

The Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea
Results of the public consultation on introduction of tree pits in Elm Park Gardens

Report by the Transport Projects Manager

26 August 2025

1. Introduction

- 1.1. This paper summarises the responses received to the recent public consultation proposing to introduce carriageway tree pits in Elm Park Gardens. The cost of installing five islands and the associated trees will be approximately £15K, using the Council's 'Green Fund' monies already allocated.
- 1.2. The consultation was run in parallel with ground investigation works to explore the technical viability of the proposals. This was done at risk, in order to reduce the length of the programme and enable the possibility of planting during the 25/26 planting season.

2. Consultation Information

- 2.1. Following a request from a resident and a successful application to the Council's 'Green Fund,' the Council consulted local residents on proposed carriageway tree pits in Elm Park Gardens.
- 2.2. The proposal was to install between five tree pits; three within resident parking on the east arm of Elm Park Gardens and two on single yellow lines on the west arm of Elm Park Gardens. Each tree pit requires two metres of kerbside space. The trees would be planted in new tree pits located at the side of the road, within or at the end of existing parking bays.
- 2.3. Details of the consultation can be found here:
<https://consult.rbkc.gov.uk/communities/elm-park-gardens/>
- 2.4. The consultation ran for six weeks between 16 June and 27 July 2025.
- 2.5. Letters were delivered to addresses in the vicinity of Elm Park Gardens, directing residents to the online consultation. Officers also placed notices adjacent to the tree pit locations, emailed local residents' associations and posted on social media platform 'NextDoor'.
- 2.6. There were 49 responses to the consultation. Forty-nine residents responded regarding the proposals on the western arm of Elm Park Gardens. Thirty-three responded on the proposals on the eastern arm of Elm Park Gardens. All the responses are provided in Appendix 1.

3. Consultation Results

- 3.1. Thirty-one (65 per cent) of the respondents supported the proposed carriageway tree pits on the western arm of Elm Park Gardens. Three (six per cent) supported the proposal in part and 14 (29 per cent) objected to the proposal. One person had no opinion.
- 3.2. Twenty-four (50 per cent) respondents supported the proposed carriageway tree pits on the eastern arm of Elm Park Gardens. One person (two per cent) supported the proposal in part and seven (15 per cent) objected to the proposal. One person had no opinion. All the responses are provided in Appendix 1.
- 3.3. Table 1 below illustrates the main themes of the objections and those concerns or queries raised by those who supported the proposals in part.. Officers have not responded to the supportive comments received, or comments that are out of scope of the proposals.

Table 1 - Objections/support in-part responses by theme

Theme	Loss of parking space	Too many trees already	Bird faeces	Waste of money	Visibility issues for drivers	Choice of tree	Disruption during works	Impact on allergy sufferers	Other comments (see Table 2)
Proposed tree pits on western arm of Elm Park Gardens	14	8	6	5	4	4	3	3	5
Proposed tree pits on eastern arm of Elm Park Gardens	6	3	2	1	-	-	-	1	3
TOTAL	20	11	8	6	4	4	3	4	8

Loss of parking

- 3.4. Some respondents were concerned at the loss of parking to accommodate the proposed tree pits, stating residents already have trouble finding parking. One resident was also concerned about the impact on local shops of removing parking.

Officer response

- 3.5. Parking occupancy surveys carried out in 2024, show that the parking bays had occupancy rates over 90 per cent in the evenings and overnight. The rest of the time occupancy is below 80 per cent on the eastern arm and below 70 per cent on the western arm. The tree pits proposed on the eastern arm will reduce the theoretical number of parking spaces by two. Given the current parking pressures, even a small reduction in capacity will be noticed by residents trying to park. That disbenefit must be weighed against the broader environmental and community benefits of urban tree planting, such as enhancing air quality, reducing urban heat, improving biodiversity, and contributing to the visual character of the area.

Too many trees in the area already

- 3.6. Some respondents felt there are already sufficient trees and greenery in Elm Park Gardens, as it already has three large private communal gardens, one of which is three acres, as well as trees and greenery within private front gardens.

Officer response

- 3.7. This scheme has been developed at the request of local residents. There are no trees on the eastern kerb of the eastern arm of Elm Park Gardens and relatively few on the western arm. While the trees in the gardens provide some of the benefits listed at paragraph 3.5, they do not, for example, provide shade on the western and eastern arms of Elm Park Gardens. Ultimately, while this is a matter of opinion, the consultation results suggests that most respondents felt more trees would be of benefit.

Bird faeces

- 3.8. Eight comments related to the tendency of birds to gather in trees and that the subsequent droppings cause a health hazard and render adjacent parking bays unusable.

Officer response

- 3.9. Officers acknowledge that trees attract birds, and that droppings may occasionally fall onto vehicles parked beneath. However, this is considered a relatively intermittent inconvenience when weighed against the broader environmental and community benefits of urban tree planting, (see para 3.5) The choice of tree species can help mitigate these concerns, for example, choosing varieties that are not berry-bearing and that have narrow upright canopies, so reducing the likelihood of birds perching above vehicles. The Council's Arboricultural Officer will consider this when making the final selection of tree species if the proposals proceed.

