

<b>Delegated Report</b>		<b>Analysis sheet</b>	<b>Expiry Date:</b>	16/06/2022
		N/A / attached	<b>Consultation Expiry Date:</b>	
<b>Officer</b>			<b>Application Number(s)</b>	
Nick Bell			2022/1951/T	
<b>Application Address</b>			<b>Drawing Numbers</b>	
28 Redington Road London NW3 7RB				
<b>PO 3/4</b>	<b>Area Team Signature</b>	<b>C&amp;UD</b>	<b>Authorised Officer Signature</b>	
<b>Proposal(s)</b>				
<p>FRONT GARDEN: 1 x Cherry (T3) - Fell to Ground Level.  1 x Laburnum (T4) - Fell to Ground Level.  REAR GARDEN: 1 x Beech stump (T10) - Fell to Ground.  1 x Golden King Holly (T36) - Fell to Ground Level.  1 x Palm (T43) - Fell to Ground Level.  1 x Birch (T41) - Fell to Ground Level.  1 x Storm Failed Birch (T42) - Fell to Ground Level.  1 x Silver Birch (T39) - Fell to ground level.  1 x Monolith (T25) - Fell to Ground Level.  1 x Ash Monolith XL trunk (T22) - Fell to Ground Level.  1 x Horse Chestnut (T20) - Fell to ground Level.</p>				
<b>Recommendation(s):</b>		No objection to notification of intended works to tree(s) in a conservation area.		
<b>Application Type:</b>		Notification of Intended Works to Tree(s) in a Conservation Area		

Conditions or Reasons for Refusal:	Refer to Draft Decision Notice					
Informatives:						
<b>Consultations</b>						
Adjoining Occupiers:	No. notified	<b>30</b>	No. of responses	<b>02</b>	No. of objections	<b>02</b>
			No. electronic	<b>00</b>		
Summary of consultation responses:	The council received two consultation responses which are detailed below.					
<b>CAAC/Local groups* comments:</b> *Please Specify	<p>Hampstead CAAC submitted the following objection:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>HCAAC objects to any tree felling or interference to the front and rear gardens at 28 Redington Road. This historic unique 'wood like' long rear garden is of great importance to Redington Frogna! Neighbourhood Forum (and its adopted plan). NP aspirations to enhance the green aspect of Hampstead; an attractive feature of its Conservation area. This unique property was only considered recently as a main dwelling (planning ref; 2022/0297/p) for refurbishment on the premise that its gardens and its trees were retained. The gardens should remain untouched for future generations who are custodians of the bio diversity in the CA. There are many small animals and birds insects etc that have made their nests in the area and need full protection. Please refuse this application.</li> </ul> <p>Redington Frogna! Neighbourhood Forum submitted the following objection:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Forum understands that, in addition to individual TPOs on four beech trees, all trees at 28 Redington Road are subject to a Woodland TPO. This is in recognition of the trees' importance to the woodland character of the site, which provides considerable biodiverse habitat and is of great importance to bats, birds and other RedFrog wildlife for foraging and commuting. It is also significant that the wooded site forms an important corridor to Branch Hill Woods, a Grade 1 Borough level Site of Importance for Nature (CaB104). Moreover, the remaining trees and woodland setting are an endangered component of the wooded character of the Redington Frogna! Conservation Area. Indeed, the latest Conservation Area Character Appraisal and Management Strategy emphasises the importance of trees to the Conservation Area. While the Arboricultural Impact Assessment refers to a 2019 "Landscape Concept Design" (drawn up prior to adoption of the Neighbourhood Plan), this does not appear to form part of the documents accompanying the 2022 notices of intent. An updated landscape document, taking account of the RedFrog Neighbourhood Plan policies, would be helpful to understand the applicant's plans to preserve and enhance the natural woodland setting.</li> </ul>					

## Assessment

The s.211 notification is for the removal of various trees from the front and rear garden of a residential property that is situated within the Redington Frogna Conservation Area.

The site contains a large number of trees but has been vacant for many years and the tree stock unmanaged. None of the trees in question are subject a tree preservation order. While there are large number of trees proposed for removal, the quality and condition of the majority of the trees in question are either dead or in poor condition as follows:

Cherry (T3) and Laburnum (T4). Both trees are supress by larger, more dominant trees. Two new trees are to be planted in similar positions.

Golden King Holly (T36). Small tree of minimal public visibility. Sparse crown, poor physiological condition.

Beech stump (T10). Dead.

Palm (T43) Minimal public visibility, low amenity value.

Birch (T41) – Tree has failed in storm, hazardous condition.

Birch (T42) – Fell to ground level. Tree has failed in storm, hazardous condition.

Silver Birch (T39). Poor condition. *Piptoporus betulinus* fungal fruiting brackets on stem.

1 x Monolith (T25). Dead.

1 x Ash Monolith. Dead.

1 x Horse Chestnut. Dead.

While there are a high number of trees proposed for removal, the quality, condition or low level of amenity value is considered to justify their removal. None of the trees are of a rare species or of any known cultural or historical significance, nor are they considered to be noteworthy examples of their species. It is not expedient for the council to serve a tree preservation order to protect the trees.

The council does not object to the proposed works.

