



**Camden tree ref. 2018/1894/T**

Dear Sir/Madam

I am writing, as a leaseholder living at 16 Parsifal Road and also on behalf of the freeholder, Ms Carina Hilderbrandt, who has given full permission to use her name and authority in these discussions.

We object most strongly to the proposal to remove the Cherry tree that is referred to.

The Arboriculturalist's report acting for #14 concludes that subsidence is being mainly caused by the soil drying out and that our tree is the prime cause.

The report talks about ornamental grasses at #14 being a contributing factor and also the street tree directly outside #14. No mention is made of the extensive hedging surrounding the frontage of #14 on 3-sides.

It is known that climate change is affecting soil conditions in general and it is most unfair to remove a tree especially when there is a lack of hard evidence that this tree is primarily responsible. The report even admits there was no evidence of the Cherry tree's roots in the sample bore hole.

I note the following in a section of 'The London Tree Officer's Association' report - 'A Risk Limitation Strategy for Tree Root Claims' within section 3.4:

"..... we must resist precipitate removal of trees just because this seems the least expensive and quickest option at the time for the insurer to settle or deal with a claim....." The full report can be seen here (<https://www.ltoa.org.uk/documents-1/risk-limitation-strategy-for-tree-root-claims>)

We hope the committee will consider all aspects of the proposal and not recommend precipitate removal of this considerable private and public amenity.

Yours faithfully

Philip Stokes