Waste of money / maintenance

- 3.10. Some respondents felt that the proposals were a waste of money when Council budgets are under pressure. Some also felt that the new trees would not be maintained adequately and that maintenance was an additional financial burden.

Officer response

- 3.11. The 2023-2027 Council Plan sets a target to plant 400 new trees across the borough by 2027, to enhance our streets, estates, and green spaces. Although the Council has already met this target, the goal is not limited to areas with no existing biodiversity and to leave a new space open would be a missed opportunity. The funding for the proposed trees pits has been allocated to 'green' improvements. If the scheme were not to proceed, the funding would be returned to the Green Fund for re-allocation to other 'green' schemes.

Visibility issues for drivers

- 3.12. Four commented that they felt the tree pits had the potential to block sight lines for drivers, posing a hazard to road users.

Officer response

- 3.13. On the eastern arm, there is no reason to believe that the introduction of tree pits would block visibility any more than vehicles parked at these locations at present. On the western arm, at the junction, there would be more potential to interrupt sightlines if the tree had a low canopy. Again, careful selection of tree species should address this risk to sight lines. Whichever species is selected, the tree trunks are not likely to be of such a width as to cause visibility problems.

Type of tree

- 3.14. Four respondents queried the type of tree to be planted, commenting that deciduous trees pose a particular risk when wet leaves accumulate on the footway, and that fruit trees like cherry species, attract birds and subsequent droppings.

Officer response

- 3.15. The species of tree is yet to be determined. The Arboricultural Officer will make the final selection and will ensure that it will be a hardy, low maintenance species that can thrive in a carriageway tree pit, while remaining in keeping with the other tree stocks in the vicinity. Generally, varieties with narrow upright canopies are selected, to reduce the likelihood that tree branches will overhang the carriageway, requiring more maintenance. Fruit trees are avoided.

Disruption during works

- 3.16. Three responses objected to the scheme on the basis that the works to introduce the trees would be disruptive.

Officer response

- 3.17. Whilst improvement works can be disruptive, the long-term benefits justify the temporary inconvenience. Construction of tree pits is a fairly simple process that can be carried out quite quickly. When undertaking works, the Council and its contractors implement measures to reduce disruption such as avoiding night-time working and staging works.

Impact on hay fever/allergy sufferers

- 3.18. Some respondents felt that introducing more trees would increase pollen, affecting hay fever or allergy sufferers.

Officer response

- 3.19. It is recognised that pollen from certain tree species can contribute to seasonal allergic reactions. The choice of tree species can help mitigate these concerns, if opting for a low pollen variety. The Council's Arboricultural Officer will consider this when making the final selection of tree species if the proposals proceed.
- 3.20. Table 2 lists comments received that fall outside of the above main themes, alongside officer responses.

Table 2 – 'Other' comments and officer responses.

	Comment	Officer Response
1	Three responses felt trees would block natural light, particularly into basement flats.	Officers acknowledge that tree planting can influence light levels, particularly in lower-ground residences during the summer. The Council's Arboricultural Officer would make the final selection of the tree species and generally, varieties with narrow upright canopies are selected, to reduce the likelihood that tree branches will overhang the carriageway, requiring more maintenance, but more upright canopies also reduce the impact of loss of light.
2	One response (to both arms) felt the introduction of trees would detrimentally impact the urban feel of Elm Park Gardens.	As some respondents have stated, there are already numerous trees in Elm Park Gardens, so there is no reason to believe new trees would detract from the architecture of the area. The Council believes trees contribute to the streetscape of both modern and historic buildings.
3	One response believed the trees were being implemented in 'giant pots' and would become targets for dog faeces and cigarette butts.	The trees are not being introduced in raised pots or planters. There is no reason to think that a tree pit would garner more dog faeces or cigarette butts than the footway in Elm Park Gardens at present, particularly as the tree pits are proposed in the carriageway, out of the desire line for the footway.
4	One response was concerned that one of the tree pits was directly outside the home of an elderly resident and that it would block an essential drop off/pick up point as well as pose a trip hazard for older people.	Tree pits occupy two metres of carriageway space. The adjacent single yellow line on Elm Park Gardens south arm is being maintained. As the tree pits are proposed within carriageway space, there is no reason to think that the trees would cause a trip hazard as the existing footway will be maintained for pedestrians to use.
5	One response suggested putting the trees into large containers on the pavement instead.	The footways on Elm Park Garden are not of sufficient width to accommodate planters large enough to host trees and permit adequate widths for pedestrians, particularly those using prams or wheelchairs.

4. Ground Investigations

- 4.1. Ground investigations were carried out in Elm Park Gardens at a similar time to the consultation. The site investigations showed that most of the proposed tree

pits were viable, except for 'tree pit 2', which may need to be relocated or excluded entirely. If the decision is to proceed, contractors would need to determine that when on site.

