

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2018/2465/T	Elsa Nelson	11/07/2018 19:32:40	OBJNOT	<p>The documents supporting this application make a case that two lime trees, T2 and T3 are responsible for clay soil movement that has damaged the main entrance area of Gilling Hall. Minor reduction of these two and Pollarding of a third (T1) in May 2017 were used to make the argument that the three trees are responsible for soil movement causing the damage, even though the trees are more than 10 metres, sometimes 15 metres away from the damage. If this is true and such planning becomes the norm, there would soon be no leaves in "leafy Hampstead", which is all built on this clay soil. In my own experience, permission to fell trees 5 metres from my property in Maresfield Gardens was denied in the 1990's, but the alternative root barrier and underpinning were also refused by my selfish co-owners. Twenty years later, new owners are implementing the alternative and the trees are still there. I am shocked that rather than step up and pay the £90,000 across scores of owners for underpinning, root barrier and strong canopy control, Gilling Hall want to further denude NW3 of old-growth vegetation to save maybe £1000 per owner. It must also be asked what is the difference in Crawford's profit between felling and the alternative. I say NO felling, and do the underpinning, root barrier and strong canopy control on T2, T3 and T1.</p>
