

ARBORICULTURAL STATEMENT IN RESPONSE TO TREE OFFICER CONSULTATION

17 November 2022

Site: 137 Huntingdon Road, Thrapston, Kettering

This statement is in response to the Tree Officer email consultation, dated 01/11/2022.

For clarity and ease of reading, I have addressed each of the statements separately:

"This report hasn't explored in details the issues of post development pressure for work to the trees, and the long term sustainability of the potential relationship between the trees and any extension of the first floor into consideration. This is the principal issue of concern.

These trees particularly the one closest to the side of 137 Huntingdon Road tower above the property and needles and cones will regularly fall from them, onto the existing property, which may be more noticeable if the living areas of the property are moved closer to the tree. The trees are going to require pruning periodically as they will grow from the reduction pruning points over the existing boundary wall and roof of the property.

The sheer size of the trees, towering above the side of 137 Huntingdon Road, the noise they make, the movement in strong winds, the regular needles and cone fall, in combination with the shading, will have an impact on the use and enjoyment of the property, which has been simply dismissed by the report's author."

Paragraph 1

"At 3.4.1.1 the report states that "none of the trees are considered to possess a significant potential for a negative shading on the proposed extension"

The proposed extension is to be a bedroom with a window on the northern or southern side, the level of shading that can be expected will not be of concern as bedrooms are not primary living areas, and due to the bedroom's location, it will get daylight from roughly midday to sunset. It should also be noted that the adjacent trees possess relatively thin and open canopies allowing significant levels of light to penetrate.

Paragraph 2

"At 3.4.2.1 it states that "The layout of the scheme has been designed with consideration of the location and growth of potential of nearby trees. Owing to such, no noteworthy contention between tree canopies and property are anticipated."

The trees in question located on the adjacent property's boundary line are mature Austrian pine. Owing to their mature life stage, any shoot elongation is expected to be relatively slow. It should also be noted that some of the trees' eastern branches have historically been pruned back to the boundary with no growth points for regenerative growth. Therefore, it is highly unlikely that any new growth will be a cause for contention. The notion that the trees will 'require pruning periodically' doesn't take into consideration the species, and the rate of growth that can be expected for Austrian pines of a mature age. Should the trees require pruning in the future, any required works are unlikely to exceed what might be required with the current garage below.

Paragraph 3

“At 3.4.3.1 it states that “additional unreasonable tree-related nuisances, such as leaf and fruit fall, are not thought to exist beyond what might generally be considered as acceptable limits.”

Having spoken to the client, the amount of debris that the trees cause is not a significant point of concern, the amount that collects on their driveway and in their rear garden hasn't altered since they brought the property, and in addition to this, the amount of debris falling on the proposed extension will not exceed the current acceptable levels experienced by the garage.

Paragraph 4

“The sheer size of the trees, towering above the side of 137 Huntingdon Road, the noise they make, the movement in strong winds, has been simply dismissed by the report’s author.”

Having discussed the issue of ‘the noise they make’ and the movement of the trees in the wind with the client, I feel this is an unfounded concern in attempts to stop the proposed extension when there is no concern for either of these problems. Why should this become a new issue when both properties (137 and owner of trees) are in close vicinity of the trees, and neither party have ever raised concerns or worries about the noise the tree’s create. The client bought the property with the knowledge of the tree’s existence and were well aware of any foreseeable obstacles with them and proceeded with the sale, therefore, dismissing any potential for concerns surrounding the trees.

Conclusion

As discussed above, the relationship between the trees and the proposed extension will not result in any more nuisance than is currently experienced with the existing garage. This is considered acceptable and not of concern by the occupant and owner of the property. They bought the house with the trees adjacent to the property willingly, they were not concerned about the debris or size of the trees when signing the contract, and their lack of concern continues to this day. The trees have historically been heavily reduced away from the property and driveway, so future similar works are not necessary. The points of concern raised by the Tree Officer are not of significant weight to legitimately object to the scheme on.

We would therefore invite the Tree Officer to review their objection to the application.

Yours Faithfully,

Jennifer Sinclair

Arboricultural Consultant, Ligna Consultancy Ltd
[REDACTED]

Jennifer Sinclair is a technician member of the Arboricultural Association. She has worked in arboriculture for over ten years, including supervisory roles undertaking both domestic and commercial arboricultural work. She possesses a level 3 extended diploma in arboriculture and is currently furthering her academic knowledge by undertaking a level 6 professional diploma in arboriculture. A full CV and list of experience and CPD is available on request.