

Pre-development **Arboricultural Survey**

11, Chapel Lane
Methwold
Norfolk
IP26 4NS

T/F: 01366 727898
e: jives@lineone.net

Site Details: 11, Netherhall Gardens, Hampstead,
London, NW3

Client Details: Michael Scott Associates, Level 2
182, Histon Road, Cambridge, CB4 3JP

Instructions and scope of report:

To survey the above site and adjacent property and assess the impact of the proposed development on surrounding trees and advise on protective measures to safeguard their health and integrity.

Report compiled by: Jonathan Ives BSc. Hons (For.) M. Arbor. A.


Title: Managing Consultant

Date: 26th April 2005

1.0 Introduction, aims and objectives

This report has been compiled on behalf of Michael Scott Associates to assess the general health and amenity value of three trees that lie within and adjacent to the north west corner of the existing property at 11, Netherhall Gardens, Hampstead, NW3. An assessment was made in accordance with B.S. 5837 'Guide to trees in relation to construction' 1991.

The report is concerned with the affect on the trees surveyed of the proposed demolition of the existing property at 11, Netherhall Gardens and construction of a purpose built block of residential units occupying a similar footprint.

2.0 Site description and development proposals

The site covers an area in the region of 1800 m² and contains a large residential property sub-divided into flats. There is a carriage driveway to the front containing mature trees and shrubs and a large sub-divided garden to the rear also containing mature trees and shrubs.

No structural survey of the existing property has been reviewed but observations of the property suggest that it is suffering from moderate to severe structural movement throughout. There was also evidence of damage to the foul drainage system. The new development proposals are for the construction of a detached block of flats which have been designed to blend in with the local architecture whilst retaining all visually important trees within and adjacent to the site. Basement parking is proposed to facilitate off-street parking to residents.

3.0 Survey methodology

The trees surveyed are identified on the plan produced by Michael Scott Associates. Whilst there are a number of trees to the front of the property, this survey is concerned with trees to the rear only. Measurements for heights are estimated to the nearest metre with all other measurements made using conventional devices.

4.0 Key trees for retention

Of the trees surveyed surrounding the proposed development, T1 and T2 make a significant contribution to the amenity of the area even though they are set back from the street. These trees are growing in the rear garden of No. 13 Netherhall Gardens and are on ground approximately 500mm lower than the existing level of No. 11. Both trees are considered to be self sown specimens and have grown up as a pair, thus forming a single crown outline. Design proposals have taken the trees into account by stepping in the north west corner of the development to allow three metres exclusion from the centre of the trees. The cherry, T3, is not significant although as a modest ornamental it will add some interest to users of the site following completion.

5.0 Implications of Development

As previously mentioned, the rear corner of the development has been stepped back to allow 3 metres clearance from the trees T1 and T2. The excavations for basement parking is similarly to be stepped back. Given the nature of the crown spread and growth of T1 and T2, lateral growth to a height of 6 metres requires removal on the south and south east side of the trees. It is recommended that this is taken back to the main stem. The size of branches specified for removal are such that occlusion of cut surfaces should be fairly rapid with no deleterious effect on the health of the trees. The height and remaining crown spread of the trees will be unaltered. T3 will be unaltered by the development with no pruning work required.

6.0 Recommended protective measures for retained trees

Given that the existing property is scheduled for demolition, it is essential that all necessary protective measures are in place beforehand, and that they be left in situ until all works are completed. As the development affects T1 and T2 on one side only, it is considered acceptable that protection on the development side be reduced to 3 metres as prescribed in section 7.5.5 of B.S. 5837, provided that protective fencing is extended in all other directions.

The protective fencing distances outlined in the tree schedule are taken from those guidelines given in table 1 of B.S. 5837. These distances are the extent of protective fencing, within which there should not be any activity including changes in levels. This fencing should take the form of 2.4m exterior grade 20mm ply erected on a scaffold framework for specimens within the 'Green' and 'Blue'

categories with 1.2 metre chestnut paling to be used for any marginal 'Brown' specimens which might be retained.

All areas within the exclusion fencing should be kept free from construction traffic and the storage of all materials. All protective fencing should be in place prior to any ground works. It is recommended that the proposed pruning of T1 and T2 be undertaken prior to demolition works.

7.0 Summary and conclusions

The proposed demolition of the existing property and construction of a purpose built block of at 11, Netherhall Gardens has been reviewed in relation to three trees growing adjacent to the north west corner of the existing property. The design of the new block has taken into account the trees in order that they may be safely retained for the benefit of future users.

The two sycamores growing in the rear of 13, Netherhall Gardens are good specimens which have grown up as a group. Lateral growth to a height of 6 metres requires removal on the south and south east side to accommodate the development but the remaining height and crown outline will be preserved.

Protection of these trees as recommended will ensure their continued health and integrity provided both demolition and construction operations are undertaken with due regard to the exclusion zones and protective fencing.

Tree no.	Species (tag no. if present)	Height (m)	D.b.h. (cm)	Crown spread (m) N/S/E/W	Maturity	Condition and Comments	Retention Category	BS 5837 Exclusion Zone (m)*
1	Sycamore	11	40	5/5/5/3	Mature	Good overall condition with no significant defects or pruning wounds. Damage to stem on NW side now well occluded. Minor deadwood to remove.	Blue	3 metres on south side. 6 metres on remaining sides.
2	Sycamore	9	35	3/5/2/4	Mature	Good overall condition with no significant defects or pruning wounds. Minor deadwood to remove.	Blue	3 metres on south side. 6 metres on remaining sides.
3	Flowering Cherry	4	20	2/4/2/3	Mature	Fair condition but suppressed by T2. Not a significant specimen.	Brown	3 metres all round.

* Based on development on one side only as per Section 7.5.5 BS 5837.

Key to terms in tree schedule.

Tree No. - As referred to on plans.

Species – common or local name.

Height (m) – height estimated to nearest metre.

DBH (cm) – diameter of stem(s) at 1.5 metres above ground, unless otherwise stated.

Crown spread (m) N/S/E/W – lateral extent of branches as measured from trunk.

Age – relative to species.

Y: Young, newly established.

E-M: Early mature, less than 1/3rd anticipated life expectancy.

M: Mature, between 1/3rd and 2/3rds anticipated life expectancy.

O-M: Over-mature, in excess of 2/3rds anticipated life expectancy.

Condition – visually assessed health and vigour of tree at time of inspection.

Comments – Other material factors relating to the tree and its environment.

Retention Category – a relative measure of health and contribution to visual amenity. This is the evaluation used in BS 5837

Green = trees whose retention is most desirable, high category.

Blue = trees whose retention is desirable, moderate category.

Brown = trees which could be retained, low category.

Red = remove - dead, dying or dangerous.

BS 5837 Exclusion Zone (m) – recommended minimum distance for protective fencing. This is measured in metres from centre of tree.

11, Netherhall Gardens, NW3

APPENDIX

Joining boundary

T3

T2

T1

T1 C/S 5/6/5/3

T2 C/S 3/5/2/4

T3 C/S

Now retained

Sycamore tree 200mm girth
8-9M high to be removed,
tree damaged in storms of 1987.

T3 Flaming cherry
5m
Ø20

T2
1.2
9.250

T1
1.2
4.00

Fair - minor dieback
G.P. not + dead

CL to C? at entry
Fence deadwood

T1 damage to skin @
base - 2m, now occluded
Self soon not subject
to previous management
Size 25+

T3 Suppressed by T1
Fair
Size 10+

2 No apple trees, 100mm
girth, 5-6M high 2500mm
spread to be removed

Garden for Flat 4

1 girth
n spread

1800mm post &
rail close boarded
fencing

150mm girth 8m high
2500mm spread to be removed

Access to rear garden

11 NETHERHALL GARDENS, HAMPSTEAD LONDON

Notes of meeting 14th March 2005 at Camden Council Planning Department

Present

Mr D C Blayney MRICS – Senior Partner, Michael Scott Associates
Ms Clare Taylor – Development Control Officer, Camden Planning Department.
Ms Joanna Ecclestone – Senior Design & Conservation Officer, Camden Planning Department.
Mr Rob Farnsworth Senior Planner, Camden Planning Department.
Mr Louis Gavriel – Senior Planner, Affordable Housing, Camden Planning Department.
Mr Michael Williamson – Client 11 Netherhall Gardens Management Company
Mr Ian McDonald – Client 11 Netherhall Gardens Management Company

Introduction

The meeting began with a resume on current situation. The Planning Application had been withdrawn pending further information and revised details required on design. The previous meeting had been summarised in a letter to Ms Taylor on the 10th February 2005 and revised drawings had been forwarded which are commented upon below:

Revised Design

- Allowance had now been made for the two adjoining trees which are situated over the boundary to No13. 4.0M exclusion zone provided. The basement had been re-designed accordingly. CT requires a report on the canopy spread affecting the building in this location by an arborcultural consultant. This would mean losing areas of floor space to Flat 4 (Kate Crisp), Flat 8 (Miss Schurmann), Flat 12 (Mr Georgalis) and Flat 14 (Third floor). DCB stated this would affect the design and reduce the value slightly of the flats in this location. Report to be provided to Mr Kevin Fisher (Camden's Landscape Architect) and to be submitted with the Planning Application. Report has to be carried out before any re-design undertaken. Method statements would be provided on any foundation works as a condition to Planning Permission.
(No 13's Managing Agents are George Ellis & Co)
- DCB stated 2 additional disabled parking spaces provided in basement. CT to confirm if double parked disabled bays were acceptable but any revisions would be minor in nature.
- JE confirmed the front elevation was improved removing squashed appearance and North Elevation had also improved visually. JE was also concerned about the general appearance and robustness of detailing for the Conservation Area. DCB confirmed that a section detail would be provided through the front elevation. DCB also agreed that general detailing to the gutters, brickwork features, windows, bargeboards including other important areas such as the entrance porch would be dealt with by imposing conditions on any planning permission which was a normal procedure with this type of project. (Including choice of bricks, roof tiles etc.)
- JE confirmed as part of PPG 15 and for buildings that make a positive contribution to the Conservation Area detailed costings would be required on

the refurbishment of the building to confirm it was uneconomic to repair. DCB confirmed this would be submitted with the revised Planning Application.

- CT asked for the existing building to No 9 to be superimposed onto the south elevation of the new building. DCB confirmed this would be submitted with the revised Planning Application. CT confirmed that the Planning Committee sat every three weeks at Camden Town Hall and this application would be a major works scheme and referred to the ODPM and the usual 8 week consultation period before a decision is extended to 13 weeks.
- DCB confirmed he had copies of all objections to the previous scheme including a letter from Network rail on the underground railway out of St Pancras. This would be passed on to the structural engineering consultant in due course to meet the stringent conditions relating to underground.
- MW reiterated that the Management Company were not developers and through no fault of their own had watched the building deteriorate and simply wished to carry on living in the area. The cost of renovating the building had proved excessive and the reason for building the additional flats were to fund the work. The flats were not mortgageable in their present state and redevelopment was the only viable option. MW understood the planning process did not take any personal factors into consideration and that each scheme was judged on its own merits but funds were not available to spend the money required to bring the property up to a habitable standard and the flats were very dilapidated and not fit to live in.
- RF confirmed that the committee members would need to be reassured that the application for 14 flats was not to avoid the affordable housing policy of Camden's UDP. There was a 1500M2 rule which meant that calculations had to be produced to confirm that the scheme did not produce a profit of more than 15%. DCB thought the previous scheme RF had mentioned was 20%. DCB confirmed that the Flats were 1587M2 excluding basement parking and common areas (*although this figure would be revised downwards slightly with the alterations to Flat 13 where the balcony had now been recessed into the roof slope to avoid overlooking of No 9 Netherhall Gardens.*) DCB had designed the new building to maximise the use of the site and had not specifically designed the scheme to avoid building 15 flats. The shape of the site with a central staircase and lift fits four flats on each storey. By adding an extra storey and using the roof space this worked out at 14 flats. There was no more room with present site constraints to build any further flats. Additionally The UDP required more family accommodation and by adjusting the layout on each floor three and four bedroomed accommodation was introduced. (as 1 bedroomed accommodation was required for some of the existing occupants) The general area suited larger flat accommodation and the introduction of four extra flats to the street would have no harmful affect on adjoining residents compared with other more intensive uses.
- RF introduced LG to the meeting who was more familiar with the toolkit calculation method. LG confirmed that an Estate Agent valuation of the flats in their present condition would be required and would run the three dragons toolkit test. He would also need the value of the flats when the development was completed and the build cost. RF also confirmed that a normal residual valuation for the project would also be acceptable as LG mentioned the toolkit test was a little over complicated for this case. DCB would liase with MW on appointing a local estate agent in order to supply the necessary information

that was to be supplied to the other surveyor's that were due to carry out the toolkit test. *(as well as normal professional fees to add to the build cost DCB would also contact Corus Interface Management to assess the monitoring and engineering checks and costs likely in relation to the Underground Network Infrastructure).*

- CT passed on revised Education Contributions that were updated on a yearly basis. The question arose on determining the number of Flats to be subject to this charge as only 4-5 Flats were to be sold on the open market. CT agreed to liase with other senior members of the Planning Department regarding this issue.

(subsequent to the meeting CT confirmed that no education contributions would be required in this scheme as contributions only applied where 5 or more additional dwellings were being created)

- CT confirmed that S106 agreements were required for the Highways Contribution and Education Contribution. CT agreed to liase with her legal team to determine when payment was required.

- *Circulation- All present including 4 other members of Management Company ,solicitor acting for management company & File*