



Broad Oak Tree Consultants Limited
Laurel House, Burwash Road, Broad Oak, Heathfield, East Sussex
TN21 8SS Tel: 01435 862444 office@broadoaktrees.co.uk



**ARBORICULTURAL IMPLICATIONS ASSESSMENT
FOR
PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT WORKS**

AT

**CHOWNES MEAD
CHOWNES MEAD LANE
CUCKFIELD
HAYWARDS HEATH
RH16 4BS**

BY

**Tim Laddiman
BSc.(Hons) M.I.C.For. M.Arbor.A.
Chartered Arboriculturist**

**Our ref: J65.57
17th March 2026**

CONTENTS

Page No.

1.	INTRODUCTION	1
2.	GENERAL SITE DESCRIPTION	1
3.	SCOPE OF TREE SURVEY	1
4.	DATA COLLECTION	1
5.	RISK ASSESSMENT - INFORMATIVES	2
6.	RESULTS OF TREE INSPECTIONS	3
7.	BS CALCULATED ROOT PROTECTION AREAS (RPAS)	4
8.	TREE SAFETY WORKS	5
ARBORICULTURAL IMPLICATIONS ASSESSMENT		
9.	REDEVELOPMENT PROPOSALS	7
10.	TREES FOR REMOVAL	7
11.	POTENTIAL IMPACT OF PROPOSALS ON RETAINED TREES	7
12.	TREE PROTECTION FENCING	9
13.	GROUND PROTECTION MEASURES	9
14.	SITE OPERATIONS AND MATERIALS STORAGE	9
15.	SERVICES/DRAINAGE/SOAKAWAYS	10
16.	SUMMARY	10

APPENDICES:

1.	COPY OF ANCIENT WOODLAND ASSESSMENT, PRODUCED BY PLACE SERVICES
2.	EXPLANATORY SHEETS, TREE INSPECTION SHEETS
3.	TREE CONSTRAINTS PLAN, DRAWING NO. J65.57/01 REV C
4.	TABLE OF BS CALCULATED ROOT PROTECTION AREAS (RPAs)
5.	TREE PROTECTION PLAN, DRAWING NO. J65.57/02
6.	EXAMPLES OF FENCING SPECIFICATION AND SIGNAGE

1. INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 Broad Oak Tree Consultants Ltd. received instructions from RCM Partnership LLP to undertake an inspection of trees located on and immediately adjacent to the site referred to as Chownes Mead, Chownes Mead Lane, Cuckfield, Haywards Heath, RH16 4BS. The purpose of the inspection was to produce a base inventory of the tree stock and an Arboricultural Implications Assessment of redevelopment proposals.
- 1.2 The proposals are for amendments to hotel layout approved under DM/18/2201, new single storey extension to main building and erection of new detached two storey spa building, provision of relocated secondary access to Chownes Mead Lane, new parking area and landscaping of the site. Details of the proposals will have been submitted by others.
- 1.3 The trees on the site had previously been inspected in April 2024 and were reinspected and the survey area expanded in January 2026. The inspections were undertaken by Tim Laddiman, BSc.(Hons) M.I.C.For. M.Arbor.A., Chartered Arboriculturist and Principal Consultant of Broad Oak Tree Consultants Ltd.
- 1.4 At the time of reporting online checks with Mid Sussex District Council did not indicate the site to be within a Conservation Area and no Tree Preservation Orders were indicated to be present. Checks with Defra group ArcGIS Online maps indicated part of the site to the east and south-east of the existing house to be Ancient Woodland.
- 1.5 An assessment of the integrity and quality of this Ancient Woodland was undertaken as part of the preapplication advice by Place Services, dated 12th November 2025. A copy of their email report is included in Appendix 1 for reference purposes.

2. GENERAL SITE DESCRIPTION

- 2.1 Chownes Mead is a large detached residential property located on the south side of Chownes Mead Lane within extensive grounds. Ground levels fall from the road to the south with a dry pond like feature to the south of the house. An ornate access drive feeds in from the west to an area of gravel parking and garaging. To the east is a swimming pool set in a terraced area with a large barn to the east and extensive surfacing with a secondary access onto the lane. South of the barn is a tennis court, bowling green and scalping surfaced area with a timber pavilion building.
- 2.2 A wooded belt separates the pool and barn from the lane with further wooded areas to the east and numerous trees of varying dimensions across the grounds to the south and west.

3. SCOPE OF TREE SURVEY

- 3.1 Only those trees indicated on the supplied topographic survey and in proximity to the main house and surrounding outbuildings/features were included in the inspections. Only trees of 75mm stem diameter and above at 1.5m height qualified for inclusion in a BS 5837:2012 "Trees in Relation to Design, Demolition and Construction - Recommendations" tree survey.

4. DATA COLLECTION

- 4.1 All trees were inspected from the ground and no climbing or specialist investigations were undertaken. Each tree was inspected to the requirements of Section 4.4 "Tree Survey" of BS 5837:2012 "Trees in Relation to Design, Demolition and Construction - Recommendations".
- 4.2 The tree survey followed the numbered sequence from G1 to T116 inclusive. Tree numbers, together with BS recommended colour coding of condition, have been added to the Tree Constraints Plan, our drawing no. J65.57/01 Rev C in Appendix 3. This drawing also includes crown spreads based on four compass points and BS calculated root protection areas.
- 4.3 The following categories of information were obtained for each tree. Separate detailed tree survey sheets are attached in Appendix 2, together with comprehensive explanatory sheets which cover the details of the categories listed below.
- (1) Tree reference number
 - (2) Species
 - (3) Height in metres
 - (4) Stem count
 - (5) Stem diameter or equivalent in millimetres
 - (6) Branch spread in metres
 - (7) Age class
 - (8) Height of crown clearance in metres
 - (9) Physiological condition
 - (10) Estimated remaining contribution in years
 - (11) Category grading
 - (12) Structural condition
 - (13) Preliminary management recommendations
- 4.4 Within the assessment of physiological condition and remaining contribution, a visual inspection of each tree was undertaken to assess the crown and stem for any weak structures, deadwood, hollows, forks or other defects that might affect its stability and safety. The base of each tree was also visually inspected, together with tapping and probing, to search for signs of root lifting, bark death or decay. Where stems were heavily ivy clad, no full assessment of structural integrity could be undertaken. Clearance of the ivy would be necessary for confirmation of tree condition.

5. RISK ASSESSMENT - INFORMATIVES

- 5.1 Although the potential risk to someone passing beneath a tree when the tree or part of it fails is relatively remote, the risk is present. This increases significantly in areas of consistent and regular usage on a year round basis, such as footpaths, gardens and roadways. Where static structures exist, the risks become constant and an assessment is made as to whether complete or partial failure of a tree could potentially cause physical damage to such structures.
- 5.2 Within the scope of any tree survey it is a fact that not all risks of stem or crown failure can be covered, particularly in relation to freak occurrences of weather when even healthy trees can suffer stem snap or windblow. There is also a well known propensity for mature trees to occasionally shed limbs for no discernible reason, even on calm days. Although relatively rare, limbs may occasionally be shed and this should be acknowledged as a risk that cannot entirely be mitigated.

6. RESULTS OF TREE INSPECTIONS

- 6.1 A total of 89 individual trees and 27 groups were inspected, ranging in age from <15 to circa 150 years of age, representing numerous past phases of landscaping, some of which potentially pre-date the 1912-1920 construction of the existing house.
- 6.2 To the north the Limes and Oaks represent early planting with the numerous Conifers (mainly Cypress) of several age classes, representing later screen planting, presumably as traffic levels increased. Remnants of Beech and Holly hedging, planted and left to develop unchecked, also line the northern boundary.
- 6.3 On the southern part of the bank above the barn dense self seeded tree growth of <20 years of age dominates.
- 6.4 The belt of trees between the tennis court and dry pond represent further phases of landscaping with Redwoods, Holm Oaks and Pines. The Holm Oaks (T13 and T17) are in a poor condition due to weak structures and will require works to reduce safety issues.
- 6.5 To the west of the dry pond is a Red Oak (T45) which is one of the largest in the country. Unfortunately, it has suffered past stem/limb failures with extensive hollows/decay representing risks of further failures. The tree has Veteran status though its condition represents a safety risk and either exclusion from its fall zone will be required or extensive crown works to reduce hazards.
- 6.6 Of the trees inspected, the following is a breakdown of the various numbers of trees and groups in each BS Category.

BS Category	Sub Total
A	2
B	20
B/U	2
C	58
C/U	8
U	26
TOTAL:	116

6.7 *Interpretation of table*

Category A

Retention most desirable. Of high quality and value and in such a condition as to be able to make a substantial contribution (a minimum of 40 years is suggested).

Category B

Retention desirable. Of moderate quality and value and in such a condition as to make a significant contribution (a minimum of 20 years is suggested).

