

Annual Tree Condition Survey with Management Recommendations

| | |
|------------------------|--|
| <u>Client:</u> | Ardleigh Parish Council |
| <u>Date of visit:</u> | 16 th and 28 th June 2021 |
| <u>Prepared by:</u> | J Fryer |
| <u>Signed:</u> | |
| <u>Date completed:</u> | 28 th June 2021 |
| <u>Contact Details</u> | John Fryer: 07841 623027 |
| <u>Contents:</u> | 1. Introduction 2. Methodology 3. Tree health and safety audit recommendations Appendix 1. Limitations of Report Appendix 2. Tree schedule Appendix 2. Site plans |

1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 INSTRUCTION

I have been instructed by Ardleigh Parish Council to carry out a survey to establish the condition of each tree (over 150mm diameter at 1.3m above ground level) within the Ardleigh Parish

This survey involves a ground level only inspection to establish the condition of the trees. To the following sites

1. The Village Hall/ Recreation ground/ Millennium Green, Station Road
2. The Cemetery, Harwich Road
3. The Churchyard, Harwich Road.
4. Slough Lane

1.2 INFORMATION PROVIDED AND SCOPE OF THE REPORT

The brief is to survey all trees on the designated sites and provide specifications for any necessary safety works. I visited the sites on 16th and 28th June 2021. All observations were made by visual means, without detailed investigations and from ground level. All dimensions are estimated.

1.3 ASPECT DEALT WITH WITHIN THIS REPORT

The tree survey includes details of the physiological and structural condition of the trees. From the site visits, recommendations have been made within the tree survey with any immediate and future management requirements. A consideration of the 'targets' where within the report targets are considered as those things, people and property that could be hit by the trees failure, whether partial or total. All observations are made from within the boundaries of the property on which the tree is situated.

1.4 ASPECTS NOT DEALT WITH WITHIN THIS REPORT

Please also refer to Appendix 1. The survey did not excavate around the root plate of any of the trees. Further in-depth investigations that are considered necessary are highlighted within the management recommendations of the survey. The report only considers the current condition and health of the tree. An assessment of the risk of subsidence, heave and direct damage to adjacent properties, built structures and drainage is not considered.

2. METHODOLOGY

2.1 All trees over 150mm at 1.3m were surveyed, plotted on a plan and given a unique reference number.

2.2 The details and work requirements (if any) of each tree are given in the schedules for the individual sites included with this report. All works necessary have been given priority ratings of low, medium or high.

2.3 Re-inspection periods have been designated as 1 year for trees on all sites unless specified within the report.

2.4 With reference to specified works:

Explanation of category headings within Tree Survey:

| | |
|--------------------------------|---|
| Tree No: | The tree number that has been given to the tree or group of trees as shown on the site plans. T= Tree G= group H= hedge |
| English name: | This is the general common usage name given to the tree. |
| Height: | This is an approximate figure given in meters. Measurements are estimated unless elsewhere stated. |
| Canopy width: | This is an approximate figure given in meters. Measurements are estimated unless elsewhere stated. |
| Girth: | This is an approximate figure given in millimeters of the diameter at 1.3m above ground level. |
| Age: | Y= Young trees aged less than one third of life expectancy. MA= Middle aged trees between one to two thirds of life expectancy. M = Mature tree over two thirds of life expectancy. OM= Over mature trees exceeding life expectancy. |
| Tree condition: | A single word summary is used to describe the tree. Good: A tree in generally good health and free of significant defects with an ability to resist pathogens Reasonable: A tree in generally good health but with significant defects requiring works. Poor: A tree in poor condition both structurally and physiologically with significant defects requiring substantial works or removal. Multi= Multi Stemmed. |
| Recommended tree works: | These recommendations are drawn from consideration of the structural condition and observations made at the time of the survey. |
| Other comments | These observations and comments on the visible physiological and structural condition of the tree on the day of the survey. They are brief and relate to unaided observations from the ground. |
| Work Priority | 1= Low priority works. To be completed within 1 year of the date of this report if budgets allow 2= Medium priority works. To be completed within 6 months. 3= High priority works. To be completed within 3 months |

All works should be carried out in accordance with BS3998:2010: Tree Work - Recommendations.

TREE HEALTH AND SAFETY AUDIT RECOMMENDATIONS

3.1
Records should be kept of the timing and scope of inspections and works carried out to each tree.

3.2
A competent person in accordance with this schedule should carry out inspections, and works are to be carried out within the timescales specified following the inspections.

