

1.

**LONDON'S ARCADIA – Warren Footpath phase 2 consultation – January 2007**

\*Trees numbered 1 – 61 see plans for exact tree

| Respondent<br>No * | Summary of comments –general or by tree number **  | Officers comments   | Executive Committee<br>Recommendation  |
|--------------------|--|---|--|
|                    | Petition of 496 names against<br>7 & 7a Acuba's<br>14 & 15 Elders<br>Sycamores   | Retain acubas<br>Recommend remove one small elder to far left of clump. Dead wood and remove one low branch over Marble Hill Park entrance gate. RETAIN ALL OTHER ELDERS.<br>Sycamores as below in 27 | Agreed with officer  |
| 1.                 | All that is needed is some judicious pruning and a bit of tidying up. It's just like the time when a great scheme was put forward by English Heritage when they took over the responsibility of Marble Hill Park. Reinstating the cricket pitch as of George II time, redoing the Quadrants round the house and putting hard wearing grass on the rugby fields on the low lying ground near the river. NOTHING ever came out of that. Accept, of course, the cost of the whole needless project.<br>Is all this known as 'job creation'?   | To be reviewed under Marble Hill Park Conservation Management Plan  | Agreed with officer  |
| 2.                 | My only comment concerns no's 14 & 15, the two clumps of elder either side of the riverside entrance to MH park. I am not a lover of elder but total removal of these trees would leave a rather bare and bleak entrance and a lot of empty containers. Would it be possible just to tidy up and remove any dead wood from these trees, their total removal being left to a future occasion when something appropriate could then be planted? Would be happy with replacing them with hawthorn (The draft management plan for the park wants woodland and soft edges for the riverside boundary) | Recommend remove one small elder to far left of clump. Dead wood and remove one low branch over Marble Hill Park entrance gate. RETAIN ALL OTHER ELDERS.  | Agreed with officer- retain elders- remove one lower branch over gate to Marble Hill Park and remove one sycamore in clump to left of gates growing through footpath |

2.

**LONDON'S ARCADIA – Warren Footpath phase 2 consultation – January 2007**

\*Trees numbered 1 – 61 see plans for exact tree

|    |   |   |                     |
|----|---|---|---------------------|
| 3. | My suggestion is that the removed trees are cut into logs and made available for the local residents to take home   | Not possible unless they collect directly from arb team on day due to risk of logs floating down river creating a hazard. If public wish to ask arb contractors for wood it will need to be between individual and arb team and subject to arb team's approval. Dead wood to be used in nearby log piles, | Agreed with officer |
| 4. | <p>Good opening up the view to the octagon and the view down Cambridge footpath.</p> <p>Main concern is the entrance to MH grounds. Removing the elders on both sides may be ok, but will anything be put in their place? The big tree pit on the west side needs either something in it or to be removed. More discussion needed on how this area will/can be made into a more imposing entrance. (Are we going to get a new entrance at the extreme east of the grounds?) I have asked for this several times over the years.</p> <p>There were a few apparent omissions e.g a stump opposite 43 &amp; a dead tree near 45, a stump near the dingies &amp; a missed tree by iron post?<br/>(I couldn't quite see the difference in branches/boughs trailing in the river, between some that needed removing and some that can remain)</p> | Elder -As above in 2<br>Empty pits are to be reviewed in detailed design stage, which will go through pubic consultation later this year. Works to tree pits to ensure retention of Elders  | Agreed with officer |
| 5. | <p>Generally plan is good with the following exception – The two sunken circular beds on either side on the riverside entrance to Marble Hill Park which contain elder, <u>should not be changed!</u> In particular replacement of these attractive features with municipal style park benches and cycle stands would ruin the natural character of the area.</p> <p>There is another semi circular sunken bed about 20 metres upstream which should not be changed.</p> <p>You <u>should</u> remove the ugly privet at the end of Cambridge Park footpath but not the tree(s) it surrounds.</p>  | Elder as above in 2<br>Tree pit as above in 4<br>Recommend no cycle rack in this location<br>Privet hedge to be pruned to ground level but not removed, to be reviewed at a later date.   | Agreed with officer |

3.

