

Delegated Report		Analysis sheet	Expiry Date:	12/06/2024
		N/A / attached	Consultation Expiry Date:	
Officer			Application Number(s)	
Nick Bell			2024/1723/T	
Application Address			Drawing Numbers	
Flat Lower Ground Floor 33 Belsize Park London NW3 4DX				
PO 3/4	Area Team Signature	C&UD	Authorised Officer Signature	
Proposal(s)				
FRONT GARDEN: 1 x Cordyline (T2) - Fell to ground level. 1 x Privet (H4) - Fell to ground level.				
Recommendation(s):	No Objection to Works to Tree(s) in CA			
Application Type:	Notification of Intended Works to Tree(s) in a Conservation Area			

Conditions or Reasons for Refusal:	Refer to Draft Decision Notice					
Informatives:						
Consultations						
Adjoining Occupiers:	No. notified	23	No. of responses	02	No. of objections	02
Summary of consultation responses:	<p>The council received two consultation responses:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I have worked on the privet hedge between numbers 33 and 34 Belsize park for 15 to 20 years now, it's regularly maintained. I'm astounded that anyone might suggest it is causing damage to these properties, likewise the cordyline. Such insubstantial plants are not likely to cause heave nor threaten any foundations with their roots. There is a good size lime tree in the rear garden of no 34 that is close to both houses. This, I believe, is a much more probable cause of any damage. I performed a reduction on this tree in 2022 and think a further reduction would be a far more sensible course of action than the pointless removal of the privet and cordyline. • I totally object to these works on the grounds that this hedge immediately between us has been strenuously cut back every year and can't possibly be causing any significant damage as Privets are not known to have deep roots. There are no signs of any paving movement or damage my side. There is no damage to our party wall either. Locally in Camden there are thousands of Privet hedges to be seen up very close to houses with no apparent problems. This Privet between us also affords vital privacy and security from possible attackers. I sincerely hope the Council will continue their excellent record of tree preservation and refuse the application to cut down a fine Privet hedge causing in my view absolutely no problems of any significance. 					
CAAC/Local groups* comments: *Please Specify	None received.					

Assessment

The s.211 notice is for the removal of a Cordyline and a section of privet hedge. The s.211 notice has been submitted by loss adjuster due to alleged tree related subsidence.

The privet forms part of a hedge. Hedges are not afforded legal protection under s.211 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended). As such the privet can be removed without interaction with the council and is not suitable to be protected by a tree preservation order.

The Cordyline is visible from the public realm but is anatomically speaking not a tree. As an exotic, non-native monocot, this Cordyline (aka cabbage palm) are of low biodiversity value and has a more shrub-like than tree-like form.

The Cordyline is not considered to significantly contribute to the character and appearance of the conservation area. It is not of a rare species and is not considered to be a noteworthy example of its species. The palm is of no known historic or cultural value.

The council shares the view of objectors that is surprising the privet hedge and the palm could be contributing to structural damage however this does not make them any more suitable for a tree preservation order.

It is not expedient for the council to serve a TPO to protect the hedge and the palm.

The council does not object to the propose works.