

7.1 – TPO 533

ADDENDUM

M [REDACTED] I M [REDACTED], [REDACTED] Letter in support of TPO at 156 Peckham Rye

No damage has been caused by the tree during our former occupation for over thirty years.

There is no clear indication that any damage to the garden wall adjacent can be positively attributed to the growth of the tree. Our insurers advised that the tree was not a notifiable problem.

The tree was of significant personal value to our deceased mother and to visiting children.

It has great biodiversity benefit especially for at least 25 species of wildlife including Greater Spotted Woodpeckers, Jays and Goldfinches, together with lichens, and an unknown amount of insects.

When we had to sell the property to fund our mother to go into a home, we met the owner and stated that we did not want the tree removed. She assured us that she had no plans.

The owners have already removed a mature tree from the front garden.

The Maple is probably one of the only examples of a mature tree of this species in the area of such an age – over one hundred years at least. It is also an extremely beautiful example.

The need to retain and protect such trees is becoming more recognised. Every tree lost is also a loss to the rich tapestry of biodiversity in this historic area of London, adjacent to where William Blake saw a host of angels on a tree on the Common.

This should be of particular relevance to the department of Place and Wellbeing with regards to the recognised benefit of trees to the wealth of the wider community and to the heritage of this part of Peckham.

There are technical reasons that the owners should consider keeping it due to the risk of heave if it were removed. This would be far more expensive to remedy.

Furthermore, should the removal be for other reasons than those stated, for instance, that the new owners wish to extend their kitchen, then there is plenty of scope within the template of the house as it stands.

The present dining room area is not original to the house and if they applied to have the section of wall removed that now separates it from the kitchen, we believe that they would be granted planning permission.

M [REDACTED] M [REDACTED] (also on behalf of S [REDACTED] M [REDACTED])