**LONDON'S ARCADIA – Warren Footpath phase 2 consultation – January 2007**

\*Trees numbered 1 – 61 see plans for exact tree

|    |  |  |                                   |
|----|--|--|-----------------------------------|
| 6. | I agree with the removal of the sycamores is probably a good idea as I discussed with Jason, to allow the pollarded riparian willows and flora to develop. However it would be a great shame and very unpopular with the birds and residents alike to remove those largest elderflower trees marked along that stretch – those found near the river towpath gate from MH house. Please let me know if this can be avoided.   | As above in 2  | Agreed with officer as above in 2 |
| 7. | The proposals on the website and clear and precise leaving little room for misunderstanding. Well-considered and thoughtful proposals. In order to maintain a safe and attractive environment, these proposals appear to be not only essential but overdue.  | No comment required  | Agreed with officer               |
| 8. | <p>The trees and shrubs along the Warren Footpath have obviously suffered from years of neglect and self-seeding. The way to rectify the problem, however, would be to institute a programme of regular care and maintenance, not to tackle it in one swinging campaign, which will leave the riverside sadly shorn until the subjects that have been pruned or cut to the ground have a chance to re-sprout. The elders, for eg could be cut down over a period of several years rather than all at once. They are attractive, a habitat for birds and they help to screen the towpath from the unsightly structure in the park during the summer concerts.</p> <p>I am appalled by the proposal to install bicycle racks anywhere on the towpath. This kind of intrusive furniture is out of character and unnecessary. There are plenty of railing to which bicycles can be chained if need be. If Arcadia and the other orgs involved really care about the appearance and accessibility of the riverside they would do better to consider improving the lighting. It is so dim that only the brave and foolish risk walking along the towpath after dark and the ugly cement lamp standards are a disgrace.</p> | <p>Proposals are being done in part so that in future volunteers can sustain the maintenance by coppicing etc.</p> <p>Elders as above at 2</p> <p>Bike racks as above in 5</p> <p>Lighting work design stage to be consulted in late 2007.</p> | Agreed with officer               |
| 9. | <p>The scrub could be thinned. This would not need tree surgeons, but could be done by volunteers under discretion</p> <p>Some trees are being removed as they are damaging the revetment (bank), The revetment should be repaired before the damage spreads.</p> <p>I understand the tree works is being contracted out as RuT's team is otherwise occupied. The Council should consider employing a tree warden again to prevent a backlog building up of trees dangerous to passers by and river traffic.</p>   | <p>Some trees are too big for volunteers but a future management plan could involve volunteers.</p> <p>Tree warden to discuss with LBRuT.</p>  | Agreed with officer               |

4.

**LONDON'S ARCADIA – Warren Footpath phase 2 consultation – January 2007**

\*Trees numbered 1 – 61 see plans for exact tree

|            |   |  |  |
|------------|---|--|--|
| <p>10.</p> | <p>In principal the proposals for the Warren footpath are both sensible and acceptable. However there are several specific proposals with which we disagree strongly and would ask Arcadia to reconsider.</p> <p>7 &amp; 7a – Quite why being exotic justifies removal of the two Acuba shrubs, is beyond us. They are evergreen with pretty red berries and provide much-needed colour in an area that is otherwise short of plant life at ground level. The 'native marginal' irises and sedges that are to be planted would in any case grow lower down the riverbank.</p> <p>14 &amp; 15 – Your proposal to remove the elder clumps either side of MH park gate is unacceptable! There is no need to widen the access gate to the park nor open up the space, visually, by removing the elders. A wider gateway will simply encourage cyclists to career at even greater speed out of and into the park. Having already lost the lilac trees from the footpath because they interfered with the view from MH House, the last thing that is needed is the loss of any more flowering tree/shrubs that not only provide a habitat for the birds but also help screen off the mess of the summer concerts from the towpath.</p> <p>Mr MacKenzie (PM) who accompanied a group of us along the footpath on Saturday 13/01/07, mentioned in passing the proposal to remove the two tree pits (in which the elders are growing) and the scarcely credible idea to install a cycle rack in their place at the gate entrance! Please remember that Warren footpath is first and foremost a footpath. A cycle rack would be totally out of character with the natural, rustic feel of the footpath and riverbank.</p> <p>47.48 &amp; 53 – It is proposed to remove mature alder and ash trees because their roots have caused 'heaving revetment'. Is it not more reasonable to shape the path over and around the offending roots? This solution is happily applied to a couple of trees in Morley road!</p> <p>55 – Why does anyone need a clear view of the river when walking down Cambridge Park footpath? In fact there would be a downside to the removal of the elders/privets: the Petersham Road, which is quite close at that point, which would become instantly visible to anyone walking down the Cambridge Park footpath. By all means remove the ugly railings around the elder and the privets but not the shrubs.</p> | <p>Acubas- Refer to Exec Comm. Note that Acuba on riverside was proposed to be removed for site lines to ferry docks due to high crime incidents. Recommend that the Acuba on Marble Hill Park side be retained.</p> <p>Elder as above at 2</p> <p>47, 48 &amp; 53 – heaving to the revetments when such trees fail is considerable. The advice received from Arboriculture is that these specimens are in a poor state and are likely to fail in the near future and as such should be removed.</p> <p>55 as above at 5</p> | <p>Retain both Acuba japonica (Portuguese laurel) on both sides of footpath</p> <p>Remove 47, 48, &amp; 53 for H&amp;S issues</p> <p>55 - Coppice privet to ground and review condition of tree. If tree is in good condition retain (dead wood and crown raise) review privet growth.</p> |
|------------|---|--|--|

