



URBAN EDGE
ENVIRONMENTAL
CONSULTING

NATURAL PROGRESSION

Sunte House, Birchen Lane, Haywards Heath, West Sussex

Arboricultural Impact Assessment

May 2025

Sunte House, Birchen Lane, Haywards Heath, West Sussex

Arboricultural Impact Assessment

Client:	Richard Parr Associates	
Report No.:	UE0664_SunteHouse_HHA_AIA_0_250514	
Author: Wesley Rawson FdSc BSc(Hons) MArborA	Proofed: Wesley Rawson FdSc BSc(Hons) MArborA	Approved: Nick Pincombe BA(Hons) MSc CEnv MIEMA MCIEEM
Revision No.: 0	Status/Comment: First issue to client	Date: 14 May 2025
Urban Edge Environmental Consulting Ltd is a Registered Practice of the Chartered Institute of Ecology and Environmental Management. The information, advice and opinions provided in this report are true and were prepared and provided in accordance with CIEEM's Code of Professional Conduct. We confirm that the opinions expressed are our true and professional bona fide opinions.		



Contents

0	Executive Summary	i
1	Introduction	1
1.1	Instruction	1
1.2	Scope of the Report	1
1.3	Site Context	1
1.4	Description of the Proposals	1
1.5	Supporting Documents	2
1.6	Personnel	2
1.7	Limitations	2
2	Arboricultural Impact Assessment	3
2.2	Tree Removals	3
2.3	Trees which could Potentially Sustain Damage to Stem, Canopy or RPA	3
2.4	Proposed Incursions into the RPA of Retained Trees	4
2.5	Access Facilitation Pruning	6
2.6	Site Specific Issues	6
3	Conclusions	7
3.2	Post Consent Tree Retention and Protection	7
3.3	Arboricultural Method Statement Heads of Terms	7
3.4	Mitigation Replanting	8
	References and Bibliography	10
	Appendix 1: Schedule of Trees	A
	Appendix 2: Tree Retention and Removal Plan	AA
	Appendix 3: Draft Tree Protection Plan	CC
	Appendix 4: Glossary of Terms	EE
	Appendix 5: Tree Protection Fencing Specification, Ground Protection and Signage Examples	GG
	Appendix 6: Photographs	II

Disclaimer

NN

List of Tables and Figures

<i>Table 2:1: Summary of tree removals</i>	3
<i>Table 2:2: Summary of arboricultural impacts due to development</i>	4
<i>Table 2:3 RPA incursions</i>	4
<i>Table A.1: Schedule of Trees and Tree Quality Assessment</i>	B
<i>Table A.2: BS: 5837 2012 Tree Quality Assessment Definitions</i>	W
<i>Table A.3: Key for Schedule of Trees</i>	Y

Abbreviations

AIA	Arboricultural Impact Assessment
AMS	Arboricultural Method Statement
CEZ	Construction Exclusion Zone
DBH	Diameter at Breast Height
DTPP	Draft Tree Protection Plan
LPA	Local Planning Authority
RPA	Root Protection Area
SRZ	Structural Root Zone
TCP	Tree Constraints Plan
TPO	Tree Preservation Order
TPP	Tree Protection Plan
TRRP	Tree Retention and Removal Plan
VTA	Visual Tree Assessment



0 Executive Summary

0.1.1 Urban Edge Environmental Consulting Ltd was instructed by Richard Parr Associates to undertake an Arboricultural Impact Assessment for the development of land at Sunte House, Birchen Lane, Haywards Heath, West Sussex (the 'Proposed Development') based on tree survey data previously produced by Urban Edge Environmental Consulting (UEEC, 2024). The following report has been produced in accordance with British Standard BS 5837:2012, '*Trees in Relation to Design, Demolition and Construction– Recommendations*'.

0.1.2 A summary of report findings is detailed as follows:

- ▶ The Arboricultural Impact Assessment has concluded that tree removals associated with the Proposed Development are considered very low impact.
- ▶ Based on the design proposal a total of five individual trees, one partial group and four hedges will need to be removed to facilitate the Proposed Development.
- ▶ Of the trees to be removed one individual tree, one partial group and one hedgerow were attributed category B status while, a further four individual trees and three hedges were attributed category C status.
- ▶ Trees T1, T2 and T3 were subject to Tree Preservation Order restrictions (Council Reference TP/15/0001).
- ▶ The Arboricultural Impact Assessment and site specific assessment has demonstrated that development can occur within the veteran tree buffer zone of T85 without causing any deterioration to the tree's condition
- ▶ The use of 3D cellular confinement systems to provide low-impact, durable surfacing within RPAs, where permeability must be maintained and ground compaction avoided, is significant in the tree protection strategy.
- ▶ The construction process has the potential to cause a total of 13 individual impacts to either the stem, canopy or RPAs of trees scheduled for retention. To ensure that these features are successfully retained during the proposed works it is recommended an Arboricultural Method Statement be undertaken prior to the development commencing.
- ▶ All Category A and B trees should be given priority consideration for retention during any future development works.

1 Introduction

1.1 Instruction

- 1.1.1 Urban Edge Environmental Consulting was instructed on 5 February 2025 by Richard Parr Associates to undertake an Arboricultural Impact Assessment for land at Sunte House, Birchen Lane, Haywards Heath, West Sussex to aid in the determination of a Planning Application.

1.2 Scope of the Report

- 1.2.1 This report has been produced in accordance with British Standard BS 5837:2012 '*Trees in Relation to Design, Demolition and Construction – Recommendations*' and provides details on the quality and value of the existing tree stock at the Application Site.
- 1.2.2 The report also provides an assessment of likely impacts to arboricultural features as a direct result of the Proposed Development and seeks to mitigate any potential loss of public amenity through design iterations and sympathetic construction methods, as provided.

1.3 Site Context

- 1.3.1 The Application Site comprises the grounds of Sunte House, a private residence with multiple out buildings including barns and tool sheds. Within the grounds there are a number of gardens comprising lawns, formal and walled gardens in addition to arable pasture and densely planted wooded areas. The Ordnance Survey National Grid reference for the centre of the site is TQ 33379 25525.

1.4 Description of the Proposals

- 1.4.1 The proposal comprises the construction of new hard landscaping for carparking and vehicular use, the excavation and construction of an outdoor swimming pool and the erection of a new associated outbuilding.

1.5 Supporting Documents

- 1.5.1 Drawing Reference: 335_XX_DR_00_101-Proposed Site Plan-Householder App (Richard Parr Associates, 2025) and Topographical Survey 109569-2D (Midland Survey LTD, 2024) were provided for the purposes of compiling this report. They included the layout of existing site features, along with a footprint overlay of the Proposed Development.
- 1.5.2 This report is based on tree survey information previously produced by Urban Edge Environmental Consulting. The Tree Constraints Report UE0664_SunteHouse_TCR_1_240503 (UEEC, 2024) should be read in conjunction with the following Arboricultural Impact Assessment report.

1.6 Personnel

- 1.6.1 The report was produced by Wesley Rawson FdSc BSc (Hons) MArborA. Wesley is a Professional Member of the Arboricultural Association and a Quantified Tree Risk Assessment registered user. Wesley is a Senior Arboriculturist with over 10 years' industry experience working as a consultant and private contractor.

1.7 Limitations

- 1.7.1 Trees recorded as T5, T6, T7, T8, T46, T72, T84, T86 and T87 within the Tree Constraints Report (UEEC, 2024) have been removed from the site in accordance with tree felling exemptions (Forestry Act 1967). As such, any reference to these trees has been removed from the following Arboricultural Impact Assessment.

2 Arboricultural Impact Assessment

2.1.1 Drawing Reference: 335_XX_DR_00_101-Proposed Site Plan-Householder App (Richard Parr Associates, 2025), received April 2025 was used to assess the impacts of the Proposed Development on the sites existing tree stock.

