

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2020/4281/T	Stephen Williams for and on behalf of the Netherhall Neighbourhood Association	11/10/2020 13:45:47	OBJ	<p>This application adds no meaningful additional evidence to that submitted with the recent application made by the same Applicant to fell the Oak and Beech in the property at 15 Maresfield Gardens. This earlier application by the same Insurer at Mourne House, 11/13 Maresfield Gardens was refused by Camden. With inadequate evidence, there is therefore no reason to approve the felling of the Oak and the application should again be rejected.</p> <p>The importance of this healthy mature Oak to the Conservation Area has been established by the Tree Preservation Order which Camden have now applied to this valuable tree visible from the road.</p> <p>Evidence in the submitted Arboricultural Report remains very flimsy. It states that the Oak and Beech are “potentially implicated”.</p> <p>Similarly, no meaningful additional structural evidence has been submitted in support of the application.</p> <p>The arguments the Netherhall Neighbourhood Association (NNA) made to the previous application to fell the Oak and Beech at 15MG remain and we ask that these objections again be taken into account.</p> <p>The Oak is of considerable age and would have been mature at the date of construction of Mourne House. There would be no alteration to the degree of water absorption made by these trees in the years following the construction of Mourne House and any differential movement cannot be assigned to the trees but questions the adequacy of the original foundations, structure and design to deal with differential movement between two elements of the building on different foundations as seen here at 11/13 Mourne House.</p> <p>At the time of construction, the location of the two mature trees should have been noted and foundations designed accordingly to accommodate any root activity. The cracks occur at the junction of the rear small single storey extension and the larger, taller and deeper 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 smaller rear extension building. There is no indication of significant structural damage in the main building. This indicates that there are possibly inadequate foundations for the rear single storey stair building element and the original 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. It seems clear from the documents submitted that the applicant is seeking to mitigate his costs by incorrectly apportioning blame to the tree roots rather than addressing the need to undertake underpinning, and/or introduce adequate measures in the structure to address the rigid connection of two structural elements on differing foundations.</p> <p>It should be noted that monitoring has taken place over a period of 6 months and not 12 months as is recommended. Furthermore, there is no reference to the extremes of weather conditions experienced over the 6 months, where we encountered a long period of wet weather followed by a long period of hot dry conditions. This will undoubtedly have an effect on any readings.</p> <p>The structural report simply refers to the “high plasticity” of the soil but does not carry out the necessary thorough analysis of the ground conditions in the area. There has in recent history been considerable major structural work at new major developments along Finchley Road below Mourne House. The strata in our area of Hampstead comprises of layers of silt and friable clay giving a real risk of ground slippage especially on</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
				<p>steeply sloping land, as these buildings are, sitting as they do on higher ground running down to Finchley Road below. There is also a risk of disturbance from large nearby developments involving basement work as has recently occurred below in Finchley Road. Information is available but has not been addressed in any submitted document.</p> <p>The possibility of subsidence caused by ground heave is dismissed without addressing the possibility. There is a real danger that the 19C property at 15 Maresfield Gardens will be affected by the removal of the Oak, which have happily coexisted over the past 150 years. This is not addressed.</p> <p>The Application makes no reference to the recent approval to prune the Oak and Beech and its possible beneficial effect. It would appear, the Applicant simply wishes to go for the “nuclear” option of felling in the unproven hope that it will solve his problem and avoid the necessary structural work required to his property and risk structural movement to his neighbour’s property through ground heave.</p> <p>The NNA therefore urge you to refuse the application to fell.</p>
2020/4281/T	Linda Cooper	11/10/2020 13:37:15	OBJ	<p>The oak tree in question is a healthy 200-year-old tree that can be seen from the street and contributes significantly to the local amenity, making Maresfield Gardens a green and pleasant environment. It is widely acknowledged that mature trees play a part in air quality, in maintaining wildlife, and also in stabilising the ground in hilly areas such as this one.</p> <p>Although the oak is growing on the boundary between the two properties (11-13 Maresfield Gdns and 15 Maresfield Gdns), it has caused no visible damage at all to the brick wall immediately adjacent to it. Yet the applicants suggest that the tree is causing subsidence of a structure several metres further away. To fell this magnificent oak would be an irreversible measure that should only be contemplated if there is cast-iron proof that it is responsible for subsidence.</p>
2020/4281/T	Thomas Welsford	12/10/2020 09:40:11	OBJ	<p>I write to register my objection to the proposal to fell an oak in the back garden of 15 Maresfield Gardens. I am a resident of Mourne House, 11-13 Maresfield Gardens, and the two oaks located in the property next door are intrinsic to the character of the neighbourhood and the amenity of living here. They are both ancient trees, long predating the construction of Mourne House, and they serve an invaluable role in helping muffle the sound of traffic on Finchley Road; they also help sustain a flourishing local ecology, including what sounds like a family of tawny owls (one hears them hooting at night), which in the case of one or other tree's being felled would be deprived of valuable habitat. I furthermore struggle to understand exactly what will be gained by felling the tree: it is suggested that the tree is responsible for subsidence, and that felling it will remedy this problem - but the fact that the dividing wall between 11/13 and 15 Maresfield Gardens, located right by the two oaks, presently shows no sign of buckling or stress would seem to challenge this argument. Until it can be *conclusively* demonstrated that 1) the tree in question is indeed causing damage, and, if so, 2) there is no non-destructive way of mitigating the problem, there should be a presumption in favour of leaving it in place.</p> <p>If you require any further information, please do not hesitate to get in touch.</p>