## 5.

**LONDON'S ARCADIA – Warren Footpath phase 2 consultation – January 2007**

\*Trees numbered 1 – 61 see plans for exact tree

|              |  |  |  |
|--------------|--|--|--|
| 10.<br>con't | 58 – We agree that the lower tidal shelf needs sorting out and raising the crowns of the trees to encourage newly planted irises, sedges etc is sensible. However some of the owners of the moorings alongside the tidal shelf have taken it upon themselves to install large, ugly, gangways, concrete blocks, etc to give themselves access from the shore. In the summer the vegetation along this lower tidal shelf is often trampled and flattened by those seeking access to their boats. We were under the impression that access to vessels on these offshore moorings was by boat and not direct from the land? Perhaps the PLA could clarify this point and whether therefore the boat owners in question have any right to litter the bank with their home made gangways?   | Refer to PLA and LBRuT   | Agreed with officer  |
| 11.          | The walking tour was excellent   | No comment   |  |
| 12.          | The work proposed is really only catch up with delayed maintenance. I would want to see a more dramatic approach. I would particularly like to see the privet removed at the junction of alleyway leading from Cambridge park to the towpath. This action would open the view from the alley and make it feel brighter and safer.  | Privet see above at 5  | Agreed with officer  |
| 13.          | Would be nice if you could plant some snowdrops, which could be left to spread under the willows, along the river.<br>I think the rubbish stored by the river by the man who lives on the river is a health HAZARD and should not be allowed and left there. WHAT is being done about it?  | Snowdrops not suitable in damp tidal area - check with ecologists<br>Refer rubbish matter to English Heritage and PLA  | Agreed with officer  |
| 14.          | The proposed tree removal / pruning does not include any works to healthy trees which I consider of significant value within the local or wider landscape, therefore in principal I raise <u>no objections</u> to the proposed work.<br>I was however somewhat concerned by the scope of the survey and some of the tree identification. I walked the path and felt that a few trees had been missed out which, in my professional opinion require remedial work. I have marked the most significant of these on the plan you supplied for your reference, perhaps we can discuss. The identification errors I noted are as follows:<br>Page 7, 47 is a poplar, not ash. 50 is a poplar, not ash and 48 is a willow, not an alder.<br>Page 8, 40 is a poplar, not willow. 44 is unidentified, this is an Ash.<br>Page 10, 29 is an Ash, not sycamore | Noted on tree names and mistakes.<br>Refer mooring post to Exec Comm for comment - note boat that is chained to tree is complete submerged under water and the owner should remove | Agreed with officer - Remove tree 23 with chain around it to ground level and secure boat chain to stump with a nail |

