

8<sup>th</sup> April 2020

Mr L Salter Director Salter Property Investments Ltd Cliff Barton Sowden Lane Lympstone Devon EX8 5HB

Our Ref: TH/A537/0120

Dear Mr Salter,

# Re: Land off Spruce Close, Exeter – Effect of Proposed Development on Trees

# Introduction

Further to receipt of the finalised proposals drawn up by Place By Design for the development of the land off Spruce Close in Exeter, I have undertaken a full arboricultural appraisal of the site and considered the effect of the proposals based on the data collected, following the principles of British Standard 5837:2012 *Trees in relation to design, demolition and construction – Recommendations.* The purpose of this report is to provide a supporting statement for an outline planning application to Exeter City Council. This report has been undertaken in accordance with the instructions of the client and is intended for their sole and specific use.

This covering letter provides a full Tree Stock Appraisal along with an Arboricultural Impact Assessment. As the proposals are only seeking outline planning consent at this time, a detailed Tree Protection Statement comprising a Tree Protection Plan and Arboricultural Method Statement has not yet been drawn up; this recognises the fact that the proposed site layout may be subject to change prior to any detailed reserved matters. It is therefore reasonable to expect the requirement for a detailed Tree Protection Statement relating to the finalised detailed proposals to be included as a pre-commencement condition of any outline planning consent granted.

# **Document Limitations**

This document has been prepared based on information available to Advanced Arboriculture Ltd at the time of writing, however, further technical, topographical, arboricultural, architectural, ecological or engineering information may come to light after the relevant arboricultural conditions have been cleared. It is the responsibility of the project manager to draw any changes in the project scope to our attention at the earliest opportunity.

#### advanced:

progressive *adj*. forward-thinking forward-looking unconventional cutting edge innovative

higher adj. superior highly developed sophisticated complex



Trees are dynamic structures and advice should be taken on validity two years after the survey was undertaken. The report may not be considered valid after more than three years. The report has been prepared using all reasonable skill and care. Opinions are provided in good faith.

# **Tree Stock Appraisal**

The proposed development plot comprises two agricultural fields located on the northern side of Exeter. The south-western boundary backs on to the rear gardens of the existing dwellings on Celia Crescent while the south-eastern boundary is defined by the public open space associated with Juniper Close and Spruce Close. The north-western and north-eastern boundaries are defined by hedgerows and wooded strips which continue onto open countryside.

The site can be accessed from the service road extending off Celia Crescent or across the public open space leading from Juniper Close and Spruce Close.

A total of one individual tree, one group of trees and seventeen discrete areas of trees have been surveyed for the purposes of this arboricultural appraisal. These shall be described following a clockwise path around the proposed development plot, starting and finishing at the access from Celia Crescent.

The south-western boundary extending in a north-westerly direction from the Celia Crescent access is defined by a number of broadly-spaced former hedgerow trees, the significant majority of which are located within the back gardens of the dwellings in Celia Crescent. There is a noticeable gap in the trees and thus their separation into areas A1 and A2.

The trees which comprise areas A1 and A2 are primarily Oaks with occasional Elm understorey. Four of the ten Oaks are covered by a Tree Preservation Order, though all contribute to the character and visual amenity value of the local landscape.

The north-western boundary features one short stub of hedgerow (area A3) to the south-west of the gateway and a significantly longer section to the north-east (area A4). Whilst visually neither hedgerow is particularly outstanding, and both would benefit from the removal of Elm and Ash stems, they almost certainly offer an important conservation corridor.

There is one individual tree of note on the north-western boundary, this being Oak T1. This British Standard 5837:2012 category A tree is a dominant and attractive specimen adjacent to the gateway and is unquestionably worthy of retention in the context of any development of the site.

The majority of the north-eastern boundary of the proposed development plot is dominated by a line of mature trees, primarily Oak, set in a goyle (area A5). Some of these larger trees are displaying veteran characteristics, and whilst the understorey is variable in quality, it still offers significant habitat value.

