Camden Council Customer feedback and enquiries Comments on a current Planning Application - Ref. 20809298

Planning Application Details Year 2016 Number 6113 Letter Т Planning application address Rochester Square Nursery Rochester Square London Title Your First Name Charles Initial Last Name Hodgkinson Organisation Comment Type Object Postcode nw19sa Address line 1 22 Rochester Square Address line 2 LONDON Address line 3 Postcode NW1 9SA E-mail Confirm e-mail Contact number

If you wish to upload a file containing your comments then use the link below

Objections are set out in a separate document.

Objectionsto20166113T

Your comments on the planning

About this form

Camden Council Customer feedback and enquiries Comments on a current Planning Application - Ref. 20809298

About this form

Issued by Camden Council

Customer feedback and enquiries

Camden Town Hall Judd Street London WC1H 9JE

Form reference 20809298

Comments and Objections to:

Planning Application: 2016/6113/T

Re: tree work at Rochester Square Nursery, Rochester Square London NW1

Thank you for the helpful and clear plan and schedule of works.

In general we object to anything but the most marginal treatment of the trees, and essentially only when treatment is needed for safety reasons.

The trees, and in general the hedge level vegetation are an important visual screening and sound barrier from the houses around the square to the dilapidated and unsightly buildings on the site and the buildings on the other sides of the square. Any reduction in this screening, which will certainly be the inescapable effect of the proposed treatments, will serve to <u>reduce amenity</u> for the houses around the square.

In addition, in an area where the <u>pollution levels</u> are unacceptable and the council is committed to their significant reduction, we believe that the unnecessary pruning and cutting back of trees from one of the few areas of local greenery should be resisted entirely.

Furthermore, the trees and hedge provide an important <u>sound barrier</u> across the square which should not be interfered with.

Finally, we feel that there should be a clear statement that any vegetation / tree removed should be replaced so as not to reduce the level of greenery in this important area.

Please see our per tree details below:

T12

If this is to be felled - it should be replaced

T14

This tree requires ivy control, but should not have its crown reduced, it occupies an important corner position and any reduction will create unacceptable amenity reduction.

T26

This tree should not be cut back at all. It is a self contained tree which does not cause obstruction. Any cutting back or reduction will create unacceptable amenity reduction, especially in one of its current roles in screening the site and building beyond.

T24

This tree is missing from the Schedule of Works document. We therefore assume that it is being left as is.

T16

This tree should not be cut back from the crown. It has a good shape and is not in a congested spot. Any specific branch that interferes with the telephone line may be a candidate for cutting down. Otherwise any cutting back or reduction will create unacceptable amenity reduction, especially in one of its current roles in screening the site and building beyond.

T17

This tree should not be cut back. Any specific branch that interferes with the telephone line may however be a candidate for cutting down - but it is not at all clear that this is necessary in this case. Otherwise any cutting back or reduction will create unacceptable amenity reduction, especially in one of its current roles in screening the site and building beyond.

T18

This is a nicely shaped tree and there is no need to reduce this in any respect - (unlike its neighbour tree T20 -where we agree with the pruning of the branch as suggested).

T29

We see no reason for this tree to be cutback in any way. The suggested treatment will only serve to reduce amenity and reduce the screening the tree provides.