1. Firstly, we would like to praise Mark McDonald and the Scottish Parliament for addressing this matter which we’re sure is a common area of dispute between neighbouring properties. There is a fine line to privacy for one party and intrusion for the other.

2. Secondly we’re not anti-tree, indeed we are very firmly pro tree, as apart from enjoying their aesthetic, environmental and wildlife benefits, John Knowles works for a company which only converts pulp based products so we appreciate that national and global management of trees is essential.

3. We are however very disappointed and confused to learn that under the current definition of a High Hedge, that deciduous trees which can grow to similar or greater heights of evergreen trees, are not currently being considered under legislation. After all, for the sunniest months of the year they both create similar problems.

4. For instance Beech is a very common plant used for hedging, indeed the famous Meiklour Hedge uses this deciduous tree, so will it no longer be considered a hedge?

5. From correspondence with Mark McDonald’s office, it would seem that deciduous trees have been dropped from the definition because of issues with similar legislation in the isle of Man. In our view changing the definition is not a satisfactory solution and it would be better to establish the root cause and correct in our new Bill.

6. Trees grow from natural seeding or can be planted as saplings. In either case, we suggest that little or no attention is given to the species selected and to the effect they will have as they reach maturity. Once planted, the clock starts ticking and we are then in the control of others as to how they attend these and the lack of management mean they often end up intrusions to others.

7. The reasons that we should continue to include two or more deciduous trees are exactly the same as evergreens for the majority of the year

   - the stress and frustration that is brought when an unreasonable third party has so much undisputable legal power over you quality of life and there being no route for mediation.
   - the obstruction of sunlight reducing the enjoyment of neighbouring properties.
   - lack of sunlight reducing the opportunity to grow preferred crops or plants.
   - lack of direct and ambient light with the resultant use of artificial lighting that uses power at increased environmental and monetary expense. A real problem for many of us with continually increasing costs.
• lack of heat from natural sources with the resultant use of artificial heating that uses artificial power at increased environmental and monetary expense. A real problem for many of us with continually increasing costs.
• doubt about a household’s ability to make use in the future of natural energy resources such as solar power due to the time it takes for trees to reach maturity. Only then can you be sure of their final height and effect they would create.
• the potential threat of physical and property damage during the increasingly more frequent storms.
• general well being that comes from sensible exposure to sunlight.

8. We would not think that our view of problematic deciduous trees is unique and would ask that you reconsider the definitions in the proposed High Hedges Bill so we have legislation that covers all concerned areas.