

**From:** Penny Marks  
**Sent:** 18 September 2023 14:38  
**To:** Planning  
**Subject:** Application number - 2023/3530/T

Dear Sirs

**Re: Application no: 2023/3530/T**

I am writing to oppose the above application giving permission to destroy two trees in a conservation area.

I am the owner and reside at Flat 1 32 Eton Avenue NW3 3HL.

I oppose the destruction of both the trees marked London Plane T5 on the corner of the garden of 22 Lancaster Grove and the Ash tree marked as T1.

It appears that the application has been made by the insurance broker for one resident at 30 Eton Avenue.

**I object on the following grounds:**

The trees are mature, healthy and contribute to the natural beauty and the bio-diversity of the area. Furthermore they provide a vital visual barrier between the properties on Eton Avenue and Lancaster grove. I am strongly of the opinion that the destruction of healthy trees should be a last resort taken only if there are no other options and certainly not at the bequest of one resident and their insurance company, whose only motive would seem to be to minimise expenditure for an insured leaseholder.

The applicant is an insurance broker (Sedgwick International, based in Leeds) who has been instructed by one, importantly only one of the 5 joint leaseholders of 30 Eton Avenue. The preliminary and unscientific advice is that the mild cracking in this property is being caused by this Plane tree. Rather than paying for the underpinning, that would be the logical way forward in a conservation area (where preservation of healthy trees is of the highest priority), they are recommending the cheap (and ineffective) option of removing this tree, together with an Ash, the subject of a different application.

The insurer has no local knowledge and is assuming that the damage is being caused by living trees.

No account has been made of the group of trees to which this tree belongs, nor of the knock on effect that its removal will cause. The dying roots will shrivel, allowing more water to fill the gaps, creating heave and also, in most likelihood, damage the root structure of the other trees around it.

There are bats roosting in the area and no bat report has been submitted

No impact assessment has been submitted or prepared on the effect of heave on the neighbouring properties by the insurance company

The application should be rejected for being unsubstantiated, detrimental and contrary to Camden's policy.

I await to learn the Planning authorities considered decision.

Yours sincerely

Mrs Penelope Marks

Flat 1

32 Eton Avenue

NW3 3HL