## 6.

**LONDON'S ARCADIA – Warren Footpath phase 2 consultation – January 2007**

\*Trees numbered 1 – 61 see plans for exact tree

|     |  |  |                                     |
|-----|--|--|-------------------------------------|
|     | <p>Whilst this may appear somewhat “picky” and irrelevant, I feel that small errors like these bring the scheme into disrepute, as I am aware your work is closely scrutinised by borough residents.</p> <p>On page 12, you have recommended leaving a stump as a mooring post; I do not think this a sound idea.</p>  |  |                                     |
| 15. | <p>I do not necessarily agree with some of the specific proposals (e.g. sycamores nos. 18 and 49, and elder no. 15, which are attractive and harmless specimens). However, the overall scale of the proposed works is not unreasonable – <i>provided</i> that you do not intend to do any other works, e.g. in connection with any hard landscaping, and that no one else, e.g. LBRUT or BTCV, does any work that will change the character of the area.</p> <p>Perhaps you could give an assurance on this point.</p>   | <p>The established character of the Warren Footpath is as a natural, leafy, wildlife diverse riverwalk with occasional long views to Richmond Hill. All current works and future management of this area will be to maintain this established character.</p> | <p>Agreed with officer</p>          |
| 16. | -  |  |                                     |
| 17. | <p>No 14 &amp; 15, the Elder trees are sound and in spring provide beautiful flowering and in Autumn provide essential food for birds. They should not be removed. No view should be involved. I refer to the trees in front of the river steps. The details attached are a complete irrelevance and should not have been included. The context map is WRONG, nos 14 &amp; 15 should be 13, The MAP shows 14 in front of MH House.</p>   | <p>Elder as above at 2</p>   | <p>Agreed with officer</p>          |
| 18. | <p>Sycamore on Towpath, scorched tree is not dying but recovering. And is not being killed by a chain.</p>   | <p>Refer to Exec Comm as in 14</p>   | <p>Agreed with officer - remove</p> |
| 19. | <p>As Volunteers' Coordinator for the Environment Trust, I have been involved in conservation activity along the river for some years and have considerable knowledge of the local issues. I also took part in the guided walk on 13th January and have read the consultation documents.</p> <p>It is quite clear that the problem on Warren footpath is related to chronic neglect of maintenance over many years. Trees and shrubs have become overgrown and in some cases dangerous; there has been a loss of light on the foreshore and some blocking of vistas. I am therefore broadly in favour of the works proposed, not least since the consequence will be to foster more diversity of plant life on the foreshore and to re-open lost views. In some cases also, pruning or removal of trees will reduce the risk of damage to the footpath and greatly increased cost of maintenance in the future.</p> <p>However, unless it is clear what will replace them, I am NOT in favour of removing the elders on each side of the gates into Marble Hill Park. I would also</p> | <p>Elder as above at 2</p>   | <p>Agreed with officer</p>          |

## 7.

**LONDON'S ARCADIA – Warren Footpath phase 2 consultation – January 2007**

\*Trees numbered 1 – 61 see plans for exact tree

|     |   |   |                     |
|-----|---|---|---------------------|
|     | like some assurance from the Council about how the area is to be managed and maintained in the future on a regular basis.<br>Unfortunately there has been insufficient time to consult the Trustees of ETRuT but I believe the majority would support my comments which are also endorsed by the Project Manager, Angela Kidner."   |   |                     |
| 20. | I attended the 13.01.07-guided tour, which I found most helpful. I hope any branches or trees which show signs of decay in the highly frequented are will also be removed. There was mention of cycle racks near the entrance to MH house. I question whether this is a suitable site. Nearer the house would seem more sensible.   | Elder as above at 2   | Agreed with officer |
| 21. | Apart from the obvious removal of dead wood (ie fallen trees that may drift off down the river) I do not see the need to remove or change the following:<br>No 7 & 7a, Acuba tree – leave, although exotic it adds colour and density<br>No 14 & 15, Elder clumps at east and west gate of MH park, leave this looks beautiful in summer and provides lovely foliage, no to a bike rack.<br>No 55, privet and hedge should remain! If view is opened up it will cause the elements to batter the Cambridge Footpath – tidy only.<br>No 48, rather than moving Alder, round off footpath likewise at other locations see diagram ***** TH's comments what this person means is where the trees are undermining the towpath, rather than remove tree mould towpath over tree roots. | Acuba- see above at 10<br>Elder as above at 2<br>Privet as above at 5<br>No 48 – see 10 above | Agreed with officer |
| 22. | General objection to the removal of the Elder's on the towpath with white.  | Elder as above at 2   | Agreed with officer |
| 23. | Disappointed with tree removal but no re-planting planned. Thinks the view from Richmond Hill will consist of tarmac towpath, concrete riverbank and railings.  | As above at 15  | Agreed with officer |
| 24. | Please preserve the rough/wild/untamed aspects of the area. Although some management needs to be done should resist the temptation to tidy up too much. Suggested that as tree roots get compacted under concrete surface some thought could be given to un-compacting the areas.   | As above at 15  | Agreed with officer |
| 25. | No 55, the privet should be kept as the view coming down the Cambridge Path will be bare and urban without it.  | Privet as above in 5  | Agreed with officer |
| 26. | No's 14 & 15, in favour of retaining brickwork and trees, object to bicycle parking parks – put them in the car park.<br>No's 7 & 7a, retain the Acuba shrubs for their colour, contrast and shelter.<br>No 55, rather than remove the privet, thin to show glimpses of view, which is not  | Elder as above at 2<br><br>Acuba as above in 10<br>Privet as above in 5                       | Agreed with officer |

