to exempt the trees from the TPO. With regard to T3, remedial works in the form of reduction is required to provide a reasonable level of safety. This work would also therefore come under the exceptions.

### Justification for Removal

- What is the justification
- The location and extent of the defects in T1 and T2 make the removal of the trees the most appropriate way to manage the risk associated with retention. The damage to T3 is less significant and the tree's retention can be accommodated with an acceptable level of risk with management in the form of pollarding.
- Is there a financial consideration  
Yes in the form of legal action resulting from below.
- Is there a health and safety consideration  
Yes , harm or damage fron structural fialure.
- Does the risk outweigh the potential benefit of retention.  
For the reasons detailed above, the Tree Officer is of the opinion that the removal of T1 and T2 and the pollarding of T3 are justified. As the garden is dominated by large trees, officers are of the opinion that only one replacement tree is appropriate as a condition to consent.

## 5.3 Objections with Officer Comments

- The objections received focus on a lack of justification for the works and the impact that the removals will have on the envirnment and private screening.
- *The tree officer has visited the site and inspected the subject trees and is satisfied that the works are not only justified but that the trees are in such condition to exempt them from the requirement to apply for the permission. While there will be a loss of leaf cover as result of the works, other trees already in the garden will soon fill the void as they mature. While officers have sympathy with objectors regardeing loss of screen, these private benefits can not outweigh health and safety.*

## 6.0. OPTIONS

6.1 Members may

- Grant consent for the works without condition,
- Grant consent to works with condition or,
- Refuse permission for the works.

## 7.0 CONCLUSIONS

7.1 Members are asked to grant consent for the removal of T1 and T2, subject to the replacement of one tree the tree and grant consent for the pollarding of T3.

## 8.0 IMPLICATIONS

(a)	<b>Financial Implications</b>	Potential
(b)	<b>Staffing Implications</b>	None
(c)	<b>Equal Opportunities Implications</b>	None
(d)	<b>Environmental Implications</b>	None
(e)	<b>Community Safety</b>	None

**BACKGROUND PAPERS:** The following are the background papers that were used in the preparation of this report:

TWA 14/032/TTPO

Objections in the form of letter or email, received from three neighbours.

To inspect these documents please either view Public Access or contact Joanna Davies on extension 8522

The author and contact officer for queries on the report is Joanna Davies on extension 8522

Report file:	July 2014 PC St Marks Vicarge
Date originated:	24 June 2014
Date of last revision:	24 June 2014

## Appendix 1 Plan