Category B/U	Trees that would be included in category B but have structural faults, areas of decay, etc. that require more detailed investigations or climbing inspections to ascertain whether or not they can be safely retained.
Category C	Could be retained – of low quality and value. Poor crown form, heavily asymmetric, large numbers of similar species/size. Currently in adequate condition to remain until new planting could be established (a minimum of 10 years is suggested) or young trees with a stem diameter below 150mm.
Category C/U	Trees that would be included in category C but have structural faults, areas of decay, etc. that require more detailed investigations or climbing inspections to ascertain whether or not they can be safely retained. Groups that include dead/dying/dangerous individuals.
Category U	Trees for removal. Dead/dying/dangerous trees due to structural defects, fungal decay or root plate uplift. Those in such a condition that any existing value would be lost within 10 years and which should, in the current context, be removed for reasons of sound arboricultural management.

7. BS CALCULATED ROOT PROTECTION AREAS (RPAs)

- 7.1 To provide an indication of the critical areas of root plate necessary for tree survival and longevity, BS 5837:2012 requires the calculation of RPAs for trees in the BS Categories A, B and C. Calculations are not made for Category U trees which will require removal on safety grounds within 10 years.
- 7.2 The table in Appendix 4 has been calculated using the measured stem diameters and the formula as described in Section 4.6 in BS 5837:2012. These are represented as basic circles on the Tree Constraints Plan. Where buildings, walls, services and hard surfacing exist within the indicated RPAs it is likely that the architecture of root systems will have been affected. Foundations to walls and buildings can completely obstruct root development, depending on their depth and the nature of the underlying soils. In the absence of detailed site investigations the indicated RPA circles should be used for guidance only within any redevelopment proposals.

8. TREE SAFETY WORKS

- 8.1 The tree inspections identified a number of trees that represent potential hazards to current usage of the site and users of the lane and these works would be recommended to be undertaken in a timely fashion. The works to trees T55 Lime, T76 Sycamore, T84 Larch and T91 Field Maple should be considered a priority, as they represent hazards to users of the lane and secondary entrance and should be undertaken immediately.

Table: Recommended Tree Safety Works

Tree No.	Species	Works recommended	Comments
G4	Oak, Ash	Remove bowed out stem or cut back to upright limb	Potential stem collapse.
T11	Cypress	Top at 5m.	Dead upper two thirds of crown.
T13	Holm Oak	Heavily reduce or spider web brace crown structure.	Weak stem unions. Past stem/limb tearouts.
T14	Wellingtonia	Deadwood crown.	Risk to users of pavilion.
T17	Holm Oak	Pollard at 3m.	Part collapsed. Failures likely.
T20	Sycamore	Pollard at 4m.	Extensive squirrel damage. Limb failures likely.
T27	Sycamore	Heavily crown reduce.	Extensive squirrel damage. Limb failures likely.
T30	Ash	Crown reduce.	Ash Dieback. Failures likely.
T45	Red Oak	Restrict access within fall zone.	High risk of multiple limb/stem failures.
T55	Lime	Pollard at 2m - URGENT.	High risk of failure onto road.
T56	Ash	Pollard at 8m.	Failures likely.
G65	Cypress	Pollard central stem at 4m.	Collapse of stem likely.
G66	Oak, Sycamore, Cypress	Pollard Sycamore at 3m.	Squirrel damage in Sycamore.
T67	Maple	Pollard at 3m.	Split limb and decay.
T72	Sycamore	Pollard at 3m.	Squirrel damage. Failures likely.

Table: Recommended Tree Safety Works
Continued

Tree No.	Species	Works recommended	Comments
T74	Lime	Brace stems together at height or reduce height by one third.	Weak stem unions.
T76	Sycamore	Pollard at 8m.	Squirrel damage. Failures onto road likely.
T78	Sycamore	Pollard at 5m.	Failures likely.
G79	Sycamore, Holly	Pollard damaged Sycamore at 3m.	Squirrel damage in Sycamore.
T84	Larch	Pollard at 3m - URGENT.	Dead. Decayed. Leaning over road.
G89	Sycamore, Ash, Yew, Cherry Laurel	Pollard dying Ash at 3m.	Ash Dieback.
T91	Field Maple	Heavily reduce.	Extensive crown dieback.
T100	Holm Oak	Reduce crown all over or pollard at 5m.	Basal decay and hollowing dieback.
T101	Corsican Pine	Deadwood crown.	Risk of failures.
T102	Corsican Pine	Deadwood. Crown reduce and canopy off wound site by 50%. Inspect wound site.	Risk of failure and upper crown collapse.
G105	Elm, Sycamore	Fell dead Elms.	Dutch Elm Disease.
T109	Sycamore	Remove hung up limb.	Snapped hung up limb.

- 8.2 The above works represent a combination of lapsed maintenance, old age and past storm damage, together with fungal and mammalian issues.
- 8.3 Any tree work should be carried out by a competent tree surgeon to comply with BS3998:2010 "Tree Work - Recommendations".
- 8.4 All trees recommended for felling or tree surgery works should be checked for the presence of bats or nesting birds prior to works commencing. Disturbance to bats or nesting birds could contravene the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 and result in prosecution.

ARBORICULTURAL IMPLICATIONS ASSESSMENT

9. REDEVELOPMENT PROPOSALS

- 9.1 The proposals are for amendments to hotel layout approved under DM/18/2201, new single storey extension to main building and erection of new detached two storey spa building, provision of relocated secondary access to Chownes Mead Lane, new parking area and landscaping of the site. Details of the proposals will have been submitted by others.
- 9.2 The supplied ABIR Architects proposed site layout has been used as the base for the Broad Oak Tree Consultants Ltd. Tree Protection Plan, drawing no. J65.57/02 in Appendix 5. This indicates trees for removal and measures to protect retained trees in accordance with BS5837:2012 requirements.

10. TREES FOR REMOVAL

- 10.1 Based on the supplied proposed site layout the following trees are indicated for removal to facilitate the proposals.

Table: Trees for removal

Tree No.	Species	BS Category	Comments
G7	Cypress	C	Compact screen. Areas of dead foliage.
T23	Cypress	C	Leaning S. Gappy crown. Thinning and dieback.
T24	Monterey Cypress	C	Leaning NW. Thinning crown. Possibly <i>Corineum</i> Canker.
T25	Ash	U	Ash Dieback.
T26	Ash	U	Ash Dieback.
T40	Hawthorn	U	Main stems collapsed.
T41	Holly	C	Small tree.
T42	Hawthorn	C	Small tree.
T52	Cypress	U	Small young tree. Thin crown.
T53	Yew	C	Small young tree.

- 10.2 All of the above are either BS Category C or U. BS Category U trees are of no planning relevance, according To BS5837:2012. The BS Category C trees are mostly in decline with short remaining lifespans (under 20 years) and/or of small dimensions. According to BS5837:2012 BS Category C trees should not represent a significant constraint to proposals and all of the key landscape elements are retained.
- 10.3 The trees for removal are indicated as such with a blue hatched crown outline on the Tree Protection Plan.
- 10.4 Extensive new tree planting is proposed to offset these losses, with 71 new trees proposed, which are indicated and detailed within the Landscape Architects submission.

11. POTENTIAL IMPACT OF PROPOSALS ON RETAINED TREES

- 11.1 The proposals have been designed with the benefit of the tree constraints information and as such impacts on retained trees have been minimised wherever possible through design.

11.2 *Proposed Access Road*

- 11.2.1 The alignment of the new access road at the eastern end of the site has been designed to avoid road frontage tree RPAs. Where it is indicated passing through the RPA of the Oak T3 this represents a build up over an existing tarmac access road. Therefore there will be no impacts on any underlying roots beneath the existing surfacing and sub-base. Any edge grading with top soil will be kept to a minimum depth.

11.3 *Proposed Parking Area*

- 11.3.1 The proposed parking to the east of the tennis courts will not impact on any retained tree RPAs.

11.4 *Proposed Spa Complex*

- 11.4.1 This primarily utilises existing building footprints and areas of hard surfacing/disturbance to minimise/avoid any impact on tree root systems.
- 11.4.2 The extended footprint to the east of the existing swimming pool will be formed with cantilevered or piled foundations and suspended floor levels to avoid any impact on the Ancient Woodland soils. No tree RPAs will be affected.

11.5 *Proposed Ponds*

- 11.5.1 The formation of the ponds will overlap with the outer RPAs of the Redwood T28 and a small section of the T47 Cedar. For the Cedar the impact will be limited and additional unrestricted rooting areas beyond the indicated RPA exist to the north, east and west that would counter any minor impact.
- 11.5.2 For the Redwood the main area of RPA overlap is within the lower part of the existing basin, which is heavily waterlogged and generally unsuitable for rooting due to anaerobic conditions. No excavation is proposed but levels will be built up to retain the new pond. Impacts on roots will not be significant compared to excavation works.

