

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2017/1308/T	kim Guignabaudet	25 nassington rd	29/03/2017 18:39:11	OBJ	I strongly object as the trees are not only enjoyed by nearby residents but also by the general public who can enjoy the view from the trains. The trees offer screening between the houses and the train line as well as reducing pollution and increasing oxygen. The trees also contribute to the general character of the area which is loved by many for being green. The number and size of trees in the 2 gardens have already been reduced making the remaining trees all the more vital.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2017/1308/T	O. Guignabaudet	25 Nassington Road	25/03/2017 18:32:17	OBJNOT	<p>1) I would like to present the most forceful objections to the removal of the Protected Ash Tree under TPO REF C753. A number of reasons for refusing consent are already well-known to the Council as shown in some of its previous decisions from the very beginning of this 10 year series of planning applications since the construction of the swimming pool in 2006 (2006/2853/P) up to 2016 (Refusal Of Consent For Works To Tree/s Under A Tree Preservation Order 2016/1048/T). All Tree Applications from Ms Lucy Scott-Moncrieff appear unrelated to the health, amenity or beauty of the trees and seem to be otherwise motivated. I also object to the proposed further works, to the TPO Oak Tree, which are entirely unnecessary.</p> <p>2) Ms Lucy Scott-Moncrieff is the Leaseholder of two separate Basement-Garden Flats at 25 and 27 Nassington Road. In the last 10 years, since the swimming pool was mooted, she has made 21 Planning Applications involving reduction and removal of trees to the Council. Prior to her swimming pool plans there were none. The main intention seems to have been to clear the ground for her private swimming pool and to open up more areas of the gardens for sunbathing which would be detrimental to the Conservation Area.</p> <p>3) It should be recalled that from the very beginning, in granting its conditional permission for the swimming pool (decision 2006/2853/P of 03/10/2006), the Council gave among its conditions and reasons that :</p> <p>"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 being "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 accordance with policy requirements.</p> <p>However continual Tree Applications have been aimed at reducing / removing the trees despite the conditions and reasons given by the Council to protect them.</p> <p>An excessive amount of tree work has already been carried out particularly to the Ash as noted by the Council in its Decision 2016/1048/T (see below).</p> <p>4) I refer in this respect to the Council's decision of 05/05/2016 (2016/1048/T) quoting the following excerpts under the section "reason(s) for refusal" :</p> <p>The multi-stemmed ash tree is situated within the rear garden of the property. The property is situated within sub area 2 of the South Hill Park Conservation Area, the statement for which refers to the rear gardens along the south side of Nassington Road, the allotments and the railway embankment as a "significant open space" and that "the relationship between the built and natural environment is an essential part of the special character of the South Hill Park Conservation Area".</p>

Application No: **Consultees Name:** **Consultees Addr:** **Received:**

Comment: **Response:**

The tree provides visual amenity to residents of the property, of neighbouring properties and to some degree the users of the train line which runs from east to west to the south of the property. The tree also forms part of a green corridor running along the rear gardens of the south side of Nassington Road. The residents of the property are provided with visual screening of the railway and some degree of noise reduction from rail traffic by the tree.

An application to prune the ash tree back to the previous points of reduction was approved on 19/12/2014 under ref. 2014/7178/T. During a recent site visit it was apparent that when works were carried out following the approval the tree may have been pruned by a greater degree than what was approved.

5) In this present application dated 21/02/2017 the Applicant expressly requests permission to further reduce or remove the Ash Tree in order to allow more sunlight in the Swimming Pool. The provision of light is not a valid reason in Camden's Tree Policy.

Policy 6 –Tree Pruning

The following reasons will not 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

The claim that the tree is no longer attractive is extraordinary given the huge amount of work carried out by the applicant to reduce / thin this tree. If it were no longer attractive as they claim this is the applicant's fault. It cannot then be used as a reason for removing the tree.

6) The swimming pool was constructed primarily for leisure, sunbathing and swimming as Ms Scott-Moncrieff herself told us. Guests and paying visitors come to events (such as fireworks, jazz bands etc.) and barking dogs run loose in the garden none of which is conducive to wildlife.

I don't think a swimming pool which has already involved the reduction / removal of so many trees and their important wildlife habitats can possibly be described as a wildlife haven. These are gardens where the few remaining trees are constantly under threat. Despite the window dressing, this is basically a swimming pool for one household and has to date involved a huge loss of trees to the gardens to provide light to this pool which often appears stagnant and overgrown with what looks like algae. It often needs topping up and has had to be refilled.

I consider to grant permission for further tree works would be detrimental to the Conservation Area.

