

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2021/2216/T	Dr T Challoner	06/06/2021 19:22:25	OBJ	<p>I object strongly to felling to ground level of this mature lime tree, which is subject to a TPO. The tree was established well before the garage and the house at number 2 were built. Indeed you can see in the photo below https://www.themodernhouse.com/sales-list/regal-lane/ that the very same tree was there at the back of no. 2 Regal Lane (on the upper right of the photo, in the history section of the house description), when the celebrated modernist architect John Winter built this house for his own use in 1961. He preserved the tree then, and for its extension in the 1990s.</p> <p>Apart from the recognised benefits of trees (particularly mature trees) in carbon capture and reduction in air pollution, the loss of this tree would be a significant, irreversible loss of amenity - such an established tree is not replaceable. Its presence shields our properties in Gloucester Avenue from directly seeing the neighbouring house at no. 2 Regal Lane, giving a pleasant country outlook to our windows. Furthermore, the tree is a habitat for wildlife - including jays that have been nesting in the tree.</p> <p>Sometimes, development makes it inevitable that we sadly lose trees - see for instance the trees have been lost along Prince Albert Road to HS2 creating their lorry park. This situation is quite different. To remove this tree, thus to lose another tree, particularly in the vicinity of an A road, would be a huge loss.</p> <p>The majestic appearance of this tree is not apparent in the present application, but is shown in part in supporting photos and thumbnail images in the recent application to you by no. 2 Regal Lane to fell the silver birch tree by their front door, adjacent to the garage door of Mr Reekie - application 2021/2222/T. http://camdocs.camden.gov.uk/HPRMWebDrawer/PlanRec?q=recContainer:%222021/2222/T%22 Its majesty is more apparent from our flats, and as turns one turns the corner in Regal Lane. The "adjoining" tree mentioned in the comment appended on 18 May, is a very much less majestic sycamore in the garden of 27 Gloucester Avenue (also subject to a TPO), which does not shield us from no. 2.</p> <p>The application states the tree in question has not been maintained because there is no freeholder. Regal Lane has a Residents Association, who could well have managed this tree, and indeed appear to manage other vegetation in the lane. (Further, I remember someone in Regal Lane applied previously to you to have this tree felled due to "leaf litter".)</p> <p>I could not find any structural surveyor report attached to the application commenting on subsidence to any house in Regal Lane from its presence, or removal, nor a report on "health and safety risks". We have had several high winds and only a few minor twigs appear to have fallen.</p> <p>Out of a sense of elementary fairness, I have to point out that the favourable comment by Danielle Rodrigue made on 15 May, appended to the application on 18 May, is not an independent comment, as she is married to Mr Reekie, who is applying to get this tree removed.</p>