2.2 Tree Removals

- 2.2.1 BS:5837 2012 recognises that while trees should inform the site layout design, 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 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, or post-completion demands for their removal.
- 2.2.2 Tree removals associated with the Proposed Development have been illustrated with red dashed outlines in the Tree Retention and Removal Plan found in Appendix 2. A summary of tree removals is provided below in Table 2.1.
- 2.2.3 Based on the design proposal a total of five individual trees, one partial group and four hedges will need to be removed to facilitate the Proposed Development.
- 2.2.4 Of the trees to be removed one individual tree, one partial group and one hedgerow were attributed category B status while, a further four individual trees and three hedges were attributed category C status.

Table 2:1: Summary of tree removals

Arboricultural Impact	Reason	Category A Trees	Category B Trees	Category C Trees	Category U Trees
Trees to be felled	To facilitate construction	-	T105, G9 (partial), H11	T65, T75, T78, T79, H5, H12, H13	-
Total		-	3	7	-

2.3 Trees which could Potentially Sustain Damage to Stem, Canopy or RPA

2.3.1 A summary table attributing construction activity to arboricultural impacts is provided below in Table 2.2.

- 2.3.2 Where construction access and the use of plant has been considered necessary, appropriate crown lifting and pruning operations have been accounted for using the standard minimum carriageway clearance of 5m (HSE, 2023).
- 2.3.3 The construction process has the potential to cause a total of 13 individual impacts to either the stem, canopy or RPAs of trees scheduled for retention as displayed in Table 2.2. To ensure that these features are successfully retained during the proposed works it is recommended an Arboricultural Method Statement be undertaken prior to the development commencing.

Table 2.2: Summary of arboricultural impacts due to development

Arboricultural Impact	Reason	BS Cat A	BS Cat B	BS Cat C	BS Cat U
Trees which could sustain damage to the RPA	New hard landscaping proposals including carparking, vehicular and pedestrian routes	T85	T69, T70, T71, G10	-	-
	Construction of building foundations for pool house	-	-	T103	-
	Soil compaction through construction access	T85	-	-	-
Trees which could sustain damage to stem or canopy	Erection of Pool House			T103	
	Impact by construction traffic	-	T69, T70, T71	T82, T83	-
Total		2	7	4	0

2.4 Proposed Incursions into the RPA of Retained Trees

- 2.4.1 Where Proposed Development encroaches into the trees' RPAs within the Application Site, an arboricultural assessment has been undertaken to ascertain the likely effects on individual tree survival and retention. A summary of incursions into the RPAs of trees from the Proposed Development have been summarised in Table 2.3 and detailed below.

Table 2.3 RPA incursions

Tree No.	Total RPA m ²	Area of Incursion m ²	Percentage of Incursion (%)
T69	6.5	1.4	21.5
T70	6.5	1.5	23

Tree No.	Total RPA m ²	Area of Incursion m ²	Percentage of Incursion (%)
T71	167.5	22.7	13.6
T85	2533.9	120.2	4.7
T103	11.6	1.2	10.3
G10	N/A	4.6	N/A

- 2.4.2 T69 Cornus sp. will require hard surfacing for vehicular use over 21.5% of the trees total RPA. The tree has further rooting area contiguous with the trees RPA to the north, south and west that can be protected as part of mitigatory measures. Permeable surfacing that retains its porosity throughout its design life, laid over a 'no dig' installation of a 150mm depth 3D cellular confinement system subbase will be required to maintain an acceptable rooting environment to retain this tree.
- 2.4.3 T70 Star magnolia will require hard surfacing for vehicular and pedestrian use over 23% of the trees total RPA. The tree has further rooting area contiguous with the trees RPA to the south and east that can be protected as part of mitigatory measures. Permeable surfacing that retains its porosity throughout its design life will be required to maintain an acceptable rooting environment to retain this tree. The surface will need to be laid over a 75mm depth 3D cellular confinement system where pedestrian use is expected, and a 150mm depth 3D cellular confinement system where vehicular use is expected. The 3D cellular confinement system is to be installed using a no-dig methodology.
- 2.4.4 T71 Persian ironwood will require hard surfacing for vehicular and pedestrian use over 13% of the trees total RPA. The tree has further rooting area contiguous with the trees RPA to the north, south and east that can be protected as part of mitigatory measures. A 3D cellular confinement system sub-base will need to be installed using a no-dig methodology in order to protect the trees underlying rooting area before the construction of hard surfacing. A 75mm depth 3D cellular confinement system will be required where pedestrian use is expected, and a 150mm depth 3D cellular confinement system is required where vehicular use is expected.
- 2.4.5 Veteran tree T85 Pedunculate oak will require hard surfacing for vehicular use over 4.7% of the trees total RPA. While BS5837:2012 stipulates that a trees RPA should be capped at a 15m radius from the tree, the standing advice from the Forestry Commission and Natural England recommends for veteran trees, buffer zones of at least 15x the diameter of the tree be used. This extended buffer zone will then create the minimum Root Protection Area (FC & NE, 2022). The NPPF recommends that any proposals resulting in the loss or deterioration of ancient woodland, or ancient or veteran trees be rejected unless under wholly exceptional reasons or if a suitable compensation strategy is in place (Ministry of Housing, Communities & Local Government, 2024). For registered veteran tree T85, any incursion by the Proposed Development within the buffer zone must be accompanied by a suitable strategy that prevents any deterioration to the tree's condition. As part of the Proposed Development, the new carparking area and vehicular route will be constructed using a 150mm depth cellular confinement system sub-base, installed using a no-dig methodology over the areas that are contained within the veteran tree buffer zone. This will protect the trees rooting area from ground compaction associated with the construction methods and the expected vehicular use. A permeable wearing course will be used on top of the

3D cellular confinement system that maintains gaseous and aqueous exchange throughout its design life. This will ensure that the rooting environment within the Proposed Development area is unchanged and the normal functioning of the tree's root system will remain unimpeded.

- 2.4.6 G10 is a group of early mature euonymus, rhododendron and magnolia species. The existing road runs partially through the existing default RPA of G10. The proposed vehicular route realignment will require new hard surfacing over an area of 4.6m². The trees have further rooting area contiguous with the trees RPA to the north and south that can be protected as part of mitigatory measures. Due to the existing site layout and ground conditions, traditional construction methods are not expected to adversely affect these trees condition and no specialist construction methods are recommended as part of the proposal in this area.

2.5 Access Facilitation Pruning

- 2.5.1 Based on the design proposal and the impacts of construction activity, the following tree surgery operations will need to be undertaken to facilitate the development works:
- ▶ T70 will require crown lifting on its northern canopy quadrant by a minimum of 2.4m.
 - ▶ T103 should have the lateral branches in its northern canopy quadrant reduced by 1.5m-2m.
 - ▶ G10 should have the lateral branches in its north eastern canopy quadrant reduced by 2.5m-3m.

2.6 Site Specific Issues

- 2.6.1 Trees T1, T2 and T3 were subject to Tree Preservation Order restrictions (Council Reference TP/15/0001). Any works to these trees must first have the prior written consent of the Council unless full planning permission specifically detailing the proposed works has been granted and has not expired. Consent should be sought by the submission of a tree works application, details of which can be found on The Planning Portal national planning application service.
- 2.6.2 The proposed swimming pool will require excavation within a small area of the projected default RPA of tree group G8. The location of proposed pool sits within the existing location of the tennis court. Due to the historic construction of the tennis court and the impermeable surface laid over the area, no roots are expected to be within this Proposed Development zone.
- 2.6.3 The proposed pool house is sited within the default projection of the veteran tree buffer zone of T85 however, due to the existing site layout and the historic development within this area, no roots from T85 are expected to be contained within the area beyond the existing garden wall. While roots are able to grow beneath the shallow footings of garden walls, this is generally only when the wall is within close proximity to the tree and rooting area is limited. The stem of T85 is located 18m from the existing garden wall and the tree has ample rooting area within soft landscaping to the north and west. As such, any fibrous roots extending south towards the garden wall are expected to have been redirected to the east and west.

