



SITE VISIT/MEETING NOTE

Ref: 21-0256
Client/Site: Seacon Ltd/28 Redington Road, Hampstead
Date: 20th May 2021
Venue: 28 Redington Road, Camden
Attendees:

Name	Company	(Initials)
Bill Freeman	Seacon Ltd	BF
Shaun Phillips	Lockhart Garratt	SP

Ref	Description
1.0	Purpose of Meeting <p>The meeting was a site visit for the consented construction and partial demolition of 28 Redington Road in Hampstead (Camden Borough Council Ref: 2019/6407/P) and to confirm that works were being undertaken in accordance with the approved Arboricultural Method Statement (AMS) (Ref: 20-3573).</p>
2.0	Tree Protection Measures <p>Tree Protective Fencing (TPF) was erected around the trees on site. However, there is evidence of gaps in fencing or material storage within the Construction Exclusion Zones (CEZ). There were gaps in TPF adjacent T1, T7-11 trees located in the rear of the garden. BF confirmed that the trees T7-T11 and the in the rear garden had until recently been protected by temporary ground protection. This was shown in file note ref 20-5356 from the ACoW inspection in March. It was evident that ground protection mats had only been removed recently following the completion of the remaining 3 bore holes for Ground Source Heat Pump (GSHP), as some Mats were still present on site but had been lifted ready to be removed from site.</p> <div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-around;">   </div> <p><i>Plate 1 & 2 Completed bore hole in area of removed patio adjacent tree T7-11</i></p>

SP stated that the TPP, had shown existing hard standing adjacent to T7-11 as being retained to protect the RPA of these trees. SP discussed with BF the protection required for this area. BF stated no works or storage would be necessary and he would erect TPF around the RPA.

The original CEZ adjacent trees to the rear of the garden, had been protected by the ground protection as the proposed TPF in front of trees T10 and T43 had to be removed to facilitate GSHP works. This was covered in file note 20-5356. BF stated that access was still required for the trenching works to be completed by Down to Earth Trees Ltd. BF proposed to re-erect the original Hoarding but to include an access gate. SP confirmed this was acceptable.

This area had been used for the storage of the lifted patio slabs, SP confirmed that as they had been stored on pallets and were to be reused on site, the impact to the retained trees would be minimal and it was acceptable for them to remain until reused. BF confirmed the ground protection mats in this area were from the GSHP bore hole works and were to be removed from site shortly.



Plate 3 - TPF erected around T13 and T14 (materials stored on loadbearing system)

SP noted that the fencing that was missing adjacent T1, and the removal of lightweight materials identified at the previous ACoW visit had not been completed. BF confirmed it would be carried out straight away.



Plate 4 – Materials stored in CEZ and fencing missing adjacent T1.

3.0	<p>Additional Information</p> <p>BF confirmed that once the trench for the GSHP had been completed, most works would now be contained to internal areas of the house and works affecting trees would be limited until the implementation of SUDS and Landscaping.</p> <p>SP discussed the drainage and SUDs work with BF, SP was aware that some amendments to the underground storage tank may be required, BF was also aware of this. SP confirmed that the RPA for the protected trees cover most of the area to the front of the house, and that existing hard standing provides ground protection currently. Excavation in this area will require ACoW input.</p> <p>Further design works are required before the drainage and SUDs are finalised. SP confirmed that these works would need, hand digging, or air spading as the excavations would be in the RPA. SP confirmed that he would not need to attend site during this process if carried out by contractors with suitable knowledge and experience.</p> <p>BF confirmed that landscaping works would not be undertaken by Seacon Ltd, but Jinny Blom would likely undertake these works.</p>
4.0	<p>Actions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • BF to erect TPF fencing and send photos to SP. • SP advised fencing would need Tree Protection Signs and on-site contractors should be informed of the propose of the fencing during induction. • SP also recommended BF take regular photos of TPF for a photographic to record that is has been retained in place and added to a tick list of daily checks or similar. • BF to send current drainage drawing for review. • BF to liaise with SP over trenching works for GSHP or any on site works affecting retained trees. • SP to liaise with DTET (where required) regarding trenching routes. • SP to review tree protection measures on next site visit. ACoW visits would not be likely until excavation for drainage works, or landscaping with on site works within the house. • BF to contact SP with any tree related queries during construction works or inform SP of works programmed which effect the CEZ.
5.0	<p>Actions Carried Out</p> <p>BF provided SP with photos of corrective measure to clear materials and erect TPF adjacent T1 on the following day Friday 21st May, and confirmation other works would be carried out on Monday.</p>



Plate 5- TPF adjacent T1

BF provided additional photos on Wednesday 26th May, of the TPF to protect the RPA for trees T7-10, and trees to the rear of the site T11-T43. BF confirmed that although the original discussion was to put up hording fencing with a gate access. This could not be done due to requiring a UXO survey. Therefore, herras fencing wired and secured with swivels connected to scaffold had been used. SP confirmed this was appropriate.



Plate 6-8-TPF for Trees T7-T43

Circulation: As attendees plus:

Name	Company
David Peres-Costa	Camden Borough Council
Fabio GonzaleCalzada	Thomas Croft Architects
Daniel Ridgeway	Jinny Blom

Prepared By: Shaun Phillips 27th May 2021

Checked By: Freddy McCreery 27th May 2021