

Delegated Report		Analysis sheet		Expiry Date:	28/08/2024
		N/A / attached		Consultation Expiry Date:	
Officer			Application Number(s)		
Nick Bell			2024/2961/T		
Application Address			Drawing Numbers		
143 Haverstock Hill London NW3 4RU					
PO 3/4	Area Team Signature	C&UD	Authorised Officer Signature		
Proposal(s)					
FRONT GARDEN: 1 x Fig (T1) - Fell to ground level. 1 x Cherry (T2) - 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			

Conditions or Reasons for Refusal:		Refer to Draft Decision Notice				
Informatives:						
Consultations						
Adjoining Occupiers:	No. notified	61	No. of responses	05	No. of objections	04
			No. electronic	00		
Summary of consultation responses:	<p>The council received five consultation responses:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> I object to these trees being felled as they provide privacy, protection from the street sounds, and mental health benefits, and they pose no threat or obstruction to either people or vehicles. No rationale given for felling these trees. Visible from the street, they are a public amenity and offer greenery in a built up area. If trees are to be felled at such a rapacious rate in the borough, particularly in a conservation area, there must be good reason given. 1) Trees are good for the area. They make Belsize Park a beautiful place to live. 2) Trees are environmentally good. I don't need to say this. We want more trees not less. 3) Trees provide a green shield from looking at a block of flats and cars parked outside. 4) Trees absorb some of the noise from Haverstock Hill traffic. 5) Trees from what I see are alive and well. Please can you confirm what the reason for the felling of these trees is as I see no reason given in the paperwork. Are the trees in question posing any sort of problems? If so, please clarify what as I see nothing about this in the planning application documentation. The cherry tree in question was trimmed / coppiced relatively recently so why the desire to fell it now? The fig can be trimmed again too, just to deal with any branches hanging too low, (for large vehicle access into Romney Court's driveway). These trees screen residents at both 143 and the neighbouring property (Romney Court) from street noise and provide heightened privacy. They are of value to residents' mental health and the biodiversity of the area. If there is no rationale behind felling these trees, the plan should be rejected. I am a resident of 143, the cherry tree and fig, covers from the sight of the street helping not being exposed, helping in security. Trees are part of green spaces, these two are quite green, that help with health issues, specially mental health. Lowers sound of the street. I live just in front of the cherry tree and I love it, looking to a green landscape generates a good impact. I don't think those trees need to be taken down, maybe trim a little bit, cause they don't even touch the building. 					
CAAC/Local groups* comments: *Please Specify	None received.					

Assessment

The s.211 notice is for the removal of a cherry tree and a fig tree from the communal front garden of a residential block that is situated within the Belsize Park Conservation Area.

The trees are visible from the public realm and contribute to the character and appearance of the conservation area.

Both trees are in close proximity to a retaining wall between the application site and the neighbouring 141 Haverstock Hill. The soil level at the application site is approx. 1.5m above the ground level at 141 Haverstock Hill. The brick retaining wall is cracked extensively in various places, it is considered highly likely the expansion of the trees rooting system is contributing to the damage given the proximity of trees to the damage. The trees are yet to achieve their ultimate size and form; further expansion will likely result in further damage.

The trees are of no known cultural or historic value and are not of a rare species. Neither tree is considered to be a noteworthy example of its species. Given the structural damage to the wall the trees are not considered to be of sufficient quality and/or significance for the council to insist on their retention.

The trees do provide some degree of screening function but given the other factors stated this is not considered to be robust enough justification for the council to object to their removal.

It is not expedient for the council to serve a tree preservation to protect the trees.

The council does not object to the proposed works.