

Gentet, Matthias

From: Karen Beare <zbkarli@me.com>
Sent: 01 February 2016 08:33
To: Thuaire, Charles
Cc: Anthony Beare; Mary-Jane O'Neill; Bob Warnock; Michael Hammerson; Tye Blackshaw; Elspeth Clements; Jane Shallice; Mary Cane; Marc Hutchinson; Lynda Cook; Susan Rose; Harley Atkinson; Dr Colin Cooper; Georgia Abrams; Richard Stokes; Derrick Dale QC; Berry, Sian (Councillor); Gimson, Sally (Councillor); Lewis, Oliver (Councillor)
Subject: Water house - trees

Charles

The key issue with regards to trees off site is the CBR data that the COL will be forwarding to you as part of their objection. Given the extraordinary discrepancy between the COL data, which shows extremely low CBR percentages along the length of the Lane vs the Applicant's data, which miraculously shows very high percentages, can you please confirm what action LBC will be taking to obtain an explanation from the Agent.

This 'discrepancy' follows on several others that we consider to be blatant attempts to mislead and potentially pervert this planning process eg:

Overstating the width of the Lane;

Understating the number of pedestrians and other users; Manipulating rear garden photo montages to distort extent of gym bund; Stating wrongly:

there is a gravel drain parallel with Millfield Lane, when none exists; that Dr Haycock requested the gravel drain on behalf of COL, when he did not; that initially my property had been surveyed, when it had not; that residents had refused permission for CBR tests to be carried out along the Lane when they were never approached; that swept path analyses are possible for HGVs when they are not; and most recently, that I had refused access to my property to survey my beech tree as stated in the most recent Landmark arbo report, when I have never received any such approach.

Further comments on this last tree report include:

Neither off site tree - T18 Beech or T30 Mulberry - have been measured or surveyed by landmark yet Mr Hollis makes unprofessional and detrimental comments about both; No attempt has ever been made to access these trees despite repeated requests from owners for the applicant to do so; The trial pits for each were not independently verified and no methodology was given. This is unprofessional. The depth of them was extremely restricted and no independent tests were done to verify roots; There is no quantum for weighted vehicle movements so no valid assumptions can be made about the deployment of ground guards; Surface protection has been considered previously for Fitzroy farm and roundly rejected; RPAs are not sufficient to afford site storage and access to rear of property; The attempt to suggest T18 Beech has no roots on the windward side and therefore remove any RPA from the development site is ridiculous. If that were the case the tree would have failed. The reality is that 3 mature ash trees in the front of our property catastrophically failed following a similar basement development that damaged the RPAs. In this case the Applicant - wrongly - had everyone believe there were no roots growing laterally; T18 beech does not have a poor form caused by my swimming pool. If Mr Hollis has bothered to survey the tree then he would know that it was not showing any signs of stress or that the pool is outside the entire RPA; Despite several attempts by James Remington, Mr Hollis has failed to update the tree tables and references to Hornbeam T17 remain with a category of U not B. He once again slips into the narrative that the tree was stressed when no-one else, including James

is of that option. This is critical because should this application go to JR or Appeal a category of U conveniently takes it out of the planning process.

The suggestion by Mr Hollis that "the applicant is merely tinkering at the margins to modernise a build and drive that already encroaches the RPAs" is breathtaking given the trebling of the footprint of the existing dwelling.

And finally, I marvel at the justification that the redevelopment will bring positive impacts for trees and may even provide greater protection to trees on and off site in the long run. As I have said previously, it would appear Mr Hollis has picked up the wrong file.

With regards
Karen Beare
On behalf of the friends of millfield Lane.

Sent from my iPad