



Director of Planning
Planning Department
Civic Centre
44 York Street
Twickenham
TW1 3BZ

12th September 2023

Dear Sir

RE: Planning Application 23/2401/FUL

It is now 4 years since planning application 19/TO639/TPO was made to reduce the crowns of the trees fronting Cambridge Park by 2-4M, and to raise the crowns to give 3M clearance from the ground. This application was refused.


A further planning application 22/T0764/TPO was submitted at the end of 2022 seeking an even greater cut back. This was also refused.

These existing trees are the subject of a Tree Preservation Order, and their important community value to the local environment was one of the reasons given for refusing previous planning applications for development on the application site.

Had these recent applications been successful it is possible they may have resulted in the trees being so reduced or damaged by cut back that they no longer presented a reasons for rejecting an application for development of the site.

The attached photographs taken from the same location on Roseleigh Close looking along the existing building line, fronting Cambridge Park, would indicate that the tree canopies appear to extend over the location of the proposed construction. This could potentially result in serious cut back of these trees during the construction process although this may not be readily apparent from the application drawings. Some might, for example, question the validity of the trees and the extent of the foliage as depicted on Drg 19.001_3D4.

The roots of the existing trees may extend out to the full reach of the canopy and, if this is the case, then I would suggest that there may also be considerable damage incurred to the root systems during the construction process if the proposals were to be granted consent.




The trees in question make a significant contribution to the local environment and, it would be seriously detrimental to the amenity of the area if these trees were irreversibly damaged as a consequence of the proposed construction.

If this application were to be approved it may possibly portend an outcome not dissimilar to the potential outcome that may have resulted from 19/TO639/TPO and 22/T0764/TPO had they not been refused.

It would appear that it was always the intent of the original developer that this corner site should remain as an open amenity space for the enjoyment of the residents. It greatly contributes to the open and welcoming feel of the area. This would be lost if the application were granted and, I would formally register my objection to the current application for the reasons previously cited for the development of this site (that application was previously refused, and then again refused on appeal) as well as for those cited above.

Yours faithfully

A large black rectangular redaction box covers the signature and name of the sender.



ROSELEIGH CLOSE