11.6 *Parking to West of Main Entrance*

- 11.6.1 This area is already surfaced and the proposals will only involve some additional stone and definition of parking spaces with no excavation required. No specific precautions will be necessary due to the existing load bearing surface.

11.7 *General Paths/Steps*

- 11.7.1 All paths/steps within tree RPAs will be installed to a no dig, porous specification/above ground steps, with only temporary access to protected areas and all works undertaken by hand tools only.
- 11.8 Overall the impacts on individual trees have been minimised through design or installation methodologies and impacts on the key area of Ancient Woodland to the north (as identified by Place Services) are avoided.

12. TREE PROTECTION FENCING

12.1 *Location of fencing*

- 12.1.1 The Tree Protection Plan indicates the proposed location of protective fencing based on the calculated tree protection areas and space available.

12.2 *Design of fencing*

- 12.2.1 Protective fencing to comprise weldmesh panels securely fixed together with scaffold ties set within rubber/plastic feet to form a continuous barrier. Feet to be pinned to the ground with road pins/short scaffold bars or panel joins back braced. Waterproof signs to be attached to every 5th panel declaring "TREE ROOT PROTECTION ZONE – KEEP OUT" or similar wording. Fencing to be constructed in accordance with Fig 3 of Section 6.2 of BS5837:2012.

- 12.2.2 Examples of the fencing specification and signage required are included in Appendix 6.

12.3 *Timing of fencing*

- 12.3.1 Protective fencing is to be erected prior to commencement of site works and remain in place until completion of construction. The location and suitability of the fencing can be confirmed to the local authority by an arboricultural consultant prior to commencement of construction. Any tree felling will need to be undertaken prior to fence installation to minimise risks to operatives. All tree surgeons' vehicles will be kept outside the indicated protection zones utilising existing areas of hard standing and drive.

12.4 *Additional precautions*

- 12.4.1 Potentially injurious materials such as fuels, oils, chemicals and cement will be stored at least 20m from any stem, or in a bunded storage vessel. No fires will be lit within 5m of the drip line of any retained tree. No level changes will occur, either raising or lowering within the protected areas. A list of these additional precautions are included on the Tree Protection Plan.

13. GROUND PROTECTION MEASURES

- 13.1 In areas within root protection zones where access around the new building footprint adjoining the swimming pool will be required during construction, specific ground protection measures will be required. Due to the sloping ground these will be formed off a scaffold framework and suspended above the existing ground.

14. SITE OPERATIONS AND MATERIALS STORAGE

- 14.1 Details of site zoning cannot be specified by an Arboriculturalist as these are commonly determined by contractors on the basis of Health & Safety Assessments. However, the robust protective fencing will define the remaining site space available for storage and operations.
- 14.2 The proposed areas of parking to the east of the existing tennis court can be utilised as a temporary compound for site facilities, materials and contractors vehicles with minimal risks to retained trees.

15. SERVICES/DRAINAGE/SOAKAWAYS

- 15.1 Based on the supplied layout, any new services, drainage or soakaway alignments should be located outside root protection areas. If incursion into the protective areas of retained trees is unavoidable, then the routing should be obtained either by hand tool excavation or air spade, supervised by an arboricultural consultant. Any works within the protective areas will need to be undertaken to the requirements of NJUG Volume 4 "Guidelines for the Planning, Installation and Maintenance of Utility Apparatus in Proximity to Trees".

16. SUMMARY

- 16.1 The proposals will require the removal of 9 individual trees and a "U" shaped Cypress screen. All are BS Category C or U and should not represent a significant constraint to the proposals, according to BS5837:2012. The landscaping proposals indicate 71 new trees will be planted to offset these losses.
- 16.2 Robust tree protection measures are proposed, in accordance with BS5837:2012 recommendations, with disturbance to retained tree RPAs minimised through design and installation methodologies.
- 16.3 The Tree Protection Plan can be referred to as an approved drawing or in a specifically worded Condition to ensure that the retained trees are appropriately protected during the demolition and construction works.

Tim Laddiman
Chartered Arboriculturist
Broad Oak Tree Consultants Ltd.

APPENDIX 1



Date: 12 November 2025

Our ref: 11092

Joanne Fisher
Mid Sussex District Council
Oaklands Road
Haywards Heath
West Sussex
RH16 1SS

By email only: Planning Department, planninginfo@midsussex.gov.uk

WITHOUT PREJUDICE

Thank you for requesting advice on this pre-application advice from Place Services' ecological advice service. This service provides advice to planning officers to inform Mid Sussex District Council planning decisions with regard to potential ecological impacts from development. Any additional information, queries or comments on this advice that the applicant or other interested parties may have, must be directed to the Planning Officer who will seek further advice from us where appropriate and necessary.

Application: DM/25/0133
Location: Chownes Mead, Chownes Mead Lane, Haywards Heath
Proposal: Proposed development of a new spa building and associated infrastructure

Summary

Thank you for consulting Place Services on the above pre-application proposal and arranging a site meeting on the 1st May 2025. We have reviewed the details provided by the applicant at pre-application stage, which includes the following documents:

- Preliminary Ecological Appraisal – Rev 01 (Lizard Ecology Ltd, June 2025)
- Great Crested Newt EDNA Report (Lizard Ecology Ltd, May 2025)
- Assessment of Ancient Woodland (Lizard Ecology Ltd, January 2025)
- Reptile Survey Report (Lizard Ecology Ltd, September 2024)
- Bat Emergence Survey Report (Lizard Ecology Ltd, September 2024)
- Report on Inspection of Trees (Broad Oak Tree Consultants Ltd, May 2025)
- Ancient Woodland Study (ABIRD Architects Ltd, December 2024)
- Existing Local Plan (ABIR Architects Ltd, June 2025)
- Pre-application advice (DMH Stallard Ltd, 17th January 2025)



We also note that the proposed scheme will include the following:

- i. The refurbishment of the main Grade II listed house as a small hotel. This includes the retention of the format and details of the rooms to the main core of the original building.
- ii. The erection of an extension to link the rear service wing of the main building to the existing garage structure.
- iii. Amendments to the internal layout of the main building including the creation of an additional bedroom to the scheme granted planning permission and listed building consent in 2018 under references DM/18/2193 and DM/18/2201.
- iv. A modified design to the extant 2018 permission as it relates to the pool house enclosure including the provision of a new spa facility that is linked to a new Member's lounge and gym to replace the existing timber structure.
- v. The closure of the existing secondary access and provision of a replacement secondary access to be located further away from the adjoining residential property.
- vi. The provision of a new area of blue badge car parking served off the relocated secondary access.
- vii. The creation of a freshwater pool in the existing natural dell to the south of the main building.

As for any proposal, a planning application will need to be supported by adequate ecological surveys and assessments to enable the LPA to determine any application submitted in line with national and local policy and its statutory duties. This will include likely impacts on designated sites (international, national and local), protected and Priority species and habitats - not just significant ones.

Any report accompanying a planning application should follow [CIEEM guidelines](#) (these also comply with BS42020). Guidelines include Preliminary Ecological Appraisal Report, Guidelines for Ecological Impact Assessment, Ecological Report Writing and Lifespan of Ecological Surveys and Reports.

Ecological assessments should take data search records & survey information and use professional judgement to come to reasoned conclusions as to the likelihood of species being present and affected by the proposed development. The ecological data search from the [Sussex Biodiversity Record Centre](#) should inform the scope of surveys needed for protected and Priority species and any designated sites with Impact Risk Zones (on MAGIC maps) which may be greater than 10km. All surveys must be undertaken by suitably qualified ecologists at the appropriate time of year using standard methodologies.

Effective and robust measures, in line with the mitigation hierarchy, must be also proposed which have a high degree of certainty for their deliverability in the long term. If there are residual impacts, these will need to be compensated for on site or offsite with long term management secured, and appropriate enhancements included to ensure mandatory 10% Biodiversity Net Gain and biodiversity enhancements for protected and Priority species are demonstrated from the development.

Ecological reporting:

We have assessed the Preliminary Ecological Appraisal – Rev 01 (Lizard Ecology Ltd, June 2025) relating to likely impacts from the development, as well as the accompanying reports and are satisfied this document follows [CIEEM guidelines](#).

Statutory Designated Sites:

There are two statutory designated sites present within 1km radius of the proposed development. This includes the following sites:

- Blunts and Paiges Wood Local Nature Reserve (LNR), located approximately 0.4km north of the scheme.
- Ashenground and Bolnore Woods LNR, located approximately 0.5km to south-east of the scheme.

However, the proposals are not expected to impact upon these statutory designated sites. Therefore, no further considerations are required.

In addition, the development is located within the SSSI Impact Risk Zone (IRZ) of Ditchling Common Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI). However, it is agreed that the proposals of the development do not meet the requirements for further consultation with Natural England.

