

**From:** Alex Mace [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 16 June 2020 16:20  
**To:** Planning [REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]

**Subject:** Comment regarding applications 2020/2301/T and 2020/2307/T

Good afternoon,

I am writing as one of the freehold owners of [REDACTED] (with fellow owners copied).

We welcome the chance to comment on the proposed felling of three trees on our property as well as one tree at 4 Cleve Road. We object to the applications in their current form.

Firstly, the planning application contains two significant errors with respect to 89 Priory Road (2020/2301/T):

- The applicants claim to own the trees in question. This is not the case - they belong to 89 Priory Road.
- The applicants claim that the trees are not subject to Tree Preservation Orders. We have confirmed with the Council that they are.

Secondly, we are sceptical about the conclusion that the trees are causing subsidence at 2 Cleve Road.

The Engineering Appraisal Report identifies clay bed shrinkage as the cause. However, it does not adequately justify the claim that this is caused by the trees at 89 Priory Road. The report identifies other potential causes – including localised damage to drains. In fact, the report concludes that they “have not decided on the final type of repair required as our investigations have not yet been concluded”. The engineers set out the need for regular and continued monitoring of possible movement at the property.

Thirdly, felling the trees would have a substantial impact on our property and our neighbours. This spans:

- Possible unintended consequences (the reports do not assess the risk that felling the trees could inadvertently destabilise nearby walls)
- The loss of natural beauty
- Possible worsening of existing poor soil drainage problems in our garden
- Harm to biodiversity in a conservation area
- Loss of privacy and shade

Felling the trees is a drastic measure that should be undertaken as a last resort – especially as they are covered by TPOs. Doing so would be disproportionate to the evidence presented in the application.

Therefore, we request that:

- The application – in its current form – is denied;
- The applicant undertakes monitoring of any movement to evidence its nature and cause – this is a key gap in the current evidence;
- The applicants undertake other recommended repairs first – especially to the local drains – to test whether this is sufficient;
- If movement persists, and if the evidence unambiguously points to the trees at 89 Priory Road as the cause, then we would request that the applicants consider whether other, less drastic measures would be sufficient (e.g. trimming or considering whether treating one tree – rather than all three - would be sufficient).

Kind regards,

Alex Mace