

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2020/0048/T	Stephen Williams for and on behalf of the Netherhall Neighbourhood Association	09/01/2020 15:33:17	OBJ	<p>Evidence in the submitted Arboricultural report is very flimsy. It simply relies on a separate structural report to say the trees are causing structural damage and notes the building is on Shrinkable London Clay.</p> <p>The trees are in good health and the Arboriculturist report does not contest this. They are both visible from the road and contribute greatly to the Character of the Conservation Area.</p> <p>The Arboriculturist report does note that the trees predate the construction of Mourne House. Indeed they predate the house by a considerable period and would have been mature in the middle of the 20c when Mourne House was built. At the time of construction the location of the two trees should have been noted and foundations designed accordingly to accommodate any root activity.</p> <p>The cracks occur at the junction of the rear single story extension and the taller main building. This indicates that the single storey extension is on separate foundations to the main building which sits on lower foundations at basement level. There appears to be differential movement between the main and the rear extension building. There is no indication of structural damage in the main building. This indicates that there is possibly inadequate foundations for the rear single storey stair building element and detailing did not allow for movement between the two building elements. There appears to be insufficient detailing to accommodate differential movement. Underpinning and/or other structural work may be necessary.</p> <p>The Arboriculturist report states that the crack was noted in September 2019. This does not indicate the crack is recent as the building undertook a major repainting works in the Autumn of 2019 when such cracks would have become apparent. There is no evidence that a structural crack measuring device has been applied to the crack(s) to monitor the extent and character of any movement over a period of time.</p> <p>The Second "Technical" report dated 22 October 2019 by "Crawford Claims Solutions" is incomplete and inconclusive as it requires further investigations before a conclusive report can be submitted. It calls in its recommendations for trial pits and boreholes but these were carried out after the report and are not included in its final conclusions. It also suggests monitoring over a period of up to 12 months. This has not been done to support the application to fell. Therefore the Technical Report does not conclusively support the felling of the two trees.</p> <p>The NNA asks why residents of 15 Maresfield Gardens should be required to fell two trees within their garden, which are of great amenity value both to them and the Community, when at the time of the design and construction of Mourne House these trees existed. The setting out of the building and the structural design should have taken account of the location of the trees and the risks of building so close to the boundary should have been recognised and addressed.</p> <p>The Insurers are seeking to adopt the cheapest solution by felling neighbouring trees rather than undertaking remedial foundation and structural work to address the issue of differential movement within the building.</p> <p>The NNA ask that the felling of the two trees be refused and a TPO be put on both.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2020/0048/T	Jonathan Byatt	09/01/2020 09:13:39	SUPC	Can the owner developer please work with Camden and it's gardening contractors to explore the use of the cut sections of tree trunk from these felled trees. In this way, the trees can be recycled and reused for improving Campden Estates, parks or other areas. These tree trunk segments can be arranged to provide additional play areas for children or to enhance the general environment.5

Total: 12