

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2023/4740/T	Mr E Peel	11/11/2023 00:07:25	OBJ	<p>I strongly object to this further application to fell the very same oak tree (in the front garden of no. 73 Aberdare Gardens) that was the subject of a previous application to fell in 2020, which resulted in Camden placing a TPO on the tree. The wording used in Camden's decision letter at the time was as follows, and in my view it remains now every bit as relevant and appropriate, as it was then:</p> <p>"The oak tree is highly visible from the public realm and is considered to provide a high level of public amenity. The tree is considered to contribute to the character and appearance of the conservation area.....The oak tree is considered to be suitable for a tree preservation order as it has future potential as an amenity and is highly visible from the public realm. Oak trees are of high biodiversity value and help to combat climate change."</p> <p>The most recent versions of the technical reports submitted 3 years after the original ones still show only "slight cracking" to the property and note that it is of a cyclical nature. This is quite common across the whole South Hampstead Conservation Area, due to the contraction and then the swelling of the underlying clay subsoil across the seasonal rainfall variation cycles. Complete removal of major items of vegetation can cause damage through excessive 'heave', as the residual volume of water in the clay layer grows.</p> <p>The same agent has made many previous applications for similar fellings of prominent trees in front and back gardens in this Conservation Area, and always seems to approach the issue in a very binary way, with the only two options being considered by them being either complete felling or leaving the tree as it is. The intermediate compromise option of putting the tree under a regular (annual or bi-annual) maintenance regime to constrain its height and size, and therefore volume and root-spread is, regrettably, never proposed, but should be. The default approach of always seeking to fell a healthy tree is presumably in order to save underwriters costs for the insurer, but is not in the interests of the appearance and character and biodiversity and carbon sink qualities of the Conservation Area.</p> <p>It appears that the same agent responsible for this application (for the felling of the (T1) oak tree) has also very recently applied to have a large cypress tree in the adjoining front garden (of no. 75 Aberdare Gardens) completely removed, (T3), having already succeeded in having a false acacia/robinia tree (T2) also in the front garden of no. 75 Aberdare Gardens felled. (Please refer to application 2023/4711/T for the felling of the Cypress tree at 75 Aberdare Gardens).</p> <p>It does appear somewhat disingenuous to submit three separate applications for this proposed felling of the 3 trees that are highly visible to the public realm in quite close proximity in the adjacent front gardens, rather than by submitting a single application, so that the public can really understand what is being proposed. All of these proposed works reference exactly the same set of soil specialist engineers and arboriculturalists reports.</p> <p>A cynical observer might even infer that this is a way of seeking to get the approval of the devastation of 3 such closely-spaced and highly-visible trees in adjacent front gardens through 'under the radar'.</p> <p>With T2 now having already been felled, it is suggested that the TPO'd oak tree (T1) is put under an even more stringent regular tree management regime so as to constrain its crown spread and height to no more than its current size, thereby limiting its water abstraction requirements; but under no circumstances should this valuable TPO'd tree be felled.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2023/4740/T	CRASH	10/11/2023 12:49:40	OBJ	<p>It seems that the cypress (T3) next door at 75 Aberdare Gardens, has grown to be very tall and large, and seems to have been neglected in terms of not being regularly managed. It is suggested that this tree should now also be substantially reduced in height and brought under a regular tree management regime so as to reduce the roots' spread and stabilise its water demands.</p> <p>In the very unfortunate event that Camden does grant permission to allow either of tree T1 (oak) or T3 (cypress) to be entirely felled, then Camden should insist on a replacement planting for at least T1. This would require the stump to be entirely ground out, and not simply felled 'to near ground level' with the stump left in situ, as is currently proposed in the application.</p> <hr/> <p>CRASH strongly objects to this re-newed application to fell the now TPOd oak tree in the front garden of no. 73 Aberdare Gardens. CRASH supported the TPO placed on the tree by Camden in 2020 when the previous application to fell it was made and notes the wording from Camden in its decision letter remains current "The oak tree is highly visible from the public realm and is considered to provide a high level of public amenity. The tree is considered to contribute to the character and appearance of the conservation area.....The oak tree is considered to be suitable for a tree preservation order as it has future potential as an amenity and is highly visible from the public realm. Oak trees are of high biodiversity value and help to combat climate change."</p> <p>The technical reports submitted three years on continue to show only "slight cracking" to the property of a cyclical nature which is widespread across the conservation area irrespective of proximity to trees/vegetation.</p> <p>CRASH notes the current application made by the same agents to also fell the cypress in the front of no.75 Aberdare and has objected separately to it. CRASH also notes that if permitted these applications and the previously approved removal of the false acacia/robinia would represent a loss of three trees in the front gardens which are highly visible from the public realm forming an important part of the conservation area and beneficial to the environment and tackling the climate change emergency.</p> <p>In the event that Camden disappointingly decides to grant permission CRASH notes the requirement to plant a new tree to replace the TPO oak - however if the stump is not ground out there will be limited place to plant the tree and noting the pressure on Camden's tree officers CRASH is concerned whether this requirement would ever be enforced.</p>

**Total: 15**