

From: Jacob Brahms [REDACTED]
Sent: 21 September 2019 14:22
To: Planning
Subject: YOUR REF: 2019 / 4483 / T

YOUR REF: 2019 / 4483 / T

Dear Tree Team,

I would like to object / express my concerns as a long term Camden resident to the Application 2019 / 4483 / T, for the same reasons given in my email to you of 17th September regarding the Application 2019 / 4491 / T.

I was unaware of the Application 2019 / 4483 / T until it was brought to my attention by Stephen Williams of the Netherhall Neighbourhood Association and Nancy Mayo of the Redington Froggnal Neighbourhood Forum. None of the neighbours I have been in contact with were notified of this second application. It is fair to say that all will have been as, if not more, alarmed by what is proposed in this application - but are unaware. We will try to contact as many of them as possible now.

To recap:

- the grounds for suggesting to cut down these mature trees is very weak
- in both the broader context of the Climate Emergency and the local context of there being 4 schools nearby to these trees (and the highly air polluting Finchley Road), it would be wrong to cut down 4 mature trees. Since my initial email of 17th September Nancy Mayo has shared this information with us:

"ProximiTREE data, which demonstrate a 40% loss in the number of trees in the Redington Froggnal area between 2010 and 2016, a rate of loss which is clearly unsustainable for the character of the Conservation Area – especially at a time of climate emergency.

I know that the Redington Froggnal Neighbourhood Forum and Camden CAACs are also gravely concerned by Camden's inability to protect trees from felling when Notices of Intent are submitted to Planning."

It would be in the interests of the community and the environment for Camden to:

- reject applications 2019 / 4483 / T and 2019 / 4491 / T
- investigate whether the application is in fact driven by commercial interests to further develop the property, rather than the seemingly rather weak and inconsistent subsidence insurance arguments put forward
- work with the applicant and the local neighbourhood associations to find a long term solution that puts the Conservation Area criteria and environmental protection issues first

Many thanks

Jacob Brahms

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **Jacob Brahms** <brahmsjn@gmail.com>

Date: Wed, 18 Sep 2019 at 12:20

Subject: REF: 2019 / 4491 / T

To:

YOUR REF: 2019 / 4491 / T

Dear Tree Team,

I would like to object/express my concerns as a long term Camden resident to the application to cut down two Sycamore trees (referred to as T1 and T4) at Fitzjohns Mansions, [10 Netherhall Gardens](#). This application appears to be in parallel with correspondence received by residents at [27 Maresfield Gardens](#) regarding two mature Poplar trees (referred to as T2 and T3), with a suggestion from a company called Oriel who is acting as a Tree Mitigation Co-ordinator on behalf of Ruth Tamir at Flat 6 , Fitzjohns Mansions. They are suggesting a process to cut down these two Poplars too. I own Flat 3 of [27 Maresfield Gardens, NW3 5SD](#), hence my attention being drawn to this matter.

The documentation includes an **Arboricultural Assessment Report** that recommends felling and treating the stumps of: T1, Sycamore; T2, Poplar; T3, Poplar; and T4, Sycamore. It notes that the condition of both T2 and T3 is “poor”; with T3 “smothered in ivy”. We do not believe these mature trees are in poor condition. Indeed they have been regularly monitored and treated by specialist tree surgeons, etc, most recently when they were pollarded in April this year. The ivy referred to is a visual screen between the houses, and we do not believe it is relevant to the matter.

Underlying the attempt to cut down these 4 trees is a claim for subsidence in Flat 6, Fitzjohns Mansion. The **Engineering Appraisal Report related to this** describes the nature and extent of the damage, and under **Significance**, the Report notes “The level of damage is very slight, and is classed as category 1 in accordance with BRE Digest 251 – Assessment of damage in low-rise buildings.” This is the lowest level of damage recordable. In **Onset and Progression**, it is noted that the property owner “advised that damage first commenced in September 2018. We consider that the damage has occurred recently. It is likely that movement will be of a cyclical nature with cracks opening in the summer and closing in the winter.” Under **Monitoring**, it is noted that, “Level monitoring has been underway since January 2019. The level monitoring generally demonstrated a slight recovery of the rear projection between January and May. Such a pattern of cyclical movement is generally indicative of vegetation related clay shrinkage subsidence. The level of monitoring exercise is to continue.” Under **Recommendations**, the felling of “the Poplar tree located to the rear of the property” is suggested, to “mitigate against further movement”. It makes no mention of a second Poplar; nor does it mention Sycamores. Under **Repairs**, it notes that “If the street (sic) tree is not removed then it may be necessary to consider underpinning of the foundations of the property in the area of damage, in addition to structural crack repair and redecoration...”

There are a number of comments to make on this:

The Arboricultural Assessment Report recommends the felling of two Sycamores and two Poplars. The Engineering Appraisal Report recommends the felling of one Poplar and no Sycamores, and then mentions a “street tree”.

The Arboricultural Assessment Report does not qualify its assessment of the condition of the Poplars as poor. As above, we do not share this view. What does this mean in the cases of T2 and T3?

The Engineering Appraisal Report says that the damage is “very slight” and that movement is likely to be of a cyclical nature, which is generally the case in such circumstances. Apparently monitoring has shown a slight recovery between January and May. The Report suggests that if the Poplar is not removed, then underpinning of the foundations in the area affected “may” be necessary. Our understanding is that it would be normal to do at least 12 months monitoring prior to making recommendations. Further we understand, but would welcome your guidance, that a tree management programme might be relevant to managing any subsidence issues.

I note that Camden Council’s website about Tree Removal states:

“We only remove trees if they are

- ∞ dead or dying
- ∞ dangerous
- ∞ involved in tree-related subsidence claims, but only as a last resort”

I believe there are a number of reasons that the request to cut down these trees should be rejected:

1. Lack of clear evidence - The monitoring and recommendations are inconclusive on the need to remove any trees, never mind up to 4.
2. Air quality - these trees are close to a school for young children near the highly polluting Finchley Road. During this Climate Emergency we need all the trees we can get and many, many more; mature trees, like the two Poplars, are especially important.
3. Neighbourhood beauty - the trees are situated in a Conservation Area and the greenery is a fundamental part of what needs to be conserved.

These proposals clearly require further scrutiny and the local residents and the Netherhall Neighbourhood Association are keen to work with the Council to find the right solution that balances environmental and private interests.

Yours,

Jacob Brahms

--
Best wishes,

Jacob