

Appeals and Enforcement Team  
London Borough of Camden  
2nd Floor, 5 Pancras Square  
Town Hall, Judd Street  
London  
WC1H 9JE

Mark & Jenny  
[The owners of First Floor flat, 96B Haverstock Hill]  
8B Rosslyn Hill  
London  
NW3 1PH

Reference Planning Application – Supporting the Tree removal

- Planning Application - 2016/5879/T (96 Haverstock Hill, London, NW3 2BD, Elm Tree)
- Planning Application - 2016/5881/T (94 Haverstock Hill, London, NW3 2BD, Sycamore Tree)

Dear Camden Council,

I write this letter in relation to the application to remove two trees (covered by TPO) that have been adversely affecting our property for a number of years. The reason for this letter is that as a joint owner of this property I feel it incumbent on me to have it documented (and on record) that we agree with the removal of these trees and in the strongest possible terms. It is my view that the decision to refuse our original application was quite self-evidently a mistake. However, based on fresh evidence, I welcome the opportunity to reverse this decision and do the correct thing and have the two trees removed without delay.

The subsidence history, case details and evidence for this property are already well documented and have no doubt been already considered within your decision making. I won't try to repeat that here but what I would say is that on the whole I find the case for removing these trees to be highly compelling. This process has lasted for too long, and that has come at great personal cost to the owners of the property, especially those on the lower ground floor level. Other than one dissenting member - the house has been entirely united on this and has always maintained an agreed position: regrettably, the trees have to go if that is what the evidence is pointing to.

A vast amount of evidence has been gathered over several years to monitor the movement and establish clear cause and effect. I do not claim to be an expert in this area, but applying evidence-based thinking, logic and a bit common sense, I've come to the conclusion that the movement in the house is being caused by tree roots. Despite this overwhelming body of evidence, the council recommended a highly intrusive physical hole to be dug several meters down within the living room of lower ground floor flat. We have an excellent team of independent experts that have worked on this case with care and diligence from day one. The major failure on behalf of Camden council in my view has been to not grasp the evidence that has been presented by our third party experts. I really hope now it will all be reconsidered. Whilst trees add character to an area and have some utility to the wider community, the ultimate focus for the council as a public body must be the wellbeing of the public. As owners, our views and opinions should take precedence over members of the public (who may be well intentioned) but are not directly related to this particular case and do not have the facts and evidence on which to make a fair assessment.

Via this appeal the council has the opportunity to provide a sound decision, which we would warmly welcome and look forward to bringing this longstanding issue to a definitive conclusion.

Kind regards,  
Mark and Jenny