From: Herman Tribelnig
Sent: 04 October 2019 16:05
To: Planning Planning Planning Planning

Subject: Tree works 2019/5040/T - 105 Pancras Way NW1 ORA - faulty date for comment - RC 08/10/19 corrected date and informed customer.

Dear Camden Tree Allocation Team, Case Officer or Planning Officer for the above submission, which was validated on 2 October but the date for comment is stated as the 1 October 2019.

For that reason, this email to you direct, rather than leaving a comment in the comment box which is closed.

-----

The above submission must be -- refused -- on factual grounds and on misleading information provided.

The submission states that the work on these 2 trees, which are under a TPO, ...

- ... "that this will allow more light and prevent further root damage to the 'flats' "...
- 1 The sketch plan provided in the submission is misleading as the distance of one tree to the building is shown closer than is actually the case (on South flank wall).
- 2 There is no root damage visible on the structure of the building or on the paving of the public pavement next to the trees and the segregated cycle route next to it, and damage is unlikely ever to occur on a building of such recent construction of sturdy cement/brick, cast concrete foundations under the Building Regulations/District Surveyors as at the time.
- 3 Light loss? A total fantasy, There are no windows above the ground floor and up in either of the flank walls where the trees stand next to them.

-----

These two mature Sycamore trees(a multi-trunk type is next to the North flank wall) are in good health and only the removal of the smallest twigs(not branches) at ground floor level might allow (psychological) better light entry into the gardens(which are not well kept at all) and the adjoining patio doors in each the flankwalls.

POLICY: Light loss is not a reason for tree size reduction. This street is a busy and polluted street from vehicles of all kinds AND from the diesel engine trains alike on the North London Line goods route in both directions 50 yards or so away.

The property, Pegasus Court, could benefit from leaf guards being fitted to its rainwater gutters which run round the full perimeter of the building mounted on shallow projecting eaves with a pair of down pipes on each of the flank walls.

Officers, please correct the closing date of the public consultation period in the Register and please transfer this Objection to the page.

Thank you very much Faithfully

Herman Tribelnig for the Camden Town Urban Design Improvement Society