

From: John Malet-Bates [REDACTED]
Sent: 10 January 2021 15:33
To: [REDACTED] Planning
[REDACTED]
Cc: Mojgan Green [REDACTED] Vicki Harding [REDACTED]
Subject: CAC proposed tree felling.

Hampstead CAAC Objected to earlier proposals for tree felling, shrubs removal on the above property. Those were not proven as problematic to the building, whereas general ground steep slope and likely soil shift were and are considered as the cause.

Extent of movement and exact measures needed to compensate are not examined here and must be clarified for further examination of any proposal.

There has been and continues to be much stormy weather with significant rainfall capable of altering ground conditions.

Insurer should focus on that aspect, not seek to denude valuable vegetation to save costs. Too much of this tactic is seen everywhere.

The reasons given in the attached statement have been well-rehearsed previously and are not acceptable as justification for the proposal.

Owners must look to other ways to eliminate or mitigate alleged building damage caused by trees.

Any comparison of costs associated with the subject tree must be carefully and clearly analysed for consideration.

There are many economical ways of supporting building elements if affected by tree roots and these are not of a high levels of cost.

We note the statement of 'insurers aware of undertaking to replace...' – where that undertaking and for what and where exactly.

We again recommend refusal of consent with further reference giving considerable detail.

John Malet-Bates
for Hampstead CAAC,
[REDACTED]



**Statement of Reasons for Tree Preservation Order Application to
Fell and Treat T1 Cherry and Remove all shrubs and Rowan tree (No works to
remaining group) to TG1 Birch at Camden Arts Centre, Arkwright Road,
London, NW3 6DG.**

1. The above tree works are proposed as a remedy to the differential foundation movement at the insured property and to ensure the long-term stability of the building.
2. The above tree works are proposed to limit the extent and need for expensive and disruptive engineering repair works at the insured property. In this instance the estimated repair costs are likely to vary between £47,500 and £500,000, depending upon whether the tree/s can be removed or must remain.
3. The above tree works are proposed to limit the duration of any claim period and therefore allow the landowner their right to the peaceful enjoyment of their property.
4. It is the case that an alternative to felling such as pruning or significant 'pollarding' of the tree would not provide a reliable or sustainable remedy to the subsidence in this case. We do not consider that any other potential means of mitigation, including root barriers, would be effective or appropriate in the circumstances.
5. We are satisfied that the evidence obtained following completion of our Arboricultural Implication Assessment report completed 4th September 2019, clearly links the T1 and TG1 trees as the cause of damage to the risk address
6. Insurers understanding the requirement to offer replacement planting in the event consent to fell is granted.

Francesca Whitbread
Mitigation Co-ordinator
Insurance Services
Property Risk Inspection Ltd

