

From: Dan Baxter

Sent: 31 August 2021 13:24

To: Planning

Subject: Tree Felling Objection ref: 2020/2301/T and 2020/2307/T

Dear Sir/Madam

We are writing this email to object to the planning application at 4 Cleve Road 2021/3881/T. Feelings towards the tree(s) has not changed in a year (please find last years letter attached) since the last attempt to fell the trees application ref: 2020/2301/T and 2020/2307/T. I would just like to add some more points.

The document '0002Cleve road.pdf' provided on the Camden website includes the Building Consultant's Engineering Appraisal Report, a Site Investigation Report' and an Arboricultural Assessment Report. The report regarding the 4 Cleve Road tree only highlights the oak (T6) as possible cause, so why on the application is the sycamore (T5), Elder and Sycamore (G1), included to be felled and have the stumps poisoned? In the document Derek Stern has not highlighted them, why have three other trees been added to the intended works? These three trees should be left alone. The G1 trees are not even mentioned in the report! There are clear errors in the planning of these intended works, with what is planned any action that is carried out cannot be reversed. There is a Tree Preservation Order on the Oak tree, How long is the oak tree protected by the Tree Preservation Order? Has that even been looked into or taken into account?

Maybe the pruning of the oak is a possibility rather than extreme action of killing it? And then be monitored?

With the particularly wet summer we have had this year which has included 3 floods in the local area that has caused a lot of damage, the trees can be a useful aid in the soaking up of the excess water and helping to control the water table and the structural integrity of the soil/clay. With all the extreme weather happening around the globe causing loss of life and vast amounts of destruction, I can only see the recent local weather extremes becoming more worryingly common.

Camden council is planning to add a possible 2000 flats in the area adding to the carbon emissions and population to the area which will increase the CO2 emissions into the atmosphere resulting in these trees having even more importance in helping to clean the air and to aid the government's carbon emission targets/promises.

It seems to be common for the felling of trees recently as a quick and easy solution. There are other options like Irina Carter stated in her letter objecting the 1st application last year 2020/2301/T and 2020/2307/T. I have attached the previous objections from residents as a reminder, as I doubt their points and feelings have changed on the matter.

King regards

Daniel & Rachael Baxter

Rachael Baxter objection Letter

The tree in our garden is a huge beautiful oak tree. It would be awful if this were cut down. I am sure you are aware that trees are a big part of our fight against global warming and cutting them down releases more CO₂ into the atmosphere. Please do not cut down these trees. We need trees in London more than anywhere, for the mental and emotional well being of the community, for cleaner air and to help fight climate change."

As well as this there are many animals living in these gardens who need the trees : the squirrels, crows, blackbirds, robins, parakeets, wood pigeons and many different varieties of insects. So why is there an application to remove these beautiful and valuable living parts of our environment ? There is little evidence that these trees are the cause of subsidence or of creating tiny cracks in the internal walls of no.2. Why should the oak tree be trying to suck up water from underneath the brick walls of no.2 which is 15m away when the pond in no.4 's garden is only 6 m. away from the oak tree, ?

From: Lois Brown [REDACTED]
Sent: 13 June 2020 12:07
To: Planning [REDACTED]
Subject: Objection to proposed felling of trees in a conservation area

Hi,

Following receipt of letters informing us of planned works to trees, as a resident [REDACTED] I am writing to object to proposed felling of trees as per the following application references:

2020/2301/T - 89 Priory Road NW6 3NL - rear garden - 1x horse chestnut (T1), fell to ground level & 1x cypress (T2), fell to ground level

2020/2307/T - 4 Cleve Road NW6 3RR - rear garden - 1x oak (T6), fell to ground level

To protect and prevent the felling of these trees, I understand that we can request a Tree Preservation Order. There is no explanation given as to why these trees should be removed - we should be preserving these natural resources not destroying them with no justification as to why.

