

Comments Form

Name..... SALLY TORNOW.....

Address..... 42 PROGNAL, LONDON NW3 6AG.....



Planning application number..... 2014/2745/T.....

Culture & Environment

Planning application address..... 45 NETHERHALL Gdns, LONDON NW3 6AG.....

I support the application (please state reasons below)

I object to the application (please state reasons below)



Your comments

THESE GARDENS ARE IN A CONSERVATION AREA
AND TREES SHOULD BE PRESERVED AND
MAINTAINED AS FAR AS POSSIBLE.

THE ACACIA TREES DO NOT BLOCK LIGHT AND
SHOULD NOT BE FELLED OR THINNED.

THE LARGE LEYLANDII HAS BEEN CUT BACK IN
THE PAST AND COULD BE REDUCED TO THE SAME
HEIGHT AS THE ROW OF LOWER ONES.

ANY FURTHER WORK ON THESE TREES WOULD
AFFECT THE PRIVACY OF THE NEIGHBOURING
GARDENS IN PROGNAL.

MATURE TREES ARE VITAL FOR THE ENVIRONMENT
AND SHOULD NOT BE REMOVED *ANY MODIFICATIONS
SHOULD BE MINOR

Comments Form

Name..... Barbara DOHMANN

Address..... 42 Frognal NW3 6AG



Planning application number..... 2014/2745/T

Planning application address..... 45 Netherhall Gdns NW3 5RL

I support the application (please state reasons below)

I object to the application (please state reasons below)



Your comments

Please see attached
printed letter.

1 May 2014



Subject: Your Ref: 2014/2745/T - Intended Works to Trees in a Conservation Area - Rear Garden, 45 Netherhall Gardens, NW3 5RL

Dear Members of the Culture and Environment Directorate,

I write in response to your Notification Letter of 16 April 2014, and I will address each of the terms of proposed works to trees in the order in which they appear on page 1 of your letter.

I would note at the outset that:

- 1 – It has not been possible for my neighbours and me to “View Related Documents”, as these do not appear on the website. Our only information is therefore the content of your letter and our knowledge of the 45 Netherhall Gardens trees and garden – we live directly facing the Rear Garden at 42 Frognal NW3 6AG.
- 2 – I have lived at 42 Frognal since 1969. In August 1988, when I, my family and neighbours were all away, the then proposed developer of 45 Netherhall Gardens unlawfully felled 26 trees, with a view to building a very large footprint tall block of flats in the former park-like garden. As a condition of planning permission for the current structure, the Council required retention of the few remaining trees (in particular the Acacias) and required replanting, which in due course took the form of the Leylandii.
- 3 – The condition of retention and replanting which the Council rightly imposed reflects the facts that:
 - The remaining gardenscape and townscape in the Hampstead Conservation Area are its most precious possessions, and they are entrusted to the Council not only for now but for the future, hence the statutory need for planning permission and the need for careful decision-making by the Council;
 - The trees make a significant impact on our local surroundings, they have outstanding and special amenity value, they are beautiful, thus enhancing the appearance of the area, they provide privacy by forming a screen between 45 Netherhall Gardens and 42 Frognal (whose bedrooms face the Netherhall Gardens garden), they dampen road noise, and these very trees provided habitat for birds: blackbirds and finches have been nesting in them for years (and do so now).

I now turn to each individual proposal:

- 1 – “Reduce height of Group of Leylandii by 50%”: A north to south line of Leylandii was reduced in height in the past, but not by 50 %. That previous reduction remains effective, the trees are in no way too high, and they provide the necessary screening and other amenities listed above. I object to this part of the application.
- 2 – “1 x Acacia – Remove lateral limb over the lawn into off shoot. Thin remainder by 10%.” This is a beautiful, mature, healthy tree, it is quite impossible to see how it could require thinning, let alone be thinned: an Acacia is not exactly dense, far from it. I cannot judge the merit of removing the “lateral limb”. I object to the 10 % thinning proposal.
- 3 – “1 x Acacia – fell”. I am simply appalled by this proposal and object to it in the strongest terms. The tree in question is beautiful, healthy, offering every amenity calling for protection. I repeat: it was actually a *condition* imposed on allowing the present structure to be built that this tree be retained. It beggars belief that it should now be proposed to be destroyed.
- 4 – “1 x Hazel – Cut back and tidy”. I do not understand what “cut back” means here. The tree is in excellent condition and does not appear to require any work. I object to anything which goes beyond mere minor tidying.
- 5 – “Row of Leylandii – Reduce height to previous points face up”. Again, it is not possible from this language to understand exactly what is proposed. I object to any large scale reduction of these trees, which currently have several pairs of birds nesting in them.

6 – “Row of Leylandii – Lift to clear wendy house by 3-4m approx..”. We are all unaware of there being any planning permission for a “wendy house”. In any event, how can this take priority over Council-imposed tree cover and the amenity of the neighbours? It surely cannot.

Finally, as in the case of our successful opposition to the further destruction of trees at the time of the original proposal for a large block of flats, I would wish to attend any Committee meeting, and would wish to address this. I am available to you at any time should you wish to receive further information or have any queries.

