[redacted]

From: DevelopmentControl
Sent: 09 January 2025 09:29
To: DevelopmentControl
Subject: Comments for Planning Application 24/02394/TREE

Comments summary

Dear Sir/Madam,

Planning Application comments have been made. A summary of the comments is provided below.

Comments were submitted at 09/01/2025 9:29 AM from [redacted]

Application Summary

Address:	3 Elm Close School Lane Kings Ripton Huntingdon PE28 2NN
Proposal:	T1 Elm L/TPO/186 - Hortlink 212 pruning in the form of a 30% Linear reduction equating to 75% of total crown volume - Causing damage to property
Case Officer:	Sarah Cuming

Click for further information

Customer Details

Name:	[redacted]
Email:	[redacted]
Address:	1 Elm Close School Lane Kings Ripton Huntingdon

Comments Details

Commenter Type:	Member of the Public
Stance:	Customer made comments in support of the Planning Application
Reasons for comment:	
Comments:	We are the owners of 3 Elm Close, Kings Ripton, Cambridgeshire PE28 2NN. We have reviewed the documents associated with the application to undertake work on T1 Elm tree that is located within the garden of our property. The engineering appraisal report describes the nature of the damage that has occurred to our property and since that report was produced the cracking above the landing window now extends across the ceiling of the stairwell. In addition to the damage to the house the roots have also lifted several paving slabs within the back garden patio which has created trip hazards. We are especially concerned for the ongoing safety of our [redacted] that are frequent visitors and how this will affect the future enjoyment of our garden. The investigative reports are of the opinion that the subsidence has been caused by clay shrinkage brought about by the action of the roots from T1 Elm located on our property. They state that they are satisfied that there is no other factor, other than the Elm tree that is causing the damage. They state that this damage is reversible providing the cause of movement is dealt with.

The recommendation that has been made is that the Elm tree should be removed and the stump treated with eco plugs. The arboricultural report also notes that due to the size of the tree even a reduction of 70% or more would likely lead to eventual failure of the tree due to the strain from the loss of such a significant amount of canopy. The outcome of the site meeting between the HDC Tree Officer and the representative from PRI Ltd also notes that there is a fruiting fungal body at the base of T1 Elm trunk indicative of internal decay and epicormic growth which suggests that the tree is in a state of decline/stress.
The engineering appraisal states that if T1Elm is not removed then it may be necessary to consider underpinning the property. This is an invasive construction procedure and would cause damage to the tree's roots which would cause it further stress and open it up to the possibility of pathogens entering the damaged roots.
Having read numerous documents relating to Hortlink 212 pruning there is not overwhelming evidence to support the effectiveness of it. Given that the Elm's roots extend beneath the house can Huntingdonshire District Council be confident that this course of action will prevent further subsidence of the property and lifting of the patio slabs?
Based on what has been stated in the reports and the fact that this is a tree that is in decline we do not consider the Hortlink 212 pruning to be the appropriate action to take and fully support the arboriculturist conclusion that T1 Elm tree should be removed.

Kind regards