Non-Statutory Designated Sites:

There are four non-statutory designated sites present within 1km radius of the proposed development. This includes the following sites:

- Great Wood & Copyhold Hanger Local Wildlife Site (LoWS) located approximately 0.4km south-west of the scheme.
- Catt's Wood Complex & Meadows LoWS located approximately 0.6km south-east of the scheme.
- Blunts and Paiges Wood LoWS located approximately 0.7km north of the scheme.

However, the proposals are not expected to impact upon these non-statutory designated sites. Therefore, no further considerations are required.

Irreplaceable habitats:

The Assessment of Ancient Woodland (Lizard Ecology Ltd, January 2025) and Ancient Woodland Study (ABIRD Architects Ltd, December 2024) demonstrate that part of the site is designated as Ancient Woodland, which is an irreplaceable habitat under the [Biodiversity Gain Requirements \(Irreplaceable Habitat\) Regulations 2024](#). This is also outlined in the ancient woodland inventory on [Magic Map](#), See Figure 1.

Figure 1. Ancient Woodland Inventory from Magic Map.



However, this area has been partially cleared, following the granted planning application in February 2015 for the 'Enclosure of existing swimming pool within a pool house building.' Mid Sussex District Council, ref: 14/04433/HOUS, as well as the further Planning permission and Listed Building Consent (DM/18/2201 & DM/21/2630).

From Google Earth Imagery, the site contains woodland cover from 2012. See Figure 2 Below:

Figure 2. Google Earth, aerial image from 31/08/2012



Significant tree clearance has then occurred by 2013, with the pool house built in 2014 See Figure 2 below:

Figure 3. Google Earth, aerial image from 6/6/2013



Further vegetation clearance then appears to have occurred from 2018 – 2021 to facilitate the further planning application. See Figure 4:

Figure 4. Google Earth, aerial image from 16/7/2021



Based on the site visit carried on the 1st May 2025, it is acknowledged that the majority of the site is no longer functioning as Ancient Woodland, with most of the site classified as 'developed land; sealed surface'. As a result, a pragmatic approach is required for any subsequent application to demonstrate compliance under the NPPF 2024, following the previous loss of irreplaceable habitat permitted as part of historic planning applications.

It is agreed that the trees within location 2 in the 'Assessment of Ancient Woodland' included abundant non-native specimens, which included Coastal redwood, holm oak, Monterey cypress and wellingtonia. Whilst this area has retained a continuously wooded area, it was noted that the ground within the site had been reprofiled and no evidence of ancient woodland indicator species were present during an optimal survey period. Therefore, it is agreed that this area does not hold the value of an Ancient Woodland from a field assessment.

However, the small strip of woodland to the east of the site (referenced as location 3 in the 'Assessment of Ancient Woodland' does contain the following ancient woodland indicator species¹: Buebell, Wood anemone, Wood speedwell and Primrose. Therefore, it is agreed that this area forms part of the remnant Ancient Woodland and should be protected from any proposals.

¹ [A revision of the Ancient Woodland Inventory for Mid Sussex District](#)

The area referenced as location 4 in the 'Assessment of Ancient Woodland' was adjacent to a pond and dominated by Pendulous sedge, Rhododendron, Willow sp. and Bramble agg. Therefore, it is highlighted that Pendulous sedge is another ancient woodland indicator, where the species have clearly not been planted. Therefore, if this species were not planted, there is a possibility that the ground flora does indicate remnant woodland habitat. Nevertheless, given the pond in close proximity, we do not consider that this is a strong indicator species. As a result, it is not considered reasonable that this area should be classified as ancient woodland, following the permitted clearance works. However, the pond and surrounding habitat should be retained as much as possible within the proposed designs.

It is also agreed that location 5 referenced within the 'Assessment of Ancient Woodland' consists of a single Oak tree beside a Cherry laurel hedge. It is not clear when this Cherry laurel hedgerow was planted, but the only remnant of the ancient woodland is the Oak tree, with no ancient woodland indicator species.

With regard to location 6 referenced within the 'Assessment of Ancient Woodland', it is agreed that this area contains imported and disturbed soils and contains a mixture of bramble and grassland species. No obvious ancient woodland indicator species were present at this location and therefore it is agreed does not hold the value of an Ancient Woodland from a field assessment.

As a result, the planning application submission will need to demonstrate how further direct and indirect impacts will be avoided on the remaining woodland area (location 3). This could be included within the finalised Ecological Impact Assessment and should be in line with Government standing advice: [Ancient woodland, ancient trees and veteran trees: advice for making planning decisions - GOV.UK](#).

This includes the following direct effects of development:

- damaging or destroying all or part of them (including their soils, ground flora or fungi)
- damaging roots and understorey (all the vegetation under the taller trees)
- damaging or compacting soil
- damaging functional habitat connections, such as open habitats between the trees in wood pasture and parkland
- increasing levels of air and light pollution, noise and vibration
- changing the water table or drainage
- damaging archaeological features or heritage assets
- changing the woodland ecosystem by removing the woodland edge or thinning trees
 - causing greater wind damage and soil loss

This includes the following indirect effects of development:

- breaking up or destroying working connections between woodlands, or ancient trees or veteran trees - affecting protected species, such as bats or wood-decay insects
- reducing the amount of semi-natural habitats next to ancient woodland that provide important dispersal and feeding habitat for woodland species
- reducing the resilience of the woodland or trees and making them more vulnerable to change
- increasing the amount of dust, light, water, air and soil pollution
- increasing disturbance to wildlife, such as noise from additional people and traffic

- increasing damage to habitat, for example trampling of plants and erosion of soil by people accessing the woodland or tree root protection areas
- increasing damaging activities like fly-tipping and the impact of domestic pets
- increasing the risk of damage to people and property by falling branches or trees requiring tree management that could cause habitat deterioration
- changing the landscape character of the area

However, given the extent of the remnant woodland remaining, it is not considered that a buffer zone of 15m will be reasonable and instead the applicant should demonstrate that root protection areas will be protected as part of an Arboricultural Impact Assessment in line with [British Standard BS 5837 'Trees in relation to demolition, design and development'](#). The finalised proposals will then be outlined as part of a Construction Environmental Management Plan, to be secured as a pre-commencement condition of any consent.

The development should be designed around retaining the remaining remnant ancient woodland and the design should evidence that the natural buffers are provided around this habitat are retained / enhanced where possible. Furthermore, invasive species should be removed to minimise potential encroachment to the ancient woodland and other local woodland habitats.

It is also understood that there may be an intention to amend the access of the site to the Pool House. Therefore, at an ecological perspective, the access should be retained in the first instance. However, if this is considered a necessary element as part of the proposals, this should ideally be undertaken without removal of the existing trees, along with evidence that the remnant woodland will be protected and buffered.

European Protected Species:

Bats:

We support the conclusions of the Preliminary Ecological Appraisal – Rev 01 (Lizard Ecology Ltd, June 2025) and Bat Emergence Survey Report (Lizard Ecology Ltd, September 2024).

All bat surveys follow BCT Guidelines² and have been completed by suitably qualified ecologists. As the bat surveys confirmed

- We note that the survey suggest the presence of the following roosts within the main building A day roost of common pipistrelle beneath south-facing hanging tile, supporting 4no. individual bats.
- A day roost of natterers beneath south-facing roof tile.
- A day roost of common pipistrelle supporting 2no individual common pipistrelle to the apex of the south-eastern gable.
- A day roost of serotine beneath a west facing roof tile.

Therefore, a European Protected Species mitigation licence will be required from Natural England for any works which effect the known roost sites.

² Collins, J. (2023) Bat Surveys for Professional Ecologists: Good Practice Guidelines. 4th edition. Bat Conservation Trust, London.

A further Ground Level Tree Assessment will be required for any additional trees to be impacted by the development, in line BCT Guidelines. In addition, aerial inspections or emergency surveys will then be required to categorise any roost site or to determine presence / likely absence of roosting bats. However, it is understood that all trees proposed to be impacted contain negligible suitability, so no further consideration is likely to be required.

Whilst we agree that Bat Activity Surveys are not required, we recommend that any external lighting is sensitive to wildlife and secured by a condition of any consent to avoid impacts to foraging and commuting bats, as the area has been assessed as containing a high suitability for roosting bats. This must follow the [Guidance Note 8 Bats and artificial lighting](#) (The Institute of Lighting Professionals & Bat Conservation Trust). In summary, it is highlighted that the following measures should be implemented for the lighting design, which could be informed by a professional ecologist:

- Light levels should be as low as possible as required to fulfil the lighting need.
- Warm-White lights should be used preferably at < 2700k. This is necessary as lighting which emit an ultraviolet component or that have a blue spectral content have a high attraction effect on insects. This may lead in a reduction in prey availability for some light sensitive bat species.
- If light columns are required, they should be as short as possible as light at a low level reduces the likelihood of any ecological impact. However, the use of cowls, hoods, reflector skirts or shields could also be used to prevent horizontal spill.
- Movement sensors and timers could be used to minimise the 'lit time'.

