

Delegated Report

Officer	Application Number(s)	Application Address
Liam Vincent	2025/0257/T	37 Rossendale Way NW1 0XB

Proposal(s)

(TPO REF: C649-T7) AREA ADJACENT TO NUMBER 37: 1 x Norway Maple (*Acer platanoides*) (T1) - Section dismantle and leave stump in the ground.

Recommendation(s):	Refuse application for works to tree covered by a TPO
--------------------	--

Application Type:	Application for works to a tree covered by a TPO
-------------------	---

Consultations

Adjoining Occupiers:	No. notified	12	No. of responses	7	No. of objections	4
----------------------	--------------	----	------------------	---	-------------------	---

Summary of consultation responses: The Council received seven responses – four objections, two supporting and one comment which are viewable on the Council website at <https://accountforms.camden.gov.uk/planning-search/index.xhtml?jsessionId=G5p7hMs156RqNPIwAIKwGqXdXhn8xN2BnMC6N-NK.svr-prod-wfly01?faces-redirect=true&search=2025%2F0257%2FT&page=1&sortBy=RELEVANCY>

CAAC/Local groups* comments: <small>*Please Specify</small>	None received
--	---------------

Assessment

The Council has received a TPO application proposing to remove a mature Sycamore tree which is growing within a raised (walled) planter adjacent to 37 Rossendale Way on the Elm Village estate, which is not within any conservation area.

The tree is highly visible within the street-scene of the estate, and adds considerable visual amenity value to the area, helping to soften the built structures around it. It greatly contributes to the natural habitat within the estate, which has only a handful of larger scale mature trees due to limited space available. It offers much in the way of amenity values to the wider community of the estate. There has been comment that mature trees removed across the estate in recent years is depleting the natural environment in this location, which is a densely populated and built area of the borough.

The reason given for the proposed removal is that the *'tree (is) growing in restricted small raised bed and is outgrowing it's place creating severe damage to the retaining wall with a very high chance of complete collapse causing damage to surrounding properties and/or injury to human health.'*

However, an investigative report provided by an engineering consultancy gives conflicting opinion on this reasoning and states that the although the damage (vertical lean out of plumb) is demonstrably occurring, it is within acceptable tolerances and that the brick planter / wall is not at imminent risk of collapse. The report concludes that the tree is large and will *'continue to grow and exert significant force on the planter wall. It is not expected that this would be contained or withstood by the brick planter wall, although specialist design and reinforcement could potentially be considered'* i.e., an engineering solution could be found.

The report also notes that the trees in the area (i.e., the estate) are larger than would be expected to be safe in relation to the proximity to the properties and hard landscaping, but that no arboricultural assessment of the health and stability of the tree has been undertaken.

On this basis, the reasons given are not robust enough to justify the tree's removal. Removal of the tree would have a significant and negative impact upon the local landscape. There is scope to reduce the tree's canopy in order to retain the tree and the values that the tree offers rather than total loss. The operational difficulties in removing the stump of the tree from its location should the tree be dismantled are acknowledged within the proposed work specification. This indicates that replacement planting is unlikely to occur in this location, despite the obligation to replant due to the tree's protected status.

It is recommended that the proposed works be refused.