



# Tree Condition Report

For

Church Westcote Manor, Chipping Norton,  
Oxon, OX7 6SG

May 2022

**Ref: 21.190**

Pear Tree Cottage  
Strawberry Hill  
West Lavington  
Wiltshire  
SN10 4NQ

[www: southerntreesurveys.co.uk](http://www.southerntreesurveys.co.uk)

t: 01380 816199



## APPOINTMENT

Sebastian Macleod of Southern Tree Surveys has been appointed by Ben and Linda Holmes to assess and report on the health condition and safety of those trees on the residential property and gardens at Church Westcote Manor, Chipping Norton, Oxon, OX7 6SG.

Following the findings of the assessment any management recommendations deemed necessary are to be put forward.

This report has been compiled by Sebastian Macleod NCH Arb. Dip Arb L6 (ABC) who holds a Lantra Professional Tree Inspection certificate. Any management recommendations will be in accordance with British Standard (BS) 3998:2010 *British Standard Tree Work - Recommendations*.

This document has been prepared in accordance with the scope of **Southern Tree Surveys** appointment with its client and is subject to the terms and conditions of that appointment.

**Southern Tree Surveys** accepts no liability for any use of this document other than by its client and only for the purposes for which it was prepared and provided.



## **CONTENTS:**

**1.0 TREE SURVEY INTRODUCTION**

**2.0 SURVEY FINDINGS**

**3.0 CONCLUSIONS/RECOMMENDATIONS**

## **APPENDICES:**

**APP 1: TREE SURVEY KEY**

**APP 2: TREE SURVEY SCHEDULE**

## **ILLUSTRATIVE MATERIAL:**

**STS-190-01 TREE LOCATION PLAN**

## 1.0 TREE SURVEY INTRODUCTION

**1.1.1.** This survey has been conducted in accordance with industry standards to establish the general health and structural condition of the trees at Church Westcote Manor. The survey will assess the potential for failure of trees within the site, in part or in whole, to affect the house, its outbuildings and gardens or any adjoining areas, then suggest reasonable management solutions to mitigate the risk of any defects assessed.

**1.1.2** The 17<sup>th</sup> Century grade II listed Manor house with its extensive gardens and collection of outbuildings and cottages is situated on the northern edge of the village. The site is bordered by highway on the south-west and south-eastern boundaries, an adjacent residential property beyond the north-eastern boundary and opens out onto a large meadow and agricultural land to the north and west.

**1.1.3** The highly maintained gardens of The Manor are densely treed; composed largely of ornamental specimen tree species, shrubs and hedgerows around the more formal garden areas surrounding the main house and outbuildings. The gardens extend to a more open grassed area to the north-west which contain a large number of orchard species in a range of age classes set amongst the occasional ornamental and native self-set trees. A number of self-set native broadleaf tree species are found across the site, consisting mainly of ash in a range of age classes with the occasional hazel coppice and other native species.

**1.1.4** The site is within the Church Westcote Conservation Area, no trees on or adjacent to the site are subject to Tree Preservation Orders.

**1.1.5** A topographical site plan showing tree locations within the grounds of The Manor has been provided by the client. A Tree Location Plan of the site with the numbered locations of the trees cross-referenced to the survey schedule in Appendix 2 has been provided in Illustrative Material at plan STS-190-01.

**1.1.6** A site visit was undertaken on the 12<sup>th</sup> of May 2022 in fair weather conditions.

## 1.2 SURVEY LIMITATIONS

**1.2.1** This survey was assessed from ground level using visual assessment techniques only. Physical assessment of suspected decay is limited to probing with metal rods or sounding with a hammer. No specialist decay equipment or internal investigation tools have been employed during the assessment. No soil samples have been taken in the course of this assessment as these methods are not within the normal remit of visual tree assessment and were not requested by the client.

**1.2.2** The observations and recommendations presented are based on the knowledge, qualifications and experience of the surveyor.