5. Finance

- 5.1. £15,000 was awarded from the Council's Green Fund. To date £1,500 has been spent on ground investigations and consultation costs.

6. Next Steps

- 6.1. After considering the responses received, and the findings of the ground investigations, officers recommend to the Director of Highway and Regulatory Services that the tree planting scheme in both arms of Elm Park Gardens proceed, subject to final investigations on site.

Appendix One – Survey Responses – Elm Park Gardens

Responses received for “Do you support the introduction of up to two new trees in tree pits on the western arm of Elm Park Gardens?”

Objection – One

No we need parking we have plenty of trees here we dont need anymore

Objection – Two

Elm Park Gardens has three gardens, East West and Central, all veritable forests of trees. Why do we also need trees on the "carriageway"?

Not only will the trees take away five vital parking bays they will also render adjacent parking bays to the trees unusable, that is 15 parking bays. Parking close to trees inevitably results in a car splattered in highly corrosive pigeon poo and any sensible driver keeps as far away as possible. For example, a tree next to the car club bay outside 104, will render the car a filthy, damaged vehicle.

There are approximately 500 apartments in Elm Park Gardens and parking bays are at a premium.

You make no mention of the disruption the planting of these trees would cause.

They would also cause a problem of diminished visibility as they would be on the road (carriageway).

And who would be responsible for the maintenance of these trees and the cost of maintaining these trees?

Could you please confirm or otherwise that the Council's Green Fund is provided by our Council Tax? Is this simply a euphemism for the monies we pay you?

I can see nothing positive in your proposal.

Objection – Three

GENERAL

The information provided is suspiciously misleading and inaccurate eg "Each tree pit will take up approximately two metres of residents' parking, so six metres of residents parking (approximately one space) will be replaced by the new trees". I live opposite No 80 and the single tree proposed in that location would undoubtedly result in the loss of one parking space - maybe more during installation. The Survey only allows for comments to be made on proposed siting of two trees on the west arm of Elm Park Gardens ? ! ! !

SPECIFIC

- 1 Misallocation of scarce Council resources . There must be many many far higher priority uses RBKC should be spending money on than tree planting streets in an already lovely part of Chelsea. Even in terms of streetscape / amenity (which in terms of statutory services / spend must be pretty low priority) surely there are many poorer streets in other parts of the Borough where amenity might genuinely be improved by street planting
- 2 No indication of what kind of trees : semi mature ? deciduous ? coniferous ? If deciduous - leaves on damp pavements in winter , slippery and potentially dangerous for elderly residents who walk with a stick (such as me :) , and visitors .
- 3 Both arms : The long terraces of yellow stock brick (recently cleaned and painted) are a distinct total architectural feature in their own right (a memorable part of RBKC , London even). In my opinion the truly urban / "european" feel of both terraces would be slightly damaged by tree planting . Opposite both terraces, along both arms, are a series of modern blocks each with small fenced well kept gardens containing a wide variety of trees / bushes / plants and flowers - which a) provide more than enough greenery in Elm Park Gardens and b) help differentiate the streetscape provided by the two components (terraces - modern blocks)
- 4 Western arm : Planting of trees at junction / sight lines - unnecessarily unwise - even dangerous
- 5 Eastern arm - see comments above . Loss of car parking spaces

Objection – Four

I am opposed to this idea because there are already not enough parking spaces around the garden and this proposal will decrease the amount of availability where there is already a need for more spaces, not less. Also, whenever I've parked under a tree on the square it always gets riddled with bird poo and with car washes closing around the area and prices of car washing going up, this will leave me with even less choice of where to park.

Objection – Five

Parking in the area is already restricted by birds in the existing trees defaecating on cars. Most residents try therefore to avoid parking anywhere near trees. Planting more trees would only limit even further the number of available spaces.

On another point, why does the Council use the photo of a crowded Kensington High Street in its surveys?

This was particularly dishonestly used to justify widening the pavements in Sloane Square when clearly the two locations have little in common.

Objection – Six

The Communal Garden and the Gardens behind the houses have plenty of mature trees. The addition of extra trees on the street corners will obstruct sight lines and be detrimental to road safety.

This survey omits mention of taking away residents' parking spaces on the Eastern Arm of Elm Park Gardens for tree planting.

I object to this strongly, as finding a parking space is near impossible on weekday evenings.

Objection – Seven

This is a very poorly thought out project. There are already trees lining up both sides of Elm Park Gardens, not to mention the gardens adjacent to the building and the central square. It seems like a complete waste of money, which will reduce the already limited availability of parking spaces for residents. These giant pots will end up being neglected, turning into public toilets for dogs and large ashtrays.

Whoever came up with this idea clearly has too much time on his/her/their hands. At a time when costs / including the Council tax rates - keep raising it seems absurd to waste money on these vanity projects.

Objection – Eight

There are already enough trees in the area. I strongly disagree with the comments that benefits from planting these trees will outweigh the "slight reduction" in parking. There is enough greenery around. Pigeon crap on cars & pavements will increase with hazardous results.

