

---

**From:** Charles Smart [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 12 April 2021 13:46  
**To:** Planning  
**Subject:** Comment on felling of T2 Poplar (Ref: 2021/1333/T)

**[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.

Hi,

I am a tenant of 101 Torriano Avenue and I wish to object, at the present time, to the proposed felling of the T2 poplar tree at 107 Torriano Avenue (Ref: 2021/1333/T) on three grounds:

The first is practical. I don't think there is enough specific evidence that the poplar is the sole or principal cause of any subsidence. It has been pollarded recently and it seems too early to conclude one way or the other the impact this has had. Further, the summers of 2018, 2019 and 2020 were on average or on specific days amongst the warmest on record for London, and the impact of this on soil expansion and contraction is not considered by the arboricultural assessment report. Lastly, there appears to be no consideration of whether the removal of the tree - and so a likely gradual loss of soil cohesion around it - may end up causing a greater degree of soil movement or subsidence over time, with greater potential damage to Rennie House and/or surrounding properties. It would be helpful to have an independent assessment conducted by the council's own Tree Service, if possible.

The second is its public value. The poplar (one of the most prominent trees in the immediate area) is a carbon sink, air purifier, source of shade, wildlife habitat (including in winter for redwings which are a Schedule 1 protected species), and - as amply demonstrated by other responses - a source of aesthetic and social value to residents and tenants of surrounding buildings, myself included. As such I believe its value as an environmental and public health and wellbeing asset to the council and its residents is greater than the given estimates of the private costs of letting it live.

The third is a matter of principle and precedent. The tree predates Rennie House, and so its builders and insurers were aware of its existence. I believe it is unfair for the council to act on behalf of the insurer to mitigate a financial risk of which they should have been aware, and in any case should be obligated to bear. Further, I feel that if the poplar is removed it entrenches the moral hazard that future builders and insurers of Camden properties will worry less about the risks posed by nearby trees, leading in time to more disputes and more overly long and formal emails such as this one being sent back and forth.

I hope you consider these points and would welcome responses to them in some form as part of your decision.

Best,

Charles