



Dear Gerry

Following my email to you yesterday, I wish to object to this application to prune two trees in a conservation area

Tree 1 Magnolia

It is not clear from the application whether the additional 2m pruning is additional to the pruning agreed in the planning application in February 2016 (2014/3668/P) . This needs to be clarified. I am attaching a copy of an email from Nick Bell Camden Tree Officer in response to Tulip Sadiq MP (12th Feb 2016), as you will see he indicates that the crown of the tree is only 3m - a reduction of 2m is extreme over-pruning. In addition the approach to pruning proposed is not best practice and is likely to impact the long term health and survival of the Magnolia tree. Many of the branches are only 2m long - this proposal would remove them entirely and is likely to cause stress and bleeding. The end result of reducing the tree by 2m on one side only (the other side would create an entirely lopsided tree (the equivalent to shaving half your hair off and letting the other half grow).

Best practice on pruning Magnolia's suggests that this is done with selective branches not as is being suggested and is also carried out on a regular basis as opposed to severe over pruning.

The proposal as it stands is unacceptable and would threaten the long term health of this much loved tree.

Tree 2 Eucalyptus

I do not object in principle to the proposed tree work however, I note that the timing for pruning recommended for both trees is different eg Magnolia late summer and the Eucalyptus in Winter and Spring. Please confirm that the pruning will take place on two separate occasions. The tree is leaning badly and this needs to be addressed. The Eucalyptus is planted above the culvert/stream running between Briardale and Pattison, it plays an important role in reducing water and soggy gardens and therefore the good health and maintenance of this tree is paramount.

The trees form part of a green corridor used as a bat foraging and commuting route. A recent bat survey conducted in May/June 2016 by Dr Greg Carson C.Ecol MCIEEM of the Ecology Network has indicated bat presence at Number 29 and a potential roost at number 31 (yet to be investigated) which is close to the Eucalyptus. The bats identified were common and soprano pipistrelle. Any tree work should take into account the impact on bats and other wildlife species.

Kind regards

Penny Davis

MP enquiry - Development management 20453853 – Trees – 31 Briardale Gardens

Dear Tulip Siddiq MP,

Thank you for your enquiry regarding the magnolia tree in the rear garden of 31 Briardale Gardens, London NW3 7PN on behalf of your constituent, Ms Davis. The magnolia tree is a small tree with some degree of local amenity value and the tree is not subject to a tree preservation order. An arboricultural report was submitted with the application to detail how the proposed development would not adversely affect the magnolia.

The applicant commissioned some trial pits to be excavated to ascertain the level of rooting activity in the location of the proposed excavation to facilitate the scheme. BS5837:2012 – “Trees in relation to design, demolition and construction” details that significant roots are those over 25mm in diameter. The trial pits were created in the correct location and no significant roots were found.

The tree protection plan included with the arboricultural report detailed fencing proposals to ensure the area around the base of the tree was to be a construction exclusion zone (CEZ) to ensure the rooting area of the magnolia away from the property was undisturbed during development. However the specification of the fencing was not considered to be robust enough to ensure the CEZ was protected. As such, the arboricultural consultant was asked to amend the plans to include more robust fencing across the width of the rear garden to ensure the rooting area of the magnolia tree was protected. The arboricultural report commissioned by objectors is dated 06/02/15, the tree protection measures have since been made more robust and are considered to be acceptable.

The arboricultural report states that the crown spread of the magnolia tree extends 3m south from the trunk and that 2m of the south side of the crown would need to be removed in order to facilitate development. This pruning specification was considered to be too vague, it was not considered necessary to remove that amount of the crown when the majority of the branches on the south side of the tree extend from the trunk higher than the single storey extension will be. As such, the arboricultural consultant was asked to amend the report to remove the pruning specification. Planning permission was granted subject to conditions which included a tree protection condition. The condition states that:

“Prior to commencement of works on site, the tree protection measures detailed in the approved documents shall be installed in line with BS5837:2012. All trees on the site, or parts of trees growing from adjoining sites, unless shown on the permitted drawings as being removed, shall be retained and protected from damage in accordance with the approved protection details. A pre-commencement site meeting shall be undertaken with the applicants arboricultural consultant, the tree contractor, the site manager and the LPA tree officer to establish the extent of any pruning of T1 that is required and to agree on any other finer points of detail that may be required prior to works commencing.”