Objection – Nine

Do not want to reduce parking bays available

Objection – Ten

1. Deprivation of natural light.

We are a basement flat which is quite dark already. We manage but I don't think I would have bought it if there was a tree outside it increasing the darkness.

2. Leaves. With a light well we are already bombarded with leaves in the space. I don't want or need this onerous task to become bigger.

3. I am affected already by the pollen from the existing trees. Don't want more.

4. We don't need to lose ANY parking on that corner or the street. There is not enough already.

5. I believe with the trees further up the street and on the Vale and with the Gardens that is sufficient and we have enough green already and the money could be spent elsewhere.

6. It would be nice to have a period of no works and the associated disruption in the area.

Sorry, appreciate the thinking but it is a NO from me.

Objection – Eleven

We struggle daily with finding parking. A further loss of more parking places is totally unacceptable. The thinking that "loss of parking will be minimal, and we feel that the benefit to residents of the new trees will outweigh the slight reduction in parking" is flawed and not the thinking of someone who experiences parking on a daily basis in the area.

Objection – Twelve

I am concerned about [redacted] Elm Park Gardens as my 90 year old mother who lives there has mobility problems and the area at the end of the resident's bay is an essential drop-off and pick-up point for her as the resident bays are rarely empty. It looks like the tree would take that away. And as the opposite corner would also house a tree that will not be an alternative place to stop.

I am also concerned about tripping hazzards near the front door of [redacted]

Please consider this very seriously.

Objection – Thirteen

I am a long term permanent resident of Elm Park Gardens. I have expertise in parks management and public realm regeneration grant funded projects, including new tree planting, in addition to the conservation of historic buildings and spaces.

I have designed, managed, analysed and written up reports on community consultation projects. Therefore, I have all the expertise to comment on this scheme.

Having considered the project and discussed it with many residents of Elm Park Gardens, I have an IN PRINCIPLE OBJECTION to each and every part of the scheme. It is a well meaning idea, but very ill thought out. It is both unnecessary, inappropriate and would cause significant inconvenience to residents and visitors to Elm Park Gardens. NO ALTERNATIVE CAN BE SUGGESTED. There may be other parts of the borough that planting new trees might be appropriate, but nowhere in Elm Park Gardens (Chelsea).

The consultation material includes one image which is a block plan, showing all parts of Elm Park Gardens (west, east, south) in addition to the Fulham Road, which forms the northern boundary.

Elm Park Gardens has three large private communal gardens. These are: west and east. The trees and greenery for the west can be seen from Elm Park Road to the south and from there and to the north on the Fulham Road side for the east garden. The central one, which is some three acres, and also includes a separate rose garden on the east side, located between nos 93 and 95, which borders the east side of Elm Park Gardens.

All these garden areas are very green, with tall mature trees, which can be clearly seen from the public realm. In addition, there are existing street trees on both the west and east sides of Elm Park Gardens. On the southern border, there are only the garden railings dividing the garden from the southern border of Elm Park Gardens, so there is a rich view of greenery from those sides. Again, to the northern border of the central garden, which comprises Fulham Road, there is the same only division with the iron garden railings, so the view is extremely green already.

There are also gardens in front of some of the blocks of flats, which add to the greenery of the west and east sides of Elm Park Gardens, which are very visible.

Therefore, it can be concluded that the whole of the planted areas of Elm Park Gardens are extensive and extremely green, more so than many areas of Chelsea.

Flawed consultation: However, the block plan provided with the consultation is entirely misleading and does not show much of the impact of all the greenery, nor any of the existing street trees. The rose garden is shown as blank. Therefore, this block plan with the proposed location of five additional street trees, should not have been used in the consultation.

The consultation should also have included a range of photos, to show how very green Elm Park Gardens is, with its extensive mature and growing trees.

My professional opinion, given my parks and consultation expertise, is that the consultation should be withdrawn and a better designed consultation pack provided, including a more accurate block plan and clear photos of the views from the street scene.

My objections to the current proposal are:

1. Flawed and misleading consultation (see details above).
2. The loss of all the parking spaces, whether for residents' use or visitors, is totally unacceptable. Contrary to what is claimed in the consultation, this would be a very significant loss and totally unacceptable. There is great pressure on parking spaces already, and as more housing is being built in the borough, this will be ever increasing. At present, any resident who holds a resident's parking permit in RBKC can park in any part of the borough. In addition, there are insufficient parking spaces for non residents as it is and this is causing a lot of problems for visitors to Elm Park Gardens, including for contractors carrying out work in the blocks of flats.

3. Elm Park Gardens as a whole is extremely green, with numerous trees and gardens. There are existing street trees on the west side and the southeast corner. There are many street views of these street trees and of the private communal gardens, together with front gardens in front of some of the blocks.

4. There is a significant pigeon problem all round Elm Park Gardens. This causes significant pigeon droppings from pigeons roosting in the trees, including the existing street trees. Pigeon droppings are hazardous due to being a slip hazard and children can contract a particular disease from contact, including causing blindness (I know of one case). The droppings from the existing trees that overhang a number of parking spaces, cause a significant problem due to falling on parked cars, damaging the paintwork and needing a thorough clean, as well as generally on all cars from the pigeons flying around. The droppings also cause a problem with parked bicycles. All these problems would be significantly exacerbated by the proposed five new trees, when mature.

