

**From:** Tom Simon  
**Sent:** 17 June 2021 16:05  
**To:** Andrea Coscelli; Elizabeth Beaumont; Nick Bell; Tom Little; Bethany Cullen  
**Subject:** Re: Plane tree at 28a Glenilla Road

Dear All

I would like to support Andrea's points. It feels like in this case there is a danger that by a gradual process harm can be done to the local area via the removal of trees, that would never have been acceptable if it was all applied for up front. I do think the reasons for issuing this TPO in the first place were sound. I would reiterate that the decision to do so included an assessment of the amenity of the tree and how visible it is from the public realm, which it is quite clearly in my opinion.

Best regards

Tom

---

**From:** Andrea Coscelli  
**Sent:** 13 June 2021 22:37  
**To:** Elizabeth Beaumont; Nick Bell; Tom Little; Bethany Cullen  
**Cc:** Tom Simon  
**Subject:** Plane tree at 28a Glenilla Road

Dear all

I understand you're considering the application to remove the mature plane tree at 28a Glenilla Rd in the coming days. As someone who runs a large Government agency (Competition and Markets Authority) and deals with public law challenges daily, I understand well the basis for your decision. I am also extremely grateful for your hard work day in and day out to balance various considerations when applying Camden's planning regime.

On the other hand, I would like you to understand our perspective.

In the last three years Camden Council has allowed the following in the Belsize Conservation area around our house (18 Belsize Park Gardens):

- 1) the removal of a mature sycamore tree at 30 Glenilla Rd in connection with the demolition of the house there (while allowing two extra storeys to be built);
- 2) the removal of a limb and a very aggressive pruning a few weeks ago of another mature tree at 26 Glenilla Road.

If the proposed application were to be approved, we would lose 2 1/2 of the 5 mature trees comprising a beautiful historical belt between Belsize Park Gardens and Glenilla Road. At a time of climate emergency, a forward-thinking council would preside over the systematic removal of various historical trees in a conservation area.

The decision is also highly asymmetric. If the application were to be approved and the tree removed it would be the end of it. On the other hand, it is open to you to reject the application and ask for further evidence of the damage, particularly given that the surveyor's report of damage to the building is more than 2 years old as explained in the technical report of Hollins Associates we submitted. The tree is very far away from the property and we believe that robust evidence is needed to link the tree to the damage on the balance of probability. The tree is also very clearly visible from far away in neighbouring streets, which is an important aspect of the visual amenity assessment.

With best wishes

Dr Andrea Coscelli CBE