3.3
As individual trees increase in size or decline in condition, they should be considered for upgrading to a more frequent inspection regime, according to individual circumstances.

Appendix 1.

Limitations of the Tree Survey and Scope of the Report

Please also refer to sections 1.3 and 1.4 at the beginning of this report.

The survey was based on unaided, visual observations made from ground level only.

All observations were made from within the boundaries of the property, or from public land unless otherwise stated. Trees within neighboring property are inspected as closely as is reasonably possible from within the boundaries of the property or public land.

This report focuses on the physiological and structural condition of those trees as identified within the instructions or that fall within the parameters as detailed within section 1 of the report.

The report will remain valid for one year from the date of the inspection, but will become invalid if any building works are carried out on the property, soil levels around the trees are altered in any way or tree works other than those recommended within the report are carried out. If any of these occur it is strongly recommended that a new tree inspection be carried out.

The recommendations for the management of trees have been formulated after balancing:

- i) The need to avoid foreseeable damage and manage risk.
- ii) Other arboricultural considerations – aesthetics, environmental benefits, tree health.

Trees in relation to other Properties

This report/survey only considers the trees in relation to the site as identified.

It does not comment on possible effects of trees considered on neighboring properties with regard to possible hazards presented by trees surveyed.

Neighboring owners of trees that are identified as hazardous or posing a possible risk to targets identified should seek their own advice as to possible effects of the recommendations given within this report.

Damage to, or possibility of damage to, any other structure that is not referred to within the report is not considered unless otherwise specified. This includes both neighboring structures and any other structure on the property.

Consideration of the Trees in Relation to Subsidence/Heave

The report does not consider an assessment of the risk of Subsidence or Heave to any properties, built structures or damage whether within the bounds of the site considered or adjacent to the site.

Such considerations would be more appropriately considered within a specific report.

Consideration of the Trees in relation to direct damage

The report does not consider direct damage related to tree root growth in relation to any structures whether within the bounds of the site considered or adjacent to the site.

Direct damage in this instance is considered to be where the roots of a tree have physical contact with a structure.

Assessment of 'Targets' as considered

'Targets' are considered as those things, people and property that could be hit by the trees failure, whether partial or total.

These Targets are identified from an evaluation of the site at the time of the survey.

Changes to the site from the time of the survey will affect the targets as considered within the report and will require review or re-appraisal of the report.

Timing of the Survey and the Report

The Appraisal and Conclusions within the report are valid only for a year.

Such Appraisals and Conclusions will become invalid or necessary for review if changes occur to the site as considered that affect the condition of the tree, the site as evaluated or the hazards as identified at the time of the survey.

Such considerations will include building works, changes to ground levels or tree works carried out.

Trees subject to statutory controls

It has not been established whether or not any of the trees mentioned within the report are covered by any statutory controls. This can be done if requested.

If the trees are covered by a Tree Preservation Order or are located in a conservation area it will be necessary to consult the local authority before any pruning works, other than certain exemptions, can be carried out.

The works specified above are necessary for reasonable management and should be acceptable to the local authority. However, the local authority may take an alternative point of view and have the option to refuse consent.

Trees are subject to changes outside man's control

Trees are living organisms subject to changes outside man's control. Trees and environment alter with the seasons it is as well to inspect trees whilst in full leaf and when out of leaf.

If there are any harsh or unexpected weather conditions, or heavy storms it is also prudent to inspect trees.

Changes to ground water conditions will affect the root growth of a tree. Such changes are not always the result of man's influence and others factors maybe involved.

The conclusions and recommendations in this tree report are only valid for one year

Limitations of use of copyright

All rights in this report are reserved. Its content and format are for the exclusive use of the addressee in dealing with this site. It may not be sold, lent, hired out or divulged to any third party not directly involved in this site without the written consent of J F tree specialist Ltd.