3 Conclusions

- 3.1.1 The Arboricultural Impact Assessment has concluded that tree removals associated with the Proposed Development are considered very low impact.
- 3.1.2 The Proposed Development at Sunte House, Birchen Lane, Haywards Heath, West Sussex will require minimal tree removal consisting only of small, garden ornamental species contained within a private garden collection. The trees designated for removal offer no contribution to the wider locality in terms of visual amenity and local landscape character, as they are only visible from within the residence itself. Trees within private gardens are largely exempt from tree felling restrictions providing they do not fall within a conservation area or have Tree Preservation Orders however, trees that have reached veteran or ancient status are given great weight as a material planning consideration having been defined as irreplaceable habitat within the National Planning Policy Framework (2024). While development proposals are recommended to be located outside of veteran tree buffer zones, the Arboricultural Impact Assessment and site specific assessment has demonstrated that the Proposed Development can occur within the buffer zone of T85 without causing any deterioration to the tree's condition.

3.2 Post Consent Tree Retention and Protection

- 3.2.1 All Category A and B trees should be given priority consideration for retention during any future development works.
- 3.2.2 This Arboricultural Impact Assessment has considered the impacts of the development contained within the plans 335_XX_DR_00_101-Proposed Site Plan-Householder App (Richard Parr Associates, 2025) as proposed. The report has not considered the impacts that the construction process may have on retained trees during the construction of the Proposed Development. For this to occur, a Construction Site Plan must first be drafted, based on the Draft Tree Protection Plan (Appendix 3) and an Arboricultural Method Statement to be completed prior to development occurring. For the Proposed Development at Sunte House, Birchen Lane, Haywards Heath, West Sussex, this should include the details described below in Arboricultural Method Statement Heads of Terms.

3.3 Arboricultural Method Statement Heads of Terms

- 3.3.1 Construction operations that require access within the root protection area, veteran tree buffer zone or crown spread of retained trees should be described within an Arboricultural Method Statement. This can only be described once technical design has been finalised and post-consent detailed planning has begun. For this site the Arboricultural Method Statement should include:
- ▶ A detailed and dimensioned tree protection plan with protective barriers and/or ground protection specifications;

- ▶ An overlay of the Construction Site Plan;
- ▶ The specification of sympathetic construction techniques and materials to avoid damage to retained trees;
- ▶ An auditable schedule of arboricultural site monitoring and the phasing of arboricultural works;
- ▶ Temporary works associated with the development to include contractors' parking, access routes, welfare facilities, storage facilities and working space for plant, machinery and site operatives.
- ▶ Changes in ground levels within RPAs;
- ▶ Removal of existing structures and hard surfacing;
- ▶ Installation of new hard surfacing, materials, design constraints and implications for levels;
- ▶ New underground utility apparatus routes, dimensions, and depths;
- ▶ Access facilitation pruning;
- ▶ An appointed project arboriculturist and list of emergency contact details.

3.4 Mitigation Replanting

- 3.4.1 Local Planning Authorities have a duty to preserve trees and ensure, where appropriate, the provision of trees when determining a planning application.
- 3.4.2 It is recommended that any replanting scheme submitted as part of this development proposal should be fully compliant with BS 8545:2014 *Trees from nursery to establishment in the landscape - Recommendation*. This should include an aftercare plan with tree protection, a watering schedule and replacement strategy for a period of at least five years post planting.
- 3.4.3 The planting plan must be designed in accordance with any new underground service proposals so that future conflicts can be avoided either through location changes or planting pit design i.e. the use of root barriers.

This page is intentionally blank.

References and Bibliography

Ancient Tree Forum (ATF) (2013). Ancient and other veteran trees: further guidance on management. The Tree Council, London 212pp.

British Standard Institute (BSI) (2012). BS 5837:2012 Trees in Relation to Design Demolition and Construction-Recommendations. BSI, London.

British Standard Institute (BSI) (2010). BS 3998:2010 Recommendation for Tree Works. BSI, London.

British Standard Institute (BSI) (2014). BS 8545:2014 Trees: from nursery to independence in the landscape - Recommendations. BSI, London.

Department for Communities and Local Government (2014). Planning Practice Guidance on Tree Preservation Orders and trees in conservation areas. Available at: <https://www.gov.uk/guidance/tree-preservation-orders-and-trees-in-conservation-areas> (Accessed 24 November 2023).

Forestry Commission & Natural England (2022). Guidance - Ancient woodland, ancient trees and veteran trees: advice for making planning decisions. Available at: <https://www.gov.uk/guidance/ancient-woodland-ancient-trees-and-veteran-trees-advice-for-making-planning-decisions#:~:text=For%20ancient%20or%20veteran%20trees,15%20times%20the%20tree's%20diameter>. Accessed: 23/05/2024.

Health and Safety Executive (2023). *Roadways / site traffic control / immobilisation of vehicles – Height Restrictions*. Available at: <https://www.hse.gov.uk/comah/sragtech/techmeastraftic.htm> (Accessed 24 November 2023).

Helliwell, D.R. (1992). Tree roots & tree growth. Technical note. Westminster City Council. Available at: https://www.westminster.gov.uk/sites/default/files/cd_8.40_part_2_tree_roots_tree_growth_-_helliwell_1992_0.pdf (Accessed 26 July 2024).

Hirons, A D., & Thomas P A. (2018). University Centre, Myerscough, Preston, UK. Applied Tree Biology.

Lonsdale, D. (1999). Research for Amenity Trees No.7: Principles of Tree Hazard Assessment and Management. HMSO.

Mattheck and Breloer (1994). HMSO London. Research for Amenity Trees No 4; The Body Language of Trees.

Midland Survey Ltd (2024). *Topographical Survey 109569-2D*.

Ministry of Housing, Communities & Local Government (2024). National Planning Policy Framework.

Natural England (2022). Natural England Joint Publication. Biodiversity Metric 3.1. Auditing and accounting for biodiversity. TECHNICAL SUPPLEMENT.

Richard Parr Associates (2025). 335_XX_DR_00_101-*Proposed Site Plan-Householder App.*

Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended).

Town and Country Planning (Tree Preservation) (England) Regulations 2012.

Urban Edge Environmental Consulting (2024). *Sunte House, Birchen Lane, Haywards Heath, West Sussex: Tree Constraints Report.* UE0664_SunteHouse_TCR_1_240503

Appendix 1: Schedule of Trees

Table A.1: Schedule of Trees and Tree Quality Assessment¹

No	Species	Ht.	S	St. 1.5m	Canopy Spread				Cr.Cl	Ls	SC	PC	Comments / Observations	Preliminary Mgt. Advice	LE	Cat ²	RPA ^{m2}	RPA _r
					N	S	E	W										
T1	Common lime	14	1	360	4	4	4	4	3	EM	Good	Good	Part of avenue. Growing well.		20+	B2	58.6	4.3
T2	Common lime	14	1	340	4	4	4	4	3	EM	Good	Good	Part of avenue. Growing well.		20+	B2	52.3	4.1
T3	Common lime	14	1	420	4	4	4	4	3	EM	Good	Good	Part of avenue. Growing well.		20+	B2	79.8	5.0
T4	Common ash	14	1	340	4	4	4	4	3	EM	Good	Good	Part of avenue. Growing well.		20+	B2	52.3	4.1
T5	Sycamore	14	1	460	4	6	4	4	3	EM	Fair	Good	Previously codominant. Has lost main leader. Large basal cavity. Good reaction growth. Good vitality.	Light crown reduction.	20+	B2	95.7	5.5
T6	European hornbeam	8	1	80	2	1	1	1	1	SM	Good	Good	Recent planting.		10+	C1	2.9	1.0

