

From: Nigel C [REDACTED]
Sent: 27 May 2019 13:13
To: Planning [REDACTED] Bell, Nick [REDACTED]
Cc: Lizzie Carrington [REDACTED]
Subject: Application ref 2019/2604T

I wish to comment on, and oppose the above application to carry out works to a Norwegian Maple at 23 Frognal Lane London NW3 7DB. My wife and I own the house and [REDACTED] land at [REDACTED]. The tree substantially and beautifully overhangs our land.

This fine Norwegian maple is a key part of the tree landscape in Frognal Lane and looks to be one of a pair, the other of which is in the garden of [REDACTED] (our neighbour on the other side of our house).

There is no evidence that the existing tree is causing any ongoing damage to the party wall of our boundary on [REDACTED]. There is some minor dead wood in the branches but it looks to be a very healthy and beautiful part of the Hampstead treescape. It is also important to the look and feel of our property although not actually on our land.

Our main concern is that a one third reduction in the tree would substantially unbalance it, as would the proposed reduction of the overhanging branches to the public roads and the neighbouring property. I am not convinced that this will significantly reduce root growth but it would certainly make the tree look very peculiar indeed. Our greatest fear is that work to the roots might destabilise the ground and cause subsidence or damage to the wall which may well be a party wall with our property. It is noted that the substantial land to the front of 23 Frognal Lane (which is not in the ownership of our very elderly neighbour who will not have been able to consider the application) appears to have become at least in part a paid series of parking spaces which presumably belong to the freeholder of the land on which the tree sits rather than the owner of the homes themselves. There must be a risk that the freeholder will be tempted to continue to reduce the trees abutting the road to increase potential hard standing for cars.

There may be some minor work necessary to the tree to reduce dead wood but the proposal of radical reduction of the tree and work to its roots is inconsistent with the nature of this conservation area. We therefore hope that the application will be opposed so that only dead wood is removed.

[REDACTED]

Thank you for considering this objection.

Nigel Carrington