A further line of trees extend approximately north-south from the central section of area A5. All of these trees are significantly smaller and form a separating line between the two agricultural fields. Area A6 comprises a cluster of young naturally regenerated Goat Willow stems, none of which are individually or collectively worthy of note. Whilst much of area A7 is relatively scruffy, there are some higher quality stems present, many of which have reasonable future potential; a section of this area featuring poorer quality scrub has been identified for the purposes of installing a future link between the two halves of the development without impacting on the better stems. Area A8 is located at the southern end of this line and comprises almost exclusively Ash and EIm stems with a Blackthorn understorey. The Ash and EIm are more prone to succumbing to Ash Dieback Disease and Dutch EIm Disease respectively in due course and are not therefore considered worthy of retention in a development context where they can be reasonably removed as part of a wider thinning exercise.



Returning to the north-eastern boundary, the lower end of this (area A9) features far younger, often naturally regenerated stems which extend down into the goyle. While few are individually outstanding at the present time, they do have significant future potential and would certainly benefit from selective silvicultural thinning in the future to maximise their overall condition.

The south-eastern boundary comprises three discrete copses, areas A10, A11 and A12, all of which have been established as part of the wider development landscaping of this area. In the case of areas A10 and A12, a significant proportion of the stems present are Ash, and this is a cause for concern given the likelihood of future Ash Dieback Disease infection in the majority of stems. Area A11 will be more resilient as it features a greater species diversity, though would still benefit from a silvicultural thinning to remove the Ash stems present.

The public open space at the south-eastern end of the overall development features a group, G1, comprising six Grey Poplar, two Alder and one Oak. All of these trees are young specimens which contribute collectively to the character of the public open space, though none are individually outstanding. Inevitably, the Grey Poplars are the largest and most dominant stems within the area, though several of these lean significantly. The Alders and the Oak are all structurally and physiologically compromised such that their future potential as well-balanced landscape features is limited. Irrespective of any development, this area would benefit from some selective felling and replanting with the objective of developing a greater species and age-class diversity across the public open space.

The lower end of the south-western boundary comprises five discrete areas of trees, extending from the southernmost tip of the proposed development plot back to the Celia Crescent access. These individual areas are also dominated by larger legacy hedgerow specimens on the rear boundaries of the existing properties; of these, eight Oaks and four Ash are covered by a Tree Preservation Order.

Area A13 comprises almost exclusively Ash stems, many of which lean heavily into the proposed development plot. Notwithstanding their structurally compromised condition, it is highly likely that some or all of these will succumb to Ash Dieback Disease in due course.

Area A14 is dominated by hedgerow Oaks with occasional Ash present, along with some incongruous Leyland Cypress stems and a mixed understorey. The Oaks are the best trees present, and some of these are veteranising. The Field Maple within the understorey are also worthy of retention in a development context.

Area A15 comprises a mix of younger trees, including Leyland Cypress, Ash, Elm and Field Maple. The ownership of the Leyland Cypress stems is questionable, but if they are located within the red line boundary of the development land, their removal is recommended, along with the Ash and Elm, to favour the Field Maple stems which have the greatest future potential.

Area A16 is also dominated by larger Oak stems, however, the only other trees of note are the two Field Maple stems at the south-eastern end of the area. The Leyland Cypress and Elm stems are not considered worthy of retention as they are compromising the future development of the better trees.

Finally, area A17 comprises a mix of Ash and Elm stems. The significant majority of these are located within the redline boundary of the proposed development plot, though one larger multistemmed Ash was noted within a neighbouring garden. Due to the general poor quality of these trees and their susceptibility to disease, none are considered worthy of retention in a development context.



# **Arboricultural Impact Assessment**

The proposed site layout prepared for the purposes of securing outline planning consent shows the construction of 105 new dwellings along with parking, private gardens and extensive public open space, including playspace provision.

The project has sought arboricultural input at an early stage and the resulting Tree Constraints Plan (attached) has informed and refined the proposals on an iterative basis. This has resulted in the current layout which offers a robust balance between arboricultural considerations and design efficiency. Further arboricultural direction has been gained from a site meeting with Exeter City Council's Arboricultural Officer, Mr Mark Waddams on the 14<sup>th</sup> November 2019.