¹ See Table 3 for key to terms

² See Table 2 for definitions of categories

No	Species	Ht.	S	St. 1.5m	Canopy Spread				Cr.Cl	Ls	SC	PC	Comments / Observations	Preliminary Mgt. Advice	LE	Cat ²	RPA _m ²	RPA _r
					N	S	E	W										
T7	European hornbeam	8	1	80	2	1	1	1	1	SM	Good	Good	Recent planting.		10+	C1	2.9	1.0
T8	European hornbeam	8	1	80	2	1	1	1	1	SM	Good	Good	Recent planting.		10+	C1	2.9	1.0
T9	Common ash	15	1	450	5	5	5	5	5	EM	Good	Good	Crown lifted. Good vitality.		20+	B1	91.6	5.4
T10	Common ash	15	1	440	5	5	5	5	5	EM	Good	Good	Crown lifted. Good vitality.		20+	B1	87.6	5.3
T11	Ginkgo	9	1	250	2	2	2	2	2	SM	Good	Good	Weak union at 2m. Some natural bracing beginning.		20+	B1	28.3	3.0
T12	Paper bark birch	7	1	180	3	3	3	3	3	EM	Good	Good	Avenue planting.		20+	B2	14.7	2.2
T13	Paper bark birch	7	1	190	3	3	3	3	3	EM	Good	Good	Avenue planting.		20+	B2	16.3	2.3
T14	Paper bark birch	7	1	190	3	3	3	3	3	EM	Good	Good	Avenue planting.		20+	B2	16.3	2.3
T15	Paper bark birch	7	1	190	3	3	3	3	3	EM	Good	Good	Avenue planting.		20+	B2	16.3	2.3
T16	Paper bark birch	7	1	350	5	5	5	5	3	EM	Good	Good	Avenue planting.		20+	B2	55.4	4.2

No	Species	Ht.	S	St. 1.5m	Canopy Spread				Cr.Cl	Ls	SC	PC	Comments / Observations	Preliminary Mgt. Advice	LE	Cat ²	RPA ^{m2}	RPA _r
					N	S	E	W										
T17	Paper bark birch	7	1	300	4	4	4	4	3	EM	Good	Good	Avenue planting.		20+	B2	40.7	3.6
T18	Paper bark birch	7	1	240	4	4	4	4	3	EM	Good	Good	Avenue planting.		20+	B2	26.1	2.9
T19	Paper bark birch	7	1	360	4	4	3	4	3	EM	Good	Good	Avenue planting. Large basal wound.	Resurvey in 3 years.	20+	B2	58.6	4.3
T20	Viburnum	2	1	100	1	1	1	1	1	EM	Good	Good	Wrinkled viburnum.		10+	C1	4.5	1.2
T21	Portuguese Laurel	4	1	120	2	1	2	1	1	SM	Good	Good	Some branches rubbing on wall.		10+	C1	6.5	1.4
T22	Buddleja sp.	1	2	80	1	1	1	1	1	EM	Fair	Fair	Pruned back hard.		10+	C3	2.9	1.0
T23	Portuguese Laurel	9	1	190	2	2	1	3	5	EM	Fair	Fair	Poor taper. Not very wind firm. Lost previous leader.		<10	U	16.3	2.3
T24	Box	4	10	80	2	2	1	1	1	M	Good	Poor	Heavily defoliated with box caterpillar.		<10	U	29.0	3.0
T25	Skimmia	2	1	100	1	2	1	2	1	SM	Good	Good			10+	C1	4.5	1.2

No	Species	Ht.	S	St. 1.5m	Canopy Spread				Cr.Cl	Ls	SC	PC	Comments / Observations	Preliminary Mgt. Advice	LE	Cat ²	RPA _m ²	RPA _r
					N	S	E	W										
T26	Skimmia	2	1	100	1	2	1	2	1	SM	Good	Good			10+	C1	4.5	1.2
T27	English yew	15	2	380;560	9	5	9	9	4	EM	Good	Good	Over shading adjacent oak. Growing well.		20+	B2	207.2	8.1
T28	English yew	15	1	660	7	4	8	4	4	EM	Good	Good	Path runs within RPA 0.5m below buttress.		20+	B2	197.1	7.9
T29	Sycamore	15	2	280;300	6	3	7	6	4	EM	Good	Good	Codominant with good union.		20+	B2	76.2	4.9
T30	Deodar cedar	20	1	740	6	6	6	6	7	EM	Good	Good	Bifurcation at 2m with weak union. Some reactive growth.	Remove limb touching stem from adjacent laurel.	20+	B1	247.7	8.9
T31	Portuguese Laurel	10	3	400;270;180	4	4	6	6	1	M	Fair	Good	Large cavity in major leader has been reduced.		20+	B2	120.0	6.2
T32	English yew	18	1	980	5	10	9	6	5	EM	Good	Good	Has lost previous codominant leader. Large		20+	B2	434.5	11.8

No	Species	Ht.	S	St. 1.5m	Canopy Spread				Cr.Cl	Ls	SC	PC	Comments / Observations	Preliminary Mgt. Advice	LE	Cat ²	RPA _m ²	RPA _r
					N	S	E	W										
													area of exposed heartwood. 120cm-60cm. Endocormic roots. Sound wood on compression side to south.					
T33	Deodar cedar	22	1	1200	7	8	7	8	2	M	Good	Good	Crown lifted up eastern side. Some callus rolling.		40+	A1	651.4	14.4
T34	Cherry	5	1	100	1	4	2	2	1	SM	Good	Good	Leaning south towards light.		10+	C1	4.5	1.2
T35	Purple plum	6	1	280	5	5	6	4	2	EM	Good	Good	Exposed roots in path.		20+	B2	35.5	3.4
T36	Pedunculate oak	18	2	1080;2200	10	11	7	10	2	OM	Good	Good	Large basal wound with exposed heartwood. 1.5m x1m. Historically filled with cement inhibiting full occlusion. Wound wood		40+	A3	2717.2	29.4

No	Species	Ht.	S	St. 1.5m	Canopy Spread				Cr.Cl	Ls	SC	PC	Comments / Observations	Preliminary Mgt. Advice	LE	Cat ²	RPA ^{m2}	RPA _r
					N	S	E	W										
													still occluding. Artist bracket fungi on eastern buttress and north western bark inclusion between stems. Large lower limb loss exposing heartwood. 60cm by 50cm on 700mm limb. Brown cubical rot. Lots of burring and epicormic growth. 4 large rounded knotholes on northern limb. Large pruning wounds in northern canopy. Moderate retained deadwood					

No	Species	Ht.	S	St. 1.5m	Canopy Spread				Cr.Cl	Ls	SC	PC	Comments / Observations	Preliminary Mgt. Advice	LE	Cat ²	RPAm ²	RPA _r
					N	S	E	W										
													120mm x 2m long. Northern leader resting on grade 2 listed wall has been previously crown reduced with large unoccluded wounds. Veteran.					
T37	Holly leaf sweet spire	2	1	120	1	1	1	1	1	SM	Good	Good			10+	C1	6.5	1.4
T38	Pittosporum	2	1	150	1	1	1	1	1	EM	Good	Good			10+	C1	10.2	1.8
T39	Chilean myrtle	5	11	100	2	2	2	2	2	EM	Good	Good	In planting bed		20+	B1	49.8	4.0
T40	Southern magnolia	8	2	170;280	2	3	3	3	4	EM	Good	Good	Leaning on wall.		20+	B1	48.5	3.9
T41	Myrtle	7	2	100	1	2	1	1	3	SM	Fair	Good	Skinny taper.		10+	C1	4.5	1.2
T42	Loquat	4	2	100	2	1	2	1	1	EM	Good	Good			10+	C1	4.5	1.2

