

**Gentet, Matthias**

---

**From:** Lucy [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 11 January 2016 13:59  
**To:** Planning  
**Cc:** Houghton, David; [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** Objection to application: 2016/0032/T - tree work

Sir/Madam

I write in relation to application 2016/0033/T which is cited for 52 Compayne Gardens.

A couple of points that I would like clarification of:

- 1) I am unclear as to why this application is for no. 52 as the ash tree it relates to felling appears to be in the rear garden of no. 56 Compayne Gardens. The forms and documents should be resubmitted.
- 2) Where is the application relating to the proposed felling of the four lime trees at 54 Compayne Gardens contained in the OCA report appended to the application? Surely a separate application form for that proposal is required?

In terms of any comments:

- 1) It appears to be an overreaction to the arboriculturalist and engineers reports to require a neighbouring property to fell an ash tree. Regular maintenance of the tree should suffice as the property damage, cited as moderate, relates to clay shrinkage from water content rather than actual root damage. Shrinkage could relate to climatic/meteorological factors rather than the tree.
- 2) If a proposal is made to fell the four lime trees in the front garden of no. 54 Compayne Gardens I would like to strongly object. These trees form an important part of the street scape of this section of Compayne Gardens within the conservation area. The trees are regularly pollarded and maintained. It would seem to be an over reaction to the damage to the property which is cited as moderate to remove all four lime trees. If it is deemed necessary perhaps an alternative would be to reduce the trees by two rather than 4?

Please confirm receipt of this email.

Kind regards

Lucy  
Lucy Findlay  
45 Compayne Gardens