

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2021/0087/T	Tim Herbert-Smith	23/01/2021 15:59:14	COMMNT	<p>These are further comments made by CRASH in the light of the new separate application made regarding the oak, number 2021/0293.</p> <p>Firstly , CRASH is extremely concerned that on viewing the property it is apparent that the false acacia has already been removed & the oak has been unsympathetically pruned ,presumably both without consent.</p> <p>In the cases of the acacia , the property owner should be required to replant a suitable alternative.</p> <p>In the case of the oak , the Council should take appropriate enforcement action.</p> <p>The justification for removal of these trees is flimsy ; the report by Davies refers only to 'slight' cracking & advises further monitoring . No evidence of this has been supplied.</p> <p>The drainage report does not identify any root damage to Run 1 & while there is some damage to Run 2 the conclusion is that the pipe damage is not a cause of current subsidence.</p> <p>The arboricultural report recommends removing the oak & false acacia but then states that the tree works may change upon receipt of additional information. This has not been provided.</p> <p>These trees form part of the street scene in the Conservation Area every effort should be made to retain such trees . To justify removal on the grounds of subsidence caused by clay shrinkage , incontrovertible evidence of damage caused by trees should be supplied . The mere fact that some oak roots have been found in a trial pit is not sufficient evidence & it is hard to believe that this oak which is 4.3 m from the building & no more than 8m high is the cause of the minor damage. Similarly , the acacia was a considerable distance from the building & no conclusive evidence was supplied that its roots caused shrinkage & damage to the building.</p>