**1.2.3** Trees are dynamic self-optimising light-weight structures subject to a range of biotic and abiotic influencing factors (particularly the weather) the consequences of which may not always be foreseeable under the scope of this survey. There are no 'safe' trees due to the laws and forces of nature and the natural failure rate of intact trees. These are currently accepted risks balanced against the range of benefits trees provide.

**1.2.4** This survey will only be valid for 18 months from the date of receipt and may become invalid in that period following extreme weather events or if any works are undertaken on or near to trees assessed in the survey such as un-prescribed tree surgery, soil level changes, trenching etc.

**1.2.5** This survey will not include assessment of any tree/root and building conflicts with the trees surveyed and any adjacent infrastructure as this was not included in the remit of the survey.

**1.2.6** Any further inspection requirements (i.e. aerial inspection or the use of specialist diagnostic equipment) considered necessary would be recommended in the report if deemed required.

**1.2.7** Only trees measuring approximately 150mm > diameter measured at 1.5m stem height have been fully assessed and logged in this survey as those under the threshold are unlikely to pose any significant risk.

**1.2.8** Locations of the trees and groups in the plans that accompany this report are based on the accuracy of the topographical plan supplied and cannot be guaranteed by the assessor.

**1.2.9** Many common structural defects and observations of minor deadwood will not have been noted as the level of risk they pose has been appraised as low. This is balanced against the cost and/or dis-benefit to the tree that any intervention would bring which would be disproportionate to the risk involved.

## 1.3 CONSTRAINTS TO SURVEY RECOMMENDATIONS

**1.3.1** Under the terms of the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended), the Countryside Rights of Way Act 2000 and Conservation (Natural Habitats, &c.) Regulations 1994 (as amended), it is an offence to disturb any protected species including their habitat or nesting place. Expert advice must be sought if any works or recommendations are suspected to be in conflict with this legislation.

**1.3.2** Trees with a preservation order (TPO) or those sited in a conservation area are protected under section 198 and 211 (1) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 and consent from the Local Planning Authority (LPA) must be sought before any works are to be undertaken on such trees.

**1.3.3** Any remedial or felling works on trees to improve safety must be undertaken in accordance with BS 3998:2010 *British Standard Tree Work- Recommendations*. Work must be undertaken by qualified and experienced professionals.

## 2.0 SURVEY FINDINGS

**2.1** In all 67 trees and 4 groups were assessed and included in the survey schedule in Appendix 2. The trees included in the schedule are composed of a range of planted ornamental species in the more formal garden areas, a collection of fruit trees species in an orchard area on the north-west side of the gardens set among some ornamental and native tree species, along with a row of conifers (G2) forming a high hedgerow which is a dominant structural feature in the central area of the garden. Otherwise, the arboricultural and structural identity of site is dominated by native self-set ash trees ranging across the young to early-mature (in the first third of the life cycle), mature and over-mature (in the last third of the life cycle) age classes. Many small trees and shrubs across the site were not included in the survey schedule as they were below the size threshold for inspection and are therefore not considered to represent any significant hazard by failure.

**2.2** In many cases trees have contained ivy colonising their main stems and/or primary branching structures. Depending on the nature of the ivy colonising these trees its presence has hindered the visual assessment of key structural features such as basal areas, stems and key branch unions. In some cases ivy will be recommended to be controlled either to address structural concerns identified or due to the fact that it is considered to be unsuitable in the context of its ornamental host species. Ivy does not kill trees by constriction, as is commonly conceived, and brings a wide range of wildlife benefits. In most cases ivy will not be recommended to be controlled.

