

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2024/4874/T	John Forrest	22/11/2024 11:41:12	OBJ	<p>I wish to appeal against this application, specifically about the request to chop down the silver birch. For a number of reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. My understanding (based on a previous occasion) is that there is a Tree Preservation Order on this tree. No mention is made about this on the application, and no justification is given. Similarly, with respect to the justification, even if this application is being made because this is a conservation area and there is no TPO. 2. The background to this application is that there are some subsidence issues in the outside steps that lead up to the front door of this property. It has been suggested that this tree is to blame. However, it is not the only candidate – there is a large tree in the pavement outside, I don't know the type, which is actually about the same distance from the steps, and there are other large shrubs – one of the shrubs is right up against the steps. Cracking appears both sides. The Managing Agents for the property (more below) are supposed to be commissioning further survey work into what is actually causing the problem, but this has not occurred. The application is merely guessing the scenario with incomplete evidence. 3. The tree surgeon requesting the work has, as we understand, been asked to do this by the Managing Agents. However, the Managing Agents have not consulted on this measure with the lease holders on actually chopping the tree down and are exceeding their authority – they have no permission. Note it is the lease holders of the flats that are party to the head lease of the property, not the Managing Agents – the Managing Agents are supposed to be the leaseholders agents. The last report the Managing Agents commissioned suggested further investigation was required, particularly tree root analysis, and even then that the tree would be reduced in stages and not all at once. It is not clear if they are suggested the “council” tree outside be pruned – the leaseholders have suggested that, since nobody can remember when it was last done. Confronted after this application was made public, the Managing Agents I believe have said they would continue with the investigation, but this application has not been withdrawn. I would suggest they do not have the right to commission this work yet alone the application for it. 4. Not withstanding all the above, it is not clear the effect on the land of removing this tree. My understanding is that could itself result in more land movement short term, which might cause more short-term movement in the property, but this does not seem to have been considered. <p>I am resident in one of the flats in the property, specifically that on what is technically the second floor. This tree acts, and I think was always intended to act, as a screen on the front window of our flat, which is our main bedroom – otherwise we would be overlooked from the tower block directly opposite. If it turns out this tree does need to go, then so be it, but short term this has not been justified, there is no coherent plan on what needs doing, and I would be loath to lose the screening when it might not actually fix the issues. I would have no objection to further pruning of all the trees/shrubs, but that is not the application.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2024/4874/T	John Forrest	22/11/2024 11:44:29	OBJ	<p>(Second go on making this comment. Did not seem to work first time, but if it did please ignore this duplication)</p> <p>I wish to appeal against this application, specifically about the request to chop down the silver birch. For a number of reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. My understanding (based on a previous occasion) is that there is a Tree Preservation Order on this tree. No mention is made about this on the application, and no justification is given. Similarly, with respect to the justification, even if this application is being made because this is a conservation area and there is no TPO. 2. The background to this application is that there are some subsidence issues in the outside steps that lead up to the front door of this property. It has been suggested that this tree is to blame. However, it is not the only candidate – there is a large tree in the pavement outside, I don't know the type, which is actually about the same distance from the steps, and there are other large shrubs – one of the shrubs is right up against the steps. Cracking appears both sides. The Managing Agents for the property (more below) are supposed to be commissioning further survey work into what is actually causing the problem, but this has not occurred. The application is merely guessing the scenario with incomplete evidence. 3. The tree surgeon requesting the work has, as we understand, been asked to do this by the Managing Agents. However, the Managing Agents have not consulted on this measure with the lease holders on actually chopping the tree down and are exceeding their authority – they have no permission. Note it is the lease holders of the flats that are party to the head lease of the property, not the Managing Agents – the Managing Agents are supposed to be the leaseholders agents. The last report the Managing Agents commissioned suggested further investigation was required, particularly tree root analysis, and even then that the tree would be reduced in stages and not all at once. It is not clear if they are suggested the “council” tree outside be pruned – the leaseholders have suggested that, since nobody can remember when it was last done. Confronted after this application was made public, the Managing Agents I believe have said they would continue with the investigation, but this application has not been withdrawn. I would suggest they do not have the right to commission this work yet alone the application for it. 4. Notwithstanding all the above, it is not clear the effect on the land of removing this tree. My understanding is that could itself result in more land movement short term, which might cause more short-term movement in the property, but this does not seem to have been considered. <p>I am resident in one of the flats in the property, specifically that on what is technically the second floor. This tree acts, and I think was always intended to act, as a screen on the front window of our flat, which is our main bedroom – otherwise we would be overlooked from the tower block directly opposite. If it turns out this tree does need to go, then so be it, but short term this has not been justified, there is no coherent plan on what needs doing, and I would be loath to lose the screening when it might not actually fix the issues. I would have no objection to further pruning of all the trees/shrubs, but that is not the application.</p>