

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2018/0248/T	Danuta Derham	10a Montpelier Grove Kentish Town London NW5 2XD	09/02/2018 16:27:31	APP	<p>I have lived in the ground floor flat, 10 Montpelier Grove for 22 years. My husband and I strongly object to the removal of the two poplar trees located at the bottom of the gardens at 9 and 10 Montpelier Grove bordering Montpelier Gardens for several reasons. The trees are in a Conservation area and add to the environment in many ways.</p> <p>Firstly I would like to point out that the reason this insurance company has applied for planning permission to remove two mature poplar trees is due to subsidence damage which is affecting a modern extension built onto the existing Victorian property. There has been no damage reported to the original Victorian building. I have been advised that removing these trees would contribute to even greater issues as the root network of such mature trees dies off. Here is an excerpt from the Association of British Insurers (BAI) web article on Protecting You Home from Subsidence:</p> <p>"Heave is normally caused by the removal of trees or large shrubs. While the tree is growing the surrounding soil is dried out but when the tree is removed the moisture content builds up, causing the ground to swell. The process can take many years but the damage caused by heave is, in most cases, much more severe than that caused by subsidence. Problems can arise if mature trees near houses are cut down.....</p> <p>Trees which are older than the structure but within the safe distance can be managed – that is to say a programme of pollarding or crown thinning carried out to control the amount of foliage produced, which will in turn reduce the amount of water it requires. • Trees which are older than the structure should not be removed as this could cause uplift of the ground and heave."</p> <p>This suggests that removing the trees is a bad idea and pollarding would be the correct course of action.</p> <p>There are three poplar trees planted on the boundary between Montpelier Gardens and the gardens of houses along Montpelier Grove, one of them is on the park side of the fencing and belongs to Camden Council, the others are in the gardens of 9 and 10 Montpelier Grove. On the Camden Council tree map the poplar tree in the park was valued at £27,644.19 in 2016:</p> <p>Sequence25 Scientific NamePopulus nigra "Italica" Common NamePoplar - Lombardy Height In Metres25 Spread In Metres6 Diameter In Centimetres At Breast Height62 MaturityMature Physiological ConditionGood Capital Asset Value For Amenity Trees£27,646.19 Number Of Trees1</p>

Application No: Consultees Name: Consultees Addr: Received:

Comment: Response:

Inspection Date06/04/2016
 Inspection Due Date2019/2020
 Site NameBRECKNOCK RD, MONTPELIER GDNS (LS)
 Contract AreaParks
 Ward NameKentish Town

The council pollarded this tree recently.

I am happy for the trees to be pollarded as this seems to be the choice of action taken by Camden Council on the third poplar tree on the park boundary. This tree is at the same distance from houses on Montpelier Grove as the other two poplars. I do however strongly object to the removal of poplar trees at number 9 and number 10 Montpelier Grove. The tree at number 9 has a substantially greater girth than the tree at number 10 as the trunk splits in two. This tree is competing for water with a mature sycamore tree which is also on the boundary only a couple of feet from the poplar. I suspect that the number of trees at the bottom of the garden at number 9 is having a combined effect on the moisture take up from the ground and a more prudent approach might be to remove one tree (the sycamore) or better still to reduce the canopy of some or all of the trees and not to go straight in removing two of only three mature trees which exist along the whole border between the park and rear gardens of houses 1-12 Montpelier Grove.

Removing two of the three poplar trees would have a massive negative impact visually, they are a very mature (aged over 50 years), substantial presence in the park and landmarks on the skyline in this area of Kentish Town, being the tallest trees in the park. Visually they contribute massively to household residents of Montpelier Grove and to the public using Montpelier Gardens.

Removing the two poplar trees would be damaging not only visually, but also to the air quality. Brecknock Road is adjacent to Montpelier Gardens and produces a substantial amount of traffic pollution. The poplar trees contribute significantly to the air quality, and if removed would create gaping holes in the vegetative screening from the road pollution.

The impact on the natural habitat for insects, birds and animals in the park would be significant. Due to these mature trees we have abundant birds and squirrels. there is even a woodpecker. Destroying their habitat would be tragic and sadly unnecessary.

I personally love the sound of the wind in the poplar trees and feel passionate objection to them being removed. They screen traffic noise and contribute to the serenity of the environment when the wind blows through the trees. And they are beautiful.

If the insurance company had a good case for removing the trees I would still be appealing because of the value the trees bring to the neighbourhood, however having read the guidance notes from the British Association of Insurers it seems their choice to remove the trees would be a very irresponsible one as it would only exacerbate the damage caused by

Application No: **Consultees Name:** **Consultees Addr:** **Received:** **Comment:** **Response:**

land movement to the property they are insuring. They should be following the guidelines set out by their own Association.

Kind Regards,
Danuta and John Derham
