

03 March 2017

Our Ref: 5957.002
Your Ref: 2015/3793/P

Michael Bennetto is dealing with this matter
Direct Dial: **01858 383 123**
email: Michael Bennetto@tep.uk.com

Regeneration and Planning
Development Management
London Borough of Camden Town Hall
Judd Street
London
WC1H 9JE

For the Attention of: Ian Gracie

Dear Sir

RE: ARBORICULTURAL SURVEY AND REPORTING AT 63 GOLDHURST TERRACE

Retention of T1:

A small damson tree (Ref: Tree T1) has not been felled as was specified in the Arboricultural Report (Ref: 5957.001) that was submitted in support of planning application 2015/3793/P. In making the application, arboricultural advice was sought only after construction had been completed, wherein the tree had been retained. The application documents (including the Arboricultural Report) proposed removal of the tree because it could not be retained in accordance with BS5837:2012 and the possibility of damage sustained during construction meant that no guarantee of continued good health and condition could be given.

In the event, the tree has been retained because it currently provides screening from the neighbours. Since construction, the tree has continued to produce fruit which may indicate a limited impact on the rooting structure. Given the small size of the tree and private location, our client is willing to accept any risk associated with potential future decline of the tree arising from construction related impact.

The arboricultural report proposed a replacement tree. A new tree, of good size, form and condition will be planted as specified in the arboricultural report regardless of the ultimate retention or removal of T1. The new tree will be either *Magnolia Susan* or *Prunus domestica Hauszwetsche* (8-10cm girth).



Harborough
Innovation Centre,
Airfield Business Park,
Leicester Road,
Market Harborough,
Leicestershire
LE16 7WB

T: 01858 383120
E: mh@tep.uk.com
W: www.tep.uk.com

Other offices
Warrington
Gateshead
London
Cornwall



Directors
Ian Grimshaw
BA(Hons) MA(LM) MSc CMLI MRTPI

Francis Hesketh
BSc(Hons) CMLI MICFor CEnv MIEEM

Cath Neve
BSc(Hons) MA(LM) CMLI

TEP is the trading name of The
Environment Partnership (TEP) Limited.
Company No: 7745159

Tree Protection for T2 and T3:

Tree protection fencing was not installed as specified by the report 5957.001. The tree survey on which this letter is based was retrospective to construction as detailed in the enforcement notice. The survey was undertaken on August 15th 2016 by a qualified arboricultural consultant. All trees were inspected for signs of damage and general observations of the current growing context were made. The inspection was undertaken approximately four months (March 2016) after the halt on construction activities.

The type of damage to unprotected trees most likely to have occurred during construction would be to the soil structure and roots due to storage of tools and materials. It was observed that above ground parts of the trees have not sustained damage. It is also noted that access to the rear of the property is highly constrained, making it less likely that any significant movement of materials or plant would have occurred in this area.

Evidence of direct (construction) or indirect (site storage) damage to trees that could have developed within the four months since the halt on construction would be expected to include: broken ground, depressions in the lawn, dead grass, bark damage, broken branches, localised dieback, retained leaves, stem bleeding, reduced vigour, small leaf size, reduced extension growth, epicormics or other signs of physiological stress.

If damage had occurred, symptoms would be expected to be showing by now. No evidence of construction or storage within the RPA were observed and no symptoms indicative of damage were observed. The client has confirmed separately that site storage was at the front of the property and no construction activities were undertaken within the proximity of the RPAs of T2 and T3.

On the basis of the above observations, I conclude that damage to trees T2 and T3 has not occurred, despite a lack of tree protection. Damage to T1 cannot be ruled out. However, this tree was approved for removal and any risk associated with its retention can be managed. The applicant will plant a new tree as per the approved plans. Therefore I do not consider that further arboricultural mitigation, compensation or remedial measures should be required.

Yours faithfully

Michael Bennetto
Arboricultural Consultant
TEP