No	Species	Ht.	S	St. 1.5m	Canopy Spread				Cr.Cl	Ls	SC	PC	Comments / Observations	Preliminary Mgt. Advice	LE	Cat ²	RPA ^{m2}	RPA _r
					N	S	E	W										
T43	Fig	6	1	450	2	2	3	2	2	EM	Fair	Fair	Supporting itself against wall.		10+	C1	91.6	5.4
T44	Pear	5	1	400	2	2	2	2	2	M	Good	Fair			20+	B1	72.4	4.8
T45	Amelanchier sp	6	6	200	3	3	3	2	1	M	Good	Good	In process of leaf flushing. No leaves or winter twigs to identify. No significant defects.		20+	B1	108.6	5.9
T46	Southern magnolia	7	3	190;300;300	4	3	5	1	3	M	Good	Good	Crown bias north.		20+	B1	97.8	5.6
T47	Pittosporum	2	3	80	1	1	1	1	1	EM	Good	Good			10+	C1	2.9	1.0
T48	Chinese holly	4	8	100	2	2	3	3	2	M	Good	Good			20+	B2	36.2	3.4
T49	Chinese holly	4	1	220	3	2	3	3	2	M	Good	Good			20+	B2	21.9	2.6
T50	Small leaved lime	16	1	430	5	5	6	5	2	EM	Fair	Good	Compression fork. Beginning to naturally brace.		20+	B2	83.6	5.2

No	Species	Ht.	S	St. 1.5m	Canopy Spread				Cr.Cl	Ls	SC	PC	Comments / Observations	Preliminary Mgt. Advice	LE	Cat ²	RPA ^{m2}	RPA _r
					N	S	E	W										
T51	Kentucky coffee tree	12	1	450	6	6	6	6	5	EM	Good	Fair	Low bud density. Minor retained deadwood throughout crown.	Resurvey in one year.	10+	C1	91.6	5.4
T52	Styrax sp.	7	2	140	2	2	2	2	2	SM	Good	Good			10+	C1	8.9	1.7
T53	Paulownia	10	1	220	5	3	2	3	5	EM	Good	Fair	Minor retained deadwood.		10+	C1	21.9	2.6
T54	Honey locust	12	1	370	5	4	6	3	5	EM	Good	Fair	Minor retained deadwood.		20+	B2	61.9	4.4
T55	Narrow leaved lace bark	5	1	110	1	1	1	1	1	SM	Good	Good	Fastigate form.		10+	C1	5.5	1.3
T56	Juneberry	7	1	220	3	3	3	3	2	EM	Good	Good	Growing well		20+	B2	21.9	2.6
T57	Amelanchier sp	4	1	100	1	1	1	1	2	SM	Good	Good			10+	C1	4.5	1.2
T58	Common alder	7	1	260	3	2	2	2	2	EM	Good	Good			20+	B2	30.6	3.1
T59	Turkish hazel	16	1	570	8	7	8	7	4	M	Good	Good	Ground water logged.		20+	B2	147.0	6.8

No	Species	Ht.	S	St. 1.5m	Canopy Spread				Cr.Cl	Ls	SC	PC	Comments / Observations	Preliminary Mgt. Advice	LE	Cat ²	RPAm ²	RPA _r
					N	S	E	W										
T60	Dawn redwood	15	1	1330	6	6	6	6	5	EM	Good	Good	Growing well.		40+	A1	800.2	16.0
T61	Paper bark birch	7	1	310	4	4	5	3	4	EM	Good	Good			20+	B2	43.5	3.7
T62	Weeping willow	6	1	140	2	1	2	1	1	SM	Fair	Poor	No physiological function detected.		<10	U	8.9	1.7
T63	Pedunculate oak	28	1	1600#	12	12	12	12	4	M	Good	Good	Large specimen in full vigour. No access stem estimated.		40+	A1	1158.1	19.2
T64	Greek strawberry tree	10	2	480;300	4	5	4	5	4	M	Good	Good	Some decay from crown lifting with curtain crust fungus.		20+	B1	144.9	6.8
T65	Acer sp.	2	1	100	1	1	1	1	1	SM	Good	Good	Small ornamental.		10+	C1	4.5	1.2
T66	Sorbus sp.	2	1	100	1	1	1	1	1	SM	Good	Good	Small ornamental.		10+	C1	4.5	1.2
T67	Persian lilac	2	5	50	1	2	1	2	1	EM	Good	Good	Small ornamental.		10+	C1	5.7	1.3

No	Species	Ht.	S	St. 1.5m	Canopy Spread				Cr.Cl	Ls	SC	PC	Comments / Observations	Preliminary Mgt. Advice	LE	Cat ²	RPA ^{m2}	RPA _r
					N	S	E	W										
T68	Cherry	8	1	250	3	2	3	2	2	EM	Good	Good	Growing in hedge.		20+	B2	28.3	3.0
T69	Cornus sp.	6	4	120	3	3	4	3	1	M	Good	Good	Ornamental.		20+	B2	6.5	1.4
T70	Star magnolia	7	5	120	3	3	3	3	2	EM	Good	Good	One leader removed.		20+	B2	6.5	1.4
T71	Persian ironwood	9	7	230	4	4	4	4	2	EM	Good	Good	Layered form is re-rooting from branches.		20+	B1	167.5	7.3
T72	Southern magnolia	9	1	340	4	4	1	4	3	EM	Good	Good	Planted in small pit by house.		20+	B1	52.3	4.1
T73	Japanese maple	7	1	220	3	2	3	3	2	M	Good	Good	Growing well.		20+	B1	21.9	2.6
T74	Saucer magnolia	7	2	150;180	1	2	3	3	2	SM	Fair	Good	Crown bias to south.		20+	B2	24.8	2.8
T75	California Laurel	7	6	90	2	1	2	1	1	EM	Good	Good	Vigorous.		10+	C1	22.0	2.6
T76	Pear	5	1	140	1	1	1	1	3	EM	Fair	Good	Grown against wall in small planting pit.		10+	C1	8.9	1.7
T77	Paper bark birch	8	1	180	3	3	3	3	3	EM	Good	Good	Growing well.		20+	B1	14.7	2.2

No	Species	Ht.	S	St. 1.5m	Canopy Spread				Cr.Cl	Ls	SC	PC	Comments / Observations	Preliminary Mgt. Advice	LE	Cat ²	RPA ^{m2}	RPA _r
					N	S	E	W										
T78	Cherry	6	1	110	2	1	2	1	2	SM	Good	Good	Growing well.		10+	C1	5.5	1.3
T79	Box leaf azara	7	3	150	3	2	3	2	2	EM	Good	Fair	Sparse foliage.		10+	C1	30.5	3.1
T80	Paper bark maple	6	1	110	2	1	2	1	2	SM	Good	Good	Fairly exposed.		10+	C1	5.5	1.3
T81	Saucer magnolia	3	1	190	1	1	1	1	1	SM	Fair	Fair	Stump regrowth.		<10	U	16.3	2.3
T82	Kobus magnolia	6	1	120	2	1	2	1	2	SM	Good	Good	Growing well.		10+	C1	6.5	1.4
T83	Tatarian honeysuckle	3	4	90	2	2	1	2	1	EM	Good	Good			10+	C1	14.7	2.2
T84	Himalayan birch	8	1	250	1	6	3	3	3	EM	Good	Good	Crown bias south towards light.		20+	B1	28.3	3.0
T85	Pedunculate oak	25	1	1890	11	12	11	10	5	M	Good	Good	Large spreading specimen. Historical crown lifting evident. Large northern scaffold limb hinging at 5m with	Suggest acoustic tomography and relocate composting area away from RPA.	40+	A1	1616.0	22.7

No	Species	Ht.	S	St. 1.5m	Canopy Spread				Cr.Cl	Ls	SC	PC	Comments / Observations	Preliminary Mgt. Advice	LE	Cat ²	RPA ^{m2}	RPA _r
					N	S	E	W										
													longitudinal diametric shear crack. Good reactive growth with pronounced rib formation. Some historical tear out in crown with un-occluded cavities. Large tension root on windward side has open cavity . Sounding mallet reveals sound wood on western side but little on eastern side. Good vitality. Dry black exudate on southern stem possible fungal remnants.					

