

Delegated Report

Officer		Application Number(s)				
Liam Vincent		2024/4221/T				
Application Address						
52 Goldhurst Terrace NW6 3HT						
Proposal(s)						
FRONT GARDEN: 1 x Yellow False Acacia (T1) - Fell to below ground level.						
Recommendation(s):		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	12	No. of responses	14	No. of objections
Summary of consultation responses:		<p>The Council received a number of responses which can be summarised as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>There is insufficient proof that she is causing damage to no 50.</i> • <i>Trees are essential for the well-being of the local fauna</i> • <i>Provide much-needed shade and shelter</i> • <i>Help to stop flooding</i> • <i>Add to the natural beauty of the street</i> • <i>no photographic evidence of movement and evidence overall is poor</i> • <i>This type of house is typical in Greencroft gardens - they all suffer subsidence with no trees - It is bad construction to blame and not the tree. The tree just needs regular pruning.</i> • <i>Monitoring points have reported movement of less than 2mm</i> • <i>Trees improve air quality, reduce street temperatures, provide mental health benefits</i> 				
CAAC/Local groups* comments: <small>*Please Specify</small>		<p>CRASH objects to the proposed removal of this false acacia tree located in the front garden of no.50 Goldhurst Terrace. As noted in the accompanying report the tree provides "high public amenity" and is visible up and down the street as such its loss (even if replaced by a new tree) would be a detriment to the conservation area, the environment and its residents. There is no supporting evidence provided with the application of damage being caused by the tree to the property or its flats - no internal or external photos to show evidence of cracking is provided. The accompanying report documents that all monitoring points have reported movement of less than 2mm the only monitoring points that have movement in excess of that are the front pillar between 50 and 52 Goldhurst and point 11 which is the stair wall. The relative readings of the lower ground floor - under steps vault are all less than 2mm. As such there would appear to be very minimal movement, in the evidence provided, which should not require removal of an attractive tree.</p>				

Assessment

The Council has received a s.211 notification proposing to remove a Yellow False Acacia (*Robinia pseudoacacia* *Freesia*) tree (T1) to ground level in the front garden of a private residence on Goldhurst Terrace, which is within the South Hampstead Conservation Area. The tree has been implicated as being the causal factor in an alleged case of subsidence, which has caused damage to the neighbouring property (No.50).

This mature tree is approximately 10m tall and 5m wide and has previously been significantly pruned, but currently has foliar regrowth of around 2-3m of an attractive golden green colour. It can readily be seen from >100m along Goldhurst Terrace in both directions, as it is one of the few remaining large trees in the front gardens of the properties on the street.

- An arboricultural report has been provided to support the claim, but sources for information and some key elements are missing - the sources and / or copies of the soil analyses, root identification, drain investigation have not been provided.
- The monitoring shows movement of a cyclical nature, which is characteristic of the influence of vegetation.
- The monitoring has recorded the movement to be of around 2mm, but there is no description of the location or severity (width) of the cracks. According to the BRE digest 251 if the cracks were at widest 2mm, this falls within 'categories 0, 1, and 2 with crack widths up to 5mm (and) can be regarded as 'aesthetic' issues that require only redecoration.'
- No photographic evidence of the damage has been provided.
- No estimate of the cost of repairs with tree removal and tree retention has been provided.

The report has concluded that

1. Prospects for control via vegetation management are good.
2. That ongoing monitoring is required to establish the response of the building to any initial tree control measures.

The tree provides a high level of visual amenity in a street scene that otherwise has few examples of large-scale vegetation.

The Council objects to the proposed removal of the tree, and a Tree Preservation Order will be served to protect the amenity and habitat values that the tree provides, and preserve the character of the conservation area.