The significant majority of the proposed development plot is unconstrained by trees so it is only the site boundaries, and the central division between the fields which offer any significant arboricultural issues. As with the Tree Stock Appraisal, I have considered these on a clockwise basis from the Celia Crescent access.

The entrance into the site from Celia Crescent has been largely cleared recently, with a number of poor quality and structurally compromised stems having been removed. This allows for the construction of a new road with minimal arboricultural impact, however, it is recommended that the groundworks for the new road are undertaken with an arboricultural watching brief present, pruning back any roots in excess of 25mm diameter from the south-easternmost Oak which may be encountered.

Whilst some of the gardens on the north-western end of the south-western boundary do experience some shade from the trees within areas A1 and A2, this is minimised by setting the development some distance back from the redline boundary; this allows for a 5.0m wide maintenance strip which will also offer easy access to the higher fields for walkers entering from Celia Close. It will be possible to manage any overhanging limbs on an ongoing basis by means of modest lateral reduction, noting that Exeter City Council can control the extent of this for the trees covered by a Tree Preservation Order.

The north-western boundary trees remain completely unaffected by the proposals due to the generous separation maintained between this boundary and the nearest development activities. There is no construction or surfacing shown within the crown spreads or root protection areas of any of these arboricultural features.

The north-eastern boundary of the upper and lower fields have been designed without any houses nearby. Whilst the proposed footpaths will require the clearance and pruning of some understorey, the significant majority of the vegetation remains intact, and the conservation corridor provided by the goyle itself is unaffected.

The division of the two fields is reduced by means of removing areas A6 and A8, both of which comprise poor quality vegetation. Area A7 remains, albeit with some understorey clearance, however, the better quality trees remain, and the link which is shown cutting through this area is located outside of the root protection areas of any of the better quality trees. The shade path for area A7 is based on the height of the tallest stems so cannot be considered an accurate depiction of true shade levels which will be less broad-spreading across the length of the area.

Areas A10, A11 and A12 remain largely unaffected by the proposals, with only some minor pruning back of A12 required to accommodate the parking spaces adjacent. The trees within areas A10 and A11 will also provide some desirable shade for users of the informal playspace shown immediately to the north-west.



The new access into the proposed development plot from Spruce Close bisects the existing public open space and will necessitate the removal of three Grey Poplars and one small Oak. Given the inherently relatively low safe useful life expectancy of Grey Poplar, the selective removal of three of the six on the public open space is considered to be reasonable, subject to their replacement with new trees as part of the wider landscaping of the scheme. The Oak is a poor-quality specimen and the proposals offer a good opportunity to remove and replace this tree.

The lower south-western boundary of the proposed development plot features a higher density of housing than some other areas of the site but seeks to minimise conflict between trees and the built environment by placing primarily parking in closer proximity to the boundary specimens within areas A14, A15 and A16. There will be a need for some lateral pruning as part of the wider thinning of these areas, but this, in combination with the new plantings shown on the site layout, will not have a significant detrimental impact on either the visual amenity value of this screening belt, or on the trees themselves. Some of the parking and the coach-house dwellings do encroach into the root protection areas of some of the larger trees, but this can be addressed by a combination of root pruning and the use of no-dig surfacing where practicable.

Overall, the proposals allow for the retention of the significant majority of the trees on the site, whilst also offering the opportunity for the thinning of poorer quality areas to favour higher quality stems, and extensive tree planting throughout.

## **Services**

All services for the development must be routed outside of the root protection areas of all retained trees. Where this is not possible, alternative installation methods must be investigated, including manual digging, directional boring, *etc*.

I recommend that the engineering drawings showing the proposed service routes are forwarded to Advanced Arboriculture Ltd for review prior to the commencement of any ground works or services installation. I am able to forward a PDF or AutoCAD DWG file directly to the project engineers on request showing the accurate locations of the root protection areas.

#### Hard and Soft Landscaping Design

Any hard landscaping within the root protection area of any retained trees which includes changes in ground levels (cut or fill), new walls or new paths will require further arboricultural review to ensure that any detrimental impact is limited. If unsustainable damage is considered to be unavoidable then the landscaping scheme will require revision.

