



Dear Sirs,

Application Comment

I have been away and have only just seen your letter relating to the above application. My comments are as follows: no evidence has been brought to bear in the application to demonstrate that the acacia is responsible for any subsidence damage. The Technical Report accompanying the application does not support it but makes clear that significant further investigation is required to prove that the tree is responsible for subsidence damage. Virtually every property in the area suffers from movement and/or actual subsidence because of the expansion and contraction of the clay soil on which all houses in the area are built, whether trees are present or not. Insurance companies are reluctant to provide cover for subsidence other than at hefty excess premiums for this reason. The extensive wet weather followed by the hot and dry weather over the past 12 months has contributed to a marked increase in movement and/or subsidence in local properties, the signs of which are clearly visible throughout the neighbourhood.

Until such time as clear evidence can be demonstrated to the effect that the acacia, in its own right, is responsible for subsidence damage, the tree – which is a magnificent and healthy specimen – should be preserved.

Regards,
Gina Scheck