Great crested newt (GCN):

Place Services have been instructed by the LPA to leave comments relating to Great Crested Newt to the NatureSpace Partnership.

However, as the results of the eDNA Surveys shows a negative result, it is not considered likely that further consideration will be required.

Dormouse:

We support the conclusions of the Preliminary Ecological Appraisal – Rev 01 (Lizard Ecology Ltd, June 2025) for Hazel Dormouse and indicate that the works designed to avoid impacts upon suitable habitat.

It is highlighted that precautionary mitigation measures will be required if any small areas of suitable habitat is proposed to be removed as part of the proposals.

UK Protected species:

Reptiles:

We note that the Reptile Survey Report (Lizard Ecology Ltd, September 2024) shows that no evidence of reptiles has been recorded. Therefore, we agree that no further measures are required.

Badger:

We note that no evidence of Badger has been identified within the site, albeit the site contains moderate potential for the species to be present. Therefore, it is recommended that a pre-

commencement survey should be secured as part of the Construction Environmental Management Plan.

Breeding birds:

The buildings and vegetation on site are likely to contain nesting birds between 1st March and 31st August inclusive. Nesting birds are assumed to be present in the buildings stated in the above reports between the above dates, unless a recent survey has been undertaken by a competent ecologist and has shown it is absolutely certain that birds are not present. Under the Wildlife & Countryside Act 1981 as amended (section 1), it is an offence to remove, damage, or destroy the nest of any wild bird while that nest is in use or being built.

Priority habitats (s41 NERC Act 2006 as amended):

It is indicated that the woodland on-site will also be classified as Lowland Mixed Deciduous Woodland Priority habitat. Therefore, the considerations for ancient woodland above should also apply to this Priority habitat.

Priority species (s41 NERC Act 2006 as amended):

Considerations for Priority species should be included within ecological assessments, even if impacts are subsequently ruled out.

It is also recommended that construction methods are precautionary and sensitive to mobile species to avoid killing or injuring small animals which may pass through the site. It is best practice to ensure the following further measures are implemented:

- a) Trenches, pits or holes dug on site should be covered over at night. Alternatively, ramps (consisting of a rough wooden plank) or sloped/stepped trenches could be provided to allow animals to climb out unharmed;
- b) Materials brought to the site for the construction works should be kept off the ground on pallets to prevent small animals seeking refuge;
- c) Rubbish and waste should be removed off site immediately or placed in a skip, to prevent small animals using the waste as a refuge; and

Schedule 9 – Non-native invasive species (NNIS):

Considerations should also be made to any non-native invasive species or risks posed by the development to native species present in the locality.

Therefore, the Construction Environmental Management Plan should include measures to contain, control and eradicate the Japanese Knotweed identified within the site, which is an invasive species under Schedule 9 of the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended).

Further measures to control Rhododendron species should also be explored as part of the woodland and mixed scrub enhancement proposals.

Biodiversity Net Gain:

Biodiversity Net Gain is development that leaves biodiversity in a better state than before (CIEEM, 2016). Applications defined under [Article 2 Town and Country Planning \(Development Management Procedure\) \(England\) Order 2015](#), are required to deliver a mandatory 10% measurable biodiversity net gain, unless exempt under [paragraph 17 of](#)

[Schedule 7A of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990](#) and the [Biodiversity Gain Requirements \(Exemptions\) Regulations 2024](#).

Biodiversity net gains is a statutory requirement set out under [Schedule 7A \(Biodiversity Gain in England\) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990](#). This legislation was inserted into the 1990 Act by Schedule 14 of the Environment Act 2021, and was amended by the Levelling Up and Regeneration Act 2023. The Biodiversity Gain (Town and Country Planning) (Consequential Amendments) Regulations 2024 made consequential amendments to other parts of the 1990 Act.

The [Biodiversity Net Gain Planning Practice Guidance \(PPG\)](#) sets out how biodiversity net gains should be applied through the planning process. At application stage the following should be submitted if statutory biodiversity net gains apply to the development:

- confirmation that the applicant believes that planning permission, if granted, the development would be subject to the biodiversity gain condition;
- the pre-development biodiversity value(s), [either on the date of application or earlier proposed date \(as appropriate\)](#);
- where the applicant proposes to use an earlier date, this proposed earlier date and the reasons for proposing that date;
- [the completed metric calculation tool](#) showing the calculations of the pre-development biodiversity value of the onsite habitat on the date of application (or proposed earlier date) including the publication date of the biodiversity metric used to calculate that value;
- a statement whether activities have been carried out prior to the date of application (or earlier proposed date), that result in loss of onsite biodiversity value ('[degradation](#)'), and where they have:
 - a statement to the effect that these activities have been carried out;
 - the date immediately before these activities were carried out;
 - the pre-development biodiversity value of the onsite habitat on this date;
 - the completed metric calculation tool showing the calculations, and
 - any available supporting evidence of this;
- a description of any [irreplaceable habitat](#) (as set out in [column 1 of the Schedule to the Biodiversity Gain Requirements \(Irreplaceable Habitat\) Regulations 2024](#)) on the land to which the application relates, that exists on the date of application, (or an earlier date); and
- plan(s), drawn to an identified scale and showing the direction of North, showing onsite habitat existing on the date of application (or earlier proposed date), including any irreplaceable habitat (if applicable).

Therefore, in summary, this will include the following:

- Confirmation that BNG applies as part of the application form
- A Statutory Biodiversity Metric – Calculation Tool for the pre-development baseline, including a condition assessment.
- A habitat map of the pre-development baseline.
- Reference to the remaining woodland as 'irreplaceable habitat'.

It is highlighted that the planning authority will be required to secure a biodiversity gain condition as a pre-commencement requirement. The biodiversity gain condition has its own separate statutory basis, as a planning condition under [paragraph 13 of Schedule 7A of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990](#). As a result, government have recommended that it is not included in the list of conditions imposed in the written notice when granting planning permission. However, it is highlighted that biodiversity gain condition could be implemented via a separate section of the decision notice. The biodiversity gain condition should secure the provision of a Biodiversity Gain Plan prior to commencement, which includes the following:

- a) A Biodiversity Gain Plan form (Ideally using the Government's template: <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/biodiversity-gain-plan>)
- b) The completed metric calculation tool showing the calculations of the pre-development and post-intervention biodiversity values.
- c) Pre and post development habitat plans.
- d) Legal agreement (if required for on-going monitoring for significant on-site enhancements or off-site habitat in blue line boundary land).
- e) Biodiversity Gain Site Register reference numbers (if using off-site units).
- f) Proof of purchase (if buying statutory biodiversity credits at a last resort).

In addition, a [Habitat Management and Monitoring Plan](#) (HMMP) should be secured for all [significant on-site enhancements](#). The decision on whether significant on-site enhancements are present is ultimately up to the Council and Mid Sussex have made the decision that this does not apply for minor development. However, a HMMP will still be required as part of the Biodiversity Gain Plan, if the proposal includes off-site habitat in blue line boundary land. This will need to be secured via a legal agreement and registered on the biodiversity gain site register.

Where required, the monitoring of the post-development habitat creation / enhancement will need be provided to the LPA at years 1, 3, 5, 10, 15, 20, 25, 30, from the completion of development, unless otherwise specified by the LPA. Any remedial action or adaptive management will then be agreed with the LPA during the monitoring period to ensure the aims and objectives of the Biodiversity Gain Plan are achieved.

It is also important biodiversity net gain is considered throughout the planning process, to ensure the biodiversity gain objective is met and the condition can be discharged successfully. The NPPF emphasises that plans should identify and pursue opportunities for securing measurable net gains for biodiversity, and plans and decisions should minimise impacts and provide net gains for biodiversity. In particular, the Biodiversity Gain Hierarchy must be implemented into proposed designs, to ensure that this is not left to the biodiversity gain condition.

Bespoke enhancements:

In addition, we recommend reasonable biodiversity enhancements for protected and Priority or threatened species are also secured to deliver net gains for biodiversity, as outlined under Paragraphs 187d and 193d of the National Planning Policy Framework December 2024. The reasonable biodiversity enhancement measures should be outlined within a Biodiversity Enhancement Strategy and should be secured as a condition of any consent.

Please do not hesitate to contact us if you have any queries in relation to this advice.

Yours sincerely,

Hamish Jackson ACIEEM BSc (Hons)

Senior Ecological Consultant

Place Services at Essex County Council

Email: PlaceServicesEcology@essex.gov.uk



Place Services provide ecological advice on behalf of Mid Sussex District Council.

Please note: This letter is advisory and should only be considered as the opinion formed by specialist staff in relation to this particular matter.

