****

**22/05015/TPO | T1 Tulip tree - Crown reduce by 6m. SUBJECT TO TPO BB9 1960 | 66 Madeira Avenue Bromley BR1 4AS**

We object to this application.

We are a residents’ association of over 500 subscribing households serving an area in which Madeira Avenue is situated.  We concern ourselves with the built environment and with generally improving the area for the benefit of residents.

**Amenity**

This application has been made in respect of a mature tulip tree situated at the front of the property. The tree is around 20m in height and would appear to be of normal vitality. The canopy layer would indicate that any previous management has been minimal. The tree is positioned in the corner of the front garden and is highly visible from both approaches along Bromley Avenue and Madeira Avenue.

The tree is a good example of the species and makes a positive contribution to the street scene and as such has high amenity value.

A substantial crown reduction would significantly reduce the amenity of this landmark tree

**Application Form**

The application form is somewhat contradictory. In one place it states: -

*Reason(s) for proposed works: Oversized. Deadwood build up. Driveway disruption. Fear of future property damage. [my highlight]*

Yet in another it states: -

* *Reasons for works: Size management*
* *Condition of tree(s) e.g., is it diseased or do you have fears that is might break or fall?* ***No***
* *Alleged damage to property e.g., subsidence or damage to drains or drives:* ***No***

We would comment on these statements as follows: -

* The reasons (above) for the proposed work are different and only statements relating to the tree’s size are consistent.
* It is unclear whether there is damage to the drive, given the above contradictory statements and given that ‘disruption’ could mean anything. No other damage is alleged.
* We also note that in the previous application 16/05602 the damage to the drive alleged at that time was considered secondary to the amenity of the tree.
* Notwithstanding the above, it appears the owner wishes to reduce the size of the tree because it is ‘oversized’.
* We note that deadwood management does not require planning permission,
* We also note that ‘fear’ alone of future property damage is an inadequate justification for tree work, especially when not supported by professional advice.

**Proposed tree work**

No reason has been stated as to why the tree is oversized, nor why this demands a crown reduction, at the cost of the tree’s undoubted amenity.

It is not clear what a ‘6m reduction’ in the crown would entail. For example, how much of the tree’s width would be reduced?

**Conclusion**

The tree is noted as a good example. If there is damage to the drive, then this is, per the previous application, secondary to the importance of the tree. There is no justification given as to why the tree is oversized and why this is a problem. No professional advice is provided.

The reduction in the tree’s canopy would be detrimental to the character of the area and would subsequently negate the objectives of the TPO.

Yours

Ravensbourne Valley Residents