

**From:** Mick O'Neill  
**Sent:** Wednesday, March 13, 2024 4:53 PM  
**To:** Planning  
**Subject:** 2024/0706/T Planning Application Comments

I have been living in 12-14 St Albans Road for 39 years and the main view from my only front window and balcony look out on this T3 oak tree, which I do like. I do water about 90% of the garden weekly in summer and for over 5 years I have been putting grease on the T3 oak and maintaining it to stop ants and aphids producing too much honeydew and protect it from oak processionary moth caterpillars.

I was surprised to find that Clarion and Microbee Tree Management Ltd have again applied to cut back the oak tree in the front garden because they last cut it back with four other trees about 3 months ago (2023/3536/T). Searching back through this Camden website for all previous applications reveals just 6 previous approved applications for cutting back this oak between 2009 and 2023. This suggests that the average time between applications was previously 2.8 years so it was very surprising to find they are repeating one so soon after the last one.

Another concern was that both applications asked to take off 2 to 2.5 metres which both say is 30%. However, the tree will probably not have grown at all since it was last cut back, being mid winter. So if they have cut off 2.25m which was 30% just a few months ago, cutting off another 2.25 metres soon is a lot more than 30% and to cut off another 30% is a lot less than 2.25m. So this is probably erroneous.

It is particularly worrying that their applications both say they are "routine maintenance" because it is way too frequent to be continued again and again.

It is also very curious why this time they have added "Flat A" to the Site Address of the previous application for the same tree. In fact none of the 15 previous planning applications on this website for our building had a flat number on them. I have asked the resident of Flat A whether she had requested it, but she said no and had heard nothing of it. Also Flat A is on the number 12 side of the property and the oak tree (T3) is on the opposite side of the building. So it makes no sense at all.

However, one of the residents said she had spoken to the application agent, Microbee “about the difference in cutbacks” between the trees in the back garden and the front garden. So that could explain the application. And along with another resident she believes that the oak tree could be responsible for a nearby pathway which “is riding up & uneven”. Looking at it, this seems possible but is not certain because there is a similar but smaller such flaw in the path on the number 12 side of the garden with no large trees nearby. In this planning application, it asks whether the tree was causing “Alleged damage to property - e.g. subsidence or damage to drains or drives.” And whoever filled it in ticked “No”. So, the flawed path seems unlikely to be the reason for the application.

I cannot support such an unexpected application. However, because of the neighbours’ concerns I will not object to this particular application but hope the future applications will return to more normal frequency in future.

Michael O’Neill