7) I should be grateful if the Council were to reiterate it's position in protecting the Ash Tree and the Oak (the importance of both of which is demonstrated by their TPO's) as well as the natural

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
					<p>environment of the Conservation Area.</p> <p>This problematic 10-year history with an inordinate number of planning applications has also demonstrated the need to closely supervise and inspect the gardens in question with a view to enforcing the necessary conditions. For ease of reference an Annex is attached listing the 21 Planning Applications made by Ms Scott-Moncrieff in the last 10 years.</p> <p>Thank you and best regards,</p>
2017/1308/T	Gity- Leyla AMINI	29 Nassington Road Flat Ground Floor London NW3 2TX	29/03/2017 16:06:38	COMMNT	<p>my letter refers to 1xOak -Raise canopy by removing branches indicated on photo , but can not see any photo anywhere to see the extent of branch removals.</p> <p>My Letter also refers to 1x Ash -Removed , but web site does not show any information on the Ash tree on the application ?!?!</p> <p>I DO NOT want any tree to be removed at all. They are old trees and should stay there.</p> <p>I tried to contact Mr James Remmington, the case officer, by phone today 29 March 2017 , To get more clarification, but he was not available , so had left a message & my landline phone Number for him to call back.</p> <p>Basically Beside couple of branches, I do not agree with removal of any tree at all.</p>
2017/1308/T	Gity-Leyla AMINI	29 Nassington Road Ground Floor Flat London NW3 2TX	29/03/2017 17:17:02	COMMNT	<p>I would like to ask you to uphold the tree preservation orders on 25-27 Nassington Road NW3 2TX (Gardens)</p> <p>I have read the comments by Ms Elizabeth West the owner of first floor flat at No. 25 , made by letter /email 23 March 2017 and as the owner of Ground Floor flat at No. 29 , I agree with her views & particularly with following points :</p> <p>I wish to protect the amenity that is provided with these valuable and necessary trees. Both Ash and Oak tree on this application, provide sound and visual screen from railway and also privacy from nearby flats.</p> <p>Further more the Oak Tree is a valuable mature tree which contributes to good air quality .</p> <p>Prunings should be minimal and both trees should be fully preserved and according to the relevant orders.</p> <p>Please DO NOT display my Name , personal details In public . Only my comments should be disclosed if necessary.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
-----------------	------------------	------------------	-----------	----------	-----------

2017/1308/T	O. Guignabaudet	25 Nassington Road London NW3 2TX	28/03/2017 21:20:47	OBJ	
-------------	-----------------	--------------------------------------	---------------------	-----	--

25 March 2017

Mr James Remmington
Planning Officer
Division Appeals and Enforcement Team

Re: OBJECTIONS to Planning Application 2017/1308/T (TPO REF C753)
25-27 Nassington Road London NW3 2TX (TPO REF C753) REAR GARDEN: 1 x Oak - Raise canopy by removing branches indicated on photo 1 x Ash - Remove REGISTERED 08-03-2017
(South Hill Park Conservation Area)

Dear Mr James Remmington,

1) I would like to present the most forceful objections to the removal of the Protected Ash Tree under TPO REF C753. A number of reasons for refusing consent are already well-known to the Council as shown in some of its previous decisions from the very beginning of this 10 year series of planning applications since the construction of the swimming pool in 2006 (2006/2853/P) up to 2016 (Refusal Of Consent For Works To Tree/s Under A Tree Preservation Order 2016/1048/T). All Tree Applications from Ms Lucy Scott-Moncrieff appear unrelated to the health, amenity or beauty of the trees and seem to be otherwise motivated. I also object to the proposed further works, to the TPO Oak Tree, which are entirely unnecessary.

2) Ms Lucy Scott-Moncrieff is the Leaseholder of two separate Basement-Garden Flats at 25 and 27 Nassington Road. In the last 10 years, since the swimming pool was mooted, she has made 21 Planning Applications involving reduction and removal of trees to the Council. Prior to her swimming pool plans there were none. The main intention seems to have been to clear the ground for her private swimming pool and to open up more areas of the gardens for sunbathing which would be detrimental to the Conservation Area.

3) It should be recalled that from the very beginning, in granting its conditional permission for the swimming pool (decision 2006/2853/P of 03/10/2006), the Council gave among its conditions and reasons that :

"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 being "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 accordance with policy requirements.

Application No: Consultees Name: Consultees Addr: Received:

Comment: Response:

However continual Tree Applications have been aimed at reducing / removing the trees despite the conditions and reasons given by the Council to protect them.
An excessive amount of tree work has already been carried out particularly to the Ash as noted by the Council in its Decision 2016/1048/T (see below).

4) I refer in this respect to the Council's decision of 05/05/2016 (2016/1048/T) quoting the following excerpts under the section "reason(s) for refusal" :

The multi-stemmed ash tree is situated within the rear garden of the property. The property is situated within sub area 2 of the South Hill Park Conservation Area, the statement for which refers to the rear gardens along the south side of Nassington Road, the allotments and the railway embankment as a "significant open space" and that "the relationship between the built and natural environment is an essential part of the special character of the South Hill Park Conservation Area".

