

From: David Young
Sent: 22 December 2020 14:16
To: Strong Laura <Laura.Strong@charnwood.gov.uk>
Subject: P/20/2093/2 your ref : PT/58

Dear Laura,

From David Young 14 Grey Crescent LE60AA

I am shocked to see you are protecting the trees at the back of me.

I have lived here for 13 years , the trees basically make up a 70ft wall blocking all light from my house and garden I have grass that wont grow and dies every year due to the size of these trees.

My garden is only 4 meters wide the trees are very over powering.

You have stated that they are an important back drop of greys crescent ?

They can hardly be seen from the main street, I'm not understanding the importance of these trees as you call it as you can clearly stand at main street a struggle to see them ?

I have only asked for a reduction of 30% with 70ft trees this is very small.

I would like to invite you to my property to see what I am up against my number is

. They have massively out grown my property , I used to have a lovely sunny garden. A chop of 30% or less will grow back very fast . The trees are huge.

I actually really like the trees hence why a sympathetic topping would very much help me and would protect the trees. Cutting lower branches will not help my problems.

This is really getting my mental health bad I love my house but these are very much a big problem to me.

To top this off number 12 had 4 large Alders and they were allowed to be removed ? I find this

confusing that all I want to do is reduce the height and its not allowed but next door was allowed to remove the same trees ???

Also you have recently allowed the chopping down of an important Silver Birch on Grey

Crescent ? There was a report of the importance of greys crescent done by the council stating

how important it is to protect the Silver Birch lined street . Again all I am asking for is a

reduction in height to allow light back in my property.

Also the young lime tree was a self planter and had permission to be topped some years back but unfortunately was never carried out.

I would like to know why its very much one law for others and another for me who again is trying to protect the trees and just reduce them in height ? Also I would like you to explain why the 4 behind number 12 were allowed to be take down? Also work has been carried out to large trees all the way down from number 10 to number 2 in the Bradgate arms. I feel like I am very unfairly being stopped by doing something very sympathetic .

This is very upsetting to me and I believe is very unfair I will take this down every route possible to try and solve this I don't see why reducing the height of a tree that has vastly over grown the neighbouring properties is anything but a sensible option.

Regards, David Young number 14 Grey crescent Le60aa

From: Scott McGarry
Sent: 04 January 2021 09:40
To: Strong Laura <Laura.Strong@charnwood.gov.uk>
Cc:
Subject: RE: P/20/2093/2 your ref : PT/58

Dear Laura,

Subject: P/20/2093/2 your ref : PT/58

Name: Scott McGarry, 16 Grey Crescent, Newtown Linford, Leicester LE6 0AA

Thank you for your letter to David Young, which he kindly shared with me.

I can totally understand the need to protect trees in the local area and in local beauty spots, I also respect the TPO order on the trees in question. However I struggle to understand the reasoning for declining a sensible and valid request to trim the trees to a size more fitting of their location.

These trees are in a Public House Car Park and can hardly be seen by anyone other than the people living next to them.

Our feeling is these trees do the following: -

- * Significantly Block daylight
- * Significantly overhang my property
- * The deciduous nature of the trees causes immense drop of foliage onto several properties, clogging drains and killing grass

We are not requesting them to be removed just reduced and would kindly ask you to reconsider your decision.

A visit to the area would be welcome as we are sure that would convince you.

We think it is also important to point out that other trees in the same location have actually been removed, perhaps setting a precedent here, though this is something we are not proposing.

We look forward to a more positive response in due course

Kind Regards

Scott McGarry

Scott McGarry