#### **Tree Protection Statement**

As the proposals are only intended for the purposes of an outline planning application, it is considered reasonable for tree protection measures to be provided as a pre-commencement condition of any outline consent. The measures required will certainly include extensive protective fencing, along with a likely combination of no-dig surfacing, ground protection, root pruning, and an arboricultural watching brief for some specified activities.

#### Tree Works

As the proposals are only in outline form at the present time, the tree works recommendations specified within the attached arboricultural data tables are only indicative, based on the current layout. These recommendations will therefore need to be reviewed and revised as necessary based on the final detailed proposals. The definitive tree works schedule will be an essential component of the final Tree Protection Statement.

Under the Wildlife & Countryside Act 1981 & Countryside & Rights of Way Act 2000 it is an offence to recklessly damage or destroy the nest of a wild bird whilst in use or being built; planning consent



does not provide a defence against prosecution under these Acts. Trees, shrubs and hedgerows on this site may contain nesting birds between 1st March and 31st August and it is advisable to undertake a survey of the site before commencing any vegetation removal between these dates, to ensure that no nesting birds are present. It is recommended that this is carefully considered when scheduling the construction programme as it may be necessary to bring the tree works forward to minimise any risk of delay to the project.

## **Recommendations and Conclusions**

The outline proposals are considered to be sustainable from an arboricultural point of view and I am satisfied that this layout could be submitted as a reserved matters application without amendment. However, this will be contingent on the submission of a detailed Tree Protection Statement to demonstrate how any potential for harm to retained trees is to be minimised.

A copy of this report, plus the attached drawings, must be submitted to the local planning authority as a supporting document to the planning application. If the council's officers have any queries, they are welcome to contact us directly.

If you have any further queries, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Yours sincerely,

Tom Hurley, BSc(For)Hons, M Arbor A Senior Consultant.

Attachments:

Arboricultural Data Tables Tree Location Plans Tree Constraints Plans



# Data Table Key

## Site Ref: TH/A537/0120

# Site Location: Land at Spruce Close, Exeter

The following section shows the results of the tree inspection. Abbreviations used in the survey are as follows:

| Tree No      | Corres  | ponding to plan   |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|--------------|---|---|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| Species      | Comm  | on name   |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Ht           | Height  | in metres   |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Crown Spread | Crown<br>compa                                | spread in metres as measured at the four cardinal points of the ss  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Stem Dia     | Diamet<br>measu<br>the cas<br>5837:2          | ter at breast height in mm (1.5 metres above ground level), or<br>red in accordance with the prescribed British Standard protocol in<br>se of multi-stemmed specimens (see Annex C in British Standard<br>012 for full details) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| RPA          | Root P<br>5837:2                              | rotection Area radius in metres (derived from the British Standard 012 formulae)  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Ht to L/B    | Crown   | height in metres as measured to the height of the lowest branch   |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Dir          | Direction from which the lowest branch arises |   |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Cr Ht        | Height of crown in metres above ground level  |   |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Age Class    | Y   | Young (grown to less than one third of life expectancy)   |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|              | MA  | Middle Aged (grown to between one to two-thirds of life expectancy)   |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|              | М   | Mature (grown to over two thirds of normal life expectancy)   |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|              | OM  | Over Mature   |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|              | V   | Veteran   |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| SULE         | Safe us                                       | seful life expectancy range in years  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Cond         | Conditi                                       | on, both physiological and structural:  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|              | G   | Good (trees with no significant defects)  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|              | F   | Fair (trees with some defects amenable to surgery)  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|              | Ρ   | Poor (trees with significant defects)   |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| BS Cat       | British<br>5837:2                             | Standard 5837:2012 Category (see Table 1 in British Standard 012 for full details)  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| m/s          | Denote  | es multistem tree along with the individual stem diameters  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| #            | Denote  | es estimated value where access was not possible  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