**2.3** Several trees are noted as showing codominant stems in their primary and secondary structures. Codominant stems are two or more stems that grow from a single point of origin. Because of this configuration, there is little direct connection between the wood of these stems. In some cases, bark is captured in-between the stem unions and this makes the attachment even weaker. Such unions offer a higher propensity for failure under wind loading and, if considered necessary, remedial action will be recommended in the conclusions of this report to address the associated hazards

**2.4** The principal finding of the assessment was the prevalence of ash dieback (*Hymenoscyphus fraxineus*) among the ash population assessed across the site. Ash dieback is a chronic fungal disease of ash trees in the UK and Europe that causes a vascular wilt characterised by leaf loss and crown dieback in infected trees. It currently poses a profound risk to the health and structural condition of trees of this species. There are predictions of over 80% of the UK ash population dying from this pathogen in coming seasons and the structural condition of infected trees is known to deteriorate rapidly.

**2.5** The majority of the ash trees assessed are showing typical symptoms of ash dieback with dead branch tips scattered throughout the extremities and internal areas of their crowns and noticeably thinly foliated canopies which were emerging into leaf at the time of assessment. Complete tree failure is possible, but a less likely consequence of ash dieback infection in mature trees, those infected trees will however begin and continue to shed increasingly larger sections of deadwood from their crowns as they continue to deteriorate over following seasons. There are currently no effective treatments to tackle ash dieback and the complete death of those infected trees in following seasons will be the ultimate outcome.

**2.6** All but one (T57) of the ash trees assessed are showing signs of ash dieback infection to varying degrees of severity. Some are only showing early onset symptoms while others are assessed as showing over 25% loss of foliage or up to over 50-75% loss of foliage. The worst case is a mature ash (T44) in the north-west corner of the site which is moribund with very little live growth. This tree is beginning to pose a hazard to the users of the adjacent public highway which runs beyond the south-western boundary of the garden.

**2.7** Those infected ash will be recommended to be removed in the conclusions of this report with varying prioritised timescales for their removal, based on the current state of their condition and the context of their position to adjacent infrastructure or the perceived usage of the site. However, several of the more mature ash (namely T24, T33 & T50) contain features such as open cavities showing exposed dead and dysfunctional wood, woodpecker holes and/or are heavily ivy clad. Such features have a high conservation value as key habitat features for wildlife and could also indicate the potential that they host bat roosts or nesting opportunities for birds. In these cases, the retention of those features in the main stems of the delimbed trees is to be encouraged over their complete removal and the subsequent loss of valuable wildlife habitat.

**2.8** An ash (T57) standing on the field boundary in the northern corner of the site is notable as it is not currently showing any ash dieback symptoms that are assessed to be conclusive. It could be exhibiting a natural resistance to the disease, which would considerably raise its status as an arboricultural feature of the site. The condition of this tree will be recommended to be closely monitored over following seasons to determine whether ash dieback infection develops.

**2.9** An over-mature walnut (T14) standing in the southern corner of the site and near the adjacent highway to the south is considered a valuable and established amenity and wildlife conservation feature of the site. The tree, although ivy clad hindering the visual assessment of some key structural features (although the ivy has been severed near the base of the tree), does however show some



evidence of compromised structural integrity. The walnut contains a number of branch tears from missing limbs in its crown, with one associated with an *Inonotus hispidus* fungal fruiting bracket, and woodpecker holes on the primary stem structure at 8m on the northern side.

**2.10** *Inonotus hispidus* is a fungal pathogen that is sometimes found on walnuts of this age class that has the ability to cause a simultaneous white rot and loss of structural integrity in host tree species. The stem on east side of the base of the tree is also sounding hollow when struck with nylon hammer with associated areas showing some dead & dysfunctional bark. The remaining areas of the lower stem sound well when struck with a nylon hammer. The physiological condition of the crown and leafing structure of the walnut appears to be in good condition. While the structural integrity of the tree is clearly compromised by these factors, even aging trees can exist and respond to the effects of internal decay by incremental growth for many seasons in conjunction with such infections. Therefore, remedial work to consolidate its structural integrity will be recommended over the removal of the tree in the conclusions of this report.