Kind regards,

Lois Brown

From: Irina Carter [REDACTED]
Sent: 16 June 2020 00:06
To: Planning [REDACTED]
Subject: Application numbers: 2020/2301/T and 2020/2307/T

Dear Sir/Madam

RE: Notification of Intended Works to Trees at 89 Priory Road (application 2020/2301/T) and 4 Cleve Road (application 2020/2307/T)

As the owner of [REDACTED] I would like to highlight that the Site Plan is incorrect as the trees are marked incorrectly. T1 and T2 are in 89 Priory Road while T3 and T4 are in 91 Priory Road so the tree numbering in the Site Plan is mixed up. Please refer to PRI ARB Report for a correct plan / tree numbering and amend the Site Plan accordingly.

Furthermore, I strongly object to the trees being cut at 89 Priory Road and 4 Cleve Road because of:

- 1) environmental concerns already mentioned by Rachael Baxter,
- 2) negative impact on the value of our properties as cutting the trees will erode the character of the area and the appearance of our gardens,
- 3) cutting the trees is actually not a solution to the problem.

Please see the information published on Local Authority Building Control (see the link below). If you remove a mature tree in areas of clay soil, the clay won't be able to contain the excess water and will swell - sometimes with enough force to move foundations and lift concrete ground floors, causing serious structural damage.

<https://www.labc.co.uk/news/foundations-clay-soil>

The only solution is to increase the depth of the foundation and/or strengthen/reinforce it. In addition, there might be a solution in a form of introducing a barrier to prevent the roots from affecting the foundation and the house.

We can appoint a surveyor from our side to inspect the property and the area and propose an alternative plan.

Many thanks

Irina Carter
[REDACTED]

From: Alex Mace [REDACTED]
Sent: 16 June 2020 16:20
To: Planning [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

Subject: Comment regarding applications 2020/2301/T and 2020/2307/T

Good afternoon,

I am writing as one of the freehold owners of [REDACTED] (with fellow owners copied).

We welcome the chance to comment on the proposed felling of three trees on our property as well as one tree at 4 Cleve Road. We object to the applications in their current form.

Firstly, the planning application contains two significant errors with respect to 89 Priory Road (2020/2301/T):

- The applicants claim to own the trees in question. This is not the case - they belong to 89 Priory Road.
- The applicants claim that the trees are not subject to Tree Preservation Orders. We have confirmed with the Council that they are.

Secondly, we are sceptical about the conclusion that the trees are causing subsidence at 2 Cleve Road.

The Engineering Appraisal Report identifies clay bed shrinkage as the cause. However, it does not adequately justify the claim that this is caused by the trees at 89 Priory Road. The report identifies other potential causes – including localised damage to drains. In fact, the report concludes that they “have not decided on the final type of repair required as our investigations have not yet been concluded”. The engineers set out the need for regular and continued monitoring of possible movement at the property.

Thirdly, felling the trees would have a substantial impact on our property and our neighbours. This spans:

- Possible unintended consequences (the reports do not assess the risk that felling the trees could inadvertently destabilise nearby walls)
- The loss of natural beauty
- Possible worsening of existing poor soil drainage problems in our garden
- Harm to biodiversity in a conservation area
- Loss of privacy and shade

Felling the trees is a drastic measure that should be undertaken as a last resort – especially as they are covered by TPOs. Doing so would be disproportionate to the evidence presented in the application.

Therefore, we request that:

- The application – in its current form – is denied;
- The applicant undertakes monitoring of any movement to evidence its nature and cause – this is a key gap in the current evidence;
- The applicants undertake other recommended repairs first – especially to the local drains – to test whether this is sufficient;
- If movement persists, and if the evidence unambiguously points to the trees at 89 Priory Road as the cause, then we would request that the applicants consider whether other, less drastic measures would be sufficient (e.g. trimming or considering whether treating one tree – rather than all three - would be sufficient).

Kind regards,

Alex Mace