

Subject: Planning Application reference 2022/1187/T
Attachments: Inked102-4 Albert st satellite_LL.jpg

Re Planning Application

Dear Planning Team

I am writing as the owner of the property adjoining 102 -104 to object to the above planning application for permission to fell two trees in the garden of this property and to request that because these trees are in a conservation area a tree preservation order is placed on them on the following grounds.

- ∞ These trees are in a large green space overlooked by at least 45 households living in three roads that contain this space and therefore have considerable public amenity value. This is an important "green lung" for this part of Camden. Attached photograph shows the extent of the canopy provided by these two trees which will be lost if they are felled
- ∞ At a time when literally hundreds of mature trees in Camden have been and are being felled many to support the HS2 rail line. We need to maintain and cherish those that we have for their contribution to biodiversity and reducing air pollution.
- ∞ These trees are at least 7.7 metres from the extension to the main building
- ∞ Though bore holes have been dug in this garden, there is as yet no long term monitoring to provide evidence that these trees are responsible for of any movement in the building. Have all other possible causes been considered?
- ∞ The garden wall between the two properties has been affected by the sycamore, but in rebuilding this my surveyor has said this can easily be overcome by the presence of a lintel. I would far rather have a garden wall adapted to contain the roots than lose the trees which I have looked out over for the past 58 years.
- ∞ Both species are Category A carbon credit species trees (see Barcham's "Top Trunks" carbon sequestration guide). Camden has declared a climate emergency and should not be permitting the release of this carbon as a consequence.

I have consulted Arboriculturist Simon Pryce and he has made the following comments.

Although there are no monitoring readings to date the lab test results show significant desiccation of the clay from about 2 - 2.5m downwards, i.e. it is much drier than would be expected under normal conditions. That could be due to root action, although the desiccated zone extends to 5m, well below any roots. That points to the trees possibly being involved, but also indicates that removing them might lead to prolonged soil swelling, or heave, as the ground rehydrates. That can damage buildings, particularly relatively new ones. From the site investigation report plan the main building has a basement and the engineer's report states that the damage is mainly in the rear projection, which might be a later addition and more susceptible to heave.

It is possible to calculate heave potentials from soil test results but that doesn't appear to have been done here. Where there is a potential for severe heave if trees are removed, underpinning or other structural work can be a better option, but that appears not to have been considered, possibly on cost grounds.

I would thus urge you to put in place a tree preservation order at least to give time for proper monitoring of any effects these trees may be having on the back extension to the hostel and also consider whether pruning of the two trees would mitigate the situation.

Yours sincerely
Mary Burd
Resident of Albert Street

