



MH.

Trees

~~SA~~



Chancellors School.

Sent: 13 August 2012 12:41
To: Planning
Subject: Welwyn Hatfield Council Online Planning - Comment

PLANNING
DEPARTMENT
14 AUG 2012
RECEIVED

Application Number: S6/2012/1525/TP
Name: [Redacted]
Address: 55 Pine Grove
Brookmans Park
AL9 7BL
Comment Type: Object
Comment: Dear Sir/Madam

We refer to your letter 1 August 2012 (we did not receive this letter but was kindly shown a copy of it by our neighbour). However, the trees in question are within the line of sight of our property and we were sent correspondence at the time of the last application (in 2010).

Our general views regarding the application were set out in relation to the 2010 application so we do not repeat them here. Instead we wish to raise a further point. The documents supporting the application clearly acknowledge that there is an alternative to felling the trees which would deal with this problem. The figures given for adopting that alternative fluctuate wildly (between £100,000 and £150,000) and are not backed by any supporting evidence (beyond one author's "experience"). We would like to see this alternative investigated further and an explanation/detailed breakdown of costs provided. We have to say that, given that an entire new-build property can be constructed for little more than the top end of the estimates, these figures are very hard to understand.

The Chartered Institute of Loss Adjusters has published a report on Subsidence and Trees which states as follows: "Irrespective of whether a tree is reduced or removed or not, full re-hydration of the soil will cause the cracks to recover or close". See the full report at this link: <http://www.cila.co.uk/files/Subsidence%20and%20Trees%20-%20A%20Soils%20Perspective.pdf>

We therefore believe that it is imperative that an alternative method of solving this issue be investigated by an independent adviser. If an alternative method exists (for example, root barriers), we believe it should be pursued - if that method does prove more costly than felling, we feel that that is the risk which the insurers undertook when they issued the policy (a potential problem with the trees having already been identified prior to the policy and indeed the house purchase). We do not see why the council would owe any duty to mitigate that loss in such circumstances, provided that the problem can be resolved in a different manner.

Yours faithfully



Click

<https://www.mailcontrol.com/sr/YoT7md5t1XvTndxI!oX7UmUCwzNXXM!aYgkYeICMibwJXLw4p+!fA7t5nGR5Zwb+mVhPQwerPlwVvaQUGz3XVw==> to report this email as spam.