Appendix 2: Tree schedule

The following include the tree survey for the grounds of the village hall and the recreation ground.

| Tree Ref. | Species | Ht | Girth | Age Class | Physiological and Structural condition of tree and comments | Management Recommendations | Work Priority |
|-----------|------------------------------|-----|-----------------------|-----------|---|---|---------------|
| T1 | Robinia | 11 | 440 | MA | Reasonable, low branches obscuring CCTV view | N/A | |
| G2 | 2x yew, 1 x Rowan, 1x Laurel | 8 | 200 | MA | Reasonable. • Recent pruning to clear CCTV view | N/A | |
| T3 | Leyland cypress | 9 | 315 | Y | Reasonable • Suppressing pine | N/A | |
| T4 | Scots Pine | 9 | 315 | Y | Poor • Suppressed by T3 • Dead Tree | • Fell | 3 |
| T5 | Robinia | 8.5 | 280 | MA | Reasonable • Minor deadwood throughout canopy | • Remove deadwood over 50mm diameter | 1 |
| T6 | Ash | 9 | 365 | MA | Reasonable • Minor deadwood throughout canopy | • Remove deadwood over 50mm diameter | 1 |
| T7 | Robinia | 8 | 370 | MA | Good | N/A | |
| T6 | Yew | 3 | 150 | MA | Good | N/A | |
| T9 | Horse Chestnut | 7 | 150 | Y | Reasonable. • Suppressed by neighbours | N/A | |
| T10 | Walnut | 9.5 | 235 | MA | Good • Suppressed by neighbour | N/A | |
| T11 | Ash | 9.5 | 405 | MA | Reasonable | N/A | |
| T12 | Sycamore | 5 | 100 | Y | Good | N/A | |
| T14 | Oak | 8.5 | 320 | MA | Good | N/A | |
| T15 | Horse chestnut | 9.5 | 220 | MA | Good | N/A | |
| T16 | Sycamore | 14 | 3 x stems @ 450 total | MA | Reasonable • Acute fork with included bark | • Remove 2 x weaker stems retain the strongest stem | 1 |
| T17 | Sycamore | 10 | 310 | MA | Good | N/A | |

| | | | | | | | |
|-----|---------------------------|----|----------------|----|--|---|---|
| T18 | Oak | 16 | 920 | M | Reasonable <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Hung up branch over neighbouring conifers H22 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Remove hung up branch | 1 |
| T19 | Gleditsia | 8 | 170 | MA | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Good | N/A | |
| H20 | Thorn mix and spindle | 7 | 230 | M | Reasonable <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Trimmed annually | N/A | |
| T21 | Oak | 12 | 2 x stems @320 | MA | Reasonable | N/A | |
| H22 | 10 x Leyland cypress | 10 | 200 | MA | Reasonable <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Recently reduced | N/A | |
| T23 | Oak | 13 | 520 | MA | Reasonable <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Previously reduced. Bark damage with exudates/ slime flux | N/A | |
| T24 | Norway maple | 14 | 458 | M | Reasonable <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Basal damage to east of trunk Deadwood throughout canopy | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Remove deadwood over 100mm diameter | 2 |
| T25 | Norway maple | 14 | 470 | M | Reasonable <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Recently reduced | N/A | |
| T26 | Oak | 1 | <100 | Y | Good <ul style="list-style-type: none"> New planting | N/A | |
| T27 | Atlas cedar | 13 | 450 | MA | Reasonable <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Recently reduced | N/A | |
| T28 | Atlas cedar | 13 | 465 | MA | Reasonable <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Recently reduced | N/A | |
| G29 | 3 x cedar | 2 | <100 | Y | Reasonable <ul style="list-style-type: none"> New planting | N/A | |
| H30 | Mixed broadleaf hedge row | 10 | 100-300 | MA | Reasonable <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Dead elm by T31 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Remove dead elm | 1 |
| T31 | Birch | 6 | 120 | MA | Good | N/A | |
| T32 | Oak | 14 | 905 | M | Good | □/A | |
| T33 | Raywood ash | 7 | 180 | Y | Reasonable <ul style="list-style-type: none"> History of branch failure | N/A | |

