

**7 Berkley Grove,
London,
NW1 8XY.**

19 May 2016

Tree Section,
London Borough of Camden,
Town Hall Extension,
Argyle Street,
London,
WC1H 8ND.

Dear Sirs,

Application 2016/2707/T
173 Gloucester Avenue, London NW1 8LA

We are writing to oppose the above application to fell a ginkgo tree in the rear garden of the above property. The grounds of our opposition are as follows:

1. Although Barrell Tree Consultancy's inspection report, which we note was from ground level, describes the tree as 'in poor condition', this is not evident from our visual inspection, and we note that Barrell do not suggest that the tree is in any way diseased. As viewed from the first floor rear window of our property, the tree appears healthy and in full leaf, as would perhaps be expected of a species as disease resistant as ginkgo, and is visually very attractive.
2. The suggestion is that the garden of 173 Gloucester Avenue may be 'landscaped' at some indeterminate future time. In the absence of any indication of when any landscaping may take place, and what form it might take, this does not seem a strong enough reason to support the felling of the tree. Indeed, the visually attractive nature of the tree would in our view be an asset to any landscaping proposal, and its location very close to the boundary between 173 and 175 Gloucester Avenue would not cause any significant interference to any landscaping work.
3. We note that any root damage to drains is anecdotal only and not supported by evidence.

4. Our rear windows, including that of our principal bathroom, look directly into the gardens of 173 and 175 Gloucester Avenue, and the tree both provides a pleasant outlook and affords a degree of privacy: if the tree were not there, we would have a direct view into the rear windows of 173 and 175 Gloucester Avenue, as they would have into our rear windows.
5. To the best of our knowledge, the tree is not of a species commonly found in London gardens and is in fact an endangered species worldwide. This of itself should militate against felling the tree in the absence of disease or any other compelling reason.

We would add that we accept that the tree has grown tall for its location, though it is not out of proportion with trees in other gardens close by. We would have no objection to reasonable pruning, but, for the reasons set out above, believe that the felling of the tree is unnecessary and inappropriate.

Yours faithfully,
Graham Burns and Elizabeth Stanley