

Delegated Report

Officer		Application Number(s)					
Liam Vincent		2024/2873/T					
Application Address							
Flat A, 178 Camden Road NW1 9HG							
Proposal(s)							
REAR GARDEN: 1 x Tree of Heaven (T5) - Fell to ground level. 3 x Cherry Laurels (T1, T3 & T4) - Fell to ground level.							
Recommendation(s):		No objection to notification of intended works to tree(s) in a conservation area.					
Application Type:		Notification of Intended Works to Tree(s) in a Conservation Area					
Consultations							
Adjoining Occupiers:		No. notified	13	No. of responses	2	No. of objections	1
Summary of consultation responses:		<p>The Council received two responses to the proposed works, which are the same objection, one handwritten and one emailed with the same content. The response can be summarised as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 178 Camden Road is the same structure as my home 176 Camden Road. The roots of the tree are underneath both properties, removing the mature Tree of Heaven in the back garden of 178 would lead to the undermining of the foundations of both properties, due to resulting subsidence. As subsidence is well known in this area, reducing the tree would be a solution, giving the owner of 176A more light. 					
CAAC/Local groups* comments:		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> None received. 					
*Please Specify							

Assessment

The S.211 notification is to remove four trees – A Tree of Heaven (*T5 Ailanthus altissima*) and three Bay trees (*T1, T3 & T4 Laurus nobilis*) from the rear garden of a private residence on Camden Road, which is within the Camden Square Conservation Area.

The reasons for proposed removals are given as:

- T3, T4, together with much smaller T1 are growing taller and lots of leaves, partly growing on 176 Camden Road property side of the fence and blocking all light from that direction. I plan to grow vegetables and bushes around the edges of the garden and these trees would block much needed light, including direct light to the only window/access to the garden from lower ground floor.*
- T5: a very tall, leaning and top-heavy big leaf mahogany (at least to my knowledge). This tree is actually leaning on 180 Camden Road property and during storms the big top heavy swings a lot. I also believe that the lower branches are dead given they broke easily during a storm and carry no leaves whatsoever. I do fear for safety of other buildings and people, this tree can cause damage if it falls in any direction.*

T5 is a medium sized (~10-12m tall) early mature tree. It is growing at the end of the garden and very close to buildings and wall structures, in a position that is not sustainable for long-term retention. It appears to be a self-sown specimen (most likely a 'sucker' from the roots of another of the Ailanthus

in the vicinity), and its form is poor – much of the lower canopy is missing. There is a high level of deadwood throughout the canopy.

T1, 3 & 4 are smaller (~6m tall) mature trees growing against the southern rear garden boundary wall, much closer to the rear of the property. They are viewable from Murray Street and as such do have some value in their evergreen foliage adding winter colour to the conservation area. They are growing beneath the other much larger, more dominant Ailanthus in the rear garden of the property (T2), which is not part of the s211 notification.

It is not possible to compel a tree owner to carry out specific maintenance rather than what is proposed, unless a Tree Preservation Order is served, whereupon some limitations can be applied.

The response to the notification noted above regarding the removal of a tree causing subsidence to a property is possibly confused – the action of moisture uptake from the soil by the roots of a tree would be the reason for this. This would require the continued presence of the tree. T5 is beyond the zone of influence for this type of interaction.

None of the trees in the s211 are noteworthy examples of their species, are not rare or unusual species or are of any known cultural or historic importance.

It would not be expedient to TPO the trees.

The Council does not object to the proposed removal of these trees.