

07 May 2014

Tom Little
Tree Officer, Planning
Culture and Environment
Camden Town Hall, Argyle Street
London WC1H 8EQ

Dear Tom Little

2014/2710/T, Grove End Lodge, Grove End NW5 – Dartmouth Park CA
Proposed removal Ash tree in rear garden, due to 'proximity to party wall'

Further to our telephone conversation: I **object most strongly** to the removal of this mature ash tree. The tree has great amenity value and contributes significantly to the character and appearance of the local townscape. Please refuse this application and place a TPO on the tree in order to safeguard it and the contribution it makes.

The immediate **amenity value** is to residents of the surrounding neighbouring properties, but additionally it frames important views from public highways surrounding the site;

- seen from Highgate Road as part of the setting of the Grove Terrace (London) Squares it forms the backdrop and visual 'link' to the green canopy line of the magnificent trees of the squares as it sits prominently on higher ground rising above the petrol station canopy filling the gap in the green squares either side of it;
- as viewed from College Lane and Grove End, along the delightful and much used pedestrian route, an area characterized by the opening up of the semi-rural setting of Dartmouth Park CA (see DPCA Appraisal) as the Greens emerge north of the railway tunnel.
- the tree also provides a delightful element of the townscape/roofscape setting from Twisden Road as its canopy sits above the rooflines as seen through the gap between buildings adjacent to No 2 Twisden Road from its pavement opposite. Such gaps in our DPCA, due to the areas topography, provide characteristic micro townscape views.

Ecological benefits: the tree provides a contribution to the green corridor which runs from the nearby SNIs 191,194,195 along the railway lines, linking the Grove Terrace Squares with the Heath. The LDF also marks a small section of missing green chain within the Squares. The quiet pocket of land where the ash sits, set back from roads, is even in daytime a haven for birds etc. Recent sales photographs for Grove End Lodge show three new 'diminutive trees' have been strategically planted within the width of the rear garden in disregard to the existing ash. This new planting should not be allowed to replace the ash with its habitat and visual value.

Proposed felling: It is assumed that proximity to the party 'garden' wall is the reason for the proposed felling. There is no reason to remove this tree. The wall can be buttressed or a section lowered with railings inserted above. If however, it relates to any other 'party wall' please let me know as I can provide additional information to **relevant development history:** During the recent refurbishment of the Lodge timber fencing was erected on this historic wall. This may have added to disturbing it. There was no fencing previously. The boundary now appears to rise above 2m from ground, thus such installation would have required planning consent. This was not obtained. There have been a number of unauthorized works during refurbishment of the Lodge, including the complete stripping of the previously soft landscaped front garden, included several smaller trees and mature shrubbery. This previously provided a secluded haven for wildlife. Both front and rear gardens were 'sterilized' of existing greenery, with the front now laid to hard landscaping losing its contributory character in relation to the setting of the Grove Terrace Squares. The rear garden was used as work and material storage area during the years of refurbishment and rebuilding of the Chapel and old nursery (the sites were in same ownership) and it appears as if some level changes/ground works took place. The historic garden wall was subsequently pressure cleaned on the Lodge's side.

Cont/...

Planning history/TPO: During proposed development (2008/2804/P) when Grove End Lodge was to be demolished, there was discussion about a TPO for this tree. Planning consent for development was refused. Camden's Refusal reason 5 indicates the concern about harm to the tree and its contribution to the visual character and appearance of the CA. See also the tree report submitted with this application by Eardley Landscape Associates, and its conclusion. As the building was refurbished instead it was thought that the tree was secure and a TPO unnecessary.

Consultation: Notifications have been sent to many properties in Denyer House and the Chapel that are not directly affected by the tree, and thus may not generate a response. Similarly several flats in the Chapel are rental leases and currently unoccupied.

Yours sincerely



Nori Howard
(Camden Tree Warden)