**2.11** A row of three closely standing mature beech trees (G4) stand in a walled corner on the north-eastern boundary of the site close to the north-eastern elevations of the main building. The stump of a now removed beech stands within the row of standing ivy clad trees, which due to their very close proximity are considered likely to have once formed a now lapsed section of hedgerow. *Kretzschmaria deusta* fungal fruiting bodies (discrete, small patches of perennial black growth which resemble boiled tar which has set hard to form small bubbles) has been identified extensively on the stump of the removed tree within the group.

**2.12** *Kretzschmaria deusta* is a potentially aggressive fungal pathogen that is attributed to soft rot, and a later stage white rot. It is often able to breach reaction zones (defensive barriers) within the host trees, with beech trees being particularly susceptible to decay and brittle stem failure caused by the advancing decay of this pathogen. However, there was no clear evidence of any infection on the bases of the adjacent standing trees in this group and it is possible that they are resisting the ingress of this disease. The group will however need to be closely monitored for any indications that they have become infected over following seasons.

**2.13** Two mature white willows (T19 & T22) stand in close proximity to each other on a grassed area near the western highway entrance point to the site. T19 shows evidence of an element of physiological stress with some, but not excessive, deadwood in the outer crown which could be associated with unobservable root stress. T19 also shows some woodpecker activity on its upper primary stem structure that could indicate the presence of some internal decay.

**2.14** T22 has been managed as a pollard (the cyclical de-limbing of the main stem to allow a new crown to regenerate) and is now showing extensive re-growth from the previous pruning points at approximately 6m stem height. The single main stem of the tree splits into two co-dominant stems at approximately 1m stem height. Observations of the lower stem on the eastern side have revealed evidence of a structural defect in the stem. This is showing as a split emerging from the crotch of the codominant stems running vertically down the stem to near ground level which has been largely concealed by the bark of the tree.

**2.15** Willows have a high propensity to limb and stem failure in comparison to most other species and particularly in specimens managed as pollards where the re-growth is allowed to become extended, and management has become lapsed. Therefore, due to concerns as to possible decay or the consequence of defects observed both will be recommended to be pollarded or re-pollarded in the next dormant season. The undertaking of such radical pruning work will not be recommended earlier in the growing season in order to reduce the potential for either tree to fail to recover from the process.

**2.16** An over-mature black mulberry standing in the formal garden area to the front of the house is an important historic and cultural arboricultural feature that could be several hundred years old. It can therefore be described as a veteran or even ancient tree due to the clear indications of its advanced age and the evidence of the effects of environmental factors over time. The tree shows, in some places extensive dead and dysfunctional wood throughout its crown which is considered to be normal in such an aging feature. It has a heavily leaning stem to the south, indicating the possibility that the tree has previously suffered partial failure, which is now propped with a low stone feature. The two primary branching limbs split from the short stem at approximately 1m extend excessively to the east and west low to ground level, each propped near the extent of their lateral growth.

**2.17** While the tree grows in a sheltered position and the three props in use appear to have been installed suitably and its leafing crown appears to be in vital condition, the crowns born on the two heavily propped limbs are dense and congested. There remains a raised possibility that either of these limbs could suffer catastrophic failure under certain wind loading. Therefore, the thinning of the outer crowns of both trees is to be recommended to reduce the weight load on the lateral stems and allow better wind filtration to reduce the potential for significant limb failure. The crown of the tree is also beginning to become colonised by ivy which is not considered to be beneficial.

**2.18** An aging over-mature pear (T31) standing in the Japanese garden is in good physiological condition and generally fair structural condition. It has an extended low lateral limb on its south side



that is considered vulnerable to catastrophic failure under wind loading. Remedial work to consolidate the structural integrity of this limb will be recommended in the conclusions of this report.

**2.19** A mature cherry plum (T64) standing near the north-eastern boundary to the front of the main house show a large tear in its central structure from recent storm damage. It has two heavily extended lateral limbs on its southern side that are considered vulnerable to catastrophic failure under certain wind loading. Remedial work to consolidate the structural integrity of these limbs will be recommended in the conclusions of this report.

