

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2023/0207/P	annabel bacal	18/03/2023 23:59:51	COMMNT	

It is a generally held view in the wider community in the UK that it is no longer acceptable to cut down trees, especially in a conservation area and attention needs to be paid to protecting the environment and sustainability. The proposal to cut down trees as part of the redevelopment of this site should not go ahead. These mature trees are clearly visible from the street due to their height and size, they are all healthy and in good condition and have significant public amenity and cannot be replaced.

We are fortunate to live in a beautiful conservation area. The trees are an integral part of this environment. The trees offer homes to birds and other wildlife. The foliage and trees in the conservation area offer sanctuary to much wildlife in an urban setting.

There is a resident owl on our street. This is no accident - the conservation area offers it a suitable and rare habitat. This must be protected at all costs. We live in an urban environment and need as many trees as possible to contribute to a better local environment and a reduction in carbon in the air, a priority already established in Hampstead due to the high number of schools in the area.

Trees regulate the air quality, minimise pollution, offer sanctuary to birds and wildlife and are vitally necessary in urban areas. Planting 4 limes in a row was traditionally used to delineate boundaries and is an important feature in the conservation area and should be respected and retained. Trees and greenery offer health benefits in an age of high levels of pollution, along with anxiety and mental health issues.

T8 tree in particular, due to its location, offers screening and privacy between many properties both on Netherhall and Maresfield Gardens and is visible from the street. Crown tree report (in application) section 8. photo 2 shows the tall height and cover offered by these trees. The trees offer relief from the built environment and gaps and tree planting on the boundaries between properties were designed with that in mind.

The following reports and announcements are important to note:

1. The England trees action plan 2021-2024 Gov.UK section calls for "putting more trees in our towns and cities"

"As well as tackling climate change and providing vital habitats, trees and woodlands are a pivotal part of our landscapes- particularly when planted and supported in and around our towns and cities- and can provide space for people to connect with nature."

2. Greenwoods report. 26/01/2021 re 2019 application Section 11.7

Quote "The trees in addition to their amenity value offer many eco - system services."

3. The Planning Inspector on the previous application for this development commented there was no reason to remove the trees and the applicant has provided no evidence as to why they now need to be removed.

Kim Gifford's report for the 2019 application (submitted 28/05/19) states: "All of the trees stated in the crown report for removal should be retained on the grounds of preserving the local amenity and character of the neighbourhood. They are sound arboriculturally and show good potential overall". "My assessment appraisal contrasts with the Crown Consultant's assessment. T6, T7, T8, T9 and T10 are not all small trees. T6 Lime

Application No: Consultees Name: Received:

Comment: Response:

and T8 are taller than 5m. My calculations estimate 7m at their highest points.
I also contest that they are barely visible from public vantage points or there is limited visibility from Netherhall Gardens.
The following photographs fig 1 to 9 show views from all cardinal points demonstrating the importance of this group the visual public local amenity value in a conservation area. It is also my calculation that T8 Lime should have been classified as a B (BS5837:2012) not a C."

The trees have green in the last 4 years since this report of May 2019 and are of course much taller now.

4.In February 2023 government announcement - Over £14 million will be available which allow both local authorities and community groups to access funds for new tree-planting projects as part of the Government's Environment Improvement Plan ; Thousands of trees to be planted in communities in boost to nature, health and wellbeing.

The Urban Tree Challenge Fund and Local Authorities Treescapes Fund

5.Forestry Commission Chief Executive Richard Stanford: "Research is clear that streets with trees in them leads to better wellbeing and health outcomes for residents as well as providing important biodiversity in our towns and cities"

All the above professional opinions should be afforded weight in the decision to retain these important trees.Considering we already have mature trees in position on the boundary of no 26 as such, it would be incredulous to now allow these trees to be felled. They must be protected.

Further the development should fit in with the plot not vice versa. Trees should not be felled to enable a larger development envelope and diminish the green space of the garden. Developers should respect the plot and work within the established green environment. Even a small change in site layout, ground levels or construction techniques can aid tree protection.

I would encourage the council to support the public amenity offered from these trees, over and above a slightly larger property and to deny the application to cut down the trees.

2. Amenity and outlook of back bedroom window at 24a Netherhall Gardens (Window 14 on the application daylight and sunlight report.)