5. There would be no environmental benefit from planting additional trees, due to the large number of existing trees in Elm Park Gardens.

6. There is an existing problem with large amounts of debris that are blown off the existing trees, which lands on cars and also blows into residents' flats. This is also causing problems for people with allergies. This would be exacerbated by the planting of new trees.

7. It is likely that there would be a problem with RBKC staff not maintaining or watering the trees appropriately. The climate is getting hotter, with long and dry spells, as at present, and this has changed since the street trees which are less mature on the west side, were planted.

8. There is a notable problem with well meant but inappropriate projects being planned and implemented by RBKC staff, who have grant funds to spend, but not suitable projects. This includes: refurbishment of a temporary room at Elm Park House, wrongly stated to be a 'community room' and which was strongly objected to by residents; bike hanger installed to the south of 67 Elm Park Gardens which was installed on the basis of just a very few consultees and which has never been used; proposed new Sheffield bike multi stand to the southwest edge of Elm Park Gardens, whereas there are existing street Sheffield stands which are empty most of the time (not implemented). Residents are very concerned about this well meant but useless activity.

Conclusion:

The whole scheme is flawed, together with the consultation materials.

Elm Park Gardens is already extremely green and there is no need for any new street trees.

The sacrifice of several parking spaces is totally unacceptable, given the pressure on spaces, which is only getting worse.

There is no environmental benefit.

There would be a negative effect on health and safety (pigeon droppings and allergens from the trees).

Other points are given in detail above.

The project should be abandoned completely and a more suitable site found elsewhere. No alternative in Elm Park Gardens would be appropriate. In principle objection to all parts of the scheme.

Objection – Fourteen

Any reduction in parking here I feel would be to the detriment of the local shops. There is a mini M&S that I notice is used by quite a few elderly people who are able to pop their car nearby and safely get to and from the store.

Could trees not be put into large containers on the pavement instead?

Support in part – One

I am a resident of the east side and support the planting of new trees however the council has already taken up multiple parking spaces in a short space of time for disabled car parking spaces and it has made convenient parking during the week more difficult. Therefore I would support pavement trees but I do not support removing anymore parking spaces.

Support in part – Two

I like the idea of the trees. However I question the proposed positions of trees 4 and 5 especially 4. Would they be too close to the corners of the junction of the western and southern arms of EPG for visibility for cars turning right from the southern arm to the western arm?

Support in part – Three

Although I'm generally keen to enhance our streetscape with trees, I am very concerned that the proposed scheme means we are losing precious parking spaces. As a resident permit holder living in a block adjacent to one of the Western arm plantings, I already find there are rarely sufficient spaces available and we often need to park on the few yellow-lined areas out of controlled hours.

Having occasional periods of painful mobility difficulties and regularly / frequently carrying heavy loads from my car to Block 35, parking nearby is a necessary priority. There has also been no mention of the type of tree selected for the proposed planting? A deciduous tree will shed leaves and pollen dust - the existing plane trees already create a huge volume of seed pod dust which irritates eyes, nose & lungs and has regularly blocked roof gullies and entered homes... cherry trees attract birds when the fruits ripen, which then defecate on everything in the vicinity - this is quite hard to scrape off car windows on warm days. Whilst it's a lovely and welcome idea to encourage wildlife by planting trees, I feel the locations and tree varieties need careful consideration, given the impact they will have on residents nearby?

Support – One

[No Comment]

Support – Two

[No Comment]

Support – Three

[No Comment]

Support – Four

We need more trees than we have now.

Support – Five

I have resided in Elm Park Gardens for around 40 years now; I and my family are wholly in support of your proposal.

I am on the South side of Elm Park Gardens; from the perspective of green ambitions, might I also raise a suggestion from the past?

That is, the South side of Elm Park Gardens is the only one of the arms (East, West and South) not directly connected to the gardens. Whilst I would not necessarily suggest bringing the gardens to the front doors of the South side, might consideration be given to paving the Southern road (presently used for parking and rat runs)?

I have experience of governmental consulting and would be happy to assist in any further development of the greening of the borough.

Many thanks and best regards.

Support – Six

Fully support 100% - the more the better!

Support – Seven

I am 100% supportive of this

Support – Eight

[No Comment]

Support – Nine

[No Comment]

Support – Ten

[No Comment]

Support – Eleven

The more we can do projects like this the better for all in the community

Support – Twelve

[No Comment]

Support – Thirteen

[No Comment]

Support – Fourteen

[No Comment]

Support – Fifteen

Yes, I totally approve .

Like many others I wonder that this project was not put forward and completed with trees being planted many years ago.

