

## **Tree Group comments on applications June, July & August 2020**

### **26 Shrewsbury Road CA/20/0038**

*Proposal:* Previous meeting with tree preservation officer in Feb 2019 to discuss. Large trees prevent sunlight, cause debris and apparently affecting structure/stability of party wall. Smaller trees affecting mobility in and around the garden. Remove smaller trees and cut back or remove larger branches of large trees.

*Comment :* We visited the premises and met with Mr Sood and his neighbour. We advised them to contact a reputable tree surgeon and put in a specific application and we would comment on that.

### **6 Glenmore Rd CA/20/0103**

*Proposal:*

1. Beech, Chestnut and Oak front garden. Crown reduction as overgrown since last work in 2012.
2. Thorn, Beech and Sycamore rear garden. Cut back overhanging branches to boundary line.

*Comment:*

1. This group of trees appears to have outgrown their situation and we are happy with the proposed professional crown reduction whilst maintaining the overall appearance and tree cover in the street.
2. Proposed cutting back will have little impact on the views from the nearby roads. No objections.

### **Somerville, Talbot Rd CA.20.0123**

*Proposal:*

1. Tree front garden. Trim small branches from main trunk below crown. Level bottom of crown and remove some protruding branches from upper crown
2. American Oak rear garden. Crown thinning by 30% and remove dead/damaged branches.

*Comment:*

3. This large tree appears to be a type of Yew and is clearly visible in the centre of the front garden. We are happy with the modest proposals to tidy up the tree without affecting the overall appearance.
4. This is an impressive tree of great stature most visible from Templemore and Rathmore Roads. Crown thinning would be appropriate as there seem to be many interwoven branches along with some damaged in the recent high winds. We would not want there to be any significant reduction in the overall stature or shape of the tree.

## **2 Victoria Mount CA.20.0145**

*Proposal:*

1. Beech x3. Crown reduce.
2. Dead tree covered with ivy. Fell.
3. Conifer. Fell as excessive shading.

*Comment:*

1. The applicant would intend to crown reduce by approximately 20% and remove a few outlying branches whilst maintaining the overall shape and density of the canopy. We are happy with this proposal.
2. The tree is clearly dead and leaning against a high sandstone wall so should be removed.
3. This upright conifer is not visible over the high garden wall. No objection.

## **6 Templemore Road CA.20.0150**

*Proposal:* Fir x2. Crown reduce by 30% and crown lift. Blocking light to gardens.

*Comment.:* These trees are not clearly visible from the surrounding roads. No objections.

## **24 Dudley Close. CA.20.01646**

*Proposal:* Row of trees in grounds of 12 Fairview Road. Cut back to boundary wall.

*Comment:* This row of Horse Chestnuts and Sycamores lie within the conservation area but Dudley Close lies outside. We have no objection to professional removal of the lower overhanging branches but would suggest that the upper crown be left alone.

## **13 Victoria Mount. CA.20.0168**

*Proposal:* Large conifer front garden. Remove to improve light to property and neighbours

*Comment:* This tall thin conifer does not enhance the area and we would have no objections to its removal.

## **6 Templemore Road CA.20.0187**

*Proposal:* Damson. "Crown" the tree and remove lower branches as overhanging next-door driveway and the road

*Comment:* This small tree has little amenity value and we are happy with crown thinning and removal of lower overhanging branches.

### **Car Park Prices Lane. T.20.0115**

*Proposal:*

5x Willow. Coppice as excessive shading dampness and leaf fall

1 x Sycamore. Fell as excessive shading with sap deposits and bird droppings on cars.

2x Cherry. Reduce height and thickness as excessive shading.

2x Birch. Reduce height and thickness as excessive shading

1x Birch. Fell as dead

2x Lime. Fell as dead

*Comment:*

5 x Willow. Applicants wish to reduce in height to wall level and maintain as much smaller trees. Whilst we accept that these trees are overpowering at present, they do provide significant greenery and to the rear of the carpark. We wonder if an alternative would be to remove these trees fully and replant with a tree (trees) to grow with a less dense canopy or to just reduce their height by say 50%. Would removal of alternate trees here be appropriate?

1x Sycamore. This tree is visible between properties from Victoria Mount and again if removed we would suggest replacement with a tree that would grow to some stature but with a less dense canopy and less issues with falling sap.

2x Cherry. We are happy with proposed height reduction by approx. 30%

2x Birch. We are happy with proposed height reduction by approx. 30%

1 x Birch. This tree is clearly dead and should be removed

2x Lime. The smaller of these 2 trees is severely diseased/dying and should be removed. The other Lime tree seems in good health and we feel should be retained to help retain some mature trees of stature if the other works go ahead.

We suggest the applicants consider applying to the Oxton Society Tree Fund if replanting is approved.

### **16 Kylemore Road. T.20.0162**

*Proposal:* Copper Beech. Crown raising and thinning.

*Comment:* This is a fine tree of significant stature. The applicant tells me he is keen to discuss with the tree preservation officer what would be appropriate in terms of crown thinning. The canopy is dense with some overlapping branches. We would be happy with some minor crown thinning and removal of outlying branches so long as professionally performed without significantly altering the overall stature and shape of the tree.

### **39 Rose Mount. T.20.0181**

#### *Proposal:*

1. Lime. Fell due to proximity to other Lime and house
2. Lime. Reduce and crown thin due to growth over property and Roslin Rd
3. Beech (incorrectly described as Oak in application) Crown reduction and trimming due to growth over road and excess shading

#### *Comment:*

1. No objection to felling of this tree and applicants agree to a replacement tree planted elsewhere in front garden. Tree very close to its neighbour and sandstone wall.
2. Previous work on this tree has badly affected its appearance with lateral branches extending over garden and road. Professional removal of these along with crown thinning may help with overall appearance.
3. This is a magnificent tree and we would be wary of anything other than minor crown reduction along with some crown thinning and removal of some of the lateral extending branches. It would be important to maintain the overall shape and size of the tree.

### **35 Fairview Rd. T.20.0189**

#### *Proposal*

Crown thin Beech 20%. Crown thin Sycamore 70%. Crown thin Holly 70%. Crown lift Silver Birch 20%

#### *Comment:*

No objection to this limited beech crown thinning. Holly and sycamore not visible from road; no objections. Lower crown of silver birch not visible from road so no objections.