| Data Type, inutvidual frees Site Reference. Th/AJ37/0120 Location. Land at Spirice Glose, Exercit inspection Date. 4th February 2020 Lead Surveyor. Toni numey | Data Type: Individual Trees S | Site Reference: TH/A537/0120 | Location: Land at Spruce Close, Exeter | Inspection Date: 4th February 2020 | Lead Surveyor: Tom Hurley |
|--|-------------------------------|------------------------------|--|------------------------------------|---------------------------|
|--|-------------------------------|------------------------------|--|------------------------------------|---------------------------|

| Tree No. | Species | Tree<br>Height | Crown<br>Spread                      | Stem Dia<br>(mm) | RPA<br>Radius | RPA Area | LB Ht /<br>Dir | Cr Ht | Age Cl | SULE | Cond<br>Phys/Str | Observations                         | Recommendations           | BS Cat |
|----------|---------|----------------|--------------------------------------|------------------|---------------|----------|----------------|-------|--------|------|------------------|--------------------------------------|---------------------------|--------|
| T1       | Oak     | 12.0           | N: 7.5<br>E: 7.5<br>S: 8.0<br>W: 7.5 | 700<br>#         | 8.40          | 222      | 3.0/S          | 2.5   | М      | >40  | G/G              | • Hedgerow specimen<br>• Ivy present | Sever ivy at base of tree | A1     |

Data Type: Areas

Site Reference: TH/A537/0120 Location: Land at Spruce Close, Exeter Inspection Date: 4th February 2020 Lead Surveyor: Tom Hurley

