

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2020/5408/T	Kathleen J Conn	02/12/2020 14:19:45	OBJNOT	<p>I am writing to object to the felling and poisoning of 1x Sweet Cherry to the rear of 108 Haverstock Hill as the reason, given 'growing against wall and building; high risk; wall damage' does not warrant such an extreme action. Pruning should be sufficient measure to remedy the tree growing against the building and the risk to wall damage is exaggerated.</p> <p>I would like to draw your attention to the fact that Camden Tree dept did not authorise (quite rightly) the felling of a tree to the front of 106 Haverstock Hill (part of the properties known as 106-110 Haverstock Hill) which did in fact cause serious wall damage but the tree was retained at great expense and took a very long time.</p> <p>We are currently in a climate and ecological emergency, air quality in Camden is over acceptable safety levels, Camden have held a so-called Citizens' Assembly and has a climate action plan, part of this is to retain and plant AS MANY TREES as possible, not fell them. IF it were a danger to life, IF it was dying, then of course there would be good reason to fell it. These are not the circumstances, here.</p> <p>Trees are the lungs of the city and Camden's precautionary policy of systematically brutally pollarding trees, to protect buildings not life, already contributes to to a huge loss of leaf coverage and absorption of carbon.</p> <p>Further, I think you will find that the pdf plan of trees on the site that is being shown in the case file is not up-to-date which one would have expected since the properties are within a conservation area. I believe it is showing trees that have been felled mostly for unacceptable reasons, then, as now.</p> <p>I urge you, for well being of future generations, to oppose the felling, but approve the pruning of this tree.</p>
