

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2021/1435/T	Alaric Dunsmore-Rouse	28/03/2021 10:14:17	OBJ	<p>Dear Planning Officer</p> <p>I reside at 20 Belsize Park Gardens. Two properties behind me, 30 and 32 Glenilla Road, are being redeveloped. As part of that, two very large sycamore trees have been cut down and a large clump of tall conifers are about to be cut down. The area is/will be now devoid of a big area of nature used by a great deal of wildlife, not to mention CO2 absorption or hiding all the neighbours from being very visible to each other.</p> <p>I therefore read with dismay that another enormous plane tree (and this one with a TPO on it!) is also to be considered for cutting down. If this were to happen, in one year all the green barrier and nature pathway between 34 Glenilla Road and 26 Glenilla Road will have been taken away. Recent and more unusual wildlife for London is using this tree as I can clearly see it from my garden and through my living room windows. Greater Spotted Woodpecker, Long-Tailed Tits, Jays and we regularly even have an owl now - all of those are using that ACTUAL tree. PLEASE consider very carefully whether the loss of this tree is in anyone's real interest, especially since the council already considered it worthy of a TPO in the first place</p> <p>Many thanks</p> <p>Yours sincerely</p> <p>Alaric Dunsmore-Rouse</p>

---

2021/1435/T	Greene	27/03/2021 10:20:11	COMMT	<p>We need more trees not less , they are not only practice in helping to keep our air clean they are beautiful and a part of the character of NW3 .</p> <p>Refuse thus application and recommend a professional prune .</p>
-------------	--------	---------------------	-------	--

---

2021/1435/T	Jean-Baptiste Rancon	27/03/2021 07:54:49	OBJNOT	<p>I don;t see a reason why the council should change their opinion vs what they had said in 2020.</p> <p>Assuming the issue stems from the plane tree, the reports are clear that underpinning the property is one option to fix the issue - rather than destroying the tree.</p> <p>Although the redaction has sought to hide the fact that this option is likely to be a more expensive one for the insurance company than cutting the tree, it is an available option and would prevent the removal of a tree which is a major contributor to the area (and to the fight against climate change I presume).</p> <p>It is not acceptable for the insurance company - who must have known of the tree when they insured the property - to seek to save money on the cost of building repairs by destroying a common good.</p>
-------------	-------------------------	---------------------	--------	---

---