| Ref No. | Species  | Tree<br>Height | Crown<br>Spread                              | Stem Dia<br>(mm) | RPA<br>Radius | RPA Area | LB Ht | Cr Ht | Age Cl | SULE  | Cond<br>Phys/Str | Observations  | Recommendations  | BS Cat |
|---------|--|----------------|--|------------------|---------------|----------|-------|-------|--------|-------|------------------|---|--|--------|
| A1      | • Oak<br>• Elm   | <11.0          | N: <11.0<br>E: <11.0<br>S: <11.0<br>W: <11.0 | <800             | <9.60         | <290     | >=0.0 | >=0.0 | Y-M    | >40   | F-G/F-G          | Line of hedgerow Oaks with<br>occasional Elm understorey     Some stems covered by a Tree<br>Preservation Order     Ivy present     Most trees are located within<br>neighbouring properties     North-westernmost Oak is<br>significantly smaller than the other<br>Oaks | <ul> <li>Clear all stems within proposed<br/>development plot</li> <li>Crown lift as required</li> <li>Prune back lateral growth to<br/>provide ~2.5-3.0m clearance from<br/>the proposed dwelling on plot 24</li> </ul> | B2     |
| A2      | • Oak  | <10.0          | N: <10.0<br>E: <10.0<br>S: <10.0<br>W: <10.0 | <750             | <9.00         | <254     | >=2.0 | >=5.0 | Μ      | >40   | F-G/F-G          | Line of hedgerow Oaks     Some stems covered by a Tree Preservation Order     lvy present     Trees are all located within neighbouring properties  | • No works required at the present time  | B2     |
| A3      | • Elm<br>• Hawthorn<br>• Holly   | <3.0           | N: <3.0<br>E: <3.0<br>S: <3.0<br>W: <3.0     | <150             | <1.80         | <10      | >=0.0 | >=0.0 | Y-MA   | 20-40 | P-G/P-F          | <ul> <li>Stub end of hedgerow adjacent to<br/>field access</li> <li>No individually or collectively<br/>outstanding stems present</li> <li>Elm will succumb to Dutch Elm<br/>Disease in near future</li> </ul>  | • Remove all Elm stems   | C1     |
| A4      | • Goat Willow<br>• Blackthorn<br>• Ash<br>• Elm  | <4.0           | N: <4.0<br>E: <4.0<br>S: <4.0<br>W: <4.0     | <300             | <3.60         | <41      | >=0.0 | >=0.0 | Y-MA   | 20-40 | P-G/P-G          | Mixed hedgerow     Extensive Elm present at north-<br>eastern end of hedgerow     Some Ash stems in central section<br>of hedgerow     Likely conservation corridor   | Remove all Ash and Elm stems   | B3     |
| A5      | • Oak<br>• Elm<br>• Hazel<br>• Hawthorn<br>• Holly<br>• Field Maple<br>• Goat Willow     | <12.0          | N: <12.0<br>E: <12.0<br>S: <12.0<br>W: <12.0 | <1000            | <12.00        | <452     | >=0.0 | >=0.0 | Y-M    | >40   | P-G/P-G          | <ul> <li>Line of mature Oaks running along<br/>goyle with mixed variable quality<br/>understorey</li> <li>Some Oaks showing veteran<br/>characteristics</li> </ul>  | <ul> <li>Prune back understorey as<br/>required to accommodate<br/>proposed development</li> </ul>   | B3     |
| A6      | • Goat Willow  | <7.0           | N: <7.0<br>E: <7.0<br>S: <7.0<br>W: <7.0     | <300             | <3.60         | <41      | >=0.0 | >=0.0 | Y-MA   | >40   | F-G/P-G          | <ul> <li>Scruffy naturally regenerated<br/>vegetation at top of goyle</li> <li>No individually or collectively<br/>outstanding stems present</li> </ul>   | <ul> <li>Prune back understorey to path<br/>edges to accommodate proposed<br/>development</li> </ul>   | C1     |
| Α7      | • Oak<br>• Ash<br>• Goat Willow<br>• Hawthorn<br>• Hazel<br>• Blackthorn<br>• Turkey Oak | <12.0          | N: <5.0<br>E: <5.0<br>S: <5.0<br>W: <5.0     | <350             | <4.20         | <55      | >=0.0 | >=0.0 | Y-MA   | >40   | P-G/P-G          | <ul> <li>Mixed native hedgerow separating<br/>two fields</li> <li>Occasional high-quality Oak stems<br/>present</li> <li>Dense understorey throughout<br/>hedgerow</li> </ul>   | • Face up both sides of hedgerow<br>to path edges and cut route<br>through for new linkway   | B3     |
| A8      | • Ash<br>• Elm<br>• Blackthorn   | <3.0           | N: <3.0<br>E: <3.0<br>S: <3.0<br>W: <3.0     | <250             | n/a           | n/a      | >=0.0 | >=0.0 | Y      | <10   | P-F/P-F          | <ul> <li>Line of larger Ash and Elm stems<br/>with Blackthorn understorey</li> <li>No individually or collectively<br/>outstanding stems present</li> <li>Ash and Elm both likely to succumb<br/>to disease in near future</li> </ul>                                     | Clear to accommodate new<br>development  | U      |

Data Type: Areas

Site Reference: TH/A537/0120 Location: Land at Spruce Close, Exeter Inspection Date: 4th February 2020 Lead Surveyor: Tom Hurley

