

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2020/3020/T	Peter symonds	28/07/2020 15:15:30	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:
2020/3020/T	S Powley	31/07/2020 12:35:50	COMMT	<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>
2020/3020/T	S Powley	31/07/2020 12:35:50	COMMT	<p>I object to the application to fell one or more trees at the rear of 65 Greencroft Gardens, London, for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. There is insufficient evidence to support the application and there are significant inconsistencies and errors in the documentation. It is not clear which tree is the subject of the application. Key parts of the Arboricultural Assessment Report cannot be accessed beyond the title page, so the crucial pages are not available to read. The documentation mentions a "palm tree" to be felled, whereas the application is for the felling of a plane tree (to which I object)</li> <li>2. The trees are likely to be part of the original field boundary markings before the houses were built, so they are an important part of the history and conservation of the area's historical features.</li> <li>3. The trees are an important part of the environmental health of the area, they are home to many species of wildlife, they help to keep the air clean and contribute to the aesthetics of the area. To remove these trees unnecessarily would remove a highly valued amenity that is enjoyed by the community. The trees all have TPOs in place.</li> <li>4. Any issue with subsidence caused by the trees can be remedied by pruning, followed by a regular pruning and maintenance problem. It is not necessary to fell to ground level and treat stump to kill the tree.</li> <li>5. Previous applications have been declined for good reason.</li> </ol>
2020/3020/T	Stephen Pickford	01/08/2020 16:25:54	OBJ	<p>I write to object to the felling of the tree to the rear of 65 Greencroft Gardens NW6 3LJ. I find it hard to fathom why somebody who lives in the conservation area has put a planning application to Camden council to destroy this beautiful elderly tree who is a long term resident of this conservation area. Maintaining tree cover is paramount in fighting against climate change. The trees form part of our urban landscape and have an extremely important part to play, particularly in Camden. An arboricultural determines the way to look after the trees and to maintain their health and life for many more years. Not to destroy them. In this application it is said that there is damage from this tree to the property at 57 Aberdare Gardens. I looked for a structural engineer's report for the property in question and there is not one. The tree in question is the garden of a Greencroft Gardens property which means that there is a much higher chance of that property being damaged as the tree is much closer. I have lived in Greencroft Gardens for 15 years and I know there has not been any damage to this property or it's neighbours from these wonderful trees. I live in a second floor flat rear with a roof terrace overlooking the trees in the area. The trees provide a natural screen of privacy for me. If the trees were destroyed I would lose my privacy and it would cause significant impact to my mental health and wellbeing. I also feel that my personal space would be invaded.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2020/3020/T	Alan Mason	01/08/2020 10:25:45	OBJ	The application refers to the felling of a tree in the South Hampstead Conservation Area, a neighbourhood where mature trees are being destroyed at an alarming rate. We must preserve those we have left. Buildings are altered, repaired, re-built all the time. A Plane tree takes a hundred years to reach full maturity - once felled, it is lost and gone forever. This tree should be treasured, not destroyed. I wish to object, in the strongest possible terms, to the application.
2020/3020/T	Dr Tanya Deavall	28/07/2020 16:33:30	OBJ	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. The tree in question is in a line with two other trees whose felling has also been proposed in 2020/3019/T and 2020/3021/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.
2020/3020/T	Rev Lyndon van der Pump and Professor Edward Brooks	28/07/2020 11:32:07	OBJ	There seems to be an awful lot of tree work being carried out in this Garden area at the moment, one worries that it is necessary or even authorised. These plane trees are over a 100 years old and add a great deal to the general aspect, ambiance and oxygen conversion. People who move into the area are amazed by the air purity compared with most of London. We object most strongly to the unnecessary destruction of beautiful trees in this application

<b>Application No:</b>	<b>Consultees Name:</b>	<b>Received:</b>	<b>Comment:</b>	<b>Response:</b>
2020/3020/T	S. Nix	31/07/2020 15:23:23	COMMNT	<p>I am objecting to the proposed works to the tree(s) referenced above for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. The information in the supporting documents is incomplete, misleading and contains errors and inconsistencies. The files have been named incorrectly regarding file type, and I have found no photographs anywhere of the trees in question. One file described as a 'photo' is not a photo - it is a diagram. This is not standard procedure as per my experience with many other similar applications I have viewed over the last several months.</li><li>2. Files supplied by arborists, insurers, etc. are incomplete and difficult to find or identify. At least initially, in some of the applications only one page of reports usually consisting of at least a dozen pages was provided. In this application in particular, I have found no photos.</li><li>3. The trees play a crucial role in the environmental impact of the area, providing homes to many wildlife species, maintaining clean air and contributing to the general aesthetics of this 'conservation' area (South Hampstead). I believe the trees all have TPOs assigned. Unwarranted and unnecessary tree felling is reckless.</li></ol> <p>On that note I am also objecting to the increasingly large number of applications to fell trees in the area, which I have noticed in the regular 'alerts' mailings I receive from Camden Council. Sometimes the reasons given are along the lines of 'does not fit in with landscaping' or 'not visible to public view' and similar. I am concerned that there is an increasing disregard for the benefit trees provide to our environment generally, to wildlife, and to the attractive and appealing aspects of this area which make it such a desirable one.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>4. I object to the claim by a single property (no. 57 Aberdare Gardens), which by the way is NOT listed in the application form for 2020/3030/T, that trees in three different properties on Greencroft Gardens (65, 67 and 69) are causing subsidence problems, of which again NO photographs are provided in this application. I contest the statement that the supposed subsidence problems can only be rectified by felling the trees in question, as opposed to pruning and regular maintenance.</li></ol>

---

<b>Application No:</b>	<b>Consultees Name:</b>	<b>Received:</b>	<b>Comment:</b>	<b>Response:</b>
2020/3020/T	Adam Lawrence	02/08/2020 22:41:57	OBJ	<p>We object to the felling of trees proposed at 65, 67 and 69 Greencroft Gardens by the applicant. Not only are the trees in question highly significant to the character, environment and history of South Hampstead, they are also an important habitat for local birdlife. We know this because it is a real pleasure for to us to watch multiple bird species flock to these trees from our window during lockdown.</p> <p>At a time where, due to Covid-19, many of the neighbour residents are having to work from home, these trees are important to mental well-being and sense of tranquility, as well as helping alleviate the effects of pollution from traffic in Finchley Road and West End Lane.</p> <p>We could not identify clear evidence from the applicant's submission as to why the felling of these trees is necessary, particularly given the distance of the trees from the flats.</p> <p>We do note it is proposed that new trees would be planted but these substitutes would not be like-for-like replacements and the properties would not derive the same benefit for many years.</p> <p>For these reasons, we strongly urge the council to reject this application.</p>

---

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2020/3020/T	Peter symonds	28/07/2020 15:15:38	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:**

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.

In the meantime, CRASH respectfully asks that the application be refused.

Kind regards

Peter Symonds

Chair

---