Support – Sixteen

[No Comment]

Support – Seventeen

[No Comment]

Support – Eighteen

[No Comment]

Support – Nineteen

[No Comment]

Support – Twenty

[No Comment]

Support – Twenty-One

[No Comment]

Support – Twenty-Two

[No Comment]

Support – Twenty-Three

I think having more trees in the borough is a good thing, as long as they are not plane trees. Can the trees in the tree pits be put on the western side of the road, to divide up the long, continuous resident bay into smaller zones? Having the trees on a single yellow line means there is less space for parking out of hours.

Support – Twenty-Four

[No Comment]

Support – Twenty-Five

[No Comment]

Support – Twenty-Six

[No Comment]

Support – Twenty-Seven

[No Comment]

Support – Twenty-Eight

[No Comment]

Support – Twenty-Nine

[No Comment]

Support – Thirty

[No Comment]

Support – Thirty-One

To whom it may concern

Unfortunately I have just missed the deadline for expressing my view regarding this proposal.
I have been away and only just returned .

If there is still an opportunity to add my vote, I fully support the proposal.

More trees along the streets would be a welcome addition to the Elm Park Estate. I think the streets are currently quite bare and could do with more greenery.

More trees will provide habitat for the birds, and will help to absorb some of the high level of pollution caused by the heavy traffic along the Fulham Road.

My fingers are crossed this project gets the green light.

Regards

[REDACTED]

No Opinion – One

[No Comment]

Responses received for “Do you support the introduction of up to three new trees in tree pits on the eastern arm of Elm Park Gardens?”

Objection – One

GENERAL

The information provided is suspiciously misleading and inaccurate eg "Each tree pit will take up approximately two metres of residents' parking, so six metres of residents parking (approximately one space) will be replaced by the new trees". I live opposite No 80 and the single tree proposed in that location would undoubtedly result in the loss of one parking space - maybe more during installation. The Survey only allows for comments to be made on proposed siting of two trees on the west arm of Elm Park Gardens ? ! ! !

SPECIFIC

- 1 Misallocation of scarce Council resources . There must be many many far higher priority uses RBKC should be spending money on than tree planting streets in an already lovely part of Chelsea. Even in terms of streetscape / amenity (which in terms of statutory services / spend must be pretty low priority) surely there are many poorer streets in other parts of the Borough where amenity might genuinely be improved by street planting
- 2 No indication of what kind of trees : semi mature ? deciduous ? coniferous ? If deciduous - leaves on damp pavements in winter , slippery and potentially dangerous for elderly residents who walk with a stick (such as me :) , and visitors .
- 3 Both arms : The long terraces of yellow stock brick (recently cleaned and painted) are a distinct total architectural feature in their own right (a memorable part of RBKC , London even). In my opinion the truly urban / "european" feel of both terraces would be slightly damaged by tree planting . Opposite both terraces, along both arms, are a series of modern blocks each with small fenced well kept gardens containing a wide variety of trees / bushes / plants and flowers - which a) provide more than enough greenery in Elm Park Gardens and b) help differentiate the streetscape provided by the two components (terraces - modern blocks)
- 4 Western arm : Planting of trees at junction / sight lines - unnecessarily unwise - even dangerous
- 5 Eastern arm - see comments above . Loss of car parking spaces

Objection – Two

This is a very poorly thought out project. There are already trees lining up both sides of Elm Park Gardens, not to mention the gardens adjacent to the building and the central square. It seems like a complete waste of money, which will reduce the already limited availability of parking spaces for residents. These giants pots will end up being neglected, turning into public toilets for dogs and large ashtrays.

Whoever came up with this idea clear has too much time on his/her/their hands. At a time when costs / including the Council tax rates - keep raising it is seems absurd to waste money on these vanity projects.

Objection – Three

There is already sufficient greenery around. Planting these trees will not only take up valuable parking space in the area(- already at a premium)- but will also minimise light received by the associated basement flats. In addition it will further increase pigeon crap, especially on cars & pavements in the area, not to mention adding to the already existing allergies of many of the residents.

Objection – Four

[No Comment]

Objection – Five

Plenty of trees and greenery along the side of the modern blocks. Losing valuable parking which is at a premium. Encouraging more bird droppings on the parked cars and the surrounding areas. Darkening the basement properties on the side of the Victorian conversions when the trees are established. Not short of trees as have wonderful surrounding gardens on east , central and west side of Elm Park Gardens . Therefore , I feel extra trees are unnecessary. Looking at a book of this side of the gardens in the early 1900's , there were never any trees in front of the buildings displayed on the eastern arm !

Objection – Six

We struggle daily with finding parking. A further loss of more parking places is totally unacceptable. The thinking that “loss of parking will be minimal, and we feel that the benefit to residents of the new trees will outweigh the slight reduction in parking” is flawed and not the thinking of someone who experiences parking on a daily basis in the area.

Objection – Seven

I am a long term permanent resident of Elm Park Gardens. I have expertise in parks management and public realm regeneration grant funded projects, including new tree planting, in addition to the conservation of historic buildings and spaces.

I have designed, managed, analysed and written up reports on community consultation projects. Therefore, I have all the expertise to comment on this scheme.

