

Dear Mr Bell,

We are aware that a request has been made to cut down some branches out of an Oak tree at 27, Nassington road (Hampstead Heath) (ref number 2016/1081/T) and of an Ash tree at 25, Nassington road (2016/1048/T). Me (Eleni Baizani) and my husband (Ilias Koutzavekiaris) live at 25, Nassington road (Top flat) and view both of these trees directly from our balcony. We would like to strongly object to any cutting of these trees. We both love the rich leafage both of these trees grow in the summer because it covers ugly bits of the view (like the train and some tall buildings). We also consider them beneficial for our health. Furthermore the tree at 25, Nassinton road had been cut last year, which had affected its growth a lot. We love nature and consider any greenery that sourrounds our home vital. We hope that you will bear in mind our objection before you reach a decision.

Kind Regards,

Eleni Baizani and Ilias Koutzavekiaris



F.A.O. Nick Bell, via Christine Spence

25 Nassington Road London NW3 2TX

Date: 29 March 2016

Our Ref: 12767 JC

Your Ref: TPO Applications, 25 and 27 Nassington Road, London.

Dear Mr. Bell

APPLICATIONS TO CARRY OUT TREE WORK AT: 25 & 27 NASSINGTON ROAD, LONDON, NW3 2TX. Applications numbers: 2016/1048/T and 2016/1081/T

I refer to two applications lodged with Camden Council and named as:

2016/1048/T

• 2016/1081/T

1. Details of applications:

APPLICATION: 2016/1048/T – T1

CASE OFFICER: Nick Bell

LOCATION: 25 Nassington Road, London, NW3 2TX.

PROPOSAL: (TPO REF. C753-T1 2008) REAR GARDEN: 1 x Ash T1 -

thin all re-growth by 50% and remove 6 to 8 small limbs from the upper crown to thin and rebalance.

APPLICANT: Ms Lucy Scott-Moncrief

25 Nassington Road

London

NW3 2TX

AGENT: Greentrees

73c Torrington Park London, N12 9PN





APPLICATION: 2016/1081/T – **T2**

CASE OFFICER: Nick Bell

LOCATION: 25 Nassington Road, London, NW3 2TX.

PROPOSAL: 1 x Oak T2 - remove 1 low limb over compost heap at 3m -

max cut size 2 inches, remove 1 low limb over shed at 5m - max cut size 4 inches and remove 2 low limbs over garden

at 6m - max cut size 4 inches.

APPLICANT: Ms Lucy Scott-Moncrief

25 Nassington Road

London NW3 2TX

AGENT: Greentrees

73c Torrington Park London, N12 9PN

2. THE TREE PRESERVATION ORDERS

T1 Common Ash - Fraxinus excelsior.

This tree was protected formally by Camden Council in 2008 as it was considered to provide amenity value to those people who live close by and to those people travelling past the site by train.

T2 English Oak – Quercus petrea.

This tree was also afforded official protection and placed under a Tree Preservation Order (TPO) in 2008, for the same justified reasons as with T1.

Both TPOs are valid, legal and extant.

Both trees also sit within the South Hill Park Conservation Area, administered by Camden Council.

3. THE TREES AND MY CLIENT'S INTEREST IN THEM

My Client, Christine Spence is the free holder of number 25 Nassington Road. Her property looks out to the two trees in question and the tree affords the following services to Ms Spence, her immediate neighbours and users of the railway:

- The trees both offer important screening to the adjacent properties from the visual impact of the adjacent railway.
- The trees offer important sound damping services for the late spring, summer through to the autumn for the adjacent properties.
- The trees afford a pleasant green backdrop to the railway users.
- The trees provide important green corridor and wildlife habitat for birds, invertebrates and other wildlife in the area.





4. THE APPLICATIONS

T1 Common Ash.

The application under consideration is to "thin all re-growth by 50% and remove 6 to 8 small limbs from the upper crown to thin and rebalance".

As can be seen from the picture of T1 below, the tree has been rather dramatically reduced already within the last few years and as a consequence the tree is in recovery. Thinning these recovering branches by 50% would go beyond British Standard 3998:2010 which recommends 30% as an absolute maximum.

Add to this the request to remove a further 6 to 8 unspecified limbs from the upper crown and it appears to be a strategy to slowly yet surely eradicate this tree.







T2 English Oak.

The application to T2 was to "remove 1 low limb over compost heap at 3m - max cut size 2 inches, remove 1 low limb over shed at 5m -max cut size 4 inches and remove 2 low limbs over garden at 6m - max cut size 4 inches.

Frankly, such specifications for work are in my view untrustworthy. If one were to convert these maximum cuts to metric, the figures would be 7.5cm, 5cm, 10cm and 10cm respectively. I do not accept that a specification from the ground can be made to such accuracy and doubt that Camden would prosecute if the cuts made were larger than advertised (and I fully expect they would be). At which point it would be too late.







5. OBJECTION

I would like to object to both applications which will have an impact on the enjoyment of my client's property, its gardens and those of surrounding properties in Nassington Road.

These applications, relating to TPO's, are not for the health of the trees but to provide more light and sun to an adjacent swimming pool. This is not a valid reason to reduce and thin trees with a TPO's and does not comply with Camden's policy for its own trees:

Policy 6—Tree Pruning
The following reasons will <u>not</u> constitute grounds for the pruning or removal of trees by
the Council.
Obstruction of light, and or view
Where a tree is perceived to be too large

After approving the swimming pool Camden, in it's desire to protect the trees, stated:

"All trees on the site or parts of trees growing from adjoining sites, unless shown on the permitted drawings as being removed, shall be retained and protected from damage to the satisfaction of the Council" the reason given " that the development will not have an adverse effect on existing trees and in order to maintain the character and amenities of the area...."

In respect of T1 in the garden of no. 25, following a failed application to have it removed, the tree has been under a process of attrition since the swimming pool was built. This has made the tree considerably smaller and less attractive as a landscape feature. This is particularly compounded by the thinning of the tree and removal of the lowest branches. All of this loss of screening has opened up the view of the railway for the residents of the 6 flats in the upper floors of the buildings of nos. 25 and 27. Such continued work, if it were to be allowed would very soon spoil the amenity value of this tree and almost by default, pave the way for its removal.

In respect of the **T2**, this tree has had recent works carried out (despite promises from Tree Officers) that no permission would ever be given for unnecessary cutting, pruning, lopping of this tree. No further work should be allowed at present and the imprecise nature and description of this application is a worrying indication of the tree's future should these works be permitted.

Prior to the construction of the swimming pool there had been no applications for tree works in the gardens of nos. 25 and 27. Since the construction of the swimming pool there appear to have been 16, none of which were for the health or well being of the trees.





I would respectfully urge you to refuse these applications on the grounds of vague specifications, unnecessary works and continued attrition of the two trees.

I trust that this information is sufficient but should you require anything further please do not hesitate to contact me.

Assuring you of our best attention at all times.

Yours sincerely



J. P. Cocking F.R.E.S., P Dip Arb. (R.F.S.), F Arbor A., M. IOB, C.Biol Registered Consultant of the Arboricultural Association.

March 29, 2016