



To whom it may concern,

I am writing with regards to application 2017/0827/T and to object to the proposals for the reasons detailed below:

1) The application is unclear and fails to identify good cause for the substantial works being proposed. Rather the application is a muddle of ill-focussed and varying arbitrary reasons for the removal of the trees around the building. Given the importance of natural spaces in the Belsize Park area, commensurate burden should be placed on these proposals and such works certainly demand more than the hastily drafted assessment put forward. If a professional analysis has been conducted then it should be detailed in the application.

2) Aside from being barely legible, the map of the trees is inaccurate. For instance, the Tree Plan details tree 16 as being "ash saplings" while the Schedule Of Works (SOW) defines them as "elder saplings" - zero points given for attention to detail. These trees are not saplings (see attached picture 1). In fact, they are actually rather large with diameters of approximately 30cms and heights substantial enough to provide a privacy boundary from our flat, on the second floor, to the adjacent neighbours. Additional careful detailing such as tree 23, "? small tree", must lead us to the conclusion that the analysis is, let's be generous and say, questionable. With such little attention to detail it is hard to believe that much work has gone into considering the impact not only from the building's perspective but also on the adverse effects on the local wildlife - of which there is a considerable variety.

3) The extent of overhanging and wall damage attributed to tree 5 (cherry tree) is vastly exaggerated (see attached picture 2). To me it seems that removal of such a large tree is gross and extreme when compared to the current state. Without the inclusion in the application of properly conducted analysis the information given must be taken as subjective at best. Analyses such as "Large. Poor health. Remove" (tree 7, SOW) are not serious. The poor health of the fir trees (trees 4 & 7) is not evidenced and in my opinion don't warrant removal.

Overall, it is difficult to have confidence in the assessment when it has such obvious discrepancies and lack of detail. The large scale of these works will have significant impact on aesthetics, ecology, and privacy. Thus they should be accompanied by well thought professional analysis and mitigation/alternatives. Even then, only absolutely necessary and minimal work should be undertaken instead of the brutalist approach proposed.

Sincerely,
Andrew O'Harney
78 Gilling Court