| Ref No. | Species   | Tree<br>Height | Crown<br>Spread                              | Stem Dia<br>(mm) | RPA<br>Radius | RPA Area | LB Ht | Cr Ht | Age Cl | SULE  | Cond<br>Phys/Str | Observations  | Recommendations   | BS Cat |
|---------|---|----------------|--|------------------|---------------|----------|-------|-------|--------|-------|------------------|---|---|--------|
| A9      | • Oak<br>• Silver Birch<br>• Ash<br>• Goat Willow<br>• Dogwood  | <8.0           | N: <3.0<br>E: <3.0<br>S: <3.0<br>W: <3.0     | <300             | <3.60         | <41      | >=0.0 | >=0.0 | Y      | >40   | F-G/P-G          | <ul> <li>Belt of dense naturally regenerated<br/>stems between field and goyle</li> <li>Area likely to have significant<br/>habitat value</li> </ul>  | <ul> <li>Prune back laterals to path<br/>edges to accommodate proposed<br/>development</li> </ul>   | B3     |
| A10     | <ul> <li>Ash</li> <li>Hawthorn</li> <li>Elm</li> <li>Cotoneaster</li> <li>Dogwood</li> <li>Elder</li> </ul> | <11.0          | N: <4.0<br>E: <4.0<br>S: <4.0<br>W: <4.0     | <250             | <3.00         | <28      | >=0.0 | >=0.0 | Y      | >40   | F-G/P-G          | <ul> <li>Young copse extension in third party<br/>ownership</li> <li>High proportion of copse comprises<br/>Ash stems</li> </ul>  | Monitor for Ash Dieback Disease   | B3     |
| A11     | Field Maple     Goat Willow     Blackthorn     Ash     Dogwood     Beech     Silver Birch                   | <12.0          | N: <6.0<br>E: <6.0<br>S: <6.0<br>W: <6.0     | <300             | <3.60         | <41      | >=0.0 | >=0.0 | Y-MA   | >40   | P-G/P-G          | <ul> <li>Copse in third party ownership</li> <li>Copse would benefit from<br/>silvicultural thinning</li> <li>Ash only comprises a small<br/>proportion of overall copse</li> </ul>   | Monitor for Ash Dieback Disease   | B3     |
| A12     | • Ash<br>• Goat Willow  | <14.0          | N: <5.5<br>E: <5.5<br>S: <5.5<br>W: <5.5     | <300             | <3.60         | <41      | >=0.0 | >=0.0 | Y-MA   | 10-20 | F-G/P-G          | <ul> <li>Copse comprising young to early<br/>middle-aged Ash and Goat Willow<br/>stems in third party ownership</li> <li>Entire copse will be susceptible to to<br/>sequential failure following losses to<br/>Ash Dieback Disease</li> </ul>   | <ul> <li>Prune back extended laterals to ~0.5-1.0m from kerbline of parking bays</li> <li>Monitor for Ash Dieback Disease</li> </ul>  | C1     |
| A13     | • Ash<br>• Elm  | <14.0          | N: <9.5<br>E: <9.5<br>S: <9.5<br>W: <9.5     | <500             | <6.00         | <113     | >=0.0 | >=0.0 | MA-M   | 10-20 | F-G/P-F          | <ul> <li>Line of Ash trees on north-eastern<br/>side of drainage ditch</li> <li>Crowns tended heavily to north-east<br/>due to proximity of hedgerow Oaks to<br/>the south-western side of the<br/>drainage ditch</li> <li>Trees have limited safe useful life<br/>expectancy due to risk of Ash<br/>Dieback Disease</li> </ul> | <ul> <li>Monitor for Ash Dieback Disease<br/>and consider removal and<br/>replanting prior to commencement<br/>of development if extensive Ash<br/>Dieback found</li> </ul>   | C1     |
| A14     | • Oak<br>• Ash<br>• Leyland Cypress<br>• Blackthorn<br>• Field Maple  | <13.0          | N: <12.0<br>E: <12.0<br>S: <12.0<br>W: <12.0 | <1200            | <14.40        | <651     | >=0.0 | >=0.0 | Y-M    | >40   | P-G/P-G          | <ul> <li>Line of hedgerow Oaks with<br/>occasional hedgerow Ash present</li> <li>Mixed scrubby understorey present</li> <li>Some Oaks are veteranising</li> <li>Some trees covered by a Tree<br/>Preservation Order</li> </ul>  | Schart understorey to retain<br>smaller Field Maple amongst<br>understorey<br>Crown lift and prune back<br>extended laterals of Oak and Field<br>Maple plus any Ash in third party<br>ownership<br>Prune back extended laterale to  | B2     |
| A15     | • Field Maple<br>• Ash<br>• Leyland Cypress<br>• Elm  | <12.0          | N: <7.0<br>E: <7.0<br>S: <7.0<br>W: <7.0     | <400             | <4.80         | <72      | >=0.0 | >=0.0 | Y-MA   | 20-40 | P-G/P-F          | <ul> <li>Belt of mixed boundary vegetation</li> <li>Field Maple stems are the only trees of note</li> <li>Ownership of Leyland Cypress stems not clear</li> <li>Ivy present</li> </ul>  | <ul> <li>Remove all Ash and Elm stems</li> <li>Remove Leyland Cypress stems<br/>if within the proposed<br/>development plot boundary</li> <li>Prune back extended laterals to<br/>~0.5-1.0m from kerbline of<br/>parking bays and ~2.0-2.5m from<br/>new dwellings</li> </ul> | C1     |