The tree provides visual amenity to residents of the property, of neighbouring properties and to some degree the users of the train line which runs from east to west to the south of the property. The tree also forms part of a green corridor running along the rear gardens of the south side of Nassington Road. The residents of the property are provided with visual screening of the railway and some degree of noise reduction from rail traffic by the tree.

An application to prune the ash tree back to the previous points of reduction was approved on 19/12/2014 under ref. 2014/7178/T. During a recent site visit it was apparent that when works were carried out following the approval the tree may have been pruned by a greater degree than what was approved.

5) In this present application dated 21/02/2017 the Applicant expressly requests permission to further reduce or remove the Ash Tree in order to allow more sunlight in the Swimming Pool. The provision of light is not a valid reason in Camden's Tree Policy.

Policy 6 –Tree Pruning

The following reasons will not 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

The claim that the tree is no longer attractive is extraordinary given the huge amount of work carried out by the applicant to reduce / thin this tree. If it were no longer attractive as they claim this is the applicant's fault. It cannot then be used as a reason for removing the tree.

6) The swimming pool was constructed primarily for leisure, sunbathing and swimming as Ms Scott-Moncrieff herself told us. Guests and paying visitors come to events (such as fireworks, jazz bands etc.) and barking dogs run loose in the garden none of which is conducive to wildlife.

Application No: Consultees Name: Consultees Addr: Received:

Comment: Response:

I don't think a swimming pool which has already involved the reduction / removal of so many trees and their important wildlife habitats can possibly be described as a wildlife haven. These are gardens where the few remaining trees are constantly under threat. Despite the window dressing, this is basically a swimming pool for one household and has to date involved a huge loss of trees to the gardens to provide light to this pool which often appears stagnant and overgrown with what looks like algae. It often needs topping up and has had to be refilled.

I consider to grant permission for further tree works would be detrimental to the Conservation Area.

7) I should be grateful if the Council were to reiterate it's position in protecting the Ash Tree and the Oak (the importance of both of which is demonstrated by their TPO's) as well as the natural environment of the Conservation Area.

This problematic 10-year history with an inordinate number of planning applications has also demonstrated the need to closely supervise and inspect the gardens in question with a view to enforcing the necessary conditions. For ease of reference an Annex is attached listing the 21 Planning Applications made by Ms Scott-Moncrieff in the last 10 years.

Thank you and best regards,

Olivier Guignabaudet

Annex listing the 21 Applications made by Ms Scott-Moncrieff in the last 10 years.

1
2006/2982/T
25 Nassington Road, London, NW3 2TX GARDEN: 1 x Cherry Plum - Fell to ground level. 1 x Cherry - Fell to ground level. 1 x Ash - Crown reduce by 30%.
WITHDRAWN 03-07-2006 Withdrawn Decision

2
2006/3301/T
25 Nassington Road, London, NW3 2TX REAR GARDEN: 1 x Cherry Plum - Fell to ground level.
REAR GARDEN, ALONG LEFT HAND SIDE BOUNDARY: 1 x Cherry - Fell to ground level.
REAR GARDEN, ALONG REAR BOUNDARY: 1 x Ash - Reduce overhanging branches of one ash by up to 30%, thin by up to 15% and shape (amendment agreed and confirmed via email from Dick Tomlinson on 17/08/2006) FINAL DECISION 20-07-2006 No Objection to Works to Tree(s) in CA

3
2006/2853/P

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
					The Garden Flat 25 Nassington Road London NW3 2TX Excavation to create a natural swimming pool (measuring 7m x 3m) and associated decking, plus relocation of existing shed in rear garden. FINAL DECISION 17-08-2006 Granted
4					
2007/0245/T					
25 Nassington Road, London, NW3 2TX					DDD - REAR GARDEN: 1 x Cherry Plum - Fell - DDD FINAL DECISION 22-01-2007 No Objection to Emergency Works (CA)
5					
2007/0689/P					
The Garden Flat 25 Nassington Road London NW3 2TX					Submission of details of tree protection pursuant to condition 2 of the planning permission dated 03/10/06 (2006/2853/P) for Excavation to create a swimming pool and associated decking, plus relocation of existing shed in rear garden. WITHDRAWN 22-02-2007 Withdrawn Decision
6					
2007/1034/T					
25 Nassington Road, London, NW3 2TX					REAR GARDEN: 1 x Ash (Self-Seeded) - Remove. WITHDRAWN 05-03-2007 Withdrawn Decision
7					
2007/1389/T					
27 Nassington Road, London, NW3 2TX					REAR GARDEN: 1 x Bay - Cut the tree back to about 1.5m. FINAL DECISION 26-03-2007 No Objection to Works to Tree(s) in CA
8					
2007/1462/T					
25 Nassington Road, London, NW3 2TX					REAR GARDEN: 1 x Ash - Reduce in height to 6m. WITHDRAWN 28-03-2007 Withdrawn Decision
9					
2007/4139/T					
25 Nassington Road, London, NW3 2TX					REAR GARDEN: 1 x Ash - Reduce the top of the crown by no more than 1.5m and lightly reshape the crown to leave a natural outline. This will involve

