1. With reference to the high hedge bill, I have read it over several times and although I realise that it is intended to allow this issue to be debated openly in parliament and possibility as a media and votes exercise.

2. Where are the Green party, are they in favour of cutting down trees? the loss of habitat to all the birds and animal that live in and around the trees I’m deafened by their protest and words of condemnation for taking such drastic action.

3. This bill precludes the owners of Trees from their privacy, enjoyment and freedom to enjoy their gardens without constantly being overlooked from high flats next door or whatever.

4. It may also infringe on their “Human Rights” i.e. their right to Privacy. I will discuss this later.

5. There is no mention of the owners “reasonable enjoyment of domestic property” hence where is the protection for the owners? This bill seems only to satisfy one side of this debate or lobbyist groups like “Scot hedge”.

6. Or as I’ve stated earlier is this a P R Campaign? It would appear that it’s a waste of time writing to parliament with regard to this bill.

7. The bill totally excludes the hedge owners, no where in the bill does it ask the question : “Why do some owner’s feel the need to have a high hedge?”

8. I cannot speak for all owners, but in my case and I expect that it will apply to a large number of the owners, that it’s mostly for privacy, and enjoyment of their gardens.

9. By privacy I mean, that we can use/enjoy our garden as “we see fit” without curtain twitchers watching our every move or bottles, cans and other rubbish being thrown into our garden. Or individuals running through our property (without permission). Where we can walk/talk/play and just enjoy being outside with others and the enjoyment of the animals that also live there.

10. My trees have been there longer than any of my neighbours and I mean years, they were there when they bought their flats. It did not stop them buying them, so why do they now have a problem.

11. Because a particular neighbour has a problem, we must conform to their wishes or else.

12. Within the bill, should there not be provision that if the trees/ vegetation have been there for 10 years or X years then it’s too late to remove them. Instead of when someone appears and wants everyone to conform to their wishes we all must change.
13. Within the bill there are no distinction where the trees grow i.e., north/south side etc. with relationship to light into the property, the sun rises in the east and sets in the west. If the trees are on the north side, there is no or very little chance of trees on the north side of a property being a hindrance to light. What happens then is it then up to the Local Council to decide? or should the parliament not have made provision for this in the bill?

14. Or should it be decided by a light meter, with a plus and minus scale would there be any distinction if the hedges are at the front or rear of a house/flat, i.e. therefore maybe obscuring the views from lounges, or from bedrooms would that make a difference, would this be down to the person on the ground? (Council Employee)

15. Or as the planning departments would tell us we are not entitled to a view.

16. Also the distance the high hedges are from the property, will this be three meters or thirty meters it will make a massive difference to “Reasonable Enjoyment” or “Barrier to light.” Or does this not matter just cut them down.

17. The statement “Reasonable Enjoyment” How can this be quantified?

18. Is my Reasonable Enjoyment less than my neighbours? The bill only seeks to provide for one course of action to have hedges cut down, we enjoy our privacy, now it will disrupted/ruined and never be the same again. So where is my justice, where are my MSPs doing their duty looking after the minority?

19. Surely I can expect the same “Reasonable Enjoyment” from my property as next door, not more or Less just equal to.

20. If my trees are to be cut down as the bill hopes to achieve “through amicable resolution.” With local council as adjudicators. Will it make me feel good towards my neighbour? ask yourself truthfully, when they are forcing my trees to be cut down, will this help neighbourhood unification? or “Reasonable Enjoyment” of domestic property” or will one side of the “Hedge” be giving the other side the proverbial two fingers.

21. Although this may read that we have issues with our neighbours, this is not the case. We have enjoyed great relationships with the vast majority of them throughout the years (and still do) but.

22. I believe this bill started out to curtail the use of Leylandii but now it has grown to cover “other form of vegetation” why? was it as a result of pressure from where? We have so few evergreens in this country to brighten up our long dark winter months, now they will be cut down along with the leylandiis.

23. I believe we must keep all the evergreens to enlighten and enrich our lives during the winter( and summer.)
24. As a habitat for our animals that inhabit this planet along with us not destroying it as a matter of course or expedience to satisfy a small but loud group.

25. As to the fees, that would apply (Approximately £500 to £1000) I would like to see a fee that would make time wasters, “frivolous and vexatious” think twice. It should be enough money to prohibit this type from ever contemplating taking this action without due consideration of the consequences.

26. Later if this is found to be the case (any of the above) then it should preclude them from taking up this type of activity ever again. After all if the bill is prepared to allow councils to cut down trees and be reimbursed by the owners, then why should the bill not allow reimbursement to the (Tree owners) for the stress/time caused by time waster etc. and possibly their legal fees.

27. Within the bill, the emphasis is on neighbours who have problems with adjoining property with reference to high hedges. Is it enshrined in the bill that groups of individuals will not be allowed to march around the country demanding that property owners cut down their trees or give financial support to individuals (who may or not be neighbours) to further their cause?

28. There are several issues that are encompassed within the “Human Rights U. K.

29. That are being conveniently overlooked within this bill below are some examples.

30. **Right to Property.** Protection of the right to own and enjoy their property. **Privacy.** The right to Privacy. (Article 8) **Right to respect.** For private and family life.

31. Other areas that apply to this bill i.e. **Dignity, Equal Justice.**

32. Three Generations: Third solidarity: Right to peace, right to a clean environment. (From Karel Vasak)

33. From Phillip Alston, urges caution with priorisation of rights. “The call for priorisation is not to suggest that any obvious violation of rights can be ignored.

34. Some human rights are said to inalienable rights, i.e. Fundamental rights are not awarded by human power and cannot be surrendered.

35. I would say that according to my rights several of the above are being denied and squashed to allow this bill to progress.

36. Perhaps if owners were allowed the same media coverage as the groups protesting then this bill would not have been contemplated.
37. I have asked for anonymity for my submission. However I will be available to discuss my reply should the committee wish to have further explanation of some of the points that I raised.