| Application No: | Consultees Name: | Received: | Comment: | Response: |
|-----------------|-------------------------|---------------------|----------|--|
| 2022/5357/T | David Curtin | 08/12/2022 11:36:32 | OBJ | To the extent that it relates to felling two trees to the ground, I strongly object to this application. The trees in South Hampstead contribute importantly to the unique nature of the neighbourhood. Each tree we lose in the front gardens of the houses detracts permanently from the environment and ambience of this area. The application is inconsistent, in its comments about these trees. On one hand, it claims that the trees are somehow diseased, and yet, if you look at the application, it checks the box ¿no¿ when asked whether the trees are diseased. On its face, therefore, the application does not seem to state a valid reason for selling these trees. As an aside, I would ask why the name of the owner of the property has been redacted. I don¿t believe that you redact the names of people who make comments. Why the difference in approach? |
| 2022/5357/T | David Curtin | 08/12/2022 11:36:35 | OBJ | To the extent that it relates to felling two trees to the ground, I strongly object to this application. The trees in South Hampstead contribute importantly to the unique nature of the neighbourhood. Each tree we lose in the front gardens of the houses detracts permanently from the environment and ambience of this area. The application is inconsistent, in its comments about these trees. On one hand, it claims that the trees are somehow diseased, and yet, if you look at the application, it checks the box ¿no¿ when asked whether the trees are diseased. On its face, therefore, the application does not seem to state a valid reason for selling these trees. As an aside, I would ask why the name of the owner of the property has been redacted. I don¿t believe that you redact the names of people who make comments. Why the difference in approach? |

Printed on: 09/12/2022

09:10:09

Total: 5