

From: Eileen Willmott

Sent: 20 December 2021 01:22

To: Planning

Subject: Eileen Willmott's tree planning comments for the DPCAAC & DPNF

Dear Tree Officers and Planners,

List 662

2021/5873/T. 14 Brookfield Park

I met with the owner's garden designer. The owner wants to put a wall in the front garden to conform with the other houses in Brookfield Park. There is no wall there at present. This would entail the removal of the multi-stemmed Pittasporum. Although visible, I think it has a relatively low amenity value. The Pittasporum in the rear garden is a better specimen, but you may consider it to be too near to the new extension. However, I was assured that it will have the same building footprint as the one being replaced. Therefore, I prefer that it is pruned, rather than felled.

2021/5866/T. 52 St Alban's Road

According to the planning records this tree was pruned in 1989 and 1993 and the one at No. 50 in 1986. There is no record of more recent pruning, (but it could have been done privately??).

I spoke to the owner, a Camden leaseholder, who said that the case had already gone to court. I understand from the Report that the heave resulting from the felling of this tree will be 13.69mm. He said the alternative was to underpin the building, which is very expensive.

One of the factors involved is that normally these hybrid Plane trees are street trees, whereas those on the Brookfield Estate are within the front gardens and therefore nearer to the properties. The Estate was built in the 1920s and they are therefore becoming veteran trees.

My personal opinion is that the Council contractors should pollard the trees of leaseholders when they do those of the tenant's trees, namely every 2/3 years. This would maintain the trees and ensure uniformity. The leaseholders should then pay the Council the cost and this way hopefully such subsidence problems would not arise.

I did suggest this for myself, but it was not possible.

The Plane trees are a very important feature of this Estate and have a high amenity value. There is the worry that if one tree is felled, then others may

follow. However, in this case, there is another Plane tree nearby in the garden below.

2021/4896/T. 29 Dartmouth Park Hill

I do not object to the 0.5m reduction of the veteran Pear (T5).

I have spoken to Mrs Kellaway and she told me that she was told by Crawford Loss Assessors, acting for No. 31 Dartmouth Park Hill, to fell her King William Pear tree. She has agreed to this but does not want the veteran Pear to be felled. If possible, I prefer that her King William Pear is also pruned rather than felled.

Thank you,

Take care

Eileen Willmott