



Dear Tessa

As the owners of 12 Clorane Gardens, the neighbouring property, we have the following comments about the amended arboricultural report lodged by the applicants on 8 December 2016. The amended report makes a frankly disingenuous second attempt to justify the tree's removal.

The applicants wish to cut down a very tall, mature eucalyptus tree in their garden. The original reason given in their arboricultural report dated 17 September 2015 was purely *"One large tree, a eucalyptus, is in the way of the proposal and will need to be removed. There are other large trees in the immediate vicinity which will reduce the impact of this ..... One tree, a eucalyptus, is a tall tree of some visual significance. This tree needs to be removed as part of the development. Other large trees around the site will reduce the impact of the loss of this tree."*

In our first submission dated 16 February 2016 we objected to its removal for the following reasons: *"This is a large, mature and apparently healthy tree (the report does not suggest otherwise) and as such we would oppose its removal. This tree provides greenery and helps block the traffic noise from the nearby A41 and Finchley Road. This removal of this tree is against clause 2.6 of CPG4 which states that "there should be no impact on any trees or on any adjoining site". It is hard to see how the applicants can claim "the retention of the majority of dense vegetation to the perimeter of the site" when they are asking to remove the largest tree in their garden that provides privacy between our house and theirs."* This objection still stands, as referred to in our additional submissions dated 28 October 2016.

Nothing more was heard from the applicants on this subject until an amended arboricultural report lodged on 8 December 2016 stating the following: *"One tree, a eucalyptus, is a tall tree of some visual significance. However, we have expressed the opinion this tree should be removed in the interests of good design and sound arboricultural practice with high quality replacement planting secured under planning condition..... The tree could be retained (in our opinion) in terms of the preservation of its root system/rooting environment; however, the ongoing demands of the tree for pruning will disfigure its appearance (visual amenity) leads us to the conclusion that removal and replacement is the correct decision, in the interests of good design and sound arboricultural practice."*

*This is the same tree in the same garden – nothing has changed about the tree since the first report written by the same arboriculturists. However, suddenly the tree needs to be removed not just "because it is in the way of the*

proposal" as originally stated, but "in the interests of good design and sound arboricultural practice". This is a totally unpersuasive, disingenuous second attempt to justify the removal of a tree which the report itself admits is of "visual significance". We continue to object to the removal of the tree which we believe to be against clause 2.6 of CPG4 and would ask for its removal to be refused.

Yours sincerely  
Catherine Marsh and Nicholas Field  
*12 Clorane Gardens NW3 7PR*