TREETEC
Scorrier Redruth Cornwall TR16 5AT
Telephone 01209 821186

2020/5974/P. 5b Prince Arthur Road. Hampstead. NW3 6AX

Addendum to Tree Surveys. July 2021.

Consultees comments re Trees:

A tree protection plan has been submitted but it does not show the proposed footprint in relation to the tree. It not clear to what degree the basement footprint encroaches on the root protection area of the high quality copper beech in the rear garden. Can you please provide this?

Street Trees:
The arboricultural report has not covered the impact of the basement development or crossover on the alder (T6), which they have awarded an A category. This needs to be rectified considering the close distance of the tree to the development and that a lot of the roots from the tree will be in the footway and front garden of 5b.

The position of the crossover is too close to the alder and will result in root loss that could either destabilise the tree or impact its health. No consideration has been given for future growth, which over 40 years could see the trunk expand to a point where it impacts the safe use of the cross over. Furthermore, if the tree is put under stress by the development it could trigger epicormic growth, shoots sprouting from the base of the tree, which would further reduce visibility and hinder pedestrian usage of the footway.

Highways:

Concerned about the potential damage to the tree and its roots from the new crossover, but also the impact of any future growth of the of the stem and its impact on driver visibility. It would also put the tree at high risk of impact from any vehicle entering or exiting the proposed crossover. This is also covered in the response from the street trees team.

As noted above, the principle concern is with regard to the proposed location of the new crossover. Whilst this is given a brief mention in the aboricultural report, no consideration has been given to the impact of the tree on a driver's visibility, or the high risk of damage to both the tree and the vehicle when entering or exiting the proposed

crossover and driveway. This issue needs to be addressed via a road safety audit before the application is determined.

The proposed crossover would pass over a cable TV manhole cover and part of a BT manhole cover. The applicant should contact both companies to assess whether their equipment would need to relocated and what the cost of this might be.

Please provide the requested information.

From an arboricultural perspective I would not recommend moving the crossover, and suggest the applicant demonstrates the impact of the basement on the street tree. - We are ignoring this for now, as we think there is a viable option there open to us, as drawn.

Please refer to the TR studios new site layout plan GA-000- site plan rev C **(REVC)** dated 9.06.21.

This shows the ground floor and landscape.

Rear garden.

REVC shows the normative root protection area **(RPA)** of the Copper Beech T1 as a dashed circle.

It shows the outer piling line of the proposed basement drawn as a dashed line.
The submitted arboricultural method statement **(AMS)** states that the basement will be constructed using sheet piles as the outer former. Because sheet piling can be carried out from within the building footprint the tree protection fence can be as close as 0.5 metres from the piling line. The position of a suitable tree protection fence is shown on the submitted tree protection plan. **(TPP).**

In the rear garden REVC shows the air source heat pump and associated garden building to the rear of the house. The AMS states how the new garden building will be built on a suspended slab.
The AMS states how the ingress into the RPA of the Beech will be mitigated by returning areas of rain shadow in the rear garden back into permeable areas and how the not unsubstantial depth of soil will be enhanced by rhizomatous tall fescue.
The AMS describes how this work will be done first in order that the Beech can benefit from its new environment prior to the ingress into the distal part of its RPA.
The AMS states how new paving here will be set on sand and not concrete.

Basement front elevation.

REVC shows the basement footprint in relation to the street Alder, T6.
Spot levels as shown on the TPP show that the retaining wall forming the boundary with the pavement is over 1 metre high. Again the spot levels show that the retaining wall which forms the boundary with the house to the west is the best part of 2 metres high. These walls must be founded at depth and into the layer of heavy clay - they do represent at least a partial root barrier. The existing drive levels when compared to the pavement level and to drive level of the house to the west indicates that ground at number 5b is made up. The AMS describes how the retaining wall foundations and lower courses will be left in situ – this prevents any roots running parallel to them being disturbed. Roots are opportunistic and always go on the line of least resistance – they do battle through heavy clay if there is something at the end for them but more often than not they exploit areas (in towns) in which the ground has been fragmented historically. Please see below for a view as to the most likely place for roots to be proliferating.
It is most unlikely that the Alder has roots within the curtilage of number 5b which are essential to its normal functioning and therefore the basement excavations will not have a significant impact upon it.

New crossover.

Most importantly REVC shows that new vehicle crossover has been shifted to the east to move it circa 1.5 metres away from the base of the Alder. This should be now compared to the drive of the house to the west which is a similar distance from the Alder. It is not known to date that there is any visibility issue with the neighbours existing drive.
In any case there will be cars parked kerbside and any car emerging will still have to look around kerbside cars which of course means that they will already be past any present or future tree stem. There are hundreds if not thousands of drives very close to street trees in London and these are not known to be a major road safety issue.

The Borough have quite rightly pointed out the cable television & BT service covers. The REVC driveway excludes the TV and places the BT cover more or less in the middle of the crossover. These service covers work to the benefit of the Alder.
I am presuming the tree post dates TV & undergrounded telecoms which were installed say late 1980s?
It is my experience of street Alders that they are the epitome of water, carbon dioxide and sunlight standing up. They also fix atmospheric nitrogen. They are evolved to live in both drought and flood.
This Alder has already lifted the kerbs closest to it and has also lifted highway tarmac. The Boroughs point of epicormics is noted - street tree teams must be used to annual pruning of common Lime epicormics and would of course know manage them.

However if the submitted method is adhered to any stress to the tree will be absolutely avoided.

The telecoms and TV cable will be in ducts and at a depth greater than the usual anthropogenic material overlying clay. The ducts will be back filled with pea gravel which of course represents an easy and very long highway for roots. If roots over 20mm in diameter running in the gravel parallel to the ducts remain undamaged the Alder will not become stressed.
Knowledge of this ducting will enable the site appointed arboriculturalist to pick the very best point to start when locating roots.

There has been a detailed submitted method (especially wrapping roots in wool felt) for the crossover however in reality the existing kerbs are only 10 cm high and the cross over may be simply a question of planing down the existing kerbs and simple alteration of the closest slabs. The concrete BT cover could be swapped for a ductile one.
The Alder will remain in good health and continue to be a public asset for many years.

Tim Price M.arbor. A