### 3.0 CONCLUSIONS/RECOMMENDATIONS

**3.1** Without the hugely negative impacts of ash dieback the majority of the trees assessed would appear to be in a good or reasonable physiological condition and in an acceptable structural condition with little remedial action or intervention required as a result of the survey. However, all but one of the ash trees assessed are recommended to be removed due to ash dieback. As the ash are currently not all in a critical structural condition or in low-risk areas of the site their removal is not considered a high priority in all cases, with some assessed as low-priority works to be undertaken within the next year. Other trees have had remedial pruning works recommended in the tables below, to address structural concerns identified and reduce the risk of future failure.

**3.2** Several trees are recommended to have identified defects or their physiological condition monitored annually following the identification of structural or physiological defects. These include:

- G4: 3x Beech (due to presence of *Kretzschmaria deusta* fungal fruiting bodies on adjacent stump).
- T14: Walnut (following remedial works).
- T16: Ash (for indications of potential ash dieback infection).

**3.3** The following recommended works are considered to be high priority and must be undertaken within 3 months of receipt of this report.

#### Schedule of recommended high priority works

| Tree no. | Species                              | Recommended works  | Reason for works  |
|----------|--------------------------------------|--|---|
| T14      | Walnut<br><i>Juglans regia</i>       | Reduce upper crown by 1-1.5m and lateral growth by approximately 2-2.5m.<br><br>Shape to leave in good form. | To address structural concerns                                      |
| T35      | Black mulberry<br><i>Morus nigra</i> | Control ivy.<br>Reduce some end-weight of extended lateral limbs by thinning 10% of congested growth.        | To address structural concerns                                      |
| T44      | Ash<br><i>Fraxinus excelsior</i>     | Fell   | Moribund from ash dieback infection and sited over adjacent highway |

**3.4** The following recommended works are considered to be medium priority and must be undertaken within 6 months of receipt of this report.

**Schedule of recommended medium priority works**

| Tree no. | Species  | Recommended works   | Reason for works                         |
|----------|--|---|--|
| T6       | Ash<br><i>Fraxinus excelsior</i>                             | Fell  | Due to ash dieback                       |
| T19      | White willow<br><i>Salix alba</i>                            | Reduce crown to high pollard at 5m in next dormant season       | To consolidate structure                 |
| T22      | White willow<br><i>Salix alba</i>                            | Re-pollard to previous points in next dormant season            | Due to structural stem defect identified |
| T24      | Ash<br><i>Fraxinus excelsior</i>                             | Fell<br>Retain stem as conservation feature                     | Due to ash dieback                       |
| T26      | Ash<br><i>Fraxinus excelsior</i>                             | Fell  | Due to ash dieback                       |
| T26      | Ash<br><i>Fraxinus excelsior</i>                             | Fell  | Due to ash dieback                       |
| T31      | Common pear<br><i>Pyrus communis</i>                         | Reduce end weight of low lateral limb to suitable growth points | To consolidate structure                 |
| T50      | Ash<br><i>Fraxinus excelsior</i>                             | Fell<br>Retain stem as conservation feature                     | Due to ash dieback                       |
| T62      | Dark-leaf cherry plum<br><i>Prunus cerasifera</i><br>'Nigra' | Reduce end weight of low lateral limbs on south side            | To consolidate structure                 |

**3.5** The following recommended works are considered to be low priority and must be undertaken within 1 year of receipt of this report.

