

Dated: 15th December 2020

TPO/E/04/20

=====

**TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING ACT 1990**

=====

**TREE**

**PRESERVATION**

**ORDER**

Relating to: - Land Rear Of 30 To 40 Garden Close Sutton  
Cambridgeshire

=====

Printed and Published by:  
East Cambridgeshire District Council The Grange Nutholt Lane Ely Cambs CB7 4EE

=====

ORDER.TPO

**TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING (TREE PRESERVATION) (ENGLAND)  
REGULATIONS 2012**

**TREE PRESERVATION ORDER**

---

**Town and Country Planning Act 1990  
The Tree Preservation Order at Land Rear Of 30 To 40 Garden Close Sutton  
Cambridgeshire , TPO/E/04/20 2020**

The East Cambridgeshire District Council, in exercise of the powers conferred on them by section 198 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 make the following Order—

**Citation**

1. This Order may be cited as the Tree Preservation Order at Land Rear Of 30 To 40 Garden Close Sutton Cambridgeshire , TPO/E/04/20 2020

**Interpretation**

2. (1) In this Order “the authority” means the East Cambridgeshire District Council
- (2) In this Order any reference to a numbered section is a reference to the section so numbered in the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 and any reference to a numbered regulation is a reference to the regulation so numbered in the Town and Country Planning (Tree Preservation) (England) Regulations 2012.

**Effect**

3. (1) Subject to article 4, this Order takes effect provisionally on the date on which it is made.
- (2) Without prejudice to subsection (7) of section 198 (power to make tree preservation orders) or subsection (1) of section 200 (tree preservation orders: Forestry Commissioners) and, subject to exceptions in regulation 14, no person shall-
  - (a) cut down, top, lop, uproot, wilfully damage, or wilfully destroy; or
  - (b) cause or permit the cutting down, topping, lopping, uprooting, wilful damage or wilful destruction of,any tree specified in the Schedule to this Order except with the written consent of the authority in accordance with regulations 16 and 17, or of the Secretary of State in accordance with regulation 23, and, where such consent is given subject to conditions, in accordance with those conditions.

**Application to trees to be planted pursuant to a condition**

4. In relation to any tree identified in the first column of the Schedule by the letter “C”, being a tree to be planted pursuant to a condition imposed under paragraph (a) of section 197 (planning permission to include appropriate provision for preservation and planting of trees), this Order takes effect as from the time when the tree is planted.

Dated this 15th day of December 2020

Signed on behalf of the East Cambridgeshire District Council

*[Signature]*

Authorised by the Council to sign in that behalf]

## CONFIRMATION OF ORDER

This Order was confirmed by East Cambridgeshire District Council without modification on the     day of    

OR

This Order was confirmed by East Cambridgeshire District Council, subject to the modifications indicated by \_\_\_\_\_, on the \_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_

Authorised by the Council to sign in that behalf

## DECISION NOT TO CONFIRM ORDER

A decision not to confirm this Order was taken by East Cambridgeshire District Council on the      day of

Authorised by the Council to sign in that behalf

## VARIATION OF ORDER

This Order was varied by the East Cambridgeshire District Council on the      day of  
under the reference number

Authorised by the Council to sign in that behalf

## REVOCATION OF ORDER

This Order was revoked by the East Cambridgeshire District Council on the      day of  
under the reference number

Authorised by the Council to sign in that behalf

## SCHEDULE SPECIFICATION OF TREES

### Trees specified individually (encircled in black on the map)

Reference on map	Description	Situation
<b>T1</b>	<b>Hawthorn</b>	<b>Southern boundary of 10 Oates Lane</b>
<b>T2</b>	<b>Field Maple</b>	<b>Adjacent G1 as per plan</b>

### Trees specified by reference to an area (within a dotted black line on the map)

Reference on map	Description	Situation
	<b>NONE</b>	

### Groups of trees (within a broken black line on the map)

Reference on map	Description (including number of trees in the group)	Situation
<b>G1</b>	<b>7 x Horse Chestnut, 5 x Ash, 1 x Oak, 2 x Lime, 1 x Wild Cherry</b>	<b>Eastern Boundary with Rectory Farm</b>
<b>G2</b>	<b>2 x Common Alder</b>	<b>As per plan</b>
<b>G3</b>	<b>14 x Common Alder, 11 x Ash, 14 x Oak</b>	<b>Opposite entrance adjacent central hedge</b>

### Woodlands (within a continuous black line on the map)

Reference on map	Description	Situation
	<b>NONE</b>	

**TREE EVALUATION METHOD FOR PRESERVATION ORDERS - TEMPO**

## SURVEY DATA SHEET &amp; DECISION GUIDE

<b>Postal Address/Location</b>		<b>Land To The Rear Of Garden Close Sutton Cambridgeshire CB6 2RF</b>	
<b>Date:</b>	<b>11/12/2020</b>	<b>Surveyor:</b>	<b>Kevin Drane</b>

<b>DESCRIPTION OF TREE(S) – Please continue on separate sheet if needed</b>		
Category	Description (incl. species)	Situation
Group 1	7x Horse Chestnut 5x Ash 1x Oak 2x Lime 1x Wild Cherry	Eastern boundary with Rectory Farm
Group 2	2x Common Alder	As per plan
Group 3	14x Common Alder 11x Ash 14x Oak	Opposite entrance adjacent central hedge
Tree 1	Hawthorn	Southern boundary of 10 Oates Lane
Tree 2	Field Maple	Adjacent G1 as per plan

**REFER TO GUIDANCE NOTE FOR ALL DEFINITIONS****Part 1: Amenity assessment****a) Condition & suitability for TPO**

- 5) Good Highly suitable  
3) Fair/satisfactory Suitable  
1) Poor Unlikely to be suitable  
0) Dead/dying/dangerous\* Unsuitable

*\* Relates to existing context and is intended to apply to severe irremediable defects only*

**Score & Notes 3 rising to 5 when site developed**

**b) Retention span (in years) & suitability for TPO**

- 5) 100+ Highly suitable  
4) 40-100 Very suitable  
2) 20-40 Suitable  
1) 10-20 Just suitable  
0) <10\* Unsuitable

*\*Includes trees which are an existing or near future nuisance, including those clearly outgrowing their context, or which are significantly negating the potential of other trees of better quality*

**Score & Notes 4 trees are early mature to mature with plenty of growth potential**

**c) Relative public visibility & suitability for TPO**

*Consider realistic potential for future visibility with changed land use*

- |   |                     |
|---|---------------------|
| 5) Very large trees with some visibility, or prominent large trees  | Highly suitable     |
| 4) Large trees, or medium trees clearly visible to the public       | Suitable            |
| 3) Medium trees, or large trees with limited view only              | Suitable            |
| 2) Young, small, or medium/large trees visible only with difficulty | Barely suitable     |
| 1) Trees not visible to the public, regardless of size              | Probably unsuitable |

