

Agenda Item 10

Good Morning Ian,

Thank you very much for your time earlier today.

As discussed from our site meeting,

The concerns about the trees relate to three principal matters, perceived risk of tree failure due to the height and proximity of the trees to nearby properties, shading and associated moss growth on roofs, and potential obstruction of a proposed full fibre broadband connection route.

The trees were inspected from ground level and were found to be in good physiological condition. No significant structural defects were recorded that would support removal on arboricultural safety grounds. The presence of trees close to residential properties can understandably cause concern during periods of high wind, but height and proximity alone do not provide sufficient technical justification for removal. Tree risk has to be assessed by reference to observable defects, structural condition, species characteristics, site context, and target occupancy. In this instance, the inspection did not identify evidence of instability, progressive structural failure, or defects indicating an unacceptable risk to the adjacent properties.

The complaint also refers to shading and moss growth on roofs. Trees can contribute to localised shading, and this may influence moisture retention and moss development on roof surfaces.

However, moss growth is affected by several factors, including roof orientation, surface material, pitch, ventilation, local humidity, and general exposure. On its own, shading from otherwise healthy amenity trees would not normally constitute arboricultural justification for removal, particularly where the trees provide public amenity value within the village green.

Regarding the broadband, If BT or another statutory undertaker requires specific clearance to install or maintain infrastructure, this should be addressed through a formal specification from the utility provider. Any such works should be targeted, proportionate, and limited to the clearance required to facilitate installation or maintenance. The presence of a potential cable route through or near the crowns does not, in itself, justify removal of the trees.

My advice is that removal of the three trees is not currently justified on arboricultural grounds. The appropriate course of action is to undertake the recommended management works only, including ivy severance where stem inspection is restricted, removal of lower stem epicormic growth from the lime trees, and crown lifting to provide suitable clearance. The trees should then remain subject to routine inspection as part of the Council's tree management regime. This will all be outlined on the report to follow.

Should BT provide a formal clearance specification, this can be reviewed separately and, where appropriate, incorporated into a limited pruning specification. Similarly, if there is any material change in tree condition, site use, or target occupancy, the trees should be reassessed.

Please don't hesitate to get in touch if there is anything else I can do to help.

My new mobile number is 07591836369 and email is Henry.Lee@glendale-services.co.uk

Cheers,

Henry Lee *TechArborA*

North East Arboriculture Manager

Glendale

Henry.Lee@glendale-services.co.uk

07591836369