

<b>Delegated Report</b>		<b>Analysis sheet</b>		<b>Expiry Date:</b>		30/03/2007	
		N/A / attached		<b>Consultation Expiry Date:</b>			
<b>Officer</b>				<b>Application Number(s)</b>			
Kevin Fisher				2007/0466/P			
<b>Application Address</b>				<b>Drawing Numbers</b>			
William Gunn House Royal Free Hospital Lawn Road London NW3 2XA				Refer to decision notice			
<b>PO 3/4</b>	<b>Area Team Signature</b>	<b>C&amp;UD</b>	<b>Authorised Officer Signature</b>				
<b>Proposal(s)</b>							
Submission of details of tree protection measures pursuant condition 4 of the planning permission dated 06/03/06 (2005/5272/P) for Demolition of existing staff accommodation buildings and redevelopment of the site to provide 141 key worker flats (53 x studios, 78 x 1-bed and 10 x 2-bed units) in a part 6, part 8 and part 9 storey building.							
<b>Recommendation(s):</b>		<b>Refuse details</b>					
<b>Application Type:</b>		<b>Approval of Details</b>					
<b>Conditions or Reasons for Refusal:</b>		<b>Refer to Draft Decision Notice</b>					
<b>Informatives:</b>							
<b>Consultations</b>							
<b>Adjoining Occupiers:</b>	No. notified	<b>00</b>	No. of responses	<b>00</b>	No. of objections	<b>00</b>	
			No. electronic	<b>00</b>			
<b>Summary of consultation responses:</b>	<b>No SN/PN</b>						
<b>CAAC/Local groups* comments:</b> *Please Specify	<b>None</b>						

### Site Description

The existing William Gunn House is a collective name for a series of four storey buildings within the site of the Royal Free Hospital. These buildings provide 71 single occupancy flats in hostel style accommodation.

The site is not in a Conservation area.

### Relevant History

06/03/06 Planning permission was granted for the demolition of existing staff accommodation buildings and redevelopment of the site to provide 141 key worker flats in a part 6, part 8 and part 9 storey building.

### Relevant policies

N8 Ancient Woodlands and Trees

## Assessment

The Method Statement provided is considered to be unsatisfactory on the grounds that it is proposed that chestnut pale fencing is used to protect the trees and the position that it is shown does not conform with the standards set out in BS 5837: Trees in relation to construction:2005. Chestnut pale fencing is not considered to be fit for the purpose of excluding construction activity within the root protection zone of the trees to be protected. The position of the fence does not protect the required root protection zone of the trees. This area would extend to the kerb line of the road way. Site accommodation cabins are shown within the root protection zones of the trees. In theory this would be acceptable on the grounds that the cabins are raised and supported on pads therefore limiting the ground affected by the cabins. However no details were provided about the means of delivery of these cabins on to the site therefore no assessment can be made that compaction did not occur as the result of delivery.

During my site visit on 20/02/07 I found that the unprotected area outside of the fencing had been used for the storage of materials. These materials will have caused compaction within this area and as a result damage to the trees in question.

On the same day I contacted the project architect (Roger Day) to request that the materials be moved from the area and that a programme of decompaction and mycorrhizal inoculation of the soil be implemented following the removal of materials. During our conversation Mr Day stated that this area was needed for site storage due to the limited space available on the site. I suggested that this may be possible if some form of platform structure was built based on the same principles of point loading used for the positioning of the accommodation cabins. Mr Day agreed to develop these proposals in a revised submission.

On 28/03/07 a revised Method Statement and tree protection plan was submitted. The chestnut pale fencing has been changed to Heras fencing to conform to the guidelines set out in BS:5837:2005. However it has not been moved out to the kerb line. Instead the area between the line of fencing (on the same line as the originally proposed) is shown as filled with zig zag fencing attached to posts. The reason given by Mr Day is that due to the intensive use of the roadway the open area is required to provide a refuge for those needing to step off the road to avoid vehicles. However this proposal is considered to be unsatisfactory as the tape is considered to lack robustness and is an insufficient deterrent to incidental storage etc. No provision has been made for the decompaction and mycorrhizal inoculation programme. When questioned about this Mr Day said that they would consider carrying out the programme at the end of the contract if the trees showed signs of stress. When I explained that damage by decompaction will have occurred and that it would only be adding to the stress on these trees by failing to carry out the appropriate remedy now Mr Day said this was an unreasonable cost to be passing onto the contractor at this stage.

It is recommended here that the current submission for the approval of details be refused and that enforcement action be taken to get the fencing brought out to the kerb line and a programme of decompaction and mycorrhizal inoculation carried out as a means of protecting the future health and vitality of these trees..

### **Disclaimer**

*This is an internet copy for information purposes. If you require a copy of the signed original please contact the Culture and Environment Department on (020) 7974 5613*