**Score & Notes 3 to 4 when development completed**

**d) Other factors**

*Trees must have accrued 7 or more points (with no zero score) to qualify*

- 5) Principal components of formal arboricultural features, or veteran trees

**Score & Notes 4 planning info suggests part removal of groups**

- 4) Tree groups, or principal members of groups important for their cohesion
- 3) Trees with identifiable historic, commemorative or habitat importance
- 2) Trees of particularly good form, especially if rare or unusual
- 1) Trees with none of the above additional redeeming features (inc. those of indifferent form)
- 1) Trees with poor form or which are generally unsuitable for their location

**Part 2: Expediency assessment**

*Trees must have accrued 10 or more points to qualify*

- 5) Immediate threat to tree inc. S.211 Notice
- 3) Foreseeable threat to tree
- 2) Perceived threat to tree
- 1) Precautionary only

**Score & Notes 5 removal via planning consent likely**

**Part 3: Decision guide**

Any 0	Do not apply TPO
1-6	TPO indefensible
7-11	Does not merit TPO
12-15	TPO defensible just
16+	Definitely merits TPO

**Add Scores for  
Total:  
19**

**Decision:**

Issue TPO ASAP due to the significant amenity value of the trees.

# LAND OFF GARDEN CLOSE SUTTON ELY

## ARBORICULTURAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT

for



Ecology  
Archaeology  
Arboriculture  
Landscape Architecture



<b>Written By:</b>	A Bigg
<b>Revised By:</b>	T Grayshaw
<b>Date:</b>	05/08/2020
<b>Revision:</b>	A:12/11/20
<b>Ref:</b>	ABBEY22966aia

## **TABLE OF CONTENTS**

<b>1. Executive Summary</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>2. Introduction</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>3. Arboricultural Impact Assessment</b>	<b>6</b>
3.4. Evaluation of impact of proposed tree losses	6
3.5. Trees to be pruned	8
3.6. Protection for retained trees	8
3.7. Barriers	8
3.8. Shade and future pressure to prune	9
3.9. New Hard Surfaces within RPAs	9
3.10. Construction footprint within RPAs of retained trees	9
3.11. Drainage & Services	10
3.12. Levels and Landscaping	10
3.13. Boundaries	10
3.14. Supervision & monitoring	10
<b>4. Conclusion &amp; Recommendations</b>	<b>11</b>



## **1. Executive Summary**

- 1.1. This site benefits from an Outline Planning Approval which was granted at Appeal in January 2019.
- 1.2. This report is in support of a Reserved Matters application relating to access, appearance, landscaping, layout, and scale. The Appeal Decision outlined the following points:
  - The principle of a development containing up to 53 dwellings has already been established through the grant, on appeal, of outline planning permission 17/01445/OUM. (Appeal ref:APP/ V0510/W/18/3195976).
  - The Reserved Matters under consideration as part of this pre-application advice are; appearance, landscaping, layout, and scale. Vehicular access to the development is to be achieved via a new access point at the end of Garden Close, to the east of the last of the existing properties.
  - The principle of an access point in this location was proposed in the illustrative masterplan and accepted through the grant of outline planning permission.
- 1.3. This report was revised to address comments raised by ECDC Tree Team 17<sup>th</sup> June 2020. The responses to these comments have been made in the associated sections of this report.
- 1.4. This report has been revised to address comments from the East Cambridgeshire District Council tree officer 4<sup>th</sup> November 2020.
  - Proximity of unit 40 to trees identified for retention. Adequate space has been given to allow for scaffold erection (2m+) this will be appropriate space for future growth of adjacent trees. In respect of future pressure to prune it is reasoned that any potential resident will have the capacity to review the relationship between the unit and tree stock. In addition, ECDC have the means and opportunity to utilise the TPO legislation to ensure the continued long term protection of the trees.
  - Detailed services/utilities design is not available for assessment. As per Figure 1 of BS5837:2012, these details are considered detailed/technical design. The arboricultural assessment notes that there is adequate space within the site to avoid RPAs of trees identified for retention.
  - Revised information for arboricultural input has been included within section 3.14 of this report.
- 1.5. This impact assessment is intended to evaluate the direct and indirect effects of the proposed design on the trees on site, and where necessary recommends mitigation.

- 1.6. The development proposals are in accordance with BS5837:2012 'Trees in relation to design, demolition and construction – Recommendations'.
- 1.7. Adequate protection can be provided to ensure all retained trees are protected throughout development in the form of barriers and/or ground protection.
- 1.8. Details for those trees to be removed are given at section 3.4 below. Given the number of trees on the site, the development proposals incorporate the majority of the better, more sustainable specimens that are situated on the site boundaries. All trees identified for removal are internal to the site and therefore their removal will not have any significant adverse impact on the surrounding area.
- 1.9. The relationship between the buildings and retained trees is sustainable and does not result in any situations which may result in unreasonable pressure to prune requests from future occupants.

## **2. Introduction**

- 2.1. ACD Environmental was instructed in August 2020 to prepare the following impact assessment by Abbey Homes. This report is compiled from the revised information recorded within ABBEY22725 revs A-E. Reference is made to existing Tree Survey and Reference Plan under the same job number ABBEY22725tr and ABBEY22725-01. These documents are a snapshot of the site at the time of the survey and as such have not been updated for the purpose of this new submission.
- 2.2. This report is based on the recommendations given in BS5837:2012 'Trees in relation to design, demolition and construction – Recommendations'.
- 2.3. Data is extracted from, and reference should be made to, the tree survey which preceded this report. (ACD Ref: ABBEY22725tr).
- 2.4. This assessment is based upon the supplied layout drawing by CMYK drawing number 1925/P/10.02 revision C dated 18.05.2020.
- 2.5. No details have been supplied or sought of any statutory protection which may cover the subject trees.
- 2.6. The controlling authority is East Cambridgeshire District Council, who can be contacted at: The Grange, Nutholt Lane, Ely, Cambridgeshire, CB7 4PL. (01395) 516551

### **3. Arboricultural Impact Assessment**

- 3.1. This impact assessment is intended to evaluate the direct and indirect impacts on the trees on the site in relation to the proposed development. Where appropriate mitigation is proposed, with details given of any issues to be addressed by the arboricultural method statement to ensure the development is acceptable in arboricultural terms.
- 3.2. Any potentially damaging activities proposed in the vicinity of retained trees are identified, such that mitigation to significantly reduce or avoid this impact can be detailed in the Arboricultural Method Statement and Tree Protection Plan as recommended in BS5837:2012 section 5.4.2.
- 3.3. The tree survey for the site is at Appendix 2 of the Tree Report for the site ACD reference ABBEY22725tr.

