

From: Martin Franklin

Sent: 31 December 2022 12:04

To: Planning

Subject: Comments on Application ref: 2022/5180/T re the proposed felling of trees in a conservation area

Dear Sirs/Madams

Re Application ref: 2022/5180/T re the proposed felling of trees in a conservation area at 5 Cleve Road, London NW6 3RG.

Yesterday (30 December) I received a letter from you dated 28 November (sic). I am accordingly replying at the earliest possible opportunity, despite your letter stating that comments should be submitted within 21 days of the date of your letter.

As a resident of the immediately neighbouring property, I would like to agree with and add my support to the following comment which has been published on your website:

"The reason that the trees have been 'smothered in ivy for years' is that they haven't been properly and regularly managed.

It is entirely possible and feasible for a good arboriculturalist to carefully sever the ivy trunks close to ground level (without damaging the tree) and to let the ivy die back, such that some of it can eventually be removed, and the tree can continue to thrive.

The presence of the ivy is not, of itself, a sufficient justification to fell 3 perfectly healthy trees, without immediate replacement, in a Conservation Area where they form a part of the very characteristic verdant bands along the rear boundaries of many of the properties' plots, as observed in the South Hampstead Conservation Area Appraisal document.

In this position they are already very publicly visible from several nearby properties- probably amounting to some 30-40 people who can regularly see them, and enjoy their visual amenity.

If the trees are not dangerous, or demonstrably causing subsidence to a house, then they should be retained and managed properly rather than simply being felled, causing a loss of biodiversity, loss of verdant amenity and loss of valuable carbon stores.

This application should be rejected, and the ivy should be removed rather than the trees felled."

Clearly the solution here is proper maintenance, not destruction. We should be helping our wildlife and maintaining the aesthetic; not using a property owner's own negligence as an excuse for further harming these or to set a dangerous precedent for future applications. I would only add to the previous quoted comment that I would estimate the number of people affected to be significantly more than 30-40.

Thank you.

Martin Franklin