**Schedule of recommended low priority works**

| Tree no. | Species                              | Recommended works  | Reason for works                           |
|----------|--------------------------------------|--|--|
| T1       | Ash<br><i>Fraxinus excelsior</i>     | Fell   | Due to ash dieback                         |
| T4       | Juniper<br><i>Juniperus communis</i> | Control ivy  | To prevent ivy outcompeting leafing growth |
| T33      | Ash<br><i>Fraxinus excelsior</i>     | Fell<br>Consider retaining ivy clad stem as conservation feature | Due to ash dieback                         |
| T37      | Ash<br><i>Fraxinus excelsior</i>     | Fell   | Due to ash dieback                         |
| T38      | Ash<br><i>Fraxinus excelsior</i>     | Fell   | Due to ash dieback                         |
| T47      | Ash<br><i>Fraxinus excelsior</i>     | Fell   | Due to ash dieback                         |
| T48      | Ash<br><i>Fraxinus excelsior</i>     | Fell   | Due to ash dieback                         |
| T49      | Ash<br><i>Fraxinus excelsior</i>     | Fell   | Due to ash dieback                         |
| T58      | Ash<br><i>Fraxinus excelsior</i>     | Fell   | Due to ash dieback                         |
| T58a     | Ash<br><i>Fraxinus excelsior</i>     | Fell   | Due to ash dieback                         |
| T61      | Ash<br><i>Fraxinus excelsior</i>     | Fell   | Due to ash dieback                         |

**3.6** The completion of those prescribed felling/pruning works within the recommended timescale is a condition of the validity of this report.

**3.7** Any defects observed that do not require remedial action have been assessed as of such low significance that remedial action would be disproportionate in relation to the risk posed.

**3.8** All works to trees must be undertaken in accordance with the British Standard, *BS 3998:2010 – Trees work. Recommendations.*



**3.9** As the site is within a conservation area the LPA requires six-weeks notification of any of the recommended works in the above tables (see section 1.3.2), with the exception of the recommended controlling of ivy on tree T4.

**3.10** It is recommended all trees (excepting those to be felled and those marked to be monitored in section 3.2) be re-inspected within 3 years from the date of the recent inspection.

# APPENDIX 1. Tree Survey Key

**Tree No.** Showing reference number designated to tree, group or hedgerow used when describing features in written report denoted as T1, T2, etc.

Groups of trees of the same species and of similar age will be denoted as groups G1, G2 etc. Trees too numerous to individually survey or groups comprising of mainly trees of a stem diameter less than 150mm will be denoted as woodland groups W1, W2 etc. Hedgerows will also be shown as groups denoted as H1, H2 etc. Individual trees located in a group or hedge can still be assessed individually.

**Tag No:** Referring to metal tag numbers present on tree.

**Species:** using common and scientific name. If exact species or variant is not known genera may be suffixed by Spp. i.e. *Cupressus* Spp or sub-species Subsp.

**Height:** Estimated and categorised as 0-5m, 5-10m, 10-20m, 20>m.

**No. of Stems:** trees with single stem at 1.5m from ground level marked as **1**. Trees with multiple stems at 1.5m marked noting the number of stems at this height.

**Age Class:** **Y**= a young tree in first third of life cycle.

**EM** = an early mature tree in second third of life cycle.

**M**= a tree in the last third of its life cycle.

**OM**= a tree in decline due to age.

## **Physiological Condition:**

**Good**=tree appears to be in a satisfactory physiological condition showing no signs of poor health.

**Fair**=may be showing some minor signs of stress.

**Poor**= slightly compromised showing significant signs of stress i.e. crown retrenchment.

**V. Poor**= significantly compromised i.e. advanced retrenchment.

**Dead.**

## **Structural Condition:**

**Good**= tree appears to be in a satisfactory structural condition with no significant defects found.

**Fair**= some defects, but of low significance.

**Poor**= slightly compromised i.e. poor branch unions found or evidence of decay.

**V. Poor**= profoundly compromised and imminent failure likely.

**Deadwood key:** **D/W**= Deadwood **Minor (Min)**=<25mm at base. **Moderate (Mod)**=25-50mm. **Major (Maj)**=50mm> at base.