#### **3.4. Evaluation of impact of proposed tree losses**

- 3.4.1. The following B category trees are proposed for removal:

- T32 (Weeping Willow)
- G8 (Alder) 14 trees to be removed from a total of 14 in the group.
- G9 (Ash) 4 trees to be removed from a total of 11 in the group.
- G10 (Oak) 2 trees to be removed from a total of 14 in the group.

- 3.4.2. Although the removal of B category trees is not ideal, the individual Willow tree and components of the groups are all found internal to the site. Whilst it is acknowledged the trees have some value in their current context, they are not of a quality that should compromise the layout. It is reasoned to be acceptable to remove and provide replacement trees as illustrated on the proposed layout.

- 3.4.3. Officer comments have been made of the 'unnecessary loss of category 'B' trees'. Again, it is reasoned that these trees are well within the site and compensatory replanting across the site will be more beneficial in creating a continued long term contribution to the overall sylvan character of the area.

- 3.4.4. It is expressed, the central group should be assessed as a single group. The reason the group was recorded as three 'survey entries' was to accurately record species density. In assessing the group as a single cohesive group, it is reasoned the removal of the trees within the western half of the group will not have a detrimental impact to the local amenity as effectively trees are being removed from adjacent individuals whilst retaining the group feature that is visible in views from the west.

- 3.4.5. The following C category trees are proposed for removal:

- T21 – T28, T46 – T50
- G4 (Hawthorn)
- G6 (Hawthorn)
- G7 (Hawthorn/Blackthorn) 80% of group by area to be removed.

- 3.4.6. In terms of the effects of the tree loss required to implement the design, the trees to be removed are all located well within the interior of the site, and therefore will not have any significant adverse impact on the surrounding area. Any impact and loss of amenity which may be felt locally will only be short term.
- 3.4.7. The C category trees proposed for removal are not of a quality that should present any constraint to development of the site.
- 3.4.8. It is therefore deemed acceptable to remove the listed trees and, as part of the detailed landscape design for the scheme, include suitable and sustainable replacements as and where appropriate.
- 3.4.9. Replacement trees will be proposed through landscape design and will more than mitigate for their removal by providing robust long term tree cover in keeping with the proposal and surrounding properties.

### **3.5. Trees to be pruned**

- 3.5.1. No pruning works are required to implement the development, and tree surgery works are not anticipated (excluding tree removals). Should any become necessary it should comply with BS3998:2010 Tree Work or more recently accepted arboricultural good practice and be approved by the East Cambridgeshire District Council prior to any commencement.
- 3.5.2. An error was recorded between AIA report and the supporting AMS report. Trees nos. T21-T23 were identified for removal in the last set of revisions and not updated as such. It is confirmed that surgery works are not required to these individuals.

### **3.6. Protection for retained trees**

BS5837:2012 section 6.2.1. states: 'All trees that are being retained on site should be protected by barriers and/or ground protection (see 5.5) before any materials or machinery are brought onto the site, and before any demolition, development or stripping of soil commences. Where all activity can be excluded from the RPA, vertical barriers should be erected to create a construction exclusion zone. Where, due to site constraints, construction activity cannot be fully or permanently excluded in this manner from all or part of a tree's RPA, appropriate ground protection should be installed (see 6.2.3).' As such, protection for all retained trees is shown on the Tree Protection Plan according to this specification.

### **3.7. Barriers**

BS5837:2012 figure 2 recommends a default specification for protective barrier. This is a weld mesh panel design, mounted upon a well braced scaffold framework. This is perfectly adequate for this site where there are to be areas of high intensity development. Given the scale of the site, where it is likely there will be much lower pressure in terms of construction activity (such as future rear gardens), it is suggested that 1.2m chestnut pale fencing (or similar) clearly indicated as Tree Protection Fencing by signage would be entirely adequate. All tree protection fence should be erected before any works start on site whatsoever.

### **3.8. Shade and future pressure to prune**

- 3.8.1. It is acknowledged that the compiled Tree Protection Plan does not show the indicative shading arc as detailed in BS5837 section 5.2.2 Note 1. With reference to 'can be shown' and not 'should be shown'. However, this data is generated within the survey software and shown on internal CAD design drawings.
- 3.8.2. In direct reference to unit 38, following site layout revisions now as unit 40, 'the crowns of the remaining trees will be extremely close to the proposed building making the need for future pruning invertible (sic) and pressure for further tree removal'. This unit is situated to the south of this group and shading will be cast to the north. It is reasoned that perspective purchasers will be able to review and assess the property prior to purchase. Furthermore, East Cambridgeshire District Council have the means and opportunity to ensure the continued protection of these trees in the form of the confirmed Tree Preservation Order.
- 3.8.3. The site layout has been assessed in terms of shading and future pressure to prune. Given the orientation of the site, and the relationship between the proposed buildings and the retained trees, the juxtaposition is viable for long-term tree retention, and it is considered that shading by trees is unlikely to be a concern to future residents. As a result, it is considered unlikely that there would be any undue pressure to remove trees, or excessively prune from any future occupants.

### **3.9. Proposed New Hard Surfaces within RPAs**

- 3.9.1. In order to minimise impact on the trees where the proposed internal carriageway/footpath encroaches across the RPAs of off-site trees T4 and T34. However, these incursions are minimal being less than 2% of their total RPA. Therefore, it is reasoned that the new hard surface will not be to the detriment of the tree.

### **3.10. Construction footprint within RPAs of retained trees**

- 3.10.1. BS5837:2012 states at section 5.3.1: 'The default position should be that structures (see 3.10) are located outside the RPAs of trees to be retained. However, where there is an overriding justification for construction within the RPA, technical solutions might be available that prevent damage to the tree(s) (see Clause 7).
- 3.10.2. The design proposals for this project have been compiled so that all construction footprint is sited outside the RPAs of trees identified for retention. Therefore, special construction measures or adjustment of the plans are not required.

### **3.11. Drainage & Services**

- 3.11.1. Drainage details have been provided for the purpose of this assessment from Brian Chick Engineering 'Drainage Strategy Plan' Drawing number 219537/p revision A. Details from this drawing of the proposed services have been added to the Tree Protection Plan. It can be seen that the drainage has been designed such that there are no conflicts with the RPAs of retained trees.
- 3.11.2. Seven trees are proposed to be removed in the open space area at the south of the site to the south of the existing pond. It is confirmed with reference to notes taken at the time of the tree survey that these are all C category Hawthorn and Ash in poor condition due to the currently waterlogged ground in that area.

