



Dear Sir,

Re: Application 2016/3403/T

As per our discussion, we wanted to outline the facts of the application and address the objections from No 33 & No 29 as they appear somewhat skewed and we assume used as a form of protest against our previous planning application which the council granted permission under [2014/3668/P](#) which the neighbours opposed despite their own renovations a year earlier.

Magnolia

1. We have used the same tree specialist which Ms Davis at No 29 used for the pruning of her own magnolia under application 2016/2943/T which was granted permission a month earlier than date of our application.
2. The tree specialist assigned has applied his own judgement on the amount to prune for each tree based on his own expert knowledge and experience. The specialist in question can attest to fact that we have not applied any pressure or judgement and deferred entirely to

his own qualified experience which he also applied (without objection) to Ms Davis' own magnolia under application 2016/2943/T

We remain bemused that No 33 & No29 have suddenly in the space of 2 months become tree experts so much so, that they can gauge the amount of pruning required and health of trees in our garden at sight (they have no access to our garden) more so than the tree experts assigned who have over 15 years' experience of arboriculture, a large customer base ranging from households, construction companies, schools and churches. Their team of tree surgeons are fully insured professionals with NPTC certificates carrying out all work to British Standard 3998 and members of the members of the Arboriculture association. Perhaps the Arboriculture firm has vacancies for 2 new tree experts?

3. Please view the attached photos of the magnolia tree which is dangerously encroaching on the building main part of the house and against the bedroom window.
We are concerned that any more growth will jar against the brickwork of the house and against the window glass and affect the health of the tree itself aswell as the structure of the house and hence the rationale for the application.



4.



Eucalyptus

1. The Eucalyptus (not covered by a TPO) has been completely overrun by a Virginia creeper from the neighbouring garden which has affected our much loved tree and requires attention to prune back. The Eucalyptus tree has been in place for years, long before No33 own trees which were planted last year as replacement of a beautiful Nordic pine tree providing full year cover to the 'urban view' which was unfortunately felled as part of their renovation. As there is no separate access to the garden we are looking to prune back the Eucalyptus at the same time as the Magnolia to minimise the disruption of the equipment access through our property.

It is interesting to note that Ms Sochor is in favour of pruning the Eucalyptus as it encroaches her garden and affects her trees yet objects to the Magnolia which is in our garden which is in our judgement perceived a subjective view. Perhaps there is one rule for No33 and a separate rule for No 31?

2. We also note that reference to the Bats in the areas. In the years we have lived at the property we have not seen a single bat near the property or in the vicinity of the area. We would be interested to see the bat report which Ms Davis /Ms Sochor refer to in response to the application and in particular the impact of that the pruning of the trees will cause to the bats (if there are any).

In summary we defer to your judgment and that of our tree expert to assess the facts of the application on their own merit. We genuinely are not expecting to be treated any different to any other household within the neighbourhood but we would really appreciate that before making a judgement as to our motives as outlined by our neighbours on either side of our property, you would kindly afford us the opportunity to defend our position. We are happy to have this published in redacted form on the website.

Kind Regards
EMPA TEL
Mr & Mrs Patel