

Comment on a planning application

Application Details

Application: 24/2278/VRC

Address: North Boundary WallDorchester MewsTwickenham

Proposal: Variation of condition LT04 - Protective Fencing (Other)-Small Fencing of planning permission 23/3057/FUL to revise the Arboricultural Method Statement to reduce and remove all roots within trench fill foundation to secure long-term structural integrity of the boundary wall.

Comments Made By

Name: Ms. E J Bufton

Address: 24 St Stephens Gardens Twickenham TW1 2LS

Comments

Type of comment: Object to the proposal

Comment: PART 1 of 3

Objection to "Planning Application 24/2278/VRC"

I strongly object to the request for revision and removal of condition LT04 - Protective Fencing (Other)-Small Fencing of planning permission 23/3057/FUL, wherein the applicant seeks that the planning commission "revise the Arboricultural Method Statement to reduce and remove all roots within trench fill foundation to secure long-term structural integrity of the boundary wall."

This letter covers the following points and is in 3 separate digital submissions::

Removing Tree Roots Compromises Tree Health

There is No Basis to Grant a Revision and Removal of Conditions

British Standards Invoked by LBRUT Planners Must Be Adhered To

The Applicant Appears Not To Want To Invest in Tree Protection To Which They Agreed

St. Stephens Gardens is a Conservation Area

The Boundary Wall is Non-Structural

Trees Protect the Environment and Provide Numerous Other Benefits

Trees are a Historic and Mature Feature of this Conservation Area

Tree Damage Causes Financial Damage

Dorchester Mews Communications Frequently Comment On "Tree Fouling"

Applicant Should Be Required to Retain Technical Consultant To Specify and Oversee Root Protection Methods

There Are Numerous Experts in this Field

Removing Tree Roots Compromises Tree Health

Removing tree roots can cause irreparable damage, causing trees to become stressed, diseased, weaken, and die.

There is No Basis to Grant a Revision and Removal of Conditions

The London Borough of Richmond-upon-Thames's (LBRUT) planning commission does not have sufficient basis to grant a revision and removal of condition LT04. If there were no methods to protect trees and their roots while building this non-structural boundary wall, the planning commission might find sufficient basis to consider a revision. However, in this case, there are well-established and routinely employed construction techniques that should be used in building the foundation for this boundary wall. These techniques, such as root bridging, protect existing roots to protect the health and longevity of trees. The applicant, St. George, is a large developer and is presumably familiar with these routine tree root protection methods.

British Standards Invoked by LBRUT Planners Must Be Adhered To

The applicant must be required to adhere to LBRUT's original conditions for planning approval. LBRUT required the applicant to conduct their construction in accordance with British arboricultural standards. The BSI Standards Publication "5837:2012 Trees in relation to design, demolition and construction" contains details of construction techniques that protect all parts of existing trees in the built environment, especially tree root areas. These standards have been carefully developed by arboricultural and construction experts in order to preserve and protect trees which are critical for quality of life, environmental integrity, air quality, aesthetics, as well as other reasons.

The Applicant Appears Not To Want To Invest in Tree Protection To Which They Agreed The applicant was aware of, and agreed to, the required planning conditions when they embarked on the wall build, and should be required to abide by them. These British Standards should not be frivolously jettisoned for the construction of a minor non-structural boundary wall. It appears St. George would prefer not to incur any expenditure required to bridge roots, or to use other appropriate root and tree protection techniques, preferring instead to remove the roots and thereby compromise the health and longevity of these trees. The planning commission's requirement should not be vacated for St. George's convenience and financial benefit. Remember that the rebuild of this boundary wall is corrective work, motivated by a collective of owners at Dorchester Mews (originally developed by St. George), as a consequence of deficient construction of the original wall by St. George, and is therefore fully funded by St. George.