### **3.12. Levels and Landscaping**

- 3.12.1. Full details of any changes in ground levels on site remain to be finalised. Any alterations to levels close to trees may damage roots and affect tree health and stability. Unless no-dig methodology is proposed for installation of surfaces within RPAs the original levels in these areas must be noted, retained, and integrated into the engineering design of the site. Landscaping operations within the RPAs of retained trees must be carried out in a sensitive manner and be subject to a detailed method statement and arboricultural supervision.

### **3.13. Boundaries**

- 3.13.1. All plot boundaries will need to be designed, positioned, and installed to avoid damage to retained trees. When within RPAs, this will include hand excavation of all post holes, and the lining of any post holes with a non-porous membrane to stop leachates from the concrete damaging tree roots.

### **3.14. Supervision & monitoring**

- 3.14.1. The development lacks any bespoke surface installation or foundation design. Therefore, arboricultural input from the project arboriculturist will be limited to a pre-commencement meeting with interested site managers and the ECDC tree officer.
- 3.14.2. ACD Environmental have been retained as the project arboriculturist and have worked extensively with Abbey Homes. It is reasoned that whilst concentrated arboricultural input will not be required throughout the construction phase, ACD Environmental will be available to provide both telephone and/or site input.



#### **4. Conclusion & Recommendations**

- 4.1. The development proposals are in accordance with BS5837:2012 'Trees in relation to design, demolition and construction – Recommendations'.
- 4.2. Adequate protection can be provided to ensure all retained trees are protected throughout development in the form of barriers and/or ground protection.
- 4.3. The development proposals are in accordance with BS5837:2012 'Trees in relation to design, demolition and construction – Recommendations'. Adequate protection can be provided to ensure all retained trees are protected throughout the development.
- 4.4. Any comments and recommendations made in section 3 should be noted and due consideration be given to the phasing and operational impact (and viability) of special construction techniques.
- 4.5. Any fencing and other tree protection measures should be erected after tree surgery but before any demolition or construction contractor enter the site, and before any soil stripping takes place. It is recommended that protection measures are monitored during the development process by a representative of ACD or an alternative consultant acceptable to the LPA, who should be responsible to both the developer and the LPA for the enforcement of the protection as agreed by both parties.
- 4.6. There must be no changes in levels, service routing, machine activity, storage of materials or site hut positioning within areas to be protected and the protective fencing must remain in position for the duration of the construction process.
- 4.7. Surgery may also be required in order to allow trees to be retained close to structures, to allow access for construction or future site traffic, or in the interests of the future health and safety of the trees and users of the site. Detailed recommendations for surgery should be provided prior to site commencement. All surgery should comply with BS3998:2010 or more recently accepted arboricultural good practice.

Andrew Bigg *CertArb (RFS)*  
Arboriculturist

5<sup>th</sup> August 2020

Revised 12<sup>th</sup> November 2020 – To address tree officer comments.

#### **LIMITATIONS OF USE AND COPYRIGHT**

This assessment has been prepared for Abbey Homes. All rights in this report are reserved. No part of it may be reproduced or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, or stored in any retrieval system of any nature, without our written permission. Its content and format are for the exclusive use of the addressee in dealing with Garden Close, Sutton, Ely. Until all invoices rendered by the Consultant to the Client have been paid in full, the copyright of any documents, forms, statements, maps, plans and other such material will remain vested in ACD Environmental and no unauthorised use of such material may be made by the Client or any person purporting to be acting on his/her behalf. It may not be sold, lent, hired out or divulged to any third party not directly involved in this site without the written consent of ACD Environmental ©.



**Head Office**

Rodbourne Rail Business Centre  
Grange Lane  
Malmesbury  
SN16 0ES  
Tel: 01666 825646

**Surrey Office**

The Old Mill  
Fry's Yard  
Bridge Street  
Godalming  
GU7 1HP  
Tel: 01483 425714

**Hampshire Office**

Crescent House  
Yonge Close  
Eastleigh  
SO50 9SX  
Tel: 02382 026300

Email: [mail@acdenv.co.uk](mailto:mail@acdenv.co.uk)

Website: [www.acdenvironmental.co.uk](http://www.acdenvironmental.co.uk)

ECOLOGICAL SURVEYS \* PROTECTED SPECIES LICENSING \* MITIGATION \* IMPACT  
ASSESSMENT \* ARBORICULTURAL SITE MONITORING AND SUPERVISION \* ARCHAEOLOGY  
LANDSCAPE & VISUAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT \* LANDSCAPE AUDIT \* PROJECT MANAGEMENT  
\* EXPERT WITNESS\* LANDSCAPE DESIGN & PLANNING LANDSCAPE MANAGEMENT

# LAND OFF GARDEN CLOSE SUTTON ELY

## TREE SURVEY

for



<b>Written By:</b>	A Bigg
<b>Checked By:</b>	T Grayshaw
<b>Date:</b>	21/01/2020
<b>Revision:</b>	-
<b>Ref:</b>	ABBEY22725ts

## **TABLE OF CONTENTS**

<b>1.</b>	<b>Introduction and Terms of Reference</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>2.</b>	<b>Scope and Method of Survey</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>3.</b>	<b>Recommendations</b>	<b>4</b>
	<b>Appendix 1: Summary of Categories BS5837:2012</b>	<b>6</b>
	<b>Appendix 2: Tree Survey Schedule</b>	<b>7</b>
	<b>Appendix 3: Tree Reference Plan</b>	<b>16</b>

## 1. Introduction and Terms of Reference

- 1.1. ACD Environmental were instructed by Abbey Homes, in January 2020, to survey and categorize the trees at Garden Close, Sutton, Ely, in accordance with BS5837:2012 Trees in relation to design, demolition and construction – Recommendations. The survey includes all trees with a stem diameter greater than 75mm stem diameter at a height of 1.5m that are on site or close enough to pose a potential constraint to development.
- 1.2. The survey was carried out to assess the trees on site for their quality and benefits within the context of proposed development. The quality of each tree, or group of trees has been recorded by allocating it to one of four categories, where:
  - Trees of A and B category should be considered as constraints to development and every attempt should be made to incorporate them into any proposed development design.
  - C category trees will not usually be retained where they would impose a significant constraint to development but should be retained where there is no reason for their removal.
  - U category trees are in such a condition that they are unlikely to contribute beyond 10 years and may be removed as good arboricultural practice.
- 1.3. This report provides the data and advice outlined in BS5837:2012 only. It must not be substituted for a tree risk assessment. Detailed tree inspection including decay mapping, aerial inspection, soil analysis, etc. was not undertaken. If further detailed inspection is deemed necessary, then it will be made clear within this report.
- 1.4. The Tree Reference Plan was based on the supplied topographical ground survey.
- 1.5. The controlling authority is East Cambridgeshire District Council, who can be contacted at:  
  
The Grange, Nutholt Lane, Ely, Cambridgeshire, CB7 4PL. (01395) 516551
- 1.6. Any questions relating to the content of this report should be directed in the first instance to: ACD Environmental, Courtyard House, Mill Lane, Godalming, Surrey GU7 1EY, 01483 425 714/07796 832 490, quoting the site address and report reference number.