No	Species	Ht.	S	St. 1.5m	Canopy Spread				Cr.Cl	Ls	SC	PC	Comments / Observations	Preliminary Mgt. Advice	LE	Cat ²	RPA _m ²	RPA _r
					N	S	E	W										
T86	Liquid amber	10	1	360	5	4	4	4	2	EM	Good	Good	Growing well.		20+	B1	58.6	4.3
T87	Hybrid cherry	9	1	760	5	6	5	4	3	M	Fair	Poor	Limited physiological function.		<10	U	261.3	9.1
T88	Corkscrew willow	6	1	80	1	1	1	1	1	Y	Good	Good		Loosen or cut tie.	10+	C1	2.9	1.0
T89	River birch	5	1	100	3	1	1	1	2	SM	Good	Good	Crown bias towards light.		10+	C1	4.5	1.2
T90	Red maple	6	1	120	2	2	2	2	1	SM	Good	Good	Growing well.		10+	C1	6.5	1.4
T91	Cork oak	6	1	130	1	1	1	1	1	SM	Good	Good		Remove or widen supports before they girdle the tree.	10+	C1	7.6	1.6
T92	Rowan	5	1	110	1	2	1	1	2	SM	Good	Good	Crown bias south.		10+	C1	5.5	1.3
T93	Laburnum sp.	10	1	220	3	3	3	3	2	EM	Good	Good			20+	B1	21.9	2.6
T94	Laburnum sp.	10	1	220	3	3	3	3	2	EM	Good	Good			20+	B1	21.9	2.6

No	Species	Ht.	S	St. 1.5m	Canopy Spread				Cr.Cl	Ls	SC	PC	Comments / Observations	Preliminary Mgt. Advice	LE	Cat ²	RPA _m ²	RPA _r
					N	S	E	W										
T95	Tulip tree	15	1	680	6	6	6	6	3	EM	Good	Good	Growing well.		20+	B1	209.2	8.2
T96	Nordman fir	5	1	100	1	1	1	1	1	SM	Good	Good			10+	C1	4.5	1.2
T97	Corkscrew willow	6	1	80	1	1	1	1	1	Y	Good	Good		Loosen or cut tie.	10+	C1	2.9	1.0
T98	European beech	15	1	540	8	8	8	8	3	EM	Good	Good			20+	B2	131.9	6.5
T99	Holm oak	10	1	340	4	4	4	4	2	EM	Good	Good			20+	B2	52.3	4.1
T100	Handkerchief tree	9	1	220	4	3	3	3	2	EM	Good	Good			20+	B1	21.9	2.6
T101	Quince	5	1	100	1	2	1	1	1	SM	Good	Good			10+	C1	4.5	1.2
T102	Apple	6	1	160	3	2	3	2	1	EM	Good	Good	Domestic apples in orchard.		10+	C1	11.6	1.9
T103	Apple	6	1	160	3	2	3	2	1	EM	Good	Good	Domestic apples in orchard.		10+	C1	11.6	1.9
T104	Apple	6	1	160	3	2	3	2	1	EM	Good	Good	Domestic apples in orchard.		10+	C1	11.6	1.9

No	Species	Ht.	S	St. 1.5m	Canopy Spread				Cr.Cl	Ls	SC	PC	Comments / Observations	Preliminary Mgt. Advice	LE	Cat ²	RPA _m ²	RPA _r
					N	S	E	W										
T105	Southern magnolia	7	2	240	3	4	4	3	2	EM	Good	Good	Grown against wall.		20+	B2	26.1	2.9
T106	Pedunculate oak	8	1	370	5	5	5	5	4	EM	Good	Good	Crown lifted for road access.		20+	B1	61.9	4.4
T107	Pedunculate oak	8	1	520	5	5	5	5	4	EM	Good	Good	Crown lifted for road access.		20+	B1	122.3	6.2
G1	Mixed evergreen	8	1	100-250	3	3	3	3	1	M	Good	Good	Contains rhododendrons, tamarisk, camellia,		20+	B2	28.3	3.0
G2	Mixed	20	1	200-500	5	5	5	5	1	M	Good	Good	Mixed ornamental planting. Contains scarlet oak, pink oak, Chinese fur, fir, camellia, rhododendron, Portuguese laurel, bay Laurel, magnolia, Scot's pine, cherry, pedunculate oak and holm		40+	A1	113.1	6.0

No	Species	Ht.	S	St. 1.5m	Canopy Spread				Cr.Cl	Ls	SC	PC	Comments / Observations	Preliminary Mgt. Advice	LE	Cat ²	RPA ^{m2}	RPA _r
					N	S	E	W										
													oak. Growing well.					
G3	Mixed	8	1	100-300	3	3	3	3	1	EM	Good	Good	Mixed ornamental planting. Contains strawberry tree, Japanese maple, tamarisk Japanese spindle, salt cedar, mahonia, Japanese maple, Berberis, viburnum, cherry plum and spotted laurel. Growing well.		20+	B2	40.7	3.6
G4	Mixed	20	1	200-750	7	7	7	7	1	M	Good	Good	Contains beech, English yew, Portuguese laurel, Japanese spindle, holly, Japanese maple Cornus spp and		40+	A2	254.5	9.0

No	Species	Ht.	S	St. 1.5m	Canopy Spread				Cr.Cl	Ls	SC	PC	Comments / Observations	Preliminary Mgt. Advice	LE	Cat ²	RPA ^{m2}	RPA _r
					N	S	E	W										
													pyracantha. Growing well.					
G5	Mixed	7	1	100-200	3	3	3	3	1	M	Good	Good	Contains cherry plum and rhododendron aureum.		20+	B1	18.1	2.4
G6	Mixed	7	1	100-200	3	3	3	3	1	M	Good	Good	Contains rhododendron, camellia and star magnolia.		20+	B2	18.1	2.4
G7	Saucer magnolia	7	1	150-250	3	3	3	3	1	EM	Good	Good	Group of multi-stem individuals along southern boundary entrance. Stem diameters between 200 and 300.		20+	B1	28.3	3.0
G8	Mixed	20	1	100-800	5	5	5	5	1	M	Good	Good	Mixed planting. Contains rhododendrons, magnolias, silver birch, dogwood, mahonia, English yew, cherry laurel,		40+	A1	289.5	9.6

No	Species	Ht.	S	St. 1.5m	Canopy Spread				Cr.Cl	Ls	SC	PC	Comments / Observations	Preliminary Mgt. Advice	LE	Cat ²	RPA ^{m2}	RPA _r
					N	S	E	W										
													camellia, paper bark birch, cherry, holm oak, holly, London plane, sycamore, Scot's pine and hazel. Growing well.					
G9	Mixed evergreen	9	1	100-250	3	3	3	3	1	EM	Good	Good	Contains holly, cherry laurel and spotted laurel.		20+	B2	28.3	3.0
G10	Mixed broadleaf	8	1	100-300	4	4	4	4	1	EM	Good	Good	Mixed planting. Contains rhododendrons, Elaeagnus and magnolias.		20+	B1	40.7	3.6
H1	English yew	2	1	100	1	1	1	1	1	SM	Good	Good	Managed hedge.		10+	C1	4.5	1.2
H2	English yew	2	1	100	1	1	1	1	1	SM	Good	Good	Managed hedge.		10+	C1	4.5	1.2
H3	English yew	2	1	110	1	1	1	1	1	SM	Good	Good	Managed boundary hedge.		20+	B2	5.5	1.3

