



Donald Zouras
837 Francine Dr.
Bartlett, IL 60103

October 9, 2007

Mr. James G. Wiard
53 West Jackson Boulevard - Suite 1025
Chicago, IL 60604

Dear Mr. Wiard:

I received your letter of September 26. I have carefully considered the request to give your clients' tree trimmer access to my property. My position remains that the tree does not require, nor will it benefit from extensive pruning. As the steward of my land and its trees, I must decline the request for greater access to the tree in the hope that the professional doing the pruning will limit any cutting to a reasonable amount.

While you may not be sure of the meaning or significance of terminology such as collar cuts, lateral cuts, and blunt cuts, I can confidently say that I do understand these terms. That is precisely why I am troubled by the statement: "only branches overhanging my clients' property will be pruned." If a collar cut is employed to remove an overhanging lateral branch back to its point of origin at the trunk, then I will be left with a lopsided tree. By restricting the pruning to your clients' property, it is my hope that the tree trimmer will instead remove smaller branches in order to abate any perceived nuisance.

I cannot at this time give your clients or those in their employ permission to access my property for the purpose of pruning my river birch tree. I am concerned that such open ended permission could be misused. In the spirit of neighborliness, I would be willing to meet with the tree trimmer for the purpose of approving the removal of specific branches if that would not seriously degrade the aesthetic appeal of the tree. Regardless of any statements to the contrary, your clients will continue to be responsible for any damage that they may cause to the tree.

Sincerely,

Donald Zouras
