Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Printed on: 24/06/2015 09:05:19 Response:
2015/3096/T	Paul & Sarah Edwards	5 Rosslyn Heights 2 Belsize Lane London NW3 5AB	17/06/2015 11:53:43		This application relates to three Tree Preservation Order trees (one sycamore, one birch and one lime) which were included in an application in February to which we objected and to which the Council refused permission. We therefore reiterate our comments that the application is overly extreme in proposing the removal of mature and attractive trees to the detriment of the neighbourhood, intruding on our privacy and reducing light to our property. This for the sake of carrying out modest works to the garage to strengthen its foundations. We trust the Council will again see fit to turn this application down. Thank you.
2015/3096/T	Maureen johnson	4a Belsize lane London NW3 5AB	22/06/2015 13:00:49	COMMNT	I object strongly to this application to remove these trees. The trees look good, and are a vital part of the general character of this conservation area. They also, provide privacy to, the adjoining properties. It makes no sense to allow these trees to be removed because the applicant says they are adversely affecting his small garage. They are not affecting other buildings and garden walls which are even closer to the trees. II understand that a previous application to remove these trees was rejected, and trust the the council will do so again.
2015/3096/T	Michael and Teresita Cutting	Garden Flat 4B belsize Lane London NW3 5AB	21/06/2015 22:35:12	OBJEMAIL	As owners and occupiers of a property which benefits from the amenity of these trees we strongly object to their removal. We understand the first application for their removal was refused on the grounds "that the removal of the trees would be detrimental to the character of the area". In our opinion this is precisely why this application should be rejected again in its entirety. Furthermore we understand the trees are subject to Tree Preservation Orders which are designed to preserve the visual amenity they provide and protect the character of the conservation area. The trees not only have a desirable visual impact but also provide natural shielding and privacy between the boundaries of the adjoining properties. The trees also provide a natural habitat for wildlife and contribute to the environmental and visual quality of the area. To remove these trees for the sake of a small insubstantial garage, which according to one of the reports can be underpinned, is totally out of proportion. In fact it would probably be less costly to demolish the garage and rebuild it with better foundations. There are a number of other buildings and garden walls within similar (or even closer) proximity to the trees which are un-affected which would indicate the garage has been incorrectly constructed in the first place. We sincerely hope that the application will be rejected in its entirety.