## **2. Scope and Method of Survey**

- 2.1. The survey has been carried out in accordance with BS5837:2012 Trees in Relation to design, demolition and construction - Recommendations and the trees are assessed objectively and without reference to any site layout proposals. Categories are based on each tree's health and condition, together with an assessment of its life expectancy if its surroundings were to be unchanged. An explanation of the categories can be found at appendix 1.
- 2.2. The reference numbers of surveyed trees and groups of trees are shown on the Tree Reference Plan, which is based on the supplied survey drawing and appended to this report. The prefix G has been used to indicate a group of trees, and H for hedges. Stem locations within groups may be estimated, and indicative of canopy only.
- 2.3. The tree survey was carried out from ground level only.
- 2.4. In correspondence with East Cambridgeshire District Council, 22<sup>nd</sup> January 2020, it is informed that there are no Tree Preservation Orders in effect and there are no tree related planning conditions in operation. Some of the top section of the site to the rear of Rathmore 2 Station Road Sutton and 4 Station Road Sutton is within the Sutton conservation area.
- 2.5. Where trees are located on neighbouring land an estimated appraisal has been made of their quality and dimensions.
- 2.6. Where stems or branches are obscured by ivy or other materials a full assessment of those parts will not be possible.
- 2.7. Tree heights were measured with a clinometer or estimated in relation to those measured with the clinometer. If individual tree heights are of particular concern, for example in shading calculations, then they are measured using a clinometer.
- 2.8. Trunk diameters were measured or, where inaccessible, estimated. Single stemmed trees are measured at 1.5m from ground level. Multiple stemmed trees are measured according to section 4.6 of BS5837:2012. For groups of trees the diameter may be an estimated average or a maximum.
- 2.9. Tree canopies, where markedly asymmetrical, were measured (or estimated by pacing) in four directions using a laser measure. Symmetrical canopies are measured in one direction only, with dimensions in the remaining directions assumed to be similar. The canopy of tree groups will be indicated by measuring the maximum canopy radius for each compass point (more complicated groups will have further notes taken and an accurate representation will be shown on the plan).
- 2.10. No soil assessment was carried out at the time of survey. According to the National Soil Resources Institute online mapping service at <http://www.landis.org.uk/soilscapes> the soil on site is expected to be: Loamy and sandy soils with naturally high groundwater and a peaty surface.

### **3. Recommendations**

- 3.1. Trees of A and B category should be considered as constraints to development and every attempt should be made to incorporate them into any proposed development design. Trees of a C category will not usually be retained where they would impose a significant constraint to development. U category trees are in such a condition that they will be lost within 10 years and may be removed as good arboricultural practice.
- 3.2. There is scope for development of the site whilst retaining the important trees on the boundaries and by removing the lower quality trees from the interior of the.
- 3.3. Trees can be a development constraint both below and above the ground. In terms of below ground constraints, BS5837:2012 RPAs indicate an area that contains sufficient rooting volume to ensure survival of the tree. In terms of the proximity of structures to trees, the default position should be that structures are located outside the RPAs of trees to be retained. This area of ground should be considered within the site layout, such that it can left undisturbed during demolition and construction by prohibiting activity from the area using protective fencing or ground protection.
- 3.4. In terms of the above ground factors, tree constraints presented by the canopy and the psychological effects of tree proximity to dwellings (such as shading, perceived threat of tree failure, etc.) must also be considered during scheme design. This will involve optimising site layout and building room use to avoid the end-user becoming resentful of the trees and seeking excessive pruning or even tree removal. This is especially a consideration with trees located on southern boundaries.
- 3.5. Preferably, conflicts between proposed structures and RPAs and tree canopies should be 'designed out' through the careful positioning of any built form. It is therefore advisable that any development layouts are drafted in close collaboration with ACD to ensure that any trees which are highlighted for retention can be realistically integrated into the design.
- 3.6. When a final layout is agreed, an Arboricultural Impact Assessment (AIA) should be completed to discuss arboricultural issues within the scheme and demonstrate to the Planning Authority the viability of the layout.
- 3.7. Before any works start on site, including demolition, an Arboricultural Method Statement (AMS) and Tree Protection Plan (TPP) should be submitted, approved and implemented. There must be no changes in levels, service routing, machine activity, storage of materials or site hut positioning within the Root Protection Areas (RPAs) and the protective fencing must remain in position for the duration of the construction process.

- 3.8. BS5837:2012 Section 5.1.1 states that the constraints imposed by trees, both above and below ground should inform the site layout design, although it is recognized that the competing needs of development mean that trees are only one factor requiring consideration. Certain trees are of such importance and sensitivity as to be major constraints on development or to justify its substantial modification. However, care should be taken to avoid misplaced tree retention; attempts to retain too many or unsuitable trees on a site can result in excessive pressure on the trees during demolition or construction work, or post-completion demands for their removal. It is anticipated that there is to be comprehensive redevelopment of the site, which may require the removal of B category trees. Removal of B category trees may be considered acceptable, subject to mitigation planting as part of landscape proposals. It is advised that this is subject to discussion with the Local Planning Authority as to the acceptability of this approach.
- 3.9. BS5837:2012 Section 5.2.1 states that: 'The RPA and any other relevant constraints should be plotted around each of the category A, B and C trees on relevant drawings, including proposed site layout plans'. Recognition is given in Table 1 however that C category trees are 'unremarkable trees of very limited merit'. As such it is considered that C category trees should be retained where appropriate, but should not represent a constraint to an otherwise satisfactory proposal.

Andrew Bigg *CertArb (RFS)*  
Arboriculturist

21 January 2020

#### LIMITATIONS OF USE AND COPYRIGHT

This assessment has been prepared for Abbey Homes. All rights in this report are reserved. No part of it may be reproduced or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, or stored in any retrieval system of any nature, without our written permission. Its content and format are for the exclusive use of the addressee in dealing with Garden Close, Sutton, Ely. Until all invoices rendered by the Consultant to the Client have been paid in full, the copyright of any documents, forms, statements, maps, plans and other such material will remain vested in ACD Environmental and no unauthorised use of such material may be made by the Client or any person purporting to be acting on his/her behalf. It may not be sold, lent, hired out or divulged to any third party not directly involved in this site without the written consent of ACD Environmental ©.



