Roland Grimm 22a Hilltop Rd London NW6 2PY

24 Dec 2016

Dear Sir/Madam,

Planning Application 2016/6670/T Re: Letter from Andy Martin 28.Nov 2016.

Mr. Martin's letter states "we are Consulting Structural Engineers". The company Andy R. Martin & Associates Ltd. consists of one person. His associate membership of the Institute Of Structural Engineers is listed as the most basic qualification of the institute.

Andrew Robin Martin was a director of Peter Kelsey & Associates. According to his signed statement Mr. Martin visited the garden of 6 Gladys Rd in September 2013.

His report states: "Within No 4 Gladys Rd, the mortar has deteriorated where the binder has broken down." The retaining wall in No 4 Gladys Rd is new and 100% perfect.

His report states further "A measured retained height of 175cm" The true retained height is only 150cm.

This single structural report is so obviously inaccurate it cannot be trusted.

In October 2013 Peter Kelsey & Associates produced a works schedule to replace the retaining wall, which on land registry papers appears to stand on land belonging entirely to properties in Gladys Rd.

Peter Kelsey & Associates were dissolved via compulsory strike off in September 2014.

Mr Martin continued trading in Jan 2015 as a single person under the name of Andy R. Martin & Associates Ltd.

In May 2016 Mr.O'Doherty of Robson Walsh LLP signed a party wall agreement with the surveyor for Gladys Rd. making his company the building owner, thus depriving me as a tenant of having to be served with party wall notices by the adjoining owners. In reality the retaining wall sits wholly on land belonging to the Gladys Rd properties, which include covenants that their walls should not exceed 6 ft in height.

Other than hearsay there is no tangible evidence that alternative methods have ever seriously been explored. The foundation width of 1.8 m appears excessive. The

foundation of the rebuilt southern part of the wall, which is literally next to the Sycamore trunk were nowhere near as wide. The flank wall between 4 and 6 Gladys Rd which extends to the Sycamore trunk appears solid.

A tree of this quality and size is a valuable local amenity. Two people who don't even live in Camden and who have no arboriculture qualifications made the decision over 3 years ago to kill the Sycamore, one of them even claiming it was likely to kill somebody by dishonestly stating another tree had previously fallen nearby.

Such unacceptable behaviour cannot be tolerated in a civilised society based on lawful principles.

I also requested mediation. Genesis refused out of hand.

Yours faithfully

Roland Grimm