| | | | | | | | |
|-----|---------------------|----|---------------|----|---|--|---|
| T34 | <i>Laurel</i> | 6 | Multi stemmed | M | Reasonable • Split branches | • Remove split branches | 2 |
| T35 | <i>Norway Maple</i> | 10 | 460 | M | Reasonable • Stem decay/ damage to north of stem - Monitor | N/A | |
| T36 | <i>Norway maple</i> | 8 | 375 | MA | Reasonable | N/A | |
| T37 | <i>Oak</i> | 6 | 120 | MA | Good | N/A | |
| T38 | <i>Norway maple</i> | 9 | 390 | MA | Reasonable • Bark damage to stem on eastern side | N/A | |
| T39 | <i>Norway maple</i> | 10 | 460 | M | Reasonable • 2 x Limbs with acute fork and congested bark located south/ central crown | • Reduce the crown by 20% (2m) | 1 |
| G40 | <i>5 x Cherry</i> | 7 | 120 | Y | Good | N/A | |
| T41 | <i>Birch</i> | 7 | 130 | Y | Felled tree | • Replacement required | 1 |
| T42 | <i>Field maple</i> | 8 | 360 | MA | Good | N/A | |
| T43 | <i>Cherry</i> | 4 | <100 | Y | Poor • Severe stem decay – good reaction growth | N/A | |
| G44 | <i>4 x Birch</i> | 2 | <100 | Y | Reasonable • New planting • One dead tree • Stake and tie beginning to rub | • Remove stake and tie • Relace the dead tree | 1 |
| T45 | <i>Silver Birch</i> | 8 | 200 | MA | Good • Recently cut back from the bench | N/A | |
| T46 | <i>Oak</i> | 4 | 170 | Y | Good | N/A | |

The following table shows the inspection results for the Millennium Green

| Tree Ref. | Species | Ht | Girth | Age Class | Physiological and Structural condition of tree and observations | Management Recommendations | Work Priority |
|-----------|--------------------------------------|-----|-------------|-----------|--|--|---------------|
| H47 | Mixed thorn hedge | 4 | 200 | M | Reasonable <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Old structures • Obscuring path | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cut back to clear the path | 2 |
| G48 | 15x Apple | 1-7 | 50-180 | Y | Reasonable <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Vandalism issues • Over extended branches | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Formatively prune trees including reducing the extended branches | 2 |
| G49 | <i>Mixed Broadleaf tree-belt</i> | 8 | Average 100 | Y | Reasonable <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Starting to suppress each other • Obscuring path • Minor dead stems | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Thin out by approx. 20% every 5 years as part of management schedule to encourage strong trees • Coppice trees and shrubs adjacent to path to clear the path by 1m • Remove dead stems | 2 |
| G50 | 12 x Boundary Oaks | 6 | 100 | Y | Good | N/A | |
| G51 | 3 x Birch, 1x Cherry, coppice stools | 7 | 120 | Y | Reasonable | N/A | |
| G52 | 16 x Trees mix sp. | | <100 | Y | Reasonable <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 3 x dead trees • Rubbing steaks and ties | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Remove stake and ties • Replace dead trees in winter | 2 |
| T53 | Oak | 4 | <100 | Y | Good | N/A | |

The following table shows the inspection results for the Cemetery, Harwich Road

| Tree Ref. | Species | Ht | Girth | Age Class | Physiological and Structural condition of tree and observations | Management Recommendations | Work Priority |
|-----------|--|------|-------|-----------|---|---|---------------|
| T54 | Yew | 11 | 415 | M | Good | N/A | |
| T55 | Holly | 12 | 505 | OM | Reasonable <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Competing with 2 x sycamore | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Remove 2 x sycamore and poison the stumps to prevent regrowth | 2 |
| T56 | Scots pine | 12 | 450 | M | Reasonable <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Prolific ivy-previously severed. Storm damage leaving an unbalanced crown | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Fell | 1 |
| G57 | Holly/ laurel/ holm oak/ sycamore stumps | 14 | 385 | MA | Good <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Holm oak recently removed Remaining shrubs are getting large | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Cut back to contain growth | 1 |
| T58 | Lime | 22 | 815 | M | Good <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Excessive Ivy on stem | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sever ivy | 2 |
| T59 | Lime | 18.5 | 470 | MA | Good <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Excessive Ivy on stem | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sever ivy | 2 |
| T60 | Oak | 6.5 | 395 | MA | Poor <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Fire damage has lead to sparse crown and deadwood Excessive lean over boundary | N/A | |
| T61 | Scots pine | 19 | 640 | M | Reasonable <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Deadwood - stabilized | N/A | |
| T62 | Yew | 11 | 555 | M | Reasonable | N/A | |
| T63 | Sycamore 4 x stems | 10 | 200 | Y | Good | N/A | |
| G64 | 8 x Sycamore 1 x Oak | 11 | 200 | Y | Reasonable <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Inappropriate location for these trees | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Fell the dead stems and retain the oak | 3 |