APPENDIX 2

TREE SURVEY EXPLANATORY SHEET

Height	in metres (estimated where ground uneven or access restricted).
Stem count	number of stems
Stem diameter	in mm. at 1.5m. above ground level.
Branch spread	radial spread in metres at four main compass points (estimated where no access).
Age class	Young - Y Semi Mature - SM Mature - M Over mature - OM Veteran - V
Height of crown clearance	in metres. Normally range of heights of outer branches above ground level, e.g. 2-4m.
Physiological condition	Good, Fair, Poor, Dead, Variable
Estimated remaining contribution	in years e.g. less than 10, 10-20, 20-40, 40+
Category grading	see attached sheet
Structural condition	comment on presence of defects, decay, crown form, past management, deadwood, other features worthy of note. N.B. If trees are ivy clad, no full structural assessment will have been possible.
Preliminary management recommendations	requirements of further investigations, works necessary to alleviate potential hazards based on current setting and levels of access. NB: Works that may be necessary in relation to development are not included here

CASCADE CHART FOR TREE QUALITY ASSESSMENT

TREES FOR REMOVAL				
Category and definition	Criteria			Identification on plan
Category U Those in such a condition that any existing value would be lost within 10 years and which should, in the current context, be removed for reasons of sound arboricultural management	• 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 R category trees (i.e. 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 (e.g. Dutch elm disease), or very low quality trees suppressing adjacent trees of better quality NOTE Habitat reinstatement may be appropriate (e.g. R category tree used as a bat roost: installation of bat box in nearby tree.)			DARK RED
TREES TO BE CONSIDERED FOR RETENTION				
Category and definition	Criteria - Subcategories			Identification on plan
	1. Mainly arboricultural values	2. Mainly landscape values	3. Mainly cultural values, including conservation	
Category A Those of high quality and value: in such a condition as to be able to make a substantial construction (a minimum of 40 years is suggested)	Trees that are particularly good examples of their species, especially if rare or unusual, or essential components of groups, or of formal or semi-formal arboricultural features (e.g. the dominant and/or principal trees within an avenue)	Trees, groups or woodlands which provide a definite screening or softening effect to the locality in relation to views into or out of the site, or those of particular visual importance (e.g. avenues or other arboricultural features assessed as groups)	Trees, groups or woodlands of significant conservation, historical, commemorative or other value (e.g. veteran trees or wood-pasture)	LIGHT GREEN
Category B Those of moderate quality and value: those in such a condition as to make a significant contribution (a minimum of 20 years is suggested)	Trees that might be included in the high category, but are downgraded because of impaired condition (e.g. presence of remediable defects including unsympathetic past management and minor storm damage)	Trees present in numbers, usually as groups or woodland, such that they form distinct landscape features, thereby attracting a higher collective rating than they might as individuals but which are not, individually, essential components of formal or semi-formal arboricultural features (e.g. trees of moderate quality within an avenue that includes better, A category specimens), or trees situated mainly internally to the site, therefore individually having little visual impact on the wider locality	Trees with clearly identifiable conservation or other cultural benefits	MID BLUE
Category C Those of low quality and value: currently in adequate condition to remain until new planting could be established (a minimum of 10 years is suggested), or young trees with a stem diameter below 150mm.	Trees not qualifying in higher categories	Trees present in groups or woodland, but without this conferring on them significantly greater landscape value, and/or trees offering low or only temporary screening benefit.	Trees with very limited conservation or other cultural benefits	GREY
NOTE Whilst C category trees will usually not be retained where they would impose a significant constraint on development, young trees with a stem diameter of less than 150mm should be considered for relocation				

Tree ref. no.	Species	Height (m.)	Stem Count	Stem diameter or equivalent (mm.)	Branch spread (m.)				Age class	Ht. of crown clearance (m.)	Physiological condition	Estimated remaining contribution (years)	Category grading	Structural condition and Notes	Preliminary management recommendations
					N	E	S	W							
G1	Cherry Laurel	<8	Multi	<200	<4	<3	<2	<2	M	0+	Good	40+	C2	Crown raised to N to 3m. Overgrown hedge	
G2	Holly, Ash, Bay, Yew	<9	Multi	<150	<3	<3	<3	<3	Y	0+	Variable	<10-40	C/U1	Former hedge elements. Several holly dying. Pruned back to N	
T3	Common Oak	24	1	1070	9	6	6	5	M	5+	Fair	20-40	B2	Crown raised in past. Kinked stem from 6m	
G4	Oak, Ash	<20	1	<400	<6	<8	<6	<5	SM	1+	Variable	<10-40	B/U2	Crowded, drawn up. Several bowed out stems. Ash Dieback in several	Remove bowed out stem or cut back to upright limb
G5	Cherry Laurel	<7	Multi	<250	<5	<5	<5	<5	M	0+	Good	20+-40	C2	Overgrown shrubs	
G6	Sycamore, Ash, Holly	<10	Multi	<250	<4	<3	<3	<4	Y	0+	Variable	<10-40	C/U1	Crowded. Thinning crown on Holly	
G7	Leyland Cypress	<3	<31	<150	<1	<1	<1	<1	Y	0+	Fair	10-40+	C2	Topped and side trimmed. Extensive areas of dead foliage	
G8	Sycamore, Hazel	<10	2	<150	<5	<5	<2	<2	Y	0+	Variable	10-40	C2	Drawn up Sycamore. Poor form, multi-stemmed Hazel	
T9	Holly	5	1	130	1.5	2	2	3	Y	2+	Poor	<10	U	Leaning N. Basal wounding. Thinning crown	
T10	Elm	6	1	170	2	3	3	4	Y	0+	Poor	<10	U	Leaning W. Suppressed form. Torn mid crown limb to W	
T11	Cypress	13	1	370	3	3	3	2.5	SM	1+	Poor	<10	U	Dead upper three quarters of crown. Ground disturbance	Fell or top at 5m
T12	Common Oak	25	1	510	3.5	3	6	6	M	9+	Fair	20-40	B2	High crown. Dead limb to S	
T13	Holm Oak	20	Multi	1150	6	9	9	9	M	2.5+	Poor	10-20	C1	Multi-stemmed <1.5m. Weak unions. Past tear outs. Soil piling round base	Heavily reduce or spider web brace crown structure
T14	Wellingtonia	26	1	1800	8	6.5	7	7.5	M	0.5+	Fair	40+	B2	Deadwood in lower/mid crown to NE/E	Deadwood crown
T15	Field Maple	11	1	1000	6.5	5.5	5	5	M	1.6+	Fair	20-40	B2	Twin stemmed at 1.7m, 4 stems <2.2m. Past squirrel damage. Deadwood. Poor growth	
T16	Rhododendron	4	Multi	250	4.5	3	5.5	4	SM	0+	Fair	20-40	C2	Multi-stemmed from ground level	
T17	Holm Oak	17	3	600	5	4	5	12	M	1+	Poor	<10	U	Three stems from ground level, one heavily bowed over to W. Smallest stem split at 2m in past and bowed to NW. Upright stem torn out at c8m in past with multi-stemmed regrowth	Fell or pollard at 3m
T18	Yew	8	1	320	2.5	3.5	2.5	4	Y	1+	Fair	20-40	C2	Twin stemmed at 1.5m. Crowded	

Tree ref. no.	Species	Height (m.)	Stem Count	Stem diameter or equivalent (mm.)	Branch spread (m.)				Age class	Ht. of crown clearance (m.)	Physiological condition	Estimated remaining contribution (years)	Category grading	Structural condition and Notes	Preliminary management recommendations
					N	E	S	W							
T19	Cypress	13	1	500	3	2	2	2.5	SM	0+	Poor	10-20	C1	Possibly hollow base. Three stems from 2m, one dominant. Thinning crown	
T20	Sycamore	12	1	360	8.5	5	0	6	SM	4+	Poor	<10	U	Base bowed out to NE. Twin stemmed at 1.5m with decayed wound in join. Extensive squirrel damage	Fell or pollard at 4m
T21	Field Maple	18	3	850	8.5	2.5	4	8	M	5+	Unconfirmed	10-20	C1	Three stems <1.3m. Ivy clad into crown. Minor dieback and deadwood. Root disturbance	
T22	Yew	8	1	290	5	4.5	5	5.5	Y	0.5+	Fair	20-40	C2		
T23	Cypress	21	1	500	1.5	3.5	5	3.5	M	2.2+	Poor	10-20	C1	Leaning to S. Gappy crown. Minor thinning and dieback	
T24	Monterey Cypress	20	1	780	9	3.5	1	6	M	1.2+	Poor	10-20	C1	Leaning to NW. Thinning crown. Possibly Corineum Canker	
T25	Ash	19	3	620	9	3.5	0.5	10.5	M	4+	Poor	<10	U	Crowded. Three stems from ground level, one leaning N. Ash Dieback. Deadwood	Fell or pollard at 4m
T26	Ash	22	3	600	3	2	1.5	6.5	M	4+	Poor	<10	U	Three stems <1m with weak compression joins. Crowded. Ash Dieback	Fell or pollard at 4m
T27	Sycamore	13	2	400	6	4.5	3	4	SM	3.5+	Poor	<10	U	Twin stemmed near ground level. Decay in join. Extensive squirrel damage	Fell or heavily crown reduce
T28	Coast Redwood	30	Multi	1600	5.5	6	6.5	5.5	M	1.5+	Good	40+	A2	Six stems near ground level	
T29	Yew	11	1	c250	6.5	2	3.5	4.5	Y	1.6+	Fair	20-40	C2	Crowded. Ivy clad	
T30	Ash	12	1	160	5	3	0	0.5	Y	7+	Poor	<10	U	Heavily crowded. Leaning heavily N. Ash Dieback	Fell
T31	Monterey Pine	19	1	560	6	1	1	4	M	10+	Fair	20-40	C2	Crowded to E. High crown. Deadwood. Leaning to N	
G32	Sycamore, Field Maple	<13	1/2	<350	<4	<3	<4.5	<7.5	Y	1+	Poor	10-20	C1	Crowded. Squirrel damage	
G33	Sycamore, Beech, Field Maple	<13	1	<230	<7	<2.5	<2	<5	Y	1.5+	Poor	<10-20	C/U1	Heavily crowded. Squirrel damage	
T34	Yew	5	2	210	3.5	1	1	3.5	Y	2+	Poor	10-20	C2	Twin stemmed <1m. Numerous other stems cut to stubs. Ivy clad. Crowded. Overtopped	
T35	Cypress	2.5	Multi	200	3	2	2.5	4	Y	0+	Poor	<10	U	Squat crown. Multi-stemmed near ground level. Pruned in past. Extensive dieback	

