

# Delegated Report

**Officer**

Tom Little

**Application Number(s)**

2023/4773/T

**Application Address**9 - 11 Belsize Grove  
London  
NW3 4UU**Proposal(s)**

REAR GARDEN: 1 x Ash (T1) - Reduce crown by 40%, approx. 5m reduction.

**Recommendation(s):**

No Objection to Works to Tree(s) in CA

**Application Type:**

Notification of Intended Works to Tree(s) in a Conservation Area

**Consultations****Adjoining Occupiers:**

No. notified

**0**

No. of responses

**n/a**

No. of objections

**2****Summary of consultation responses:**

The Council received two objections to the application which can be read online.

**CAAC/Local groups\* comments:**

\*Please Specify

None

## Assessment

The ash is a large specimen protected by a tree preservation order, the tree is considered to provide a visual amenity within the area and to make a positive contribution to the character of the area.

The tree has been reduced in the past however this management regime has lapsed and the tree has regrown a large crown.

A number of significant defects can be seen in the crown and at the base of the tree. Within the crown there is what appears to be a fungal bracket on at least one of the former pruning points, a number of former pruning points showing signs of decay and one place where regrowth has failed at a former pruning point. The base of the tree has a cavity that would appear to be relatively large and extend through the root-plate of the tree. No evidence has been submitted indicating the extent of the decay. However given the structural defects visible, the proposed crown reduction would seem reasonable and proportionate, reducing the likelihood of the tree failing and reducing the impact of failure should it occur.

While the planning history of the site (including extant applications and enforcement cases) may be given consideration when deciding an application to carry out tree works, this would be secondary to observations regarding the structural integrity of the tree. In this case the presence of structural defects preclude consideration of other factors.

There is no statutory requirement for the Local Planning Authority to consult on tree works applications, it is the current policy of Camden Council to consult where trees are to be felled completely or where the application is made by someone who is not the owner of the land where the tree is situated or an agent working on their behalf. In this case the application was to reduce the tree so no consultation was undertaken.

In certain circumstances the Council might require that a tree is surveyed by an Arboricultural Consultant however the impact of the works are considered to be temporary as the tree will regrow foliage and reasonable given the defects clearly present within the structure of the tree.

The unlawful construction of a gazebo is not considered relevant to the decision making process in this case.

In this case the proposed work is considered to be likely to extend the safe useful life expectancy of the tree by reducing the likelihood of the tree failing and therefore extending its positive contribution to the character, appearance and ecology of the conservation area.

It is recommended that the application is approved.