

The Garden Flat 105 Greencroft Gardens London NW6 3PE

Tree Section
Town Hall Extension
Argyle Street
London WC1H 8ND

4th March 2016
Your ref: 2016/0391/T

Dear Sir/Madam

Re: Notification of Intended Works to Tree(s) in a Conservation Area ("Subject Tree")

We wrote to you on 29th January 2016 (see below). When can we expect a response from Camden Council?

We refer to your letter dated 25 January 2016 regarding works to a large London Plane tree sited at the foot of the garden to the property at 103 Greencroft Gardens. Your records should show that we have a very similar tree of identical age at the bottom of our garden (the "Related Tree"). Both trees have, for some time, been of a size disproportionate to their surroundings. We have, over a number of years, asked for the Related Tree to be cut to a size more in keeping with its surroundings or be replaced with something less likely to cause a problem because:

1. The Related Tree and the Subject Tree are causing considerable damage to garden walls dating from Edwardian times;
2. The walls at the bottom of the gardens to both properties have bowed so significantly in the past as to have posed a danger of collapse and injury to children playing in neighbouring gardens;
3. Debris from both trees during the many storms increasingly common over winters creates not only a nuisance but causes damage and has on more than one occasion struck us while working in our own gardens;
4. We have been informed by our building insurers for many years that damage to property or injury to persons caused by the Related Tree was not insurable by them;
5. We have been forced to expend several thousand pounds over the past decade trying to maintain both the Subject Tree and the Related Tree to try to minimize the impact of the above but generally to little effect; and
6. The London Planes together cause one of the undersigned, who is a hay fever sufferer, considerable distress in Summer as a severe and noxious source of allergens.

In light of the above, we wish to notify you that we whole-heartedly support the application in your letter above-referenced. However, we would like you to consider carrying out identical works in respect of the Related Tree, as it seems illogical to remove the Subject Tree on its own. This would make sense economically. But in addition, the fact that both 101 Greencroft Gardens and 103 Greencroft Gardens afford direct side access to the street-side and our own property at 105 Greencroft Gardens is landlocked, means that clearance of debris would be more efficient if the Subject Tree and Related Tree are cut at the same time, as we have always done in the past.

Yours faithfully


h.B., Solicitor
Mrs Sarah M. Das BSc (Hons), Midwife