Delegated Report

Officer	Application Number(s)	Application Address
Liam Vincent	2024/4435/T	61 Redington Road NW3 7RP

Proposal(s)

FRONT GARDEN:
1 x Sweet Chestnut (T2) - Fell to ground level.
1 x Holm Oak (T10) - Fell to ground level.

REAR GARDEN:
1 x Himalayan Birch (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**	9	**No. of responses**	1	**No. of objections**	1
Summary of consultation responses:	The Council received one response to the proposed works: • *I would object to this application as the trees are not diseased, they are a pleasure to look at and in particular the beautiful Himalayan Birch in the back garden is a long distance from any properties and its roots will probably help to soak up the recurring floods from excessive rain in our communal garden.*					
CAAC/Local groups* comments: *Please Specify	None received					

Assessment

The s.211 notification is to remove two trees (1 x Sweet Chestnut (T2) and 1 x Holm Oak (T10)) in the front garden and one tree (1 x Himalayan Birch (T4)) from the rear garden of a private residence on Redington Road, which is within the Redington Frognal Conservation Area.

- The tree removals are to enable landscaping following a development scheme at the property (granted full planning permission).
- Replacement trees are secured via Non Material Amendment 2024/4394/P (rear garden) & 2024/4395/P (front garden).
- 2024/4394/P details 1 x Crataegus prunifolia 'Splendens' & 1 x Cornus mas to replace T4 Betulus utilis 'Jacquemontii'.
- 2024/4395/P details 1 x Acer campestre 'Streetwise' and 1 x Carpinus betulus (multi-stemmed) to replace T2 Castanea sativa and T10 Quercus ilex.
- T4 is of low / negligible visibility from a public place.
- The trees to be removed are not rare or unusual species.
- The trees to be removed are of no known historical or cultural importance.

Due to the above reasons, it is not expedient to serve a Tree Preservation Order to object to the proposed works.

The Council does not object to the proposed works.