

Planning – Application

I am responding to support the application of a reduction to the Oak. I am the owner of the Oak.

The tree, subject to this application, is a large sized Oak that appears to be exhibiting normal vigour and vitality. The works applied for, are due to the excessive canopy cover within the applicants garden (over one third) and that of my property (over two thirds of my garden area).

A reduction of the canopy by 2m on the northern sector should not cause the tree to become unbalanced or lose public amenity value.

There is no getting away from the fact that “trees within the urban environment will at times require management due to their size and cannot be managed in the same way that a countryside tree is able to be left in many instances as a virgin tree with little to no intervention.”

These works if permitted should allow for harmony between the tree and applicants improving their quality of life in the garden without detriment to the health or public amenity value offered by the Oak.

I have owned and lived in my property for over 35 years. (June 1986). The Oak in question has grown beyond belief in that time. During the summer, my garden is mostly in shade. I bought my property because the garden was south facing. Now we get little sunshine, other than when the sun is at its height, during the months of June and July. Either side of that, we are in shade throughout.

Many applications have been submitted over the years, in the correct manner to request a reduction. If you look at the history of the applications, we were granted permission only twice. For over 21 years, we have had very little success in having the Oak pruned.

APP/14/00459 Permission was granted. Then subsequently quashed due to a neighbour threatening to sue HBC and fabricating about Bats roosting. It is a known fact that Bats do not roost in a healthy Oak.

APP/15/00508 Permission was granted. However, to satisfy the demands of the no. (Redacted) Durley Avenue, the Arboriculturalist had to be present, namely Mr Jamie Gargett. Which was a singular waste of his time and that of the taxpayer. Mr Gargett will attest to the fact that the neighbour at (redacted) The tree surgeons could not carry out their duties for fear of harming the person in question. As a result, we did not have 2 metres removed from the canopy and no height reduction. Therefore, we had to pay the tree surgeons the full amount of their invoice for very little work completed. At that time in 2015 (six years ago) we had permission to remove 2 metres, but fell far short of that. To this day, we still haven't had any more work agreed regarding a reduction.

I am attaching here the wording of an email I sent to the Councillor Michael Cheshire, in 2015. This was purely to make HBC aware of the situation and was fully endorsed by Jamie Gargett.