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
					<p>pruning back a few overlong branches only. FINAL DECISION 29-08-2007 No Objection to Works to Tree(s) in CA</p> <p>10 2008/3330/P 25 & 27 Nassington Road London NW3 2TX Application for a certificate of lawfulness for an existing conversion of two basement flats at No.25 and No.27 into one residential unit (Class C3). FINAL DECISION 30-10-2008 Granted</p> <p>11 2008/5117/T 25 Nassington Road, London, NW3 2TX REAR GARDEN: 1 x Apple - Reduce to previous points. FINAL DECISION 31-10-2008 No Objection to Works to Tree(s) in CA</p> <p>12 2010/0459/T 25 Nassington Road London NW3 2TX REAR GARDEN: 1 x Apple Tree - Remove 1 dead branch, 1 competing leader on main branch and 1 low crossing branch. FINAL DECISION 27-01-2010 No Objection to Works to Tree(s) in CA</p> <p>13 2011/5261/T 25 Nassington Road London NW3 2TX (TPO Ref: C753) REAR GARDEN: 1 x Ash - Reduce close to the previous reduction points. Remove dead wood and reshape. Remove one large limb. FINAL DECISION 19-10-2011 Part Granted/Refused</p> <p>14 2011/5263/T 25 Nassington Road London NW3 2TX REAR GARDEN: 1 x Apple - Reduce close to previous reduction points. Remove deadwood and reshape. 1 x Cherry - Remove 2 x branches. 1 x Unspecified Tree - Remove 1 x branch. FINAL DECISION 19-10-2011 No Objection to Works to Tree(s)</p> <p>15 2011/5265/T 27 Nassington Road London NW3 2TX (TPO Ref: C753) REAR GARDEN: 1 x Oak - Raise crown by removing the lowest branch. FINAL DECISION 19-10-2011 Approve Works</p> <p>16</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
					<p>2014/7178/T</p> <p>25 Nassington Road London NW3 2TX (TPO Ref: C753 T1 2008) WITHIN GROUNDS: 1 x Ash - Remove low lateral to the right, reduce left back to 3m. Prune back to previous reduction points. Remove dead or dying wood.</p>
					<p>17</p> <p>2014/7179/T</p> <p>25 Nassington Road London NW3 2TX WITHIN GROUNDS: 1 x Cherry - Remove wisteria, reduce back from building by 1.5m and remove branch growing to the Goat Willow. 1 x Goat Willow - Remove 2 x low branches & 1 x sub lateral, thin crown by 20%. 1 x Apple - Open up and thin 20%. 1 x Cherry - Grind the major root 300mm below soil.</p> <p>FINAL DECISION 18-11-2014 No Objection to Works to Tree(s) in CA</p>
					<p>18</p> <p>2016/1048/T</p> <p>25 Nassington Road London NW3 2TX (TPO REF. C753-T1 2008) REAR GARDEN: 1 x Ash T1 - thin all regrowth by 50% and remove 6 to 8 small limbs from the upper crown to thin and rebalance.</p> <p>FINAL DECISION 26-02-2016 Refuse Works (TPO)</p>
					<p>19</p> <p>2016/1081/T</p> <p>27 Nassington Road London NW3 2TX (TPO REF. C753-T2 2008) REAR GARDEN: 1 x Oak T2 - remove branches 1, 2 and 3 back to the main stem as detailed on photo submitted.</p> <p>FINAL DECISION 26-02-2016 Approve Works (TPO)</p>
					<p>20</p> <p>2017/1308/T</p> <p>25-27 Nassington Road London NW3 2TX (TPO REF C753) REAR GARDEN: 1 x Oak - Raise canopy by removing branches indicated on photo 1 x Ash - Remove</p> <p>REGISTERED 08-03-2017</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
					<p>21</p> <p>2017/1310/T</p> <p>25-27 Nassington Road London NW3 2TX REAR GARDEN: 1 x Goat Willow - Remove two branches indicated on photo REGISTERED 08-03-2017</p>
2017/1308/T	Scott Rowland	91 Packhorse Road Gerrards Cross	27/03/2017 18:05:26 INT		<p>I object to the removal of this tree. Within an urban environment the removal of trees should be restricted unless there are strong reason which in this situation appears not to be the case. Trees in urban environments are beneficial to reduce poor air quality and provide homes to a variety of wildlife.</p>