					9:10:06
Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:	
2022/4997/T	David Stone	10/12/2022 17:38:52	COMMNT	I wish to object to the proposed works to trees T3, T4, T5 and G2.	
				The property is in a Conservation Area which includes the protection of the trees, so each is to be treated as if a Tree Preservation Order applies to it.	
				Taken together, these trees form a screen between 12 Downshire Hill, and our back yard at 26 Pilgrim's Lane. The trees provide privacy for both the occupants of 12 Downshire Hill, and for us, both inside our properties, and in our gardens. Lowering the tree level, and thinning the trees, will open up intrusive views both ways, and should not be allowed. This is particularly the case as we have seen occupants of 12 Downshire Hill trying to look into our house with binoculars. We wish to maintain all the screening the trees currently provide.	
				These trees also form part of the designated nature corridor that runs between the rear of the even numbered houses on Pilgrim's Lane and the rear of the even numbered houses on Downshire Hill. The wildlife corridor is home to squirrels, foxes, and many types of bird life - and so the trees should be maintained.	
				In relation to the specific trees, T3 and T4 are pencil conifers, and so lopping 1.2m off the top of them is not in their interests. Peppers Home and Garden website notes: "Never cut the top portion off a pine. A pine tree that has its top portion removed will grow in a very ragged manner and be extremely susceptible to disease and insect infestation. The tree will not produce a new top "cone." Instead, branches may curve upwards and deform. More likely, a healthy tree that has been "topped" will struggle to heal the open wound at the top. It's liable to attract burrowing insects, tree diseases, and be stricken by sun-scald." Burke's Backyard also advocates against cutting the top of pencil pines. Lopping off the tops of these two trees seems like an attempt to kill them, and/or to lead to something unattractive. This request should be refused.	
				G2 - the "row of pleached hornbeams" is actually several separate trees, each of which is about 7m tall, and so should have been separately and specifically mentioned in the application. The application to alter these trees should be refused on that basis alone. Because of the way in which these trees have been pleached, it is important that they be treated carefully - simply pruning to a height of 6 metres and trimming the sides is not sufficient care.	

The application in its current form should be refused in relation to at least these trees.