## Appendix 1: Summary of Categories BS5837:2012

BS5837:2012 Table 1 -Cascade chart for tree quality assessment			
Category and definition		Criteria (including subcategories where appropriate)	
Trees unsuitable for retention (see Note)			
<b>Category U</b> Those in such a condition that they cannot realistically be retained as living trees in the context of the current land use for longer than 10 years		*Trees that have a serious, irremediable, structural defect, such that their early loss is expected due to collapse, including those that will become unviable after removal of other category U trees (e.g. where, for whatever reason, the loss of companion shelter cannot be mitigated by pruning) *Trees that are dead or are showing signs of significant, immediate, and irreversible overall decline *Trees infected with pathogens of significance to the health and/or safety of other trees nearby, or very low quality trees suppressing adjacent trees of better quality  <i>NOTE Category U trees can have existing or potential conservation value which it might be desirable to preserve; see 4.5.7.</i>	
	<b>1 Mainly arboricultural qualities</b>	<b>2 Mainly landscape qualities</b>	<b>3 Mainly cultural values, including conservation</b>
Trees to be considered for retention			
<b>Category A</b> <b>Trees of high quality</b> with an estimated remaining life expectancy of at least 40 years		Trees that are particularly good examples of their species, especially if rare or unusual; or those that are essential components of groups or formal or semi-formal arboricultural features (e.g. the dominant and/or principal trees within an avenue)	Trees, groups or woodlands of particular visual importance as arboricultural and/or landscape features
<b>Category B</b> <b>Trees of moderate quality</b> with an estimated remaining life expectancy of at least 20 years		Trees, groups or woodlands of significant conservation, historical, commemorative or other value (e.g. veteran trees or wood-pasture)	Trees present in numbers, usually growing as groups or woodlands, such that they attract a higher collective rating than they might as individuals; or trees occurring as collectives but situated so as to make little visual contribution to the wider locality
<b>Category C</b> <b>Trees of low quality</b> with an estimated remaining life expectancy of at least 10 years, or young trees with a stem diameter below 150mm		Trees with material conservation or other cultural value	Unremarkable trees of very limited merit or such impaired condition that they do not qualify in higher categories
		Trees present in groups or woodlands, but without this conferring on them significantly greater collective landscape value; and/or trees offering low or only temporary/transient landscape benefits	Trees with no material conservation or other cultural value

## Appendix 2: Tree Survey Schedule

No.	Name	Ht (crown)	Dia (stems)	Canopy spread N   E   S   W				Life stage	ERC	Comments & preliminary recommendations	BS Cat
T1	Alnus glutinosa (Common Alder)	12(1)	290(1)	3	3	3	3	SM	40+	Fair tree of moderate quality and value.	B2
T2	Alnus glutinosa (Common Alder)	12(1)	300,140(2)	3	3	3	3	SM	40+	Fair tree of moderate quality and value. Twin-stemmed.	B2
T3 Off-site	Crataegus monogyna (Hawthorn)	12(1.5)	325(1)	3	3	3	3	EM	20+	Fair tree of moderate quality and value. Heavily ivy covered.	B2
T4 Off-site	Salix fragilis (Crack Willow)	16(2)	500,300(2)	6	6	6	6	EM	20+	Off-site dominant individual. Twin-stemmed tree of moderate quality and of high landscape value.	B2
T6 Off-site	Salix fragilis (Crack Willow)	14(2)	750(1)	6	6	6	6	EM	20+	Off-site dominant individual. Tree of moderate quality and value. Topped at 12m regrowth approx. 100mm avg	B2
T5 Off-site	Populus X canadensis (Hybrid Black Poplar)	18(5)	500(1)	4	4	4	4	EM	10+	Boundary individual of moderate landscape value but of reduced structural condition. Stem removed at 3m large nonoccluded wound.	C2
T7	Sambucus nigra (Elder)	6(2)	200(1)	2	2	2	2	SM	10+	Small individual of limited quality and value.	C2
T8 Off-site	Prunus cerasifera (Cherry Plum)	7(1)	300(1)	1	2	5	2	EM	10+	Boundary individual of reduced quality and value.	C2
T9 Off-site	Fraxinus excelsior (Ash)	17(3)	430(1)	2	4	5	5	SM	10+	Tree of some landscape value of reduced structural condition. Fungal fruiting bodies at cavity trunk wound N 1m.	C2
T10 Off-site	Fraxinus excelsior (Ash)	17(3)	440(1)	2	4	3	5	EM	10+	Tree of reduced quality and of some landscape value given size. Historic pruning works. Poor crown architecture.	C2
T11 Off-site	Acer pseudoplatanus (Sycamore)	20(4)	560,570(2)	6	6	6	6	M	40+	Significant boundary tree of high quality and value. Readily visible from surrounding views.	A2

No.	Name	Ht (crown)	Dia (stems)	Canopy spread N   E   S   W				Life stage	ERC	Comments & preliminary recommendations	BS Cat
T12	Thuja plicata (Western Red Cedar)	6(0)	150,200(2)	2	2	2	2	SM	40+	Twin-stemmed fast-growing non-native conifer species of moderate quality and of reduced value due to small size.	C2
T13	Carpinus betulus (Hornbeam)	6(0.5)	150,250(2)	2	2	2	2	Y	40+	Small individual of limited quality and value.	C2
T14	Carpinus betulus (Hornbeam)	6(0.5)	150,200(2)	2	2	2	2	Y	40+	Small individual of limited quality and value.	C2
T15	Aesculus hippocastanum (Horse Chestnut)	7(1.5)	230(1)	3	3	2	3	SM	20+	A single individual planted in a linear pattern on eastern boundary of main compartment. Tree of some landscape value and of reduced quality. The tree is showing infection by bleeding canker having typical lesions and tissue degradation on main trunk in form of splits and cracks. Landowner confirms trees have historically suffered from Chestnut Leaf Miner throughout summer months.	C2
T16	Aesculus hippocastanum (Horse Chestnut)	8(1.5)	240(1)	3	3	3	3.5	SM	20+	A single individual planted in a linear pattern on eastern boundary of main compartment. Tree of some landscape value and of reduced quality. The tree is showing infection by bleeding canker having typical lesions and tissue degradation on main trunk in form of splits and cracks. Landowner confirms trees have historically suffered from Chestnut Leaf Miner throughout summer months.	C2