| | | | | | | | |
|-----|---|-----|------|----|--|--|---|
| | | | | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 2 x dead sycamore either side of the oak | | |
| G65 | 10 x Yew | 6.5 | 405 | M | Reasonable <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Climbing plants and other vegetation are competing with the yews Subsiding branches | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Cut back or sever competing vegetation Formatively prune. Prune back subsiding branches in line with canopy | 1 |
| T66 | <i>Viburnum tinus</i> | 4 | | M | Reasonable <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Obstructing the path | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Trim back from the path | 1 |
| T67 | Cedar | 19 | 1190 | M | Reasonable <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Recently pruned. Excessively thinned out middle of crown | N/A | |
| G68 | 2 x Sycamore | 9 | 320 | MA | Reasonable <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Inappropriate location for these trees – consider removing | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Fell and treat the stumps | 1 |
| T69 | Sycamore 2 x stems | 14 | 550 | MA | Reasonable <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Congested bark – weak fork on stem to North at 2.5m Ivy is present on the stem Inappropriate location for these trees – consider removing | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Fell and treat the stumps | 1 |
| T70 | <i>Leylandii</i> | 17 | 540 | MA | Reasonable | N/A | |
| G71 | 5 x Irish yew 1 x holly 1 x redwood | 10 | 350 | MA | Reasonable <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Inappropriate location for the holy – consider removing as it is suppressing the adjacent yew and pushing on a grave stone | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Fell the holy and treat the stump | 2 |
| G72 | 8 x Scots pine 2 x yew 1 x Hawthorn | 16 | 450 | MA | Reasonable | N/A | |
| T73 | Whitebeam | 9.5 | 710 | M | Reasonable <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Prolific ivy | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sever ivy | 2 |

| | | | | | | | |
|-----|----------------------------------|----|-----|----|---|---|---|
| T74 | Portuguese Laurel | 8 | 250 | M | Reasonable • Low branches obstructing mowing operations and obscuring graves | • Lift canopy to 2m | 2 |
| G75 | Portuguese Laurel | 8 | 250 | M | Reasonable • Low branches obstructing mowing operations and obscuring graves | • Lift canopy to 2m | 2 |
| T76 | Holly | 8 | 360 | MA | Good | N/A | |
| T77 | Thuja | 6 | 150 | MA | Good | N/A | |
| T78 | Lawson's cypress 3 x stemmed | 10 | 380 | MA | Reasonable • Minor dead branches from severed ivy | N/A | |
| T79 | Juniper | 9 | 280 | MA | Good | N/A | |
| G80 | 12 x Irish yew | 9 | 280 | MA | Reasonable • Subsiding branches | • Reduce tops by 1.5 – 2m to match opposite trees • Formatively prune. Prune back subsiding branches in line with canopy | 2 |
| T81 | Lawson's Cypress (multi-stemmed) | 9 | 210 | MA | Reasonable • 3 dead stems closest to the water tap | • Remove 3 dead stems | 3 |
| T82 | Oak | 9 | 178 | Y | Good • Low branches | • Lift canopy to 2m | 2 |
| T83 | Apple | 8 | 428 | M | Reasonable • Split branch to east of canopy @ 3m • Over weighted and extended limbs | • Remove split branch • Reduce the canopy by 25% | 2 |
| G84 | 2 x Scots pine 1 x oak | 7 | 185 | Y | Good | N/A | |
| G86 | 2 x variegated holly | 9 | 400 | M | Good | N/A | |
| T87 | Scots pine | 6 | 220 | Y | Good | N/A | |
| H88 | Holy hedge | 12 | 220 | MA | Reasonable • Clipped hedge with lapsed trees. Predominantly sycamore and holy | • Cut trees to below height of the clipped hedge before the trees become mature | 1 |

The following table shows the inspection results for the Churchyard, Harwich Road

| Tree Ref. | Species | Ht | Girth | Age Class | Physiological and Structural condition of tree and observations | Management Recommendations | Work Priority |
|-----------|-------------------------------------|------|-------|-----------|---|--|---------------|
| T89 | <i>Irish yew</i> | 8 | 160 | MA | Good | N/A | |
| T90 | <i>Red horse chestnut</i> | 14 | 615 | MA | Poor <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Fungal fruiting body to the south of stem with a significant column of decay Previously reduced | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Monitor | 1 |
| T91 | <i>London plane</i> | 18 | 775 | M | Reasonable <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Over extended low limb to the North Suppressed by neighbours Minor anthracnose (die-back of leaf) Ivy on stem | N/A | |
| T92 | <i>Horse chestnut</i> | 17 | 1012 | M | Reasonable <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Very large tree Subsiding limbs with bark congestion and flaking bark | N/A | |
| G93 | <i>11 x Irish yew</i> | 7 | 300 | MA | Reasonable <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Subsiding branches | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Formatively prune. Prune back subsiding branches in line with canopy | 2 |
| T95 | <i>Tulip tree</i> | 3 | >100 | Y | Dead | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Replace tree | 2 |
| T96 | <i>Elm</i> | 9 | 200 | Y | Reasonable | N/A | |
| T97 | <i>Deodar cedar (multi-stemmed)</i> | 14.5 | 1305 | M | Reasonable <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Low exposed limb growing towards church entrance (north east) showing signs of stress with fiber buckling Minor deadwood over the elm (T96) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reduce the limb towards church entrance by 4m to balance the canopy | 2 |
| T98 | <i>Juniper</i> | 9 | 275 | M | Good | N/A | |
| T100 | <i>Holy</i> | 7 | 170 | Y | Reasonable <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ivy on stem | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sever ivy | 1 |

