

## Planning application: 27 Woodfield Way, N11 - HGY/2023/0827 - Objection

I object to this application, which is to destroy a large mature oak tree that makes a significant and positive contribution to the environment, street-scene and quality of life in this area. My objection is based on the following comments:

- The oak in question is large, mature and beautiful – it rightly has a TPO and should be protected.
- The tree is a considerable distance (more than 20 metres?) from 27 Woodfield Way and it is highly unlikely to be a significant contributor to any subsidence there. Crawford's Technical Report includes a Site Plan, which although not-to-scale is misleading in showing the tree right alongside the property – it isn't.



- The Technical Report includes a diagram to show the potential extent of root damage – this shows a limit, equal to the tree-height times 1.25, and it is questionable to what extent, if any, roots at this range can cause any discernible effect.
- The so-called Expert Opinion concedes that the settlement damage is Category 2, “Slight”, and then goes on through spurious reasoning to claim seasonal cyclical settlement downward and then upward of 1.0 mm are due to the oak tree roots. Isn't it much more likely that this level of settlement on shrinkable clay subsoil is simply a result of climate change and dry summers?
- The reality is that most of this part of north London is built on shrinkable clay subsoil, which is prone to cyclical movement. In the past, this was less of a problem, but after a series of relatively dry summers, settlement and subsidence have become more common. In many cases exacerbated by shallow and uneven foundations, which may have been adequate when these houses were built, but they aren't now.
- It is quite likely that even if the oak tree is removed, there will be further and possible worse movement. Removing the tree is unlikely to solve the problem.
- The application is made on behalf of The Scout Association and presumably this is because they have been leant-on by the insurance company. How ironic that an organisation you might expect to be on the side of nature is forced to act in this way.

Better for the insurance company to pay up and have any necessary work done, rather than pass the buck onto others.

- Reference is made to the 'amenity value' of this tree, as if it could be brushed off. The tree is more than an amenity – it is a valuable significant contributor to the quality of the local environment, the street-scene and the environment more generally.

Please refuse this application and uphold the Tree Preservation Order.

Colin Marr

3 Methuen Park, N10 2JR

24 April 2023