

From: Allan Hardy [REDACTED]
Sent: 25 October 2019 11:23
To: Planning [REDACTED]
Cc: Richard Rose [REDACTED] Nathalie Gastaldo
[REDACTED] Judy Hardy [REDACTED]
Subject: proposal to fell trees

**Subject: your letter of 16 October reference 2019/5262/T
Proposal to fell two plane trees at nr 10 Regents Park
Terrace, London NW17EE**

My wife and I are the owners of [REDACTED]

We object in the strongest possible terms to the proposal to cut down these trees in our neighbours' garden. The trees are probably the same age as this terrace, 173 years.

The application appears to have come from the agents who are acting on behalf of our insurance company. Some time ago we reported to our insurers that we had a small amount of subsidence in our back extension. They appointed agents to assess the situation who carried out various tests. They concluded that the cause of the insurance was the trees in our neighbours' garden and said they would apply to have them cut down.

I have pointed out to them that:

1. It would be an act of appalling vandalism to destroy two magnificent trees on account of a few millimetres of subsidence to our house.
2. The consulting engineer who has advised us, when I first told him about the matter, told me that he had had many similar cases which were due to the shrinkage of the London clay following a long period of dry weather.
3. A friend who is a professional tree surgeon has told me that if these trees were cut down the water which is being removed from the ground by the trees would return and that the

resulting 'heave' would cause more damage than any subsidence which they may have caused.

I believe that the principal and probably the only important cause of the subsidence to our back extension is the shrinkage of the clay. We used to live in a house in Fitzroy Road not far from here which in common with our neighbours suffered from quite severe subsidence in the 1970s due to the shrinkage of the clay.

It is difficult to believe that the agents for the insurance company really believe that Camden would ever agree to such a proposal. However it seems that refusal by Camden to allow the trees to be cut down may be followed by a claim by the insurance company against Camden to compensate it for any remedial works which may be carried out under our subsidence insurance. So far no remedial works have been proposed.

Yours sincerely,

Allan Hardy