No	Species	Ht.	S	St. 1.5m	Canopy Spread				Cr.Cl	Ls	SC	PC	Comments / Observations	Preliminary Mgt. Advice	LE	Cat ²	RPA ^{m2}	RPA _r
					N	S	E	W										
H4	English yew	2	1	110	1	1	1	1	1	SM	Good	Good	Managed boundary hedge.		20+	B2	5.5	1.3
H5	Holly	2	1	100	1	1	1	1	1	SM	Good	Good	Managed hedge.		10+	C1	4.5	1.2
H6	Box	1	1	80	1	1	1	1	1	EM	Good	Good	Managed.		10+	C1	2.9	1.0
H7	Box	1	1	80	1	1	1	1	1	EM	Good	Good	Managed.		10+	C1	2.9	1.0
H8	Cherry Laurel	1	1	100	1	1	1	1	1	Y	Good	Good	New planting.		10+	C1	4.5	1.2
H9	European beech	2	1	90	1	1	1	1	1	Y	Good	Good	Young hedge planting.		10+	C1	3.7	1.1
H10	European beech	4	1	150	1	1	1	1	1	EM	Good	Good	Well managed.		20+	B2	10.2	1.8
H11	European hornbeam	3	1	150	1	1	1	1	1	SM	Good	Good	Wind shelter and screen.		20+	B2	10.2	1.8
H12	English yew	1	1	80	1	2	1	1	1	SM	Good	Good	Small hedge.		10+	C1	2.9	1.0
H13	English yew	1	1	80	1	2	1	1	1	SM	Good	Good	Small hedge.		10+	C1	2.9	1.0

No	Species	Ht.	S	St. 1.5m	Canopy Spread				Cr.Cl	Ls	SC	PC	Comments / Observations	Preliminary Mgt. Advice	LE	Cat ²	RPA ^{m2}	RPA _r
					N	S	E	W										
H14	Camellia	3	1	100	1	1	1	1	1	EM	Good	Good			20+	B2	4.5	1.2

Table A.2: BS: 5837 2012 Tree Quality Assessment Definitions

TREES UNSUITABLE FOR LONG TERM RETENTION*				
Category & Definition	Criteria			Identification on Plan
Category U Those in such a condition that they cannot realistically be retained as a living tree 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 U 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 or irreversible overall decline. • Trees infected with pathogens of significance to the health and or safety of other trees nearby by or very low quality trees suppressing adjacent trees of better quality. *Category U trees can have existing or potential conservation value which may be desirable to preserve			RED
TREES TO BE CONSIDERED FOR RETENTION				
Category & Identification	1 Mainly arboricultural values	2 Mainly landscape values	3 Mainly cultural values including conservation	Identification on plan
Category A Trees of High Quality with an estimated remaining life expectancy of at least 40 years	Trees that are a particularly good example 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 in an avenue)	Tree groups or woodlands of particular visual importance as arboricultural and/or landscape features.	Tree groups or woodlands of significant conservation historical, commemorative or other value (e.g. veteran trees or wood pasture)	GREEN

TREES TO BE CONSIDERED FOR RETENTION				
Category B Trees of moderate quality with an estimated remaining life expectancy of at least 20 years.	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 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.	Trees with material conservation or other cultural benefits.	BLUE
Category C Trees of a low quality with an estimated remaining life expectancy of at least 10 years or young trees with a stem diameter below 150mm	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 landscape value and/or trees offering low or only temporary/transient landscape benefits.	Trees with no material conservation or other cultural benefits.	GREY

Table A.3: Key for Schedule of Trees

Column Heading	Explanation	Column Heading	Explanation
Tree No	Sequential number corresponding to number on plan.	Ls.	Life stage definitions. Y= Young. SM = Semi-mature. EM = Early mature. M = Mature. OM = Over mature.
Species	Common names.	SC	Brief description of structural condition.
Ht.	Height in metres.	PC	Brief description of physiological condition.
S	Number of main stems.	Preliminary Advice	Preliminary tree works advice and recommendations.
St. 1.5 (Stem Diameter)	Stem diameter in mm when measured in accordance with Annex C of BS 5837:2012.	LE	Estimated remaining useful life contribution in years. <10, 10+, 20+ and 40+ yr.
NSEW	Crown radius in metres to cardinal points of the compass.	RPA m²	Root Protection Area (RPA). Indicative area around a tree measured in m ² and calculated in accordance with Annex C of BS 5837:2012 deemed to contain sufficient rooting volume to maintain the viability of a tree and where the protection of roots and soil structure is treated as a priority.
Cr. Cl. (Crown Clearance)	Height in metres between the ground and underside of canopy.	RPA r	Root Protection Area (RPA) radius calculation centred on the base of the tree and calculated in accordance with Annex C of BS 5837:2012
Cat. (Category)	Categorisation grading in accordance with BS 5837 2012. Trees suitable for retention: - Category A trees of high quality and amenity value. Category B trees of moderate quality and amenity value. Category C trees of low quality or amenity value. British Standards BS 5837:2012 recommends that these categories may be further broken down into sub-categories 1, 2 and 3 pertaining to Arboricultural, Landscape or Cultural values respectively.		


This page is intentionally blank.

Appendix 2: Tree Retention and Removal Plan

**Sunte House,
Birchen lane,
Haywards Heath,
West Sussex**



-  Category A - Trees with high amenity value and a life expectancy of 40+ years
 -  Category B - Trees with moderate amenity value and a life expectancy of 20+ years
 -  Category C - Trees with low amenity value and a life expectancy of 10+ years
 -  Category U - Trees of poor quality with a limited life expectancy of <10 years
 -  **RPA** Root Protection Area (RPA) of Category A Trees
 -  **RPA** Root Protection Area (RPA) of Category B Trees
 -  **RPA** Root Protection Area (RPA) of Category C Trees
 -  **RPA** Root Protection Area (RPA) of Category U Trees
 -  Veteran Tree Buffer Zone
 -  Trees to be removed
 -  RPA incursion



Title:	Tree Retention and Removal Plan		
Section:	1 of 1		
Survey date:	9 / 10 April 2024	Surveyor:	WR
Scale (at A1):	1:200	Created by:	WR
Date:	May 2025	Reviewed by:	NP
Drawing number:	UE0664_Sunte House_HHA_TRRP_0_250502		


Appendix 3: Draft Tree Protection Plan

Sunte House,
Birchen lane,
Haywards Heath,
West Sussex

- Category A - Trees with high amenity value and a life expectancy of 40+ years
- Category B - Trees with moderate amenity value and a life expectancy of 20+ years
- Category C - Trees with low amenity value and a life expectancy of 10+ years
- Category U - Trees of poor quality with a limited life expectancy of <10 years
- RPA - Root Protection Area (RPA) of Category A Trees
- RPA - Root Protection Area (RPA) of Category B Trees
- RPA - Root Protection Area (RPA) of Category C Trees
- RPA - Root Protection Area (RPA) of Category U Trees
- Veteran Tree Buffer Zone
- Tree Protection Fencing

Title: Draft Tree Protection Plan
Section: 1 of 1
Survey date: 9 / 10 April 2024
Scale (at A1): 1:400
Date: May 2025
Drawing number: UE0664_Sunte House_DTPP_0_250502

