

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2020/3021/T	Susan Hadida	28/07/2020 09:50:21	COMMNT	<p>I am the owner of the trees on the following applications nos: 2020/3019/T; 2020/3020/T; 2020/3021/T at Greencroft Gardens, NW6 3LJ.</p> <p>I hereby strongly object to the application to fell these trees and treat the stumps. Three years ago the insurance company on behalf of the owner of 57 Aberdare Gardens applied for exactly the same as above which was refused by Camden and agreement was reached to reduce them by 35%. All the good arguments for not destroying these beautiful trees are still relevant,</p> <p>This is a major destruction of very mature trees, over 100 years old, and which form part of a line of trees along the border between the gardens of Greencroft Gardens and Aberdare Gardens, and all the good arguments presented for keeping them are still relevant, in fact even more so, today.</p> <p>This must be very closely investigated to absolutely ensure that this truly necessary.</p> <p>Susan Hadida 0207 624 5908</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2020/3021/T	Peter symonds	28/07/2020 15:17:49	OBJNOT	<p>CRASH – The Combined Residents' Associations of South Hampstead – objects in the strongest possible terms to applications 2020/3019/T, 2020/3020/T and 2020/3021/T for the felling of three mature Plane trees in Greencroft Gardens.</p> <p>In the first instance, these applications claim that the trees are located in the gardens of three different properties which is simply not the case, so all three applications fail even to locate the trees accurately. Furthermore, the application suggests that because the roots of one of the trees – and it is by no means clear which one is being referred to as the culprit - is judged to be responsible for damage to the Aberdare Gardens property, ALL THREE trees should be destroyed. This would be a barbaric remedy which, if allowed, will be an act of environmental vandalism from Camden Council, who in February of this year was proudly trumpeting its having been awarded a 'Tree City of the World' designation from the Food and Agriculture Organisation of the United Nations.</p> <p>The trees under threat are each well over a hundred years old and part of a shade-giving row of Planes dividing the back-to-back gardens between Aberdare and Greencroft Gardens. They have been a much-loved feature of this conservation area for many decades. Following Camden's refusal of the same applicant's 2017 demand that they be removed, the owner of the trees had them severely pollarded at her own expense, yet that has done nothing to dissuade the applicant's determination to have them destroyed.</p> <p>The sketchy and often inaccessible technical evidence presented by Sedgwick on behalf of the applicant includes an interim insurance claim report prepared in April 2019 which suggests that, following the pollarding, the Aberdare garden property remained stable. The report suggests that further monitoring be carried out 'and if the results are the same and the property remains stable that the insurers move to repair advising that any movement in Summer 2018 was minor and due to one of the hottest summers on record whereas (in) a normal summer like 2019, the property has remained stable.' Overall, the report remains equivocal, and certainly does not suggest that the property damage is definitely due to the trees.</p> <p>Additionally, there are further cracks recorded to the front (Street frontage) of the property which suggests they are likely to be attributable to general subsidence caused by shrinkage after a hot summer. It is certainly unlikely that they too are caused by trees a street away. The landowner himself has already removed a number of trees from his own garden and no consideration appears to have been given to the possibility of this having caused 'heave' and so subsidence to the property.</p> <p>It is clearly financially convenient to the applicant and his insurers now to claim that the trees in Greencroft Gardens - which have to be over thirty metres away from his property - should be responsible for the damage, yet there has been not one single complaint of similar damage to the nearer neighbouring properties in Greencroft Gardens which are far more likely to be affected.</p> <p>The threatened Planes were fully mature long before the modern extension to 57 Aberdare Gardens was built. CRASH contends that the existence of such trees should have been taken into account when the foundations were being laid. Furthermore, insurance companies generally require clients to complete a questionnaire with direct relevance to subsidence and property damage. A question on an Aviva Insurance form, for example, asks "Are there any trees or shrubs within 20m (65ft) of the property and which are more than 5m (15ft) in height?" It was surely incumbent on the insurers to determine this issue before being prepared to underwrite a property bordered by such outstanding and mature specimens.</p> <p>Finally, the application states the felling of these trees is 'proposed as a remedy to differential foundation movement and to ensure the long-term stability of the (Aberdare Gardens) building'. It makes no allowance for the likely damage to the Greencroft Gardens properties which may be caused by the resultant heave. It goes on to state 'They are proposed to limit the extent and need for expensive and disruptive engineering work' although such works are, again, possible as a result of heave, and likely to be required to Greencroft Gardens properties. Finally, the application states that 'They are proposed to limit the duration of any claim</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
				<p>period (which is of undoubted benefit to the insurers) and thereby allow the landowner his right to the peaceful enjoyment of his property.' After the distressing three-year battle that has already been waged to save these trees, the Greencroft Gardens landowner would, I am sure, like to be afforded the same consideration. May we ask that a Camden Tree Officer makes a special effort to inspect the site and see for himself the extent of the claimed – but unseen - damage to the property.</p> <p>In the meantime, CRASH respectfully asks that the application be refused.</p> <p>Kind regards Peter Symonds Chair</p>
2020/3021/T	Dr Tanya Deavall	28/07/2020 16:36:35	OBJ	<p>I strongly oppose the proposed felling of this beautiful mature plane tree. It is in a conservation area where every effort needs to be made to preserve the remaining trees, especially mature trees which add so much benefit to the environment for people and wildlife to enjoy. Plane trees are particularly well suited to London and have an important role to play in addressing pollution too. In this day and age every attempt needs to be made to safeguard our climate and environment so felling of trees should surely only occur in rare circumstances where there is unequivocal evidence for harm which outweighs the benefits and where there is a clear requirement for a suitable replacement tree.</p> <p>The tree in question is in a line with two other trees whose felling has also been proposed in 2020/3019/T and 2020/3020/T. No photographic evidence of structural building damage is included with the application. At the very least, please consider arranging reduction of the size of the tree with further monitoring to be absolutely sure that felling is the only option.</p>