

From: George Mcdonald
Sent: Saturday, January 6, 2024 7:59 PM
To: Planning
Subject: Application ref: 2023/5284/T - Objection

George McDonald

Basement and Ground Floor 140
Agar Grove
London
NW1 9TY

1. The supporting documents (photographic evidence) merely show the trees in question and do not support the proposed reasons for the felling and poisoning of the Cordyline and reducing the canopy of the Common Lime. "REASON: Tree has caused lateral damage to adjacent rear boundary wall and is suspected of contributing to the downward rotational movement of another section of the same wall." Surely sufficient evidence of such "damage", whether photographic or that of a surveyor(s) report(s), would be more suffice and should be made available for public viewing and taken greatly into account.
2. The supporting documents (photographic evidence) are taken from the view point of 138 Agar Grove. Not one piece of supporting evidence (photographic) is taken from the view point of 140 Agar Grove - where said trees grow. The supporting documents submitted, for example: 2023-12-18 14.21.00 show the very top of the Cordyline. Which, is in fact, heavily hidden by the vast and wild overgrowth the boundary wall is submerged by - on 138 Agar Grove side. The "suspected contributing to the downward rotational movement of another section of the same wall", indicates that the Cordyline tree may not be the only factor and that the previously mentioned heavy and unkept overgrowth could also play a major factor and/or other factors too.
3. Supporting Evidence: 2023-12-18 14.20.49 (Common Lime), which grows in a "Conservation Area" as your letter states, is currently not in bloom and is surrounded all year around by evergreen trees at 142 Agar Grove and 138 Agar Grove - please see supporting evidence. I would like to raise the question, as to why, no planning permission has been submitted to fell or reduce canopy size of any of these trees? Many other trees, which are bigger, more overgrown

and unkept line the back of the consecutive gardens and yet they are not posing a problem.

4. The Cordyline: "There is an intention to replant elsewhere in the garden with a large standard Sorbus aucuparia (12cm girth)." This is a very vague statement, that no one has took time to discuss. As mentioned in point 3 (above), both trees grow in a "Conservation Area". Trees form an integral part of the built and natural environment, making a valuable contribution to the character of an area. Their longevity, often spanning many centuries, provides continuity and focus within local communities contributing to our history and culture. As design elements in both the urban and rural environments they give scale, texture and colour to landscapes, complementing or screening buildings. However, as with all living organisms, trees are sensitive to environmental change and can be irreparably damaged or destroyed. This decision should not be made lightly and I fear the supporting reasons do not justify the planned works.

5. In line with Camden's Tree Policy (December 2015) - a routine inspection has not been completed in the required time of every 3 years. I would like to request the last report and/or evidence of this inspection. I would also like to highlight that the policy in question states that, "... the following reasons will not constitute grounds for the pruning or removal of trees by the Council. However, if it is possible to improve the situation through general maintenance, this work will be carried out at the appropriate time as part of the cyclical maintenance regime:

- Obstruction of light, and or view
 - Aphid honeydew, leaf-fall, the dropping of fruit and flowers
 - Renewable energy systems such as solar panels or wind turbines
 - To improve satellite/digital television reception
 - Roosting birds in a tree and or their droppings
 - Where a tree is perceived to be too large
 - Allergies associated with trees, for example pollen and seed dispersal
 - Someone willing to pay for the removal and replacement of a tree/s
- Causing disturbance to pavements or kerbs in such cases an engineering solution will be sought).

I want to enquire why the Common Lime canopy needs to be reduced so signifally, when no valid reason has been submitted on the planned proposals,

other than the routine “cyclic management works”. Which, as previously stated, have not been carried out in line with or in the time frame of Camden’s Tree Policy. All of a sudden, it’s deemed an urgent issue. I’ve been a tenant at 140 Agar Grove for 26 years, and, to my knowledge, the trees have only been inspected, and works completed, 3 times in that period. I would like to request the complete paper trail of said inspections and works. I’d also like to highlight point 3 again and question why this less significant tree (with currently no canopy) is such an urgent issue when other surrounding trees are not?

I would like a formal response to said objection and points in the legal time frames required.