

**From:** kim guignabaudet

**Sent:** 31 March 2022 12:04

**To:** Planning; Nick Bell; Tom Little

**Subject:** Objections to Planning Applications 2022/0719/T and 2022/0721/T  
Application for Works to Trees covered by a TPO

---

Objections to Planning Applications 2022/0719/T and 2022/0721/T  
Application for Works to Trees covered by a TPO

References:

Flat Garden Floor 25 Nassington Road London NW3 2TX

REAR GARDEN: 1 x Ash (T1) - Re-pollard to previous points to keep at a size suitable for location.

Application number: 2022/0719/T

Application type: Application for Works to Tree(s) covered by a TPO

27 Nassington Road London NW3 2TX

REAR GARDEN: 1 x Oak (T2) - Remove 2 branches to allow more light into pond.

Application number: 2022/0721/T

Application type: Application for Works to Tree(s) covered by a TPO

To

Attention Tree Officer

Dear Sir / Madam,

I would like to object to the planning applications aimed at reducing these Protected Trees situated in a Conservation Area.

As a teenager I was overlooking beautiful gardens with many trees. It was all leafy and green. Why such gardens have been allowed to shrink and lose so much greenery and trees ? It is like going backwards rather than progressing at a time when there is a far greater conscience about the importance of trees. Environmental preoccupations are becoming high on the

agenda and I can only assume that yourselves and our Councillors would fight to have a “green” Camden.

I have read with great hope what was written in one of your earlier decisions in 2017 about these Gardens which need your protection. I hope that you will carry on upholding such principles as for example formulated below:

*Undertaking works to in order to reduce shade/increase light to other plants is not considered a valid reason to fell or prune a TPO tree. The impact of protected trees on the biodiversity value of the comparatively recent pond is not considered to have significant weight in this decision, particularly as the trees were retained and protected as a condition of the planning consent to construct the pond. The cumulative impact of almost annual small-scale pruning applications is beginning to become detrimental to the visual amenity that the trees provide, and in addition the apparent, repeated instances of pruning to a greater extent than that consented does not give the council confidence that the care and maintenance of the trees is a primary consideration. The works are therefore considered unnecessary, unjustified and harmful to the health and amenity value of the trees. The application has been refused to protect the visual amenity the trees provide and to preserve the character of this part of the conservation area.*

I thank you in anticipation for your attention.

Kim Guignabaudet

=====