
From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 04 May 2020 23:37
To: Lawlor, Josh
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: 2019/6090/P: 9 Perceval Avenue

[EXTERNAL EMAIL] Beware – This email originated outside Camden Council and may be malicious Please take extra care with any links, attachments, requests to take action or for you to verify your password etc. Please note there have been reports of emails purporting to be about Covid 19 being used as cover for scams so extra vigilance is required.

Dear Sirs,

HCAAC Objects to the proposals as follows:

FELLING OF VETERAN TREE.

This a prime example of the danger of allowing tree felling proposals without examination of likely purpose and possible remedies, in this case as very often to accommodate building development and without remedial proposal.. In this case we understand the tree is stated to be dead – no report to corroborate, no statement of measures to save the veteran tree by calling in professionals. The applicant's statement in this regard is questionable. If half of the tree roots are retained, the tree has a chance. If no. 11 has chopped into the roots, stability of the tree is threatened.

The ash tree subject of this matter was shown on plans for an extension scheme.

2017/6175/P seems to be the material development. In gaining consent for extension/conversion No/11 applicant engaged a tree expert whose report stated that the ash tree (T3) identified, was not in good shape having thin leaf cover but that the proposed works to No. 11 would ensure protection of the tree. No.9 should have been managing the ash tree for retention but apparently did not do so.

Either the tree was damaged by no.11 works in contravention or it appears to have failed due to neglect or a combination of the two. At any rate, it appears to have been felled by the time of no.9's subject application according to that form. However, see the sequencing of the two no. 9 applications

Such fate and lack of compensation for a veteran tree is most unfortunate and should be avoided if at all possible.

Presumably officers visited site and interviewed the applicant, without which the content of the tree application was insufficient for proper validation and scrutiny of the application

Tree applications have not figured much if at all in our Consultee Letters from officers. We now try to look out for these and we ask that tree felling applications be sent to us in CLs.

If we have sight of tree applications, we can assist in assessing validity, using Google, even visiting sites if necessary.

HCAAC notes its intention if at all possible to query and scrutinise each tree felling application at risk of becoming a nuisance to officers.

We must ensure early scrutiny of these, as separate tree applications especially seem to be granted fairly quickly. More time should be allowed for comment where these CA assets are threatened, Time is very tight for use as for many others, officers especially, but we must prevail in preservation of trees.

HCCAAC is disappointed at the cumulative loss of so many mature trees in private gardens in the past decades. The degree of loss and impact on the CAs and the beneficial green environment is now well recorded. In many applications tree felling is not justified rather than owners' maintenance, and approvals

are sometimes granted without the requisite tree and necessary Arboricultural reports. Where such reports are submitted, closer scrutiny is often required to challenge them and push for a better outcome, ie. retention.

Applicant's architect states the proposed extension would not be visible from the street. What about the tree or its replacement if indeed intended. The point is that these assets are visible from the street.

HCAAC would like to see two replacements for each tree felled, and that the replacements should be as closely as possible comparable in size and maturity to trees lost. HCAAC notes that trees plus all greenery and shrubs, provide the setting to our Conservation Area, and act as an essential attractive feature, and must be preserved for the next generations.

2020/0408/T Decision 17 March - Application 2019/6090/P 11 March latest – registered 18 March implying tree already felled. So preceding the tree felling application.

THE PROPOSED EXTENSION. 2019/6090/P,

HCAAC Objects to the proposal as follows:

This property appears to have been extended previously, the new proposals threatening a new deep plan of accommodation. Such may well bring in its wake AC and/or ventilation plant, greater use of artificial lighting.....

The effects on the existing basement and rear lightwell are not shown.

The 'squaring-off' of the existing extension seems unnecessary, aided by a suspect removal of a veteran tree.

Rooflights are excessive and unnecessary at those sizes. The glazed doors etc. are, as designed, clumsy and excessive but with the eternal view of architects and their clients to 'throw open the interior to link with the exterior to the fullest extent. Rather it offers to the community deliberately unshielded views of the interior – perhaps that is the communal intention? Light pollution?

The environmental implications and degradation of such seemingly careless proposals seems now to be highly questionable if even now permitted.

In current planning terms it may well be found 'no reason to refuse' but HCAAC Objects nonetheless and asks for scrutiny of the strange sequencing of this and the above tree application, and relation to no.11 development.

Regards,