**Action priority:** Suggested works must be undertaken within. **V/Urgent (VU)**= 24hrs.

**Urgent (U)**= 7 days. **High (H)**= 3 months. **Medium (M)**= 6 months. **Low (L)**= 1 year.

**Re-inspect:** Stating length of time before a re-inspection of the tree is required.



# Appendix 2

# TREE SURVEY SCHEDULE

Client: Ben and Linda Holmes

Location: Church Westcote Manor

Date: 12<sup>th</sup> May 2022

| Tree no: | Species:                              | Height (m): | Age class: | No of stems: | Physiological condition: | Structural condition: | Comments:  | Actions/ Recommendations: | Re-inspect in: | Priority: |
|----------|---------------------------------------|-------------|------------|--------------|--------------------------|-----------------------|--|---------------------------|----------------|-----------|
| T1       | Ash<br><i>Fraxinus excelsior</i>      | 20+         | OM         | 2            | P                        | F                     | Showing evidence of crown management and braced at 6 points with non invasive bracing<br>Showing early onset ash dieback infection >25% defoliation throughout crown<br>Fused lower stem<br>Some branch wound cavities in lower structure<br>Wearing tag no. 01695 | Fell                      | -              | L         |
| T2       | Holm oak<br><i>Quercus ilex</i>       | 0-5         | Y          | 2            | G                        | G                     |  |                           | 3y             |           |
| T3       | Holly<br><i>Ilex aquifolium</i>       | 0-5         | EM         | 3            | F                        | F                     | Some holly leaf miner damage to foliage<br>Co-dominant from base   |                           | 3y             |           |
| T4       | Juniper<br><i>Juniperus communis</i>  | 5-10        | M          | 8            | G                        | G                     | Ivy beginning to colonise crown  | Control ivy               | 3y             | L         |
| T5       | Magnolia Spp.<br><i>Magnolia Spp.</i> | 0-5         | M          | 3            |                          |                       | Ivy beginning to colonise crown  |                           | 3y             |           |
| T6       | Ash<br><i>Fraxinus excelsior</i>      | 5-10        | Y          | 1            | VP                       | F                     | Ash dieback infection >75%   | Fell                      | -              | M         |
| T7       | Prunus Spp.<br><i>Prunus Spp.</i>     | 0-5         | EM         | 1            | F                        | G                     | Some apple leaf mining moth damage to leaves in outer crown  |                           | 3y             |           |
| T8       | Hazel<br><i>Corylus avellana</i>      | 5-10        | M          | 6            | G                        | F                     | Lapsed hazel coppice<br>Pushing up stone wall to north-west  |                           | 3y             |           |

|     |   |      |           |    |          |          |  |   |    |          |
|-----|---|------|-----------|----|----------|----------|--|---|----|----------|
| T9  | Hazel<br><i>Corylus avellana</i>                | 5-10 | <b>M</b>  | 8  | <b>G</b> | <b>F</b> | Lapsed hazel coppice   |   | 3y |          |
| T10 | Deodar cedar<br><i>Cedrus deodara</i>           | 5-10 | <b>EM</b> | 1  | <b>G</b> | <b>G</b> |  |   | 3y |          |
| T11 | Antarctic beech<br><i>Nothofagus antarctica</i> | 10   | <b>EM</b> | 1  | <b>G</b> | <b>G</b> | Ivy beginning to colonise stem   |   | 3y |          |
| T13 | Hazel<br><i>Corylus avellana</i>                | 0-5  | <b>M</b>  | 10 | <b>G</b> | <b>F</b> | Hazel coppice  |   | 3y |          |
| T14 | Walnut<br><i>Juglans regia</i>                  | 10   | <b>OM</b> | 1  | <b>F</b> | <b>P</b> | Aging specimen with ivy colonising stem hindering visual inspection of key structural features<br><i>Inonotus hispidus</i> fungal fruiting bracket on primary stem structure at 8m north at point of previous branch failure<br>Lower stem on east side sounding hollow when struck with nylon hammer with area showing some dead & dysfunctional bark<br>Woodpecker activity in upper stem structure suggests evidence on internal decay<br>Showing evidence of previous crown management | Reduce upper crown by 1-1.5m and lateral growth by approximately 2-2.5m. Shape to leave in good form<br><br>Monitor Condition | 1y | <b>H</b> |
| T15 | Downy birch<br><i>Betula pubescens</i>          | 5-10 | <b>EM</b> | 1  | <b>G</b> | <b>G</b> |  |   | 3y |          |
| T17 | Downy birch<br><i>Betula pubescens</i>          | 5-10 | <b>EM</b> | 1  | <b>G</b> | <b>G</b> |  |   | 3y |          |
| T18 | Downy birch<br><i>Betula pubescens</i>          | 5-10 | <b>EM</b> | 1  | <b>G</b> | <b>G</b> |  |   | 3y |          |
| T19 | White willow<br><i>Salix alba</i>               | 10   | <b>M</b>  | 1  | <b>F</b> | <b>F</b> | Co-dominant from 1m<br>Showing some physiological stress with some deadwood in retrenching outer crown<br>Some woodpecker damage in primary stem structure indicating possible decay   | Reduce crown to high pollard at 5m in next dormant season   | 3y | <b>M</b> |
| T20 | Silver birch<br><i>Betula pendula</i>           | 5-10 | <b>M</b>  | 1  | <b>G</b> | <b>F</b> | Heavily ivy clad hindering visual inspection<br>Ivy previously severed at base of stem   |   | 3y |          |
| T21 | Silver birch<br><i>Betula pendula</i>           | 20+  | <b>M</b>  | 1  | <b>G</b> | <b>G</b> |  |   | 3y |          |