Tree ref. no.	Species	Height (m.)	Stem Count	Stem diameter or equivalent (mm.)	Branch spread (m.)				Age class	Ht. of crown clearance (m.)	Physiological condition	Estimated remaining contribution (years)	Category grading	Structural condition and Notes	Preliminary management recommendations
					N	E	S	W							
T36	Monterey Pine	19	1	1000	7.5	9	14	8	M	2.5+	Fair	20-40	B2	Deadwood and dieback	Deadwood crown if increased access
T37	Beech	7	Multi	180	3.5	3.5	3.5	3.5	Y	0+	Fair	20-40	C2	Multi-stemmed near ground level. Potentially weak unions	
T38	Norway Spruce	8	Multi	230	3	3.5	2.5	2	Y	0+	Poor	10-20	C1	Multi-stemmed <1.2m. Crown thinning- possibly aphids	
T39	Rhododendron	3	Multi	200	3	2.5	4	3	M	0+	Poor	10+-20	C1	Multi-stemmed from ground level. Crown thinning	
T40	Hawthorn	3	Multi	270	5	3	2	1	M	0+	Poor	<10	U	Multi-stemmed from ground level. Snapped stems. Deadwood. Main stems collapsed to N	Fell or remove collapsed stem
T41	Holly	5	1	200	4	2	2	3.5	SM	0+	Poor	10-20	C1	Leaning NW. Ivy clad	
T42	Hawthorn	6	Multi	400	5.5	4.5	5	5.5	M	0+	Fair	20-40	C2	Multi-stemmed near ground level	
T43	Horse Chestnut	5	1	290	4.5	4	3.5	3	Y	1+	Poor	10-20	C1	Lower stem bleeding and dead bark	
T44	Pissard Plum	6	2	300	2.5	1.5	1.5	2.5	M	2+	Poor	<10	U	Extensive crown dieback and deadwood. Leaning N. Stem decay	Fell or pollard at 2m
T45	Red Oak	23	1	1540	16.5	11	14	11	V	1.2+	Poor	<10-20	A3	Deadwood. Fluted stem. Buttressed base. Three stems at 3m with large tear out to E where 4th stem lost. Torn limbs and decay in limbs. Further limb/stem collapses likely	Restrict access within fall zone
T46	Downy Birch	16	1	370	4	4.5	4.5	5.5	SM	1.2+	Good	20-40	B2		
T47	Blue Atlas Cedar	18	1	920	9	9	9	7	M	1.5+	Fair	20-40	B2	Thinning crown	
G48	2no Oak	<8	1	<260	<4	<5	<5	<4	Y	0.5+	Poor	20-40	C1	Suppressed. Growing up through crown of T47	
T49	Corsican Pine	20	1	410	5	4	1	5	M	9+	Fair	20-40	C2	Crowded. Part ivy clad stems. High crown	
T50	Pittosporum	6	1	130	2.5	3	2.5	2	SM	0+	Fair	20-40	C2	Becoming crowded	
T51	Beech	6	Multi	150	3	2	3	3	Y	0+	Fair	20-40	C2	Multi-stemmed from ground level	
T52	Cypress	3	1	c130	2	1.5	1	1.5	Y	0+	Poor	<10	U	Ivy clad. Thin crown	
T53	Yew	3	Multi	c150	2.5	2.5	3	2.5	Y	0+	Good	40+	C2	Clipped in past	

Tree ref. no.	Species	Height (m.)	Stem Count	Stem diameter or equivalent (mm.)	Branch spread (m.)				Age class	Ht. of crown clearance (m.)	Physiological condition	Estimated remaining contribution (years)	Category grading	Structural condition and Notes	Preliminary management recommendations
					N	E	S	W							
T54	Lime	20	1	c600	5	4	4.5	3.5	M	2+	Fair	20-40	B2	Ivy clad into crown. Twin stemmed at 3m. Minor deadwood	
T55	Lime	18	1	c700	6	3	2.5	1.5	M	2+	Poor	<10	U	Pollarded at c3.5m in past with regrowth. Advanced decay from ground level to pollard point to W and S	Fell or pollard at 2m - URGENT
T56	Ash	20	3	610	4	4	13	4	SM	9+	Poor	<10	U	Three stems near ground level. Five stems <3m. Ivy clad. Crowded. Deadwood. Dieback	Fell or pollard at 8m
T57	Sycamore	11	Multi	270	1.5	2	9	4	SM	0+	Poor	10-20	C1	Crowded. Leaning S. Squirrel damage	
T58	Monterey Cypress	20+	1	c700	2	2	6	4	M	10+	Fair	20-40	B2	Ivy clad. High crown. Crowded. Deadwood	
G59	2no Himalayan Cotoneaster Tree	<5	1/2	<150	<3	<1	<3.5	<3	SM	0+	Fair	20-40	C2	Ivy clad. Squat crowns	
T60	Cypress var	6	1	c150	2	1.5	2.5	2.5	Y	1.5+	Poor	10-20	C1	Heavily ivy clad. Thin crown	
T61	Malus sp	4.5	1	<130	3	1.5	2.5	3	SM	1+	Variable	10-20	C2	Kinked stem to W. Enclosed in pen	
G62	5no Cypress	<17	1/2	<350	<1.5	<2.5	<3	<3	SM	0+	Poor	<10-40	C/U1	Crowded. Part overtopped. Ivy clad. One dead.	
T63	Monterey Cypress	20+	1	780	5	5	9	3	M	3+	Fair	20-40	B2	Deadwood. Minor crown thinning. Crowded. Part ivy clad	
G64	Beech	<19	1	<200	<5	<5	<4	<4	Y	0+	Variable	10-40	C2	Drawn up. Ivy clad. Remnants of hedge	
G65	Cypress	<14	1	<250	<2	<3	<3	<2	SM	1.2+	Variable	10-40	C1	Crowded. Central stem bowed low to SW	Fell central stem or pollard at 4m
G66	Oak, Sycamore, Cypress	<19	1	<380	<2	<2	<4	<4	Y/SM	0+	Variable	<10-40	C/U1	Self seeded, suppressed Sycamore with squirrel damage. Thinning crowns in Cypress Crowded	Fell Sycamore or pollard at 3m
T67	Maple	14	3	350	6	1	8	6	SM	0+	Poor	<10	U	Three stems at 1m with decay in join. Part split N stem. Ivy clad. Crowded	Fell or pollard at 3m
T68	Sycamore	14	1	c170	0.5	2	4.5	5	Y	3.5+	Poor	10-20	C1	Ivy clad. Crowded. Leaning S	
T69	Cypress var	3	1	c150	1	1	2	2	Y	0+	Poor	<10	U	Ivy clad. Snapped stem	
T70	Norway Spruce	10	1	c150	3	2	4	4	Y	0+	Poor	<10	U	Crowded. Ivy clad. Thin crown	
T71	Red Oak	20+	1	c450	2	1	6	11	SM	2+	Poor	10-20	C1	Ivy clad. Leaning heavily W. Twin stemmed at 6-7m	