| | | | | | | | |
|------|---------------------------------|------|------|----|--|---|---|
| T101 | <i>Deodar cedar</i> | 14.5 | 650 | MA | Poor <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Dying back with 50% of the canopy dead. The remaining leaf is chlorotic indicating stress | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Dismantle the tree to leave a stump Replacement required | 3 |
| H102 | <i>Yew and holy hedge</i> | 5 | 150 | MA | Reasonable <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Neighbours sweet chestnut has low branches over the garden of rest | Crown lift the sweet chestnut to 2m | 2 |
| T104 | <i>Sycamore (multi-stemmed)</i> | 14 | 305 | MA | Reasonable | N/A | |
| T105 | <i>Lawsons cypress</i> | 9 | 170 | MA | Reasonable <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sparse crown | N/A | |
| G106 | <i>London Plane</i> | 7 | >100 | Y | Reasonable <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Anthraxnose of leaf | N/A | |
| T108 | <i>Tree of heaven</i> | 7 | 213 | Y | Good | N/A | |
| T109 | <i>Yew (multi-stemmed)</i> | 10 | 270 | MA | Reasonable <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Recent storm damage exposing extended branches | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reduce extended branches by 2-3m | 2 |
| T110 | <i>Holy</i> | 8 | 250 | MA | Reasonable | N/A | |
| T111 | <i>Bay</i> | 10 | 450 | M | Reasonable | N/A | |
| T112 | <i>Deodar cedar</i> | 11 | 320 | Y | Reasonable | N/A | |

The following table shows the inspection results for Slough Lane between Slough Farm and Bromley Road.

| Tree Ref. | Species | Ht | Girth | Age Class | Physiological and Structural condition of tree and observations | Management Recommendations | Work Priority |
|-----------|---|------|----------|-----------|---|---|---------------|
| | 12x ash 10 x oaks 2x hornbeam 2 x Poplar | 3-10 | <100-300 | Y | Good <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1 x ash (2nd tree in from the Bromley road on the south side) with dieback 90% dead | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Fell one dying back ash Replacement required | 3 |

Appendix 3: Maps

Map1. The Village Hall/ Recreation ground/ Millennium Green, Station Road, Ardleigh



This Plan is for illustration purposes and is not to scale. All measurements should be read from the tree schedule. Plan identifies trees as relevant and does not record all features on site.

Map 2. The Cemetery



This Plan is for illustration purposes and is not to scale. All measurements should be read from the tree schedule. Plan identifies trees as relevant and does not record all features on site.

[illegible]

This Plan is for illustration purposes and is not to scale.
All measurements should be read from the tree schedule.
Plan identifies trees as relevant and does not record all features on site.

Hand-drawn map of a field site showing vegetation distribution. The map is oriented with a north arrow pointing towards the top-left. A legend in the top-left corner identifies symbols: 'O' for Oak, 'A' for Ash, 'H' for Hornbeam, and 'P' for Poplar. The map features a 'SLOUGH FM' (fence) on the left, a 'SLOUGH LN.' (line) running horizontally across the middle, and a 'BRAMLEY ROAD' on the right. The area is divided into sections by these features. The bottom-left section is labeled 'HARD STANDING'. Various symbols (O, A, H, P) are plotted along the slough line and in the adjacent areas, indicating the presence of specific tree species. For example, along the top slough line, there are several 'A's and 'O's. Along the bottom slough line, there are 'O's, 'A's, and 'H's. The bottom-left section contains 'P' and 'H' symbols.

All measurements should be read from the tree schedule.

19