|      |   |      |           |   |           |          |   |  |    |          |
|------|---|------|-----------|---|-----------|----------|---|--|----|----------|
| T22  | White willow<br><i>Salix alba</i>           | 10   | <b>M</b>  | 1 | <b>F</b>  | <b>P</b> | Managed as pollard with pruning points at approximately 6m<br>Co-dominant from 1m with evidence of concealed fissure in main stem from base of crotch of secondary limbs to ground level  | Re-pollard to previous points in next dormant season                   | 3y | <b>M</b> |
| T23  | Silver birch<br><i>Betula pendula</i>       | 10   | <b>OM</b> | 1 | <b>G</b>  | <b>G</b> |   |  | 3y |          |
| T24  | Ash<br><i>Fraxinus excelsior</i>            | 10   | <b>OM</b> | 1 | <b>VP</b> | <b>F</b> | Aging specimen with large branch wound cavity on southern side of stem at 6m<br>Several branch wound cavities in crown<br>Swollen stem structure indicating potential internal decay<br>Showing evidence of previous crown management<br>Supporting swing on western lateral limb<br>Showing ash dieback infection >75% defoliation | Fell<br>Retain stem as conservative feature<br><br>Possible bat roosts | -  | <b>M</b> |
| G1   | 3x Hazel<br><i>Corylus avellana</i>         | 0-5  | <b>M</b>  | 6 | <b>G</b>  | <b>F</b> | Group of 3 lapsed hazel coppice stools  |  | 3y |          |
| T25  | Judas tree<br><i>Cercis siliquastrum</i>    | 5-10 | <b>EM</b> | 4 | <b>G</b>  | <b>F</b> | Awkward tight co-dominant stem structure from base  |  | 3y |          |
| T25a | Magnolia Spp.<br><i>Magnolia Spp.</i>       | 5-10 | <b>EM</b> | 2 | <b>G</b>  | <b>F</b> | Co-dominant from base   |  | 3y |          |
| T26  | Ash<br><i>Fraxinus excelsior</i>            | 10   | <b>M</b>  | 1 | <b>VP</b> | <b>P</b> | Ivy clad<br>Ash dieback infection >75% defoliation  | Fell   | -  | <b>M</b> |
| T27  | Silver birch<br><i>Betula pendula</i>       | 5-10 | <b>EM</b> | 1 | <b>G</b>  | <b>G</b> |   |  | 3y |          |
| T28  | Silver birch<br