

# Delegated Report

<b>Officer</b>	<b>Application Number(s)</b>
Liam Vincent	2024/0269/T

<b>Application Address</b>
47 Compayne Gardens, London NW6 3DB

<b>Proposal(s)</b>
REAR GARDEN: 1 x London Plane (T1) - Re-pollard back to previous points. 1 x Cherry (T3) - Fell to ground level.

<b>Recommendation(s):</b>	<b>No objection to notification of intended works to Tree(s) in CA</b>
---------------------------	--

<b>Application Type:</b>	<b>Notification of Intended Works to Tree(s) in a Conservation Area</b>
--------------------------	---

## Consultations

<b>Adjoining Occupiers:</b>	No. notified	<b>28</b>	No. of responses	<b>2</b>	No. of objections	<b>2</b>
-----------------------------	--------------	-----------	------------------	----------	-------------------	----------

<b>Summary of consultation responses:</b>	<p>The Council received a two responses to this notification, which are summarised as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. I believe (the tree works application) is made in connection to the building application and not justified by an objective concern...The tree is located in my garden, however I note that the roots have expanded through the fence. It is an old tree that has been a part or my garden for many years. It has a beautiful cherry blossom. It generates some shade on warm summer days and helps to maintain at least partial privacy. Also the environmental impact should be further considered.</li> <li>2. proposal to "re-pollard" the London plane is welcome; I object to the proposal to fell the cherry tree. T3 is not a "small cherry" it is a substantial, mature cherry tree with a diameter significantly more than 10inches. It has suffered from ivy being allowed to grow on it for many years (although this has been addressed in the last year)...it produces wonderful blossom and vibrant foliage –visible from multiple neighbouring properties. Due to its proximity to the applied for permission to extend the "sunken garden/basement" and terrace further into the rear garden of the property I am not surprised by this application as the tree will now be much closer to the rear line of the property (if permission is granted for 2023/3067/P). However, loss of yet another tree in the conservation area and one which is visible and enjoyed by many neighbours and wildlife would be of detriment to the environment. The application mentions that there will be a "garden design including new planting plan....." but there is no information as to whether this will include any new trees or how much green area of the garden will be left (as opposed to hardstanding).</li> </ol>
---	---

<b>CAAC/Local groups* comments:</b> *Please Specify	<b>None received</b>
--	----------------------

## Assessment

A s.211 notification has been received proposing works to three trees in two neighbouring rear gardens of private residences on Compayne Gardens, situated within the South Hampstead Conservation Area. This report concerns the s.211 notification ref 2024/0269/T and covers a London Plane (T1) and a Cherry tree (T3). The associated notification for the neighbouring property is ref 2024/0266/T and concerns a Cherry tree (T2).

The works for this notification are to prune T1 back to previous points of reduction, and to fell T3. No reason has been given for the proposed felling of T3.

Neither T1 or T3 are visible from a public place. T1 is a large full canopied tree that has historically been subject to repeat crown reduction works, but has lapsed in recent years, leaving large scale regrowth. T3 is a smaller tree of poor form: a lack of recent past management has left the crown form compromised and it is heavily suppressed by T1. An objection to its removal supposes that T3 is being removed to facilitate a development, whereas s.211 tree works proposals are considered upon their own merits, as separate cases from any other planning application. It is not possible to condition the requirement for a replacement tree or specify what that might be if the tree is not subject to a TPO.

Though the loss of T3 would be detrimental to the conservation area overall, it can only be considered a minor loss as there are other, larger, and fuller canopied trees in the immediate area which have a greater visual and environmental impact. The tree is not of rare or unusual species, or an exemplary specimen, or of any cultural or historic importance.

It is not expedient for The Council to serve a TPO.

The Council does not object to the proposed works.