

160 Camden Road
London NW1 9HJ

27 November 2017

Tree Section
Town Hall Extension
Argyle Street
WC21H 8ND

Dear Tree Team

Reference 27/6193/T: 160 Camden Road

I am writing to you as the resident and freeholder of 160 Camden Road and object in the strongest terms to the felling of the tree

I should point out that

1. Two years ago we were in discussion with the owner of 9 Camden Mews through his lawyer and structural engineer about the felling of the tree. At the time I commissioned Nick Maclean, an eminent structural engineer with considerable experience of trees and subsidence, to look into the claim. His report convincingly dismissed the claim that the plum tree was the cause of the subsidence. We received no response from either the lawyer or their structural engineer to Mr Mclean's report which suggested, not unreasonably, their agreement with Mr Maclean's assessment
2. What I find astonishing is that MWA Arboriculture either ignored or were not shown details of Nick Maclean's assessment.
3. The latest report by MWA Arboriculture Ltd provides no fresh evidence to suggest that the plum tree in my garden has any bearing on the alleged subsidence at 9 Camden Mews. No link is established between the seasonal movement and the presence of the plum tree T1. The author's recommendation is both speculative and entirely based on the original flawed and discredited investigation of October 2012 to which Nick Maclean refers in his email of 9 July 2015 to Ms Taseen.(See attached)
4. It is also worth noting that the rear second floor of 9 Camden Mews was constructed in the 1970s and is not part of the original 19th-century building as suggested in the MWA report. The plum tree in question is older than the second floor extension which was built without any strengthening of the foundations to take into account either increased load or the possible presence of tree roots.

5. There is no evidence to support the claim that the plum tree is the cause of the alleged subsidence at 9 Camden Mews and I urge you to reject this application.

Yours sincerely

David

David Blagbrough

CC Simon Burbidge
Councillor Angela Mason

9 Camden Mews TAZT-AC1605-0940988
From Nick Maclean [nick@ecosmaclean.co.uk]

Thu 09/07/2015 08:28
ttaseen@dacbeachcroft.com

cc David Blagbrough; claims@gabrobins.co.uk

E-mail to Ms Taseen

Dear Ms Taseen,

Attached is my appraisal of the flawed investigation that was carried out at the above, specifically that the wall to the north that is the one that has moved most significantly, was not subject to a trial pit and root investigation, and had more significant trees within 'influencing distance' as surveyor's and loss adjustors put it.

I will forward to you next my detailed response Gab Robins last March and to which I had no response.

Suffice it to say that in 1978 I was a founder member of Ove Arup & Partners specialist group, set up to investigate its many substantial clients building problems and prepare expert reports. I have continued in such work since and so consider that I have above average experience of investigating building movement and determining precisely the causes.

To summarise, here, in my firm opinion, the solid north wall (no windows) has moved downwards resulting in a near vertical crack, floor to ceiling, about 4m towards the front, probably the result tree root desiccation from nearby trees passing under the adjoining patio, which porous surface would allow rainwater in but hinder surface evaporation, ie good growth conditions. The west wall has a window in it (a discontinuity, tear along dotted line), near to the north corner, and the transfer of weight from the north wall to the west wall has led to the diagonal crack under the near corner of the window, but mainly just under the window.

The more significant/substantial trees are nearer to the north wall, most obvious and significant vertical movement and patio, where no investigation has been carried out.

The weather is dry and this investigation should have been carried out some time ago.

I have seen the internal crack damage and, again in my opinion, there is no question in my mind that this amounts to minor decorative damage (see standard table of assessment of cracks and categories of damage), and is not such that the property cannot be let. The monitored movement is also such that decorative repairs could have been carried out to mitigate the visual effect.

Regards

Nick Maclean
Director & Principal Engineer
Ecos Maclean Ltd.
Engineering – materials, energy, structure
8A Chamberlain Street
London NW1 8XB

Tel: 020 7722 7525
Mobile: 07850 826245
Web: www.ecosmaclean.co.uk