



Attention Tree Officers

Dear sir/madam,

I have just heard that there are yet again applications for works to the Ash tree at my address, 25, Nassington Road (where I am the Freeholder) and to the Oak tree at 27, Nassington Road the neighbouring property.

I should just make a couple of points relating to inaccuracies in the applications. Firstly, only the Ash Tree is situated in the garden of no 25, Nassington Road. The Oak tree is situated in the garden of no 27, Nassington Road. Secondly, and very importantly, the Ash tree in no 25 is also subject to a Tree Preservation Order.

I would like to make known to you that I will be making the most strenuous objections to both these applications.

Oak - this is a very beautiful and important tree. One of the previous Tree Officers, Mr Kevin Fisher, categorically assured the objectors to previous attempts to carry out works to this tree that he would never allow this very fine tree to be touched at all.

Ash Tree - This tree has had considerable works carried out to it on a regular basis over the years. As a result of this constant process of attrition (which, as far as we could see , always seemed to go beyond what had been agreed) , the tree has never been allowed to fulfill it's potential and in our view has been aesthetically damaged. Furthermore, it has opened up the view of the railway line for the occupants of the 8 flats at nos 25 and 27 with consequent loss of amenity.

These Tree applications began following Lucy Scott Moncrieff's construction of a swimming pool. Planning was granted by the council but the objectors concerns about the garden trees (in this conservation area) were taken into consideration. The planning permission designated the trees which could be removed for the construction of the pool but stated that all other trees and parts of trees had to be retained. Nonetheless there has been a huge attrition of trees since the swimming pool was built (prior to the construction of the swimming pool there had been no applications whatsoever for the trees at 25 or 27 .)What the council had not been made aware of by the applicant at the time the swimming pool was granted permission was the fact that this type of swimming pool system was unsuitable for shaded areas with trees. The objectors only became aware of this at a later date. This also applied to the fact that the pool was passed off as an "ecological pool" at the time. We later learned that a pool with a phosphate filter and a pump requiring 24 hour 7 days a week 52 weeks of the year electricity was not in fact ecological at all. Our view is that all these tree applications have been an attempt to bring light to a swimming pool which was unsuitably sited in the first place and they are inconsistent with the councils intention to protect the garden trees at nos 25 and 27.

When this application is allocated to a tree officer for decision, I would be grateful if he or she would please contact me whilst it is under consideration and before any decision is made. I will be sending further details and issues over recent pruning to the apple tree without permission and damage to the cherry tree in no 25. Thanking you in advance.

Yours faithfully,

Christine Guignabaudet