No.	Name	Ht (crown)	Dia (stems)	Canopy spread N   E   S   W				Life stage	ERC	Comments & preliminary recommendations	BS Cat
T17	Aesculus hippocastanum (Horse Chestnut)	5(1)	190(1)	3	3	3	3	SM	20+	A single individual planted in a linear pattern on eastern boundary of main compartment. Tree of some landscape value and of reduced quality. The tree is showing infection by bleeding canker having typical lesions and tissue degradation on main trunk in form of splits and cracks. Landowner confirms trees have historically suffered from Chestnut Leaf Miner throughout summer months.	C2
T18	Aesculus hippocastanum (Horse Chestnut)	6.5(1)	200,160(2)	3	3	3	3	SM	20+	A single twin-stemmed individual planted in a linear pattern on eastern boundary of main compartment. Tree of some landscape value and of reduced quality. The tree is showing infection by bleeding canker having typical lesions and tissue degradation on main trunk in form of splits and cracks. Landowner confirms trees have historically suffered from Chestnut Leaf Miner throughout summer months.	C2
T19	Aesculus hippocastanum (Horse Chestnut)	6(1)	185(1)	3	3	3	3	SM	20+	A single individual planted in a linear pattern on eastern boundary of main compartment. Tree of some landscape value and of reduced quality. The tree is showing infection by bleeding canker having typical lesions and tissue degradation on main trunk in form of splits and cracks. Landowner confirms trees have historically suffered from Chestnut Leaf Miner throughout summer months.	C2

No.	Name	Ht (crown)	Dia (stems)	Canopy spread N   E   S   W				Life stage	ERC	Comments & preliminary recommendations	BS Cat
T20	Aesculus hippocastanum (Horse Chestnut)	6.5(1)	240(1)	3	3	3	3	SM	20+	A single individual planted in a linear pattern on eastern boundary of main compartment. Tree of some landscape value and of reduced quality. The tree is showing infection by bleeding canker having typical lesions and tissue degradation on main trunk in form of splits and cracks. Landowner confirms trees have historically suffered from Chestnut Leaf Miner throughout summer months.	C2
T21	Aesculus hippocastanum (Horse Chestnut)	8(1)	255(1)	3	3	3	3.5	SM	20+	A single individual planted in a linear pattern on eastern boundary of main compartment. Tree of some landscape value and of reduced quality. The tree is showing infection by bleeding canker having typical lesions and tissue degradation on main trunk in form of splits and cracks. Landowner confirms trees have historically suffered from Chestnut Leaf Miner throughout summer months.	C2
T22	Fraxinus excelsior (Ash)	8(1)	260(1)	3	3	3	3.5	SM	20+	A single individual planted in a linear pattern on eastern boundary of main compartment. Tree of moderate quality but of reduced landscape value due to small size. No larger than adjacent boundary vegetation.	C2
T23	Fraxinus excelsior (Ash)	8(1)	245(1)	3	3	3	3	SM	20+	A single individual planted in a linear pattern on eastern boundary of main compartment. Tree of moderate quality but of reduced landscape value due to small size. No larger than adjacent boundary vegetation.	C2

No.	Name	Ht (crown)	Dia (stems)	Canopy spread N   E   S   W				Life stage	ERC	Comments & preliminary recommendations	BS Cat
T24	Quercus robur (Common Oak)	8(1)	255(1)	4	4	4	4	SM	20+	A single individual planted in a linear pattern on eastern boundary of main compartment. Tree of moderate quality but of reduced landscape value due to small size. No larger than adjacent boundary vegetation.	C2
T25	Fraxinus excelsior (Ash)	8(1)	240(1)	3	3	3	3	SM	20+	A single individual planted in a linear pattern on eastern boundary of main compartment. Tree of moderate quality but of reduced landscape value due to small size. No larger than adjacent boundary vegetation.	C2
T26	Fraxinus excelsior (Ash)	8(1)	240(1)	3	3	3	3	SM	20+	A single individual planted in a linear pattern on eastern boundary of main compartment. Tree of moderate quality but of reduced landscape value due to small size. No larger than adjacent boundary vegetation.	C2
T27	Tilia cordata (Small- leaved Lime)	7(1)	230(1)	3	3	3	3	SM	20+	A single individual planted in a linear pattern on eastern boundary of main compartment. Tree of moderate quality but of reduced landscape value due to small size. No larger than adjacent boundary vegetation.	C2
T28	Fraxinus excelsior (Ash)	8(1)	240(1)	3	3	3	3	SM	20+	A single individual planted in a linear pattern on eastern boundary of main compartment. Tree of moderate quality but of reduced landscape value due to small size. No larger than adjacent boundary vegetation.	C2
T29	Tilia cordata (Small- leaved Lime)	6(1)	190(1)	2	2	2	2	SM	20+	A single individual planted in a linear pattern on eastern boundary of main compartment. Tree of moderate quality but of reduced landscape value due to small size. No larger than adjacent boundary vegetation.	C2

No.	Name	Ht (crown)	Dia (stems)	Canopy spread N   E   S   W				Life stage	ERC	Comments & preliminary recommendations	BS Cat
T30	Prunus avium (Wild Cherry)	7(1)	210(1)	2	2	2	2	SM	20+	A single individual planted in a linear pattern on eastern boundary of main compartment. Tree of moderate quality but of reduced landscape value due to small size. No larger than adjacent boundary vegetation.	C2
T31	Prunus 'Kanzan' (Pink Cherry)	3(1)	150(1)	1	0.75	0.75	0.75	Y	10+	A single individual planted in a linear pattern on eastern boundary of main compartment. Tree of moderate quality but of reduced landscape value due to small size. No larger than adjacent boundary vegetation.	C2
T32	Salix X chrysocoma (Weeping Willow)	17(1)	590(1)	7	7	7	7	M	20+	Dominant individual growing internally at southern end of main compartment. Large areas of water-logged ground around base of trees. Tree of moderate quality and value as readily visible in surrounding views.	B2
T33 Off-site	Fraxinus excelsior (Ash)	15(3)	400(2)	1	5	5	5	SM	20+	Twin-stemmed off-site individual. Dimms estimated as inaccessible. Ditch immediately adjacent to tree with running water. Tree of moderate quality and value.	B2
T34	Fraxinus excelsior (Ash)	14(3)	400,250(2)	4	4.5	4.5	4	SM	20+	Twin-stemmed individual of moderate quality and value.	B2
T35	Crataegus monogyna (Hawthorn)	6(2)	250(1)	2	1.5	1.5	2	SM	40+	Small individual of moderate quality and some landscape value.	C2
T36	Crataegus monogyna (Hawthorn)	6(2)	300(1)	2	2	2	2	EM	40+	Small individual of moderate quality and some landscape value.	C2
T37										Dead standing wood	U
T38 Off-site	Crataegus monogyna (Hawthorn)	7(1)	275(1)	2	2	2	2	SM	40+	Small individual of moderate quality and some landscape value.	C2
T39 Off-site	Crataegus monogyna (Hawthorn)	7(1)	275(1)	2	2	2	2	SM	40+	Individual of moderate quality and some landscape value. Growing closely to another Hawthorn with shared canopy.	C2

