

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2020/1610/T	David Shasha	26/04/2020 11:36:27	OBJ	<p>I repeat my objections which I made when this application was first made a few months ago as they are all still relevant. In addition, these trees now all have TPOs which should be respected.</p> <p>I object in the strongest possible way that these trees could be forcibly removed. This would be an appalling act of destruction, and a crime against nature and a clear violation of the council's and the government's own policies to work towards cleaner air. The main 4 reasons for my objection are as follows:</p> <p>1) The request for felling is extreme:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The insurers, without their client's permission, are basically trying to get the council to force the removal of the trees even if the owners are objecting • The existing damage at No.9 is basically a few cracks –the owners wanted to claim it on their insurance which is why this request has been made. • The trees are at a suitable distance from the properties that the roots are unlikely to be the cause of any damage. • Shrinkage of clay due to dry weather could be the culprit. • The expert opinion is that the removal of these trees is likely to do considerably more damage than keeping them. Removal could cause ground disturbances and a heave of water, particularly given the substantial age of the trees. • The scale of the subsidence is only slight and the damage is only moderate (a few millimetres of cracks). It does not warrant tree to be felled in its entirety. The trees are far enough away from the buildings and with proper maintenance will not cause any structural problems. • Additional independent studies should be obtained in any event to ascertain other remedies to felling the trees. • Underpinning of the property if necessary, inserting concrete barriers in the ground to stop roots from growing, or a reduction of the head of the tree (or pollarding) are all significantly less severe alternatives that should be considered. • As a last resort, the owners and insurance company can agree to remove subsidence from the policy cover. <p>2) Conservation area status of the site. The entire plot of land is a conservation area and should be maintained as a first priority. Removal of the trees would be a contravention of this status.</p> <p>3) Amenity value – These are the aspects that affect someone's appreciation of the area, usually including the pleasantness, aesthetic and cultural and recreational possibilities. Tree lined streets make Camden a beautiful place to live. The tops of these magnificent trees are clearly visible from the side and back of Regents Park Terrace. They can be seen when walking down Gloucester Crescent and Inverness Street and from Gloucester Avenue. The public should not be deprived of such green views.</p> <p>4) Camden's Clean Air Action Plan – Camden has recently launched its Clean Air Action Plan to great fanfare. In the media, Camden MP Keir Starmer is quoted to say "The recent Extinction Rebellion protests in London have been a stark reminder that future generations will not forgive us if we don't urgently address the environmental threat of climate change. We are at a tipping point and must take effective action now. The launch of Camden's Clean Air Action Plan is a strong step towards addressing the damaging impacts of poor air quality on the environment and on our health". Felling of trees, contravenes this policy and every effort must be found for viable alternatives. Mild subsidence does not warrant such extreme action.</p>