The outlook and amenity will be lost if permission given to build the proposal as currently designed. Amendments must be made to this design - the new extension at no 26 should be set further back towards the original building at no 26..Currently daylight and sunlight report demonstrate failures for light into this bedroom as a result of building so close. The application plans show a high wall running along the length of the current extension further to the end of the building line at no 24a - the height of this wall is nearly half the height of window 14- thus creating a boxed in enclosure.this wall needs be lowered so it matches the base of window 14 which will infinitely improve the outlook.Images from the daylight and sunlight report clearly demonstrate the effects described.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
				<p>3. There has been a 9 year history of planning applications for this site - it could be said this new application is a better option than the 2019 approved scheme as it does not include a double basement which has been of huge concern for neighbours due to the fact we live in an area of great structural instability. However - this application has its faults and the council should seek amendments to be made to these plans before granting permission. The mass of the proposed extension is too big for the site by pushing further into the footprint of the garden and wanting to build closer to no 24a - devices to compensate for the lack of the basements to add square feet. If the council are of the mind to grant permission design amendments need to be made.</p> <p>Enclosed images - of window 14. In the foreground is the current extension. The new extension proposal pushes out to the building line at 24a (in the background) and the level of the roof shown on the design and access statement is nearly high as the middle of this window - will create a " tunnel" effect and sense of enclosure. the window looks out on a 45 degree angle - no choice to look out over this proposed wall.</p> <p>4. the gap between no 24a and new proposed extension should only be allowed to be the same distance granted in the 2019 application and not closer. this planning application plans to build closer thus closing the gap and making it impossible to see foliage and trees. we live in a conservation area - this is a detail that is highlighted in the conservation policy and needs to be respected. the trees highlighted in point 1 of great public amenity will be able to be viewed through as such</p>
2023/0207/P	Caroline Formstone	19/03/2023 12:51:40	OBJ	<p>I would like to comment further on the tree at the back of the garden of Ames House and the trees along the boundary between Ames House and number 24A Netherhall Gardens.</p> <p>I can see all these trees from my Flat and these provide me with a wonderful view up the hill in addition to housing multiple birds and bats which I can see flying around. This important public amenity must be protected. The new proposal does not outline how these trees will be protected, indeed it appears to me the new proposal will lead to their being removed. This must not happen. All these trees contribute to the character and appearance of our conservation area. Removing or losing them will be detrimental to this.</p> <p>I have noted Camden's planning guidance for trees. 2.10 'Planning legislation makes special provision for trees in conservation areas. All trees that contribute to the character and appearance of a conservation area should be retained and protected. Applicants should have regard to the description of local landscape character and objectives set out in relevant Conservation Area Appraisals and Management Strategies'.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2023/0207/P	Eli Belilty	18/03/2023 11:13:33	OBJ	<p>I understand this planning application is proposed instead of building the approved scheme for the site at No. 26 with a double basement. Building a double basement would cause potential harm to neighbouring properties in a locale of high subsidence and I know it has been of huge concern for surrounding neighbours</p> <p>I request the council to make careful consideration and impose conditions and amendment to these plans regarding the application based on the following notes.</p> <p>I object to</p> <p>Building too close to No 24a. The prior application has been approved to build further away and it is not acceptable to now narrow the gap and build closer.</p> <p>It is safer to build further away for obvious structural reasons not to harm an existing property. If a 2.5m subterranean retaining wall is proposed at the rear of no 26 then careful consideration needs to be given to the neighbouring properties re construction. Building as far as possible from no 24a is imperative for this reason</p> <p>3. The mass of the building is too large. The proposal compensates for no double basement by pushing out the plans extending too far out into the garden and too wide out to build too close to No 24a. The extension is not subservient to the main building. It sits too lopsided on the right side of the plot. The 2019 approved application sits better in the plot and the spacing is better - see illustration 7.7 design and access statement. the design should respect the plot and environment rather than vice versa. plans to fell trees to make way for the development are not acceptable</p> <p>3. The building is too close, and deprives 24A of even more light from key windows into habitable spaces. It will affect the outlook from looking out of the back upstairs bedroom.</p> <p>The outlook from that window will be like looking down an alley in New York rather than looking out into a conservation area in NW3. The level of the proposed roof is approx 30% higher than window level of the back bedroom - so from that window you are not looking downwards out but will need to negotiate looking at a higher wall. This is not acceptable</p> <p>4. Narrowing the gap goes against the conservation area appraisal of allowing views between buildings to see foliage and trees. With such a narrow gap this wont be possible any more to see much through.</p> <p>5. Loss of light</p> <p>The approved application 2019/1515/P daylight and sunlight report cites figures that are different to the daylight and sunlight report for this application regarding before and after loss of light. Which report is correct? The numbers don't add up. The council needs to make their own report and investigations and independently check for themselves these important measurements. As it is it appears if the new development is built closer to No 24A even more light will be lost which is not acceptable. New buildings should not take away light from their existing neighbour; can the council double check what is going on here?</p> <p>5. Heat Pumps - there is no information submitted how these will run. How loud will they be. Noise pollution? We live in a quiet street and disturbances will be heard. Acoustic report is necessary. We have a loud echo on</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
				<p>the street and sound travels far.</p> <p>6. Overlooking. The second floor balcony will overlook neighbours especially the garden of 24a Netherhall gardens. If the trees are left on the boundary this will offer screening and privacy for all. The surrounding neighbours - including themselves at no 26. If the 2nd floor boundaries are allowed no permission should be given to cut the trees down. Likewise if permission is given to cut the trees down then no permission should be given to build the 2nd floor balcony. There must be a compromise for this situation. It is of course preferable to keep the trees</p> <p>7. I understand there are plans to cut down trees on the boundary. Not acceptable in this day and age re climate change for this to happen. Trees must be retained for all the obvious reasons - air quality, pollution, supporting biodiversity and nesting birds, It is not acceptable to cut any tree down especially in a conservation area</p>