No.	Name	Ht (crown)	Dia (stems)	Canopy spread N   E   S   W				Life stage	ERC	Comments & preliminary recommendations	BS Cat
T40 Off-site	Crataegus monogyna (Hawthorn)	7(1)	275(1)	2	2	2	2	SM	40+	Individual of moderate quality and some landscape value. Growing closely to another Hawthorn with shared canopy.	C2
T41	Prunus cerasifera (Cherry Plum)	9(2)	100(1)	2	2	2	1	SM	10+	Small boundary individual of reduced quality and value.	C2
T42	Prunus cerasifera (Cherry Plum)	10(2)	150(4)	3	3	3	3	SM	10+	Small boundary individual of reduced quality and value.	C2
T43	Fraxinus excelsior (Ash)	14(2)	500(1)	4	4	4	4	EM	20+	Fair tree of moderate quality and value growing on site boundary.	B2
T44	Salix fragilis (Crack Willow)	15(3)	900(1)	7	7	7	7	OM	<10	Large individual has partially collapsed into adjacent water body. Typical of species as main stem has continued to flourish. Structurally unsound however of landscape value given setting.	U
T45	Crataegus monogyna (Hawthorn)	8(1)	275(1)	3	2.5	2.5	2.5	SM	20+	Tree of moderate quality and value growing adjacent to water body.	B2
T46	Crataegus monogyna (Hawthorn)	6(1)	150(4)	3	2	2	2.5	SM	20+	Established boundary hedgerow individual of moderate quality and of some landscape value. Internal individual given land ownership.	C2
T47	Prunus cerasifera (Cherry Plum)	7(3)	260(1)	1	3	3	3	SM	20+	Established boundary hedgerow individual of moderate quality and of some landscape value. Internal individual given land ownership.	C2
T48	Crataegus monogyna (Hawthorn)	6(1)	150(4)	2	3	3	2	SM	20+	Established boundary hedgerow individual of moderate quality and of some landscape value. Internal individual given land ownership.	C2



No.	Name	Ht (crown)	Dia (stems)	Canopy spread N   E   S   W				Life stage	ERC	Comments & preliminary recommendations	BS Cat
T49	Prunus cerasifera (Cherry Plum)	7(3)	300,250(2)	2	1	3	3	SM	20+	Established twin-stemmed boundary hedgerow individual of moderate quality and of some landscape value. Internal individual given land ownership.	C2
T50	Acer campestre (Field Maple)	9(0)	350(1)	3	3	3	3	SM	40+	Tree of moderate quality and of some landscape value.	C2
T51 Off-site	Betula pendula (Silver Birch)	14(1)	345(1)	3	3	3	3	SM	40+	Off-site individual growing adjacent to site access point. Tree of moderate quality and value.	B2
G1	X Cupressocyparis leylandii (Leyland Cypress)	5(0)	150(1)	2	1.5	1.5	1.5	Y	40+	Boundary individuals of moderate quality and of some landscape value for screening.	C2
G2	Malus sylvestris (Crab Apple)	5(0.5)	100(1)	1	1	1	1	Y	20+	Linear group of small fruit trees planted as screening.	C1
G3	Prunus spinosa (Blackthorn)	4(1)	100(1)	2	1.5	1.5	1.5	Y	20+	Group of small individuals growing on southern boundary of reduced quality and value.	C2
G4	Crataegus monogyna (Hawthorn)	5(0)	150(1)	As shown on plan				SM	40+	Boundary individuals of reduced quality and value. Some evidence of historic management.	C2
G5	Prunus spinosa (Blackthorn),Crataegus monogyna (Hawthorn)	5(0)	150(1)	As shown on plan				SM	20+	Boundary individuals of reduced quality and value. Some evidence of historic management.	C2
G6	Crataegus monogyna (Hawthorn)	6(0)	150(1)	As shown on plan				SM	20+	Mixed species group of reduced quality and value. Some evidence of historic management.	C2
G7	Crataegus monogyna (Hawthorn),Prunus spinosa (Blackthorn)	7(0)	150(1)	As shown on plan				SM	20+	Mixed species group of reduced quality and value. Some evidence of historic management.	C2

No.	Name	Ht (crown)	Dia (stems)	Canopy spread N   E   S   W	Life stage	ERC	Comments & preliminary recommendations	BS Cat
G8	<i>Alnus glutinosa</i> (Common Alder)	12(1)	300(1)	As shown on plan	EM	20+	Group of individuals forming a small copse within the centre of the larger land parcel. Trees of moderate quality and value. Shared canopy due to group pressure.	B2
G9	<i>Fraxinus excelsior</i> (Ash)	12(1)	450(1)	As shown on plan	EM	20+	Group of individuals forming a small copse within the centre of the larger land parcel. Trees of moderate quality and value. Shared canopy due to group pressure.	B2
G10	<i>Quercus robur</i> (Common Oak)	12(1)	250(1)	As shown on plan	EM	20+	Group of individuals forming a small copse within the centre of the larger land parcel. Trees of moderate quality and value. Shared canopy due to group pressure.	B2
G11	<i>Crataegus monogyna</i> (Hawthorn)	5(0)	150(1)	As shown on plan	SM	40+	Boundary individuals of reduced quality and value. Some evidence of historic management.	C2
G12	<i>Acer campestre</i> (Field Maple)	3(0)	150(1)	As shown on plan	SM	20+	Boundary individuals of reduced quality and value. Some evidence of historic management.	C2

**Appendix 3: Tree Reference Plan**  
(REF12345-01)



**Head Office**

Rodbourne Rail Business Centre  
Grange Lane  
Malmesbury  
SN16 0ES  
Tel: 01666 825646

**Surrey Office**

Courtyard House  
Mill Lane  
Godalming  
GU7 1EY  
Tel: 01483 425714

**Hampshire Office**

Suite 6  
Crescent House  
Yonge Close  
Eastleigh  
SO50 9SX  
Tel: 02382 026300

**Cambridgeshire Office**

9 Brownlow Road  
Cambridge  
CB4 3NG  
Tel: 07825 868654

Email: [mail@acdenv.co.uk](mailto:mail@acdenv.co.uk)

Website: [www.acdenvironmental.co.uk](http://www.acdenvironmental.co.uk)

ECOLOGICAL SURVEYS \* PROTECTED SPECIES LICENSING \* MITIGATION \* IMPACT ASSESSMENT  
ARBORICULTURAL SITE MONITORING AND SUPERVISION \* ARCHAEOLOGY  
LANDSCAPE & VISUAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT \* LANDSCAPE AUDIT \* PROJECT MANAGEMENT  
EXPERT WITNESS\* LANDSCAPE DESIGN & PLANNING LANDSCAPE MANAGEMENT