



Merewood
Arboricultural Consultancy Services

**A review of a Lawson cypress hedge
in support of an application to remove it
at
10 Tanworth Close
Northwood
HA6 2GF**

**Client: Rajesh Shah
64 Copsewood Way
Northwood
HA6 2TZ**

Prepared by
Simon Hawkins Dip Arb L6 (ABC) N.D Arbor M. Arbor. A.

Date
09/11/2023



Merewood.
Gregory Road, Hedgerley, Bucks. SL2 3XW
M. 07784 915944 T. 01753 647236
E. simon.hawkins@hotmail.co.uk
VAT No: 990 9313 90

1.0 Introduction

1.1 Instruction

- 1.1.1 I am instructed by Rajesh Shah to undertake an assessment of the trees forming part of a conifer hedge at the rear of 10 Tanworth Close Northwood.
- 1.1.2 The investigations have been carried out with a view to supporting an application to remove the trees.

1.2 The Site

- 1.2.1 10 Tanworth Close is an end of terrace property at the north side of Tanworth Close served by a single entrance drive at the front of the house leading to an integral garage.
- 1.2.2 The site is bordered by Tanworth Close to the south, by Thirlmere Close to the west and north and by other residential properties on all other sides. Tanworth Close is located to the northwest of Northwood village centre, east of Mount Vernon Hospital. The surrounding area is suburban and is typified by medium density housing.
- 1.2.3 The topography of the site is more or less level.
- 1.2.4 It has been established at the time of the survey that the cypress trees at the rear of the property are covered by a Tree Preservation Order (TPO 257). If any works to protected trees are proposed, other than the removal of dead wood or the implementation of operations agreed as part of a formal planning consent, a formal application must be submitted and approved by the Local Planning Authority before such works can be carried out.

1.3 Survey date

- 1.3.1 The trees at 10 Tanworth Close Northwood were surveyed on Friday, October 27, 2023.

2.0 Observations

- 2.1 The trees form part of a hedge that extends across three gardens. The hedge is made up of Lawson cypress (*Chamaecyparis lawsoniana*).
- 2.2 The hedge has not been managed to create a cohesive continual feature, nor has it formed a formal clipped hedge.

- 2.3 Pruning has taken place on the other trees in the group (located within adjacent gardens), but this has been carried out at a later stage in the life of the trees. The pruning undertaken has included the lopping of larger limbs, leaving the trees with large areas of exposed wood and limited areas of greenery especially on one side.
- 2.4 The two trees growing within the boundaries of 10 Tanworth Close are at the end of the hedge. These trees have been lopped in the past but have remained unpruned for some time.
- 2.5 The trees are now 11m high with a stem diameter of 600mm. The branches of the trees extend south west across the garden for a distance of 8m, occupying 50% of the rear garden area. The branches also extend towards the north across the garden of the house opposite (43 Thirlmere Gardens).
- 2.6 The inner crowns of these trees show large areas of dead wood and have experienced some small branch failures in the past.
- 2.7 The trees provide limited screening to views beyond the garden, as the house opposite at 43 Thirlmere Gardens is positioned off to one side. The removal of the trees would not expose this house to overlooking.

3.0 Opinion

- 3.1 The Lawson cypress trees within the group overall have not been formally managed or regularly pruned, resulting in poorly shaped trees of limited amenity value. It is felt that the group of trees would not be considered for the formal protection of a TPO if they were to be assessed now.
- 3.2 The two trees at the end of the row at the rear of 10 Tanworth Close are much larger than the other trees and look out of place. The lack of maintenance on these trees has left them overgrown, overbearing and unsightly.
- 3.3 Just pruning the trees would expose the bare branches on the inside and would leave the trees looking worse than they do now. The pruning of the trees has been left too late to be able to produce anything attractive or constructive.
- 3.4 The only realistic solution to the problem of how to deal with these trees, and indeed all of the trees within the group would be to fell them and plant a new hedge to provide screening in the future.
- 3.5 Leaving things as they are is not an option as this matter has been kicked into the long grass for long enough and should have been addressed years ago.
- 3.6 It is only by making the decision to remove and replace these trees can the amenity

of the group and its purpose (as a screening hedge) be assured for the future.

4.0 Conclusions

- 4.1 The hedge should be removed and replanted. Several species would be suitable on these soils and in this situation.
- 4.2 Appropriate replacement species would include Hornbeam (*Carpinus betulus*); Holly (*Ilex aquifolium*); Yew (*Taxus bacatta*) ; and Cherry laurel (*Prunus laurocerasus*).

Simon Hawkins Dip Arb L6 (ABC), ND Arb, MArborA

Appendix 1

Photographs



Picture 1 The two trees at the back of the garden are much larger than the other trees in the group



Picture 2 The interior of the trees shows a lot of deadwood and bare branches that would be exposed if the trees were just lopped