Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Printed on: 18/10/2022 09:10:28 Response:
2022/4174/T	Andrew	14/10/2022 13:28:41		I have owned the second-floor front facing flat since 2004 and prior to 2018 the flat had been unaffected by cracks and windows becoming stuck. Unfortunately, with the drier Summers and wet Winters the house foundation built on London clay has become severely affected with constant clay shrinkage and swelling. The neighbouring Lime tree has been identified as the main cause as fully detailed in the associated planning application. This on-going ground movement is clearly apparent in my flat with cracks on the front and left interior walls in both my living room and bathroom. I had the cracks filled and a complete re-decoration made in Spring 2021 and since late August this year cracks are reappearing along with two windows that can no longer be opened. I believe in this case there is no option other than to have the tree at number 10 removed and replaced with a smaller specimen that requires less water with shorter roots. I do not think it reasonable that number 10 are expected to pay high arborist costs every few years to maintain the tree as CRASH suggest, having noted that number 10 has already had their Lime tree crown reduced by 20% in 2012 (2012/5223/T) and then in 2016 (2016/0257/T) it was pollarded. Our front garden path close to number 10 has also been badly affected with paving raised and cracked becoming a trip hazard and health and safety risk. The path serves a communal garden for nine flats and is the location for several gas meters. This path was previously repaired in the Spring of 2020 and has returned to a worse state then it was prior to the earlier repairs. We have been fortunate that the main sewer located in the affected area has not yet been impacted, though this is probably just a matter of time. With all this in mind and the factual information submitted, I strongly support the request for the Lime tree to be removed as soon as possible. Climate change and the result of it will not be going away soon. Five homes are currently affected, and the permanent solution is not difficult. Thank
2022/4174/T	Adrian Klemens	13/10/2022 13:45:56	SUPPRT	I am a flat owner at 8 Compayne Gardens, and many flats are facing serious impacts to the damage being caused by the tree. We are all in favour of nature, and do not want trees taken down unnecessarily of course. We love our tree lined streets of South Hampstead and want to protect it. However, after 17 months of monitoring, it has been clearly identified that the damages being caused to our building are from the lime tree. The surveyors at their first review identified the tree as the most likely cause of the subsidence, but due diligence needed to be followed and has done. The damage is across many flats, some that are unable to be lived in due to he amount of damage. The cracks on exterior walls are getting larger, and just recently we could not close a window due to the amount that the wall had dropped on one side. All flat owners are having to made regular repairs due to cracks constantly appearing on both the interior and exterior of the flats. We appreciate organisations such as CRASH reviewing planning applications to make sure the local area is not taken advantage of, but it may have not ben clear enough in the documentation, but all due diligence has been followed, and unfortunately there is no other way to resolve the issues that No 8 Compayne Gardens are facing other than for the tree to be removed. As the survey suggests another species of tree that will not be harmful to buildings could be considered, and something we all at 8 Compayne Gardens wish to happen as we want the local area to stay green - but it can not be at the cost of buildings collapsing.

					Printed on:	18/10/2022
Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:		
2022/4174/T	Jan Putnis	16/10/2022 19:47:45	INT	I am the owner of a flat in 10 Compayne Gardens, London NW6 3DH.		
				The lime tree at the front of 10 Compayne Gardens has provided essential greenery t years and its removal would have a detrimental impact on the surrounding environme		many
				The grounds presented to justify the removal of this mature tree seem weak. The tech invite the reader to accept a number of assumptions about the cause of damage to the without examining any alternative potential causes or explaining the mechanism by we tree have caused that damage. No conclusive evidence is presented that clay shrinks any tree, let alone the tree concerned.	e adjacent pro hich roots fron	perty n the lime
				What alternative causes of the damage have been considered? The application does example, I have seen no assessment of the effect of the ongoing drought, the effect or recent years, or of why no damage has been reported until recently if the culprit is the	of extreme rain	storms in
				Overall, the evidence presented is below the standard I would expect to justify the uple the environment which this application proposes.	neaval and da	mage to
				I am aware of no similar damage having been reported in 10 Compayne Gardens itse property is much closer to the tree concerned. Before concluding that this particular tr problem, it would have been sensible to conduct a survey of the property most likely tit.	ee is the caus	e of any
				Compayne Gardens is a tree-lined street. Is there evidence that similar problems have the street before? If other properties on the street have suffered similar damage, then check whether other causes of that damage were found.		
				If the tree concerned has caused the damage reported to the adjacent property, I und ways that could be considered to mitigate the problem, for example the installation of alternative remedies do not appear to have been properly considered, so we do not k protect the adjacent property without the damage to the local environment that would the tree. Council decision makers ought to have this information in order to reach a baapplication.	a root barrier. now whether t be caused by	These hey would removing
				I find it highly unsatisfactory that it has taken so long to draw this matter to the attention owners of flats in 10 Compayne Gardens given the importance of the tree concerned. Care for the environment and due consideration of all of the alternative approaches to problem would have demanded much earlier engagement and consideration of all of the application appears to be pre-programmed to recommend the removal of the tree with or due consideration of alternative remedies. It would therefore be unreasonable to all proceed.	to the local en mitigating the the options. As nout conclusive	vironment. e alleged s it is, the e evidence

09:10:28