## 8.

**LONDON'S ARCADIA – Warren Footpath phase 2 consultation – January 2007**

\*Trees numbered 1 – 61 see plans for exact tree

|     |   |   |                                 |
|-----|---|---|---------------------------------|
|     | particularly spectacular.<br>Please give some thought to softening the bleakness at the section in front of MH house, such as low indigenous hedging, on both sides of the fence line.<br>Thank you for at last giving some TLC to this lovely stretch of riverbank and its rare canopy.  | Hedging will be looked at during subsequent stage   |                                 |
| 27. | Believe view from R Hill is better with the natural trees and vegetation mostly in place.<br>Understand and agree with all deadwood and safety aspects, don't understand removal when no good reason.<br>No's 7 & 7a – disagree no good reason to remove<br>No's 14 & 15 - disagree no good reason to remove<br>No 18 – sycamore why? no good reason to remove<br>No's 21,23,24,29,34,35, 51 - sycamore – why? no good reason to remove | Acuba see above in 10<br>Elder see above in 2<br>Sycamore removal is thinning and H&S reasons. It is better from and biodiversity point of view to allow some of the native species to grow to maturity and remove some (not all) of the sycamore that is crowding out the native trees | Agreed with officer             |
| 28. | No's 7 & 7a, object they provide much needed colour.<br>15 & 15a, object, already have lost many of the shrubs from towpath. Good habitat and screen mess from summer concerts.<br>No 55, object, the privet muffles sound from road. Could do with more attractive railings though.  | Acuba see above in 10<br>Elder see above in 2<br>See 10 & 12 above- note that vegetation provides little appreciable sound barrier as per studies noted in Harris   | See above as per officers notes |
| 29. | No's 14 & 15, please leave or replace them with something else. Cycle racks would hardly enhance the view.<br>Thank you for a very informative tour.  | Elder see above in 2  | See above as per officers notes |
| 30. | Many thanks to Ken MacKenzie and his team for spending so much time to explain the proposed work.   | No comment  |                                 |
| 31. | The proposed changes are too aggressive, only trees that are dead or dangerous should be removed.<br>No's 14 – 18 opposed the removal of the elders.<br>There is too much emphasis on making the riverside look tidy; a reduced level of intervention would be better.  | See above in 15<br>Elder see above in 2   | Agree with officer              |
| 32. | Fully endorse the removal of hanging branches and sycamore trees. This will help marginal vegetation to grow and help reach Richmond and London BAP targets. All standing dead wood should be retained – where not a Health and Safety risk.  | No comment  |                                 |
| 33. | No 7a. Keep Acuba shrub on MHP side (North).  | Acuba see above in 10   | As above - Agreed with officer  |

9.

**LONDON'S ARCADIA – Warren Footpath phase 2 consultation – January 2007**

\*Trees numbered 1 – 61 see plans for exact tree

|  |  |  |  |
|--|--|--|--|
|  | <p>No 7b Fine to remove Acuba on riverside as necessary for H&amp;S reasons – opens view to Ferry for customers and staff.</p> <p>No's 14 &amp; 15. Keep elders in pits as they frame the entrance, remove dead wood and overhanging branches only. Fine to remove elders growing in the path to the side of the entrance.</p> <p>No 18. Just tackle dead wood in this sycamore &amp; make safe rather than remove entirely.</p> <p>20. EH will do this work to the sycamore as part of our own H&amp;S works.</p> <p>23. EH do not consider a stump needs to be left as a mooring post.</p> <p>29. Sycamore at this location to stay.</p> <p>Separately from the above comments, we feel that the works represent good woodland management and some long-needed maintenance, and we would like to see ongoing maintenance in this area, with particular regard to new crown lifts and pollards of trees.</p> <p>We are in agreement that something needs to be done about the unsightly tree pits, although only where the path remains safe. Where possible it would be good to remove the pit walls to ground level, or where it is necessary that they remain (in the instance of leaving a significant drop from path level), the walls need to be repaired or replaced with something more visually sympathetic to the area.</p> | <p>Elder see above in 2</p> <p>Sycamore (18) see 27 for comment</p> <p>Sycamore (20) no comment</p> <p>Sycamore (23) see 14 for comment</p> <p>Sycamore (29) see 27 for comment</p> <p>Maintenance see no 15 for comment</p> <p>Tree pits see above in 4</p> | <p>coppice privet to ground.</p> <p>Agreed with officer- retain elders- remove one lower branch over gate to Marble Hill Park and remove one sycamore in clump to left of gates growing through footpath</p> <p>(23) See 14 for comment agree with officer</p> <p>(29) See 27 for comment agreed with officer</p> <p>Maintenance see 15 for comment agreed with officer</p> <p>Tree pits see 4 for comment agreed with officer</p> |
|  |  |  | <p>Additional note- re sycamore 51- retain and crown raise both the sycamore and adjacent ash upriver</p>  |

6<sup>th</sup> February 2007