Having considered the project and discussed it with many residents of Elm Park Gardens, I have an IN PRINCIPLE OBJECTION to each and every part of the scheme. It is a well meaning idea, but very ill thought out. It is both unnecessary, inappropriate and would cause significant inconvenience to residents and visitors to Elm Park Gardens. NO ALTERNATIVE CAN BE SUGGESTED. There may be other parts of the borough that planting new trees might be appropriate, but nowhere in Elm Park Gardens (Chelsea).

The consultation material includes one image which is a block plan, showing all parts of Elm Park Gardens (west, east, south) in addition to the Fulham Road, which forms the northern boundary.

Elm Park Gardens has three large private communal gardens. These are: west and east. The trees and greenery for the west can be seen from Elm Park Road to the south and from there and to the north on the Fulham Road side for the east garden. The central one, which is some three acres, and also includes a separate rose garden on the east side, located between nos 93 and 95, which borders the east side of Elm Park Gardens.

All these garden areas are very green, with tall mature trees, which can be clearly seen from the public realm. In addition, there are existing street trees on both the west and east sides of Elm Park Gardens. On the southern border, there are only the garden railings dividing the garden from the southern border of Elm Park Gardens, so there is a rich view of greenery from those sides. Again, to the northern border of the central garden, which comprises Fulham Road, there is the same only division with the iron garden railings, so the view is extremely green already.

There are also gardens in front of some of the blocks of flats, which add to the greenery of the west and east sides of Elm Park Gardens, which are very visible.

Therefore, it can be concluded that the whole of the planted areas of Elm Park Gardens are extensive and extremely green, more so than many areas of Chelsea.

Flawed consultation: However, the block plan provided with the consultation is entirely misleading and does not show much of the impact of all the greenery, nor any of the existing street trees. The rose garden is shown as blank. Therefore, this block plan with the proposed location of five additional street trees, should not have been used in the consultation.

The consultation should also have included a range of photos, to show how very green Elm Park Gardens is, with its extensive mature and growing trees.

My professional opinion, given my parks and consultation expertise, is that the consultation should be withdrawn and a better designed consultation pack provided, including a more accurate block plan and clear photos of the views from the street scene.

My objections to the current proposal are:

1. Flawed and misleading consultation (see details above).
2. The loss of all the parking spaces, whether for residents' use or visitors, is totally unacceptable. Contrary to what is claimed in the consultation, this would be a very significant loss and totally unacceptable. There is great pressure on parking spaces already, and as more housing is being built in the borough, this will be ever increasing. At present, any resident who holds a resident's parking permit in RBKC can park in any part of the borough. In addition, there are insufficient parking spaces for non residents as it is and this is causing a lot of problems for visitors to Elm Park Gardens, including for contractors carrying out work in the blocks of flats.
3. Elm Park Gardens as a whole is extremely green, with numerous trees and gardens. There are existing street trees on the west side and the southeast corner. There are many street views of these street trees and of the private communal gardens, together with front gardens in front of some of the blocks.
4. There is a significant pigeon problem all round Elm Park Gardens. This causes significant pigeon droppings from pigeons roosting in the trees, including the existing street trees. Pigeon droppings are hazardous due to being a slip hazard and children can contract a particular disease from contact, including causing blindness (I know of one case). The droppings from the existing trees that overhang a number of parking spaces, cause a significant problem due to falling on parked cars, damaging the paintwork and needing a thorough clean, as well as generally on all cars from the pigeons flying around. The droppings also cause a problem with parked bicycles. All these problems would be significantly exacerbated by the proposed five new trees, when mature.

5. There would be no environmental benefit from planting additional trees, due to the large number of existing trees in Elm Park Gardens.

6. There is an existing problem with large amounts of debris that are blown off the existing trees, which lands on cars and also blows into residents' flats. This is also causing problems for people with allergies. This would be exacerbated by the planting of new trees.

7. It is likely that there would be a problem with RBKC staff not maintaining or watering the trees appropriately. The climate is getting hotter, with long and dry spells, as at present, and this has changed since the street trees which are less mature on the west side, were planted.

8. There is a notable problem with well meant but inappropriate projects being planned and implemented by RBKC staff, who have grant funds to spend, but not suitable projects. This includes: refurbishment of a temporary room at Elm Park House, wrongly stated to be a 'community room' and which was strongly objected to by residents; bike hanger installed to the south of 67 Elm Park Gardens which was installed on the basis of just a very few consultees and which has never been used; proposed new Sheffield bike multi stand to the southwest edge of Elm Park Gardens, whereas there are existing street Sheffield stands which are empty most of the time (not implemented). Residents are very concerned about this well meant but useless activity.

Conclusion:

The whole scheme is flawed, together with the consultation materials.

Elm Park Gardens is already extremely green and there is no need for any new street trees.

The sacrifice of several parking spaces is totally unacceptable, given the pressure on spaces, which is only getting worse.

There is no environmental benefit.

There would be a negative effect on health and safety (pigeon droppings and allergens from the trees).

Other points are given in detail above.

The project should be abandoned completely and a more suitable site found elsewhere. No alternative in Elm Park Gardens would be appropriate. In principle objection to all parts of the scheme.

[Response to question 1 above]

See above for full details and comments, which apply to all parts of the whole project to plant street trees in parking spaces in Elm Park Gardens. The trees are referred to as 'street trees', even though to be planted in parking spaces, as they would be adjacent to the pavements.

Objection – Eight

Any reduction in parking here I feel would be to the detriment of the local shops. There is a mini M&S that I notice is used by quite a few elderly people who are able to pop their car nearby and safely get to and from the store.

Could trees not be put into large containers on the pavement instead?

[Response to question 1 above]

See above. Because of the loss of parking to a useful parade of shops nearby.

Support in part – One

Although I'm generally keen to enhance our streetscape with trees, I am very concerned that the proposed scheme means we are losing precious parking spaces. As a resident permit holder living in a block adjacent to one of the Western arm plantings, I already find there are rarely sufficient spaces available and we often need to park on the few yellow-lined areas out of controlled hours. Having occasional periods of painful mobility difficulties and regularly / frequently carrying heavy loads from my car to Block 35, parking nearby is a necessary priority. There has also been no mention of the type of tree selected for the proposed planting? A deciduous tree will shed leaves and pollen dust - the existing plane trees already create a huge volume of seed pod dust which irritates eyes, nose & lungs and has regularly blocked roof gullies and entered homes... cherry trees attract birds when the fruits ripen, which then defecate on everything in the vicinity - this is quite hard to scrape off car windows on warm days. Whilst it's a

lovely and welcome idea to encourage wildlife by planting trees, I feel the locations and tree varieties need careful consideration, given the impact they will have on residents nearby?

[Response to question 1 above]

As above, although I won't personally be affected, except by the loss of potential parking spaces when none are available near my block on the western arm.

Support – One

[No Comment]

Support – Two

[No Comment]

Support – Three

Can they be cherry blossom trees and not sycamores please? As the god awful hayfever and the sap from the trees at the other end outside 67 is hellish during April to June. I fully support the planting of the trees, it's a wonderful idea and will mitigate the air pollution we get at this end of the road near the crossroads. An excellent idea! Thank you Rbkc

Support – Four

I think this is an excellent idea and would like to suggest a fourth tree in-between Nos. 92 and 86 if possible.

I don't know what type of tree you're thinking of but I think silver birches would be a very good choice.

Support – Five

[No Comment]

Support – Six

It should have happened some years ago - it is a rather neglected street/square as regard trees.

I totally support the plan.

Support – Seven

We will lose some much-needed parking, but we think that the gain of street trees is more important.

Might I suggest that Tree no. 1 replaces the fourth Car Club bay? It is always difficult to find parking in the Eastern side of Elm Park Gardens - when the car club bays are empty or only half full.

Would Ginkgo trees be appropriate? They are very good urban trees, as they counter pollution - and go a lovely yellow in autumn.

Support – Eight

[No Comment]

Support – Nine

[No Comment]

Support – Ten

[No Comment]

Support – Eleven

I fully support the addition of trees to the eastern part of Elm Park Gardens, and would advocate for more than just the three trees. I'm not sure if only three is due to parking constraints or budget, but I would argue more is better! Any tree is good, but three seems small amount for size of the road, and ideally they would be symmetrical/same distance apart.

Support – Twelve

[No Comment]

Support – Thirteen

[No Comment]

Support – Fourteen [No Comment]
Support – Fifteen [No Comment]
Support – Sixteen [No Comment]
Support – Seventeen [No Comment]
Support – Eighteen [No Comment]
Support – Nineteen [No Comment]
Support – Twenty [No Comment]
Support – Twenty-One [No Comment]
Support – Twenty-Two [No Comment]
Support – Twenty-Three [No Comment]

Support – Twenty-Four

To whom it may concern

Unfortunately I have just missed the deadline for expressing my view regarding this proposal.
I have been away and only just returned .

If there is still an opportunity to add my vote, I fully support the proposal.

More trees along the streets would be a welcome addition to the Elm Park Estate. I think the streets are currently quite bare and could do with more greenery.

More trees will provide habitat for the birds, and will help to absorb some of the high level of pollution caused by the heavy traffic along the Fulham Road.

My fingers are crossed this project gets the green light.

Regards

[REDACTED]

Not Answered – One

[No Comment]

Not Answered – Two

[No Comment]

Not Answered – Three

[No Comment]

Not Answered – Four

[No Comment]

Not Answered – Five [No Comment]
Not Answered – Six [No Comment]
Not Answered – Seven [No Comment]
Not Answered – Eight [No Comment]
Not Answered – Nine [No Comment]
Not Answered – Ten [No Comment]
Not Answered – Eleven [No Comment]
Not Answered – Twelve [No Comment]
Not Answered – Thirteen [No Comment]
Not Answered – Fourteen [No Comment]

Not Answered – Fifteen

[No Comment]

No Opinion – One

Not my street so would not want to impose an opinion.