| Data Type: Areas | Site Reference: TH/A537/0120 | Location: Land at Spruce Close, Exeter | Inspection Date: 4th February 202 | 0 Lead Surveyor: Tom Hurley |  |
|------------------|------------------------------|--|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------|--|

| Ref No. | Species  | Tree<br>Height | Crown<br>Spread                          | Stem Dia<br>(mm) | RPA<br>Radius | RPA Area | LB Ht | Cr Ht | Age Cl | SULE | Cond<br>Phys/Str | Observations   | Recommendations  | BS Cat |
|---------|--|----------------|--|------------------|---------------|----------|-------|-------|--------|------|------------------|--|--|--------|
| A16     | • Elm<br>• Field Maple<br>• Leyland Cypress<br>• Oak | <14.0          | N: <8.0<br>E: <8.0<br>S: <8.0<br>W: <8.0 | <800             | <9.60         | <290     | >=0.0 | >=0.0 | Y-M    | >40  | P-G/P-G          | Line of hedgerow Oaks in<br>neighbouring properties     Mixed dense understorey within<br>proposed development plot curtilege     Some trees covered by Tree<br>Preservation Order     Only understorey worthy of retention<br>is two Field Maple stems at south-<br>eastern end of area | <ul> <li>Remove Elm and Leyland<br/>Cypress stems</li> <li>Prune back extended laterals to<br/>~0.5-1.0m from kerbline of<br/>parking bays and ~2.0-2.5m from<br/>new dwellings</li> </ul> | B2     |
| A17     | • Elm<br>• Ash                                       | <10.0          | N: <6.0<br>E: <6.0<br>S: <6.0<br>W: <6.0 | <450             | n/a           | n/a      | >=0.0 | >=0.0 | Y-MA   | <10  | P-F/P-F          | <ul> <li>Small area of Elm and Ash stems</li> <li>Some stems have already failed</li> <li>One multi-stemmed Ash noted in<br/>neighbouring garden</li> </ul>  | Clear all stems within proposed development plot   | U      |
| G1      | • Alder<br>• Oak<br>• Grey Poplar                    | <15.0          | N: <8.0<br>E: <8.0<br>S: <8.0<br>W: <8.0 | <420             | <5.10         | <82      | >=0.0 | >=0.0 | Y-MA   | >40  | F-G/P-G          | <ul> <li>Area of low density plantings on<br/>public open space</li> <li>Some trees lean slightly</li> <li>Some basal epicormic growth noted<br/>on Alders</li> <li>Oak is in relatively poor structural<br/>condition</li> </ul>  | Remove 3no. stems as required<br>to accommodate new access road<br>Grey Poplar and 1no. Oak to<br>accommodate new road   | B2     |



Note: The original of this drawing was produced in colour - a monochrome copy should not be relied upon. All drawings © Advanced Arboriculture.



Note: The original of this drawing was produced in colour - a monochrome copy should not be relied upon. All drawings © Advanced Arboriculture.



Note: The original of this drawing was produced in colour - a monochrome copy should not be relied upon. All drawings © Advanced Arboriculture.



Note: The original of this drawing was produced in colour - a monochrome copy should not be relied upon. All drawings © Advanced Arboriculture.

![](_page_15_Picture_0.jpeg)

Note: The original of this drawing was produced in colour - a monochrome copy should not be relied upon. All drawings © Advanced Arboriculture.

![](_page_16_Picture_0.jpeg)

Note: The original of this drawing was produced in colour - a monochrome copy should not be relied upon. All drawings © Advanced Arboriculture.

![](_page_17_Figure_0.jpeg)

Note: The original of this drawing was produced in colour - a monochrome copy should not be relied upon. All drawings © Advanced Arboriculture.

![](_page_18_Figure_0.jpeg)

![](_page_19_Picture_0.jpeg)

![](_page_20_Picture_0.jpeg)