Surveyor: WR
Created by: WR
Reviewed by: NP



Appendix 4: Glossary of Terms


Term	Explanation
Arboricultural Impact Assessment (AIA)	Evaluation of direct and indirect effects of a proposed design and/or construction.
Arboricultural Method Statement (AMS)	Methodology for the implementation of any aspect of development that is in the root protection area or has the potential to result in the loss of or damage to a tree to be retained.
Branch structure	Qualitative description of formation of main framework of limbs and branches.
Canopy face	Orientation of canopy relative to cardinal points of the compass
Canopy radius	A measurement taken from the centre of a tree to the furthest radial extension of tree canopy relative to the cardinal points of the compass.
Competent Person	Person who has training and experience relevant to the matter being addressed and an understanding of the requirements of the particular task being approached.
Conservation Area	Local Planning Authority special designation generally prohibiting tree works without 6 weeks prior written notification.
Construction Exclusion Zone (CEZ)	Area based upon the calculated root protection area prohibiting access.
Cavity	Open and exposed aperture where wood tissue has internally degraded.
Constraints check	Formal search of local authority records to determine legal and statutory constraints on tree works.
Crown lifting	Removal of lower branches to achieve a stated vertical clearance above ground level or other surface.
Crown reduction	Pruning of a trees canopy in both height and width.
Decay	Deterioration and breakdown of tree wood fibres resulting in structural and/or physiological dysfunction of a tree.
Dieback	Continual decline and death of wood tissue including twigs and branches.
Epicormic growth	Growth that emerges from dormant buds along the trunk and branches of a tree.
Failure	Description of structural failure or wood fibres including fracture of branches, limbs and main stems.
Fork	Area or point of union between one or more limbs or branches.

Term	Explanation
Hazard Risk Assessment	Qualitative and quantitative appraisal of the potential for tree failure and the possible risk of harm or damage to persons or property.
Local Planning Authority	Body responsible for the administration of Statutory duties relating to Development Management.
Multi-stem	A single tree formed from 2 or more codominant main stems
Occlusion	Wood development enclosing an extant wound or pruning cut.
Pruning	The targeted removal of branches or limbs using saws or other tools.
Physiological Condition	Observation relating to a trees physiology for example vigour, leaf area, growth rate, the presence of pests or disease.
Root Protection Area	Root Protection Area (RPA). Indicative area around a tree deemed to contain sufficient rooting volume to maintain the viability of a tree.
Shelter belt	A wind break normally made up of one or more trees planted in such a way to provide cover from the wind.
Snag	A standing dead, or dying tree, often missing a top or most of the smaller branches and retained for wildlife use.
Structural Condition	Observation relating to a trees structural integrity and the presence of any physical defects.
Suppressed	Where a trees development has been influenced or effected by the presence of competing vegetation.
Tree Constraints Plan	A scaled plan indicating above and below ground constraints relating to the protection of trees
Tree Preservation Order	A legal order made by the local planning authority protecting specific trees in the interests of amenity.
Visual Tree Assessment (VTA)	A method of assessment based upon the research developed to recognise dynamic responses of a tree to its surroundings.
'V' Shaped Branch Union	The union point between two branches that have grown at a tight angle, forming the 'V' shape. This structure is inherently weaker than the 'U' shaped union.
'U' Shaped Branch Union	The union point between two branches that have grown at a wider angle, forming the 'U' shape. This structure is considered to be the strongest and most optimised shape that a union can form.

Appendix 5: Tree Protection Fencing Specification, Ground Protection and Signage Examples

Tree Protection Fencing Specification

Figure 3 of BS 5837:2012.



Ground Protection Example

Temporary ground protection in accordance with section 6.2 of BS 5837:2012.



Signage Example

Tree Protection Fencing sign example to define construction exclusion zones.



Appendix 6: Photographs

Photograph 1

View looking south west towards one of the barns. Hornbeams T6, T7 and T8 are rooted in the middle close to the barn.



Photograph 2

View looking south towards the stem of T9.



Photograph 3

View looking north towards veteran tree T36.



Photograph 4

View looking east towards the stem of T36.



Photograph 5

Ganoderma applanatum protruding from buttress of T36.



Photograph 6

Multiple rounded knotholes in the crown of T36.



Photograph 7

View looking west towards veteran oak tree T85. Ribbed formation of diametric sheer crack can be seen running up the right of the stem into the northern branch collar.



Photograph 8

View looking north towards large decayed tension root of T85.



Photograph 9

View looking east towards stem of T87.



Photograph 10

View looking north west towards Persian ironwood T71.



Photograph 11

View looking north west towards
'notable' oak tree T63.



Photograph 12

View looking south east towards
southern magnolia T46.



Photograph 11

View looking north east towards T19,
T18, T17, T16 (left to right).



Disclaimer

- This report has been prepared by Urban Edge Environmental Consulting Ltd (UEEC Ltd) with all reasonable skill, care and diligence within the terms of the contract made with the Client to undertake this work, and taking into account the information made available by the Client. No other warranty, expressed or implied, is made as to the professional advice included in this report or any other services provided by us.
- UEEC Ltd disclaims any responsibility to the Client and others in respect of any matters outside the scope of this contract. This report is confidential to the Client and is not to be disclosed to third parties. If disclosed to third parties, UEEC Ltd accepts no responsibility of whatsoever nature to third parties to whom this report, or any part thereof, is made known. Any third party relies upon the contents of this report at their own risk and the report is not to be relied upon by any party, other than the Client without the prior and express written agreement of UEEC Ltd.
- The advice provided in this report does not constitute legal advice. As such, the services of lawyers may also be considered to be warranted.
- Unless otherwise stated in this report, the assessments made assume that the sites and facilities that have been considered in this report will continue to be used for their current planned purpose without significant change.
- All work carried out in preparing this report has utilised and is based upon UEEC Ltd's current professional knowledge and understanding of current relevant UK standards and codes, technology and legislation. Changes in this legislation and guidance may occur at any time in the future and may cause any conclusions to become inappropriate or incorrect. UEEC Ltd does not accept responsibility for advising the Client or other interested parties of the facts or implications of any such changes;
- Where this report presents or relies upon the findings of ecological field surveys (including habitat, botanical or protected/notable species surveys), its conclusions should not be relied upon for longer than a maximum period of two years from the date of the original field surveys. Ecological change (e.g. colonisation of a site by a protected species) can occur rapidly and this limitation is not intended to imply that a likely absence of, for instance, a protected species will persist for any period of time;
- This report has been prepared using factual information contained in maps and documents prepared by others. No responsibility can be accepted by UEEC Ltd for the accuracy of such information;
- Every effort has been made to accurately represent the location of mapped features, however, the precise locations of features should not be relied upon;
- Populations of animals and plants are often transient in nature and a single survey visit can only provide a general indication of species present on site. Time of year when the survey was carried out, weather conditions and other variables will influence the results of an arboricultural/ecological survey (e.g. it is possible that some flowering plant species which flower at other times of the year were not observed). Every effort has been made to accurately note indicators of presence of protected, rare and notable species within and adjacent to the site but the possibility nonetheless exists for other species to be present which were not recorded or otherwise indicated by the survey;
- Any works undertaken as a consequence of the recommendations provided within this report should be subjected to the necessary health & safety checks and full risk assessments.

Urban Edge Environmental Consulting Ltd

Unit 5 | Westergate Business Centre | Brighton | BN2 4QN

T: 01273 68 67 66 | E: enquiries@ueec.co.uk

www.ueec.co.uk |  LinkedIn | 

© Urban Edge Environmental Consulting Ltd 2025



Urban Edge Environmental Consulting Ltd

Unit 5 | Westergate Business Centre | Brighton | BN2 4QN

T: 01273 68 67 66 | E: enquiries@ueec.co.uk

www.ueec.co.uk | 

© Urban Edge Environmental Consulting Ltd 2025



NATURAL PROGRESSION