Tree ref. no.	Species	Height (m.)	Stem Count	Stem diameter or equivalent (mm.)	Branch spread (m.)				Age class	Ht. of crown clearance (m.)	Physiological condition	Estimated remaining contribution (years)	Category grading	Structural condition and Notes	Preliminary management recommendations
					N	E	S	W							
T72	Sycamore	15	2	390	3	2	4.5	7	SM	1+	Poor	<10	U	Crowded. Twin stemmed from ground level. Ivy clad. Squirrel damage	Fell or pollard at 3m
T73	Norway Spruce	16	1	c400	2.5	4	2	2	SM	6+	Poor	10-20	C1	Ivy clad. Thin crown. Deadwood	
T74	Lime	25+	1	c900	5	9	8	9	M	3+	Poor	<10-40	B/U1	Multi-stemmed from 3m with weak unions. Ivy clad	Brace stems together at height or reduce height by one third
G75	Holly	<8	1/2	<200	<3	<4	<3	<3	SM	0+	Variable	10-40	C2	Ivy clad. Variable dimensions	
T76	Sycamore	18	1	c400	8	3	2	5	M	1+	Poor	<10	U	Epicormics from base. Part ivy clad. Squirrel damage. Decay in wound at 1m to S. Deadwood	Fell or pollard at 8m
G77	2no Cypress	20+	1	<600	<3	<5	<5	<4	M	10+	Fair	20-40	B2	High crowns. Part ivy clad. Deadwood	
T78	Sycamore	16	2	280	2.5	4	3	3	SM	3+	Poor	<10	U	Twin stemmed from ground level. Crowded. Squirrel damage. Deadwood	Pollard at 5m
G79	Sycamore, Holly	<11	1/Multi	<220	<3	<3	<4	<3	Y/SM	0+	Variable	<10-20	C/U1	Crowded. Squirrel damaged Sycamore. Thinning Holly	Pollard damaged Sycamore at 3m
T80	Holly	15	2	280	6	3	4	2.5	M	0+	Poor	10-20	C1	Twin stemmed <1m. Leaning to N. Thinning crown	
T81	Larch	20+	1	310	5	2.5	0	2	M	15+	Poor	10-20	C1	Crowded, leaning to N. High crown	
T82	Oak	25+	1	1060	8	9	14	9	M	7+	Fair	20-40	B2	Deadwood. Slight lean to E. Twin stemmed at 6-7m. Decayed wound at 4m to W	
T83	Beech	14	1	450	7	7	6	7	SM	3+	Fair	20-40	C2	Overtopped	
T84	Larch	20+	1	c400	4	5	1	2	M	20+	Dead	-	U	Crowded. High crown. Dead. Advanced basal decay	Fell - URGENT
T85	Sycamore	20+	1	400	7	5	3	3	M	6+	Poor	10-20	C1	Deadwood. Leaning N. Crowded. Squirrel damage	
G86	Beech, Holly	<20	1	<300	<7	<4	<4	<4	SM	0+	Variable	10-40	C2	Heavily crowded, drawn up stems. Overgrown hedge. Deadwood	
T87	Common Oak	25+	1	780	c12	5	10	5	M	9+	Fair	20-40	B2	Deadwood. Past storm damage. Torn Limbs. Deadwood	
T88	Beech	20	1	390	7	5	7	2	SM	4+	Fair	20-40	C2	Crowded	
G89	Sycamore, Ash, Yew, Cherry Laurel	<14	1/2	<200	<3	<3	<4	<3	Y	0+	Variable	<10-40	C/U1	Crowded, self seeded. Dieback in some Ash	Fell or pollard dying Ash at 3m

Tree ref. no.	Species	Height (m.)	Stem Count	Stem diameter or equivalent (mm.)	Branch spread (m.)				Age class	Ht. of crown clearance (m.)	Physiological condition	Estimated remaining contribution (years)	Category grading	Structural condition and Notes	Preliminary management recommendations
					N	E	S	W							
T90	Beech	8	1	160	2	2.5	2.5	5	Y	1+	Fair	10-20	C1	Twin stemmed <4m, main stem bowed to W	
T91	Field Maple	15	1	c600	3.5	6	7	4.5	M	4+	Poor	<10	U	Ivy clad. Deadwood. Twin stemmed at 3.5-4m. Slight lean to E Extensive upper crown dieback	Fell or heavily reduce
G92	Sycamore, Hazel, Horse Chestnut	<7	1/Multi	<130	<3	<4	<3	<3	Y	0+	Fair	10-40+	C2	Cluster of variable height and dimensions	
T93	Beech	7	1	150	2.5	3.5	4	1.5	Y	1+	Good	40+	C2	Crowded. Contorted upper crown. Lean to E	
T94	Yew	4	Multi	120	1	2	2	1.5	Y	0+	Good	40+	C2		
T95	Willow	7	Multi	150	3	3	3	2.5	Y	0+	Good	40+	C2		
T96	Silver Birch	16	1	290	5	2	1.5	3	SM	2.3+	Good	20-40	B2	Crowded. Drawn up. Twin stemmed at 1.8m	
T97	Silver Birch	15	1	230	2.5	1.5	2	3.5	SM	3+	Good	20-40	C2	Crowded. Drawn up. Kinked lower stem	
T98	Corsican Pine	31	1	1010	8	4	7	4.5	M	15+	Fair	20-40	B1	Crown raised in past. Minor deadwood and thinning. Strip dead bark up stem to N from c6m to 14m	
G99	Leyland Cypress	<7	1	<150	<2	<1.5	<2	<2	Y	0+	Good	40+	C2	Topped and side trimmed in past	
T100	Holm Oak	18	1	c900	3	4.5	7	7	M	0.5+	Poor	10-20	C1	Crowded. Leaning SW. Crown raised in past. Second stem lost to NE from ground level in past with large decayed basal wound and hollowing. Crown thinning and fine dieback. Deadwood. Dense epicormic growth <5m height	Reduce crown all over or pollard at 5m
T101	Corsican Pine	30+	1	900	5	6	2	3.5	M	15+	Fair	20-40	B1	Crowded. High crown. Deadwood and minor thinning. Slight lean to N	Deadwood crown
T102	Corsican Pine	30+	1	1370	0	7	10.5	6	M	10+	Poor	<10	U	Crown mainly to S. Large tear out at c18m where main stem lost in past. Heavily decayed wound and extensive loading. Deadwood. Crown thinning	Fell or deadwood. Crown reduce canopy off wound site by 50% Inspect wound site
T103	Corsican Pine	30+	1	760	6	5	2	3	M	20+	Fair	20-40	B2	High crown. Crowded. Crown thinning	

Tree ref. no.	Species	Height (m.)	Stem Count	Stem diameter or equivalent (mm.)	Branch spread (m.)				Age class	Ht. of crown clearance (m.)	Physiological condition	Estimated remaining contribution (years)	Category grading	Structural condition and Notes	Preliminary management recommendations
					N	E	S	W							
T104	Corsican Pine	30	1	700	4	2	4	2	M	20+	Poor	10-20	C1	High crown. Crowded. Crown thinning	
G105	Elm, Sycamore	<13	1	<250	<3	<5	<3	<2	Y	1+	Poor	<10-20	C/U1	Dead Elms. Sycamore with squirrel damage	Fell dead Elms
T106	Walnut	10	1	450	1.5	4	5.5	3	SM	1.3+	Poor	<10	U	Poor growth. Large decay hollow near base	
T107	Ash	14	1	270	5	7	4	2.5	SM	2+	Poor	10-20	C1	Twin stemmed at 3.5-4m. Fine dieback	
T108	Beech	c25+	1	c800	10	8	7	c9	M	2+	Unconfirmed	20-40	B2		
T109	Sycamore	11	1	290	4	8	6.5	6.5	Y	1.2+	Poor	10-20	C1	Crowded. Squirrel damage. Snapped mid crown limb to E	Remove hung up limb
T110	Common Oak	c30	1	c650	6	7	9	3	M	18+	Unconfirmed	40+	B2	Crowded. High crown	
T111	Sycamore	11	Multi	310	3	6	4	4	Y	1+	Fair	20-40	C2	Three stems near ground level. Crowded. Part overtopped	
G112	Sycamore	<9	Multi	<150	<3	<4	<4	<3	Y	0+	Variable	10-40	C2	Crowded. Squirrel damage	
G113	2no Beech, 1no Sweet Chestnut	<30	1	<900	<8	<14	<10	<10	M	8+	Variable	10-40	B2	Northern Beech dominant, southern Beech extensive decay up stem, to E. SW Chestnut curved to S. Large torn out limb to E on N stem at 3-4m	
T114	Sycamore	14	1	600	8.5	8.5	5.5	7	M	1.5+	Poor	<10	U	Slight lean to E. Lower stem bark death to S/SW. Multi-stemmed <5m. Contorted crown. Squirrel damage	
G115	Pittosporum	<4	3	<100	<2.5	<2	<2	<2	Y	0+	Good	40+	C2	Multi-stemmed near ground level	
G116	3no Holly	<8	Multi	<330	<3.5	<3.5	<3.5	<5	M	1.5+	Poor	10+-20	C1	Crowded. Crown raised in past. Foliar thinning	

APPENDIX 3