



Roland Grimm
22 A Hilltop Rd
London NW6 2PY

Dear Mr. Remmington

Re: Application 2016/6670/T

During the past two days contractors have disassembled a large section of the leaning non retaining section of the wall next to the sycamore. I witnessed them taking it apart brick by brick, by hand, without even a hammer or any force being required, simply separating the bricks from each other.

This observation casts further doubts on the accuracy and reliability of Genesis' engineer's report. Genesis' report alleges the cause for failure of the wall to be 60% loss of mortar adhesion and 40 % "vegetation" (NOT EVEN SPECIFICALLY THE TREE !)

During the 2013 replacement of the original boundary wall between 22 and 20 Hilltop Rd, albeit with slightly less retained level, Genesis' surveyors had inaccurately alleged that the collapse had been caused "entirely" by roots from several adjacent trees in the garden of No 20. Evidence that this was complete nonsense can be seen in the attached photo of that wall's new foundation trench.

As was the case there, loss of mortar adhesion is close to 100% responsible for the deterioration of load capacity of the Gladys Rd wall, far greater than the 60% attributed by Genesis.

The wall between 20 and 22 had no foundation whatsoever.

If this common Victorian practice turns out to be the case when the contractors get to the bottom of the wall in the garden of 8 Gladys Road it would seem even more absurd to blame the Sycamore for the failure of any portion of this retaining wall.

At the very least any roots which might be in the way of foundations for a new wall should be revealed to investigate professionally if and how they can best be bridged without harming the tree and allowing room for future growth.

In light of the above and the overwhelming support for the amenity value of the tree

Genesis' application has little, if any merit.

Yours faithfully

Roland Grimm





Ranjan Fisher
22B Hilltop Road
London NW6 2PY

Planning Application No 2016/56670T

Re: Structural Engineers Report 12. September 2013 (Andrew R Martin

The structural engineers report, submitted as supporting documentation did not identify the tree as requiring removal, in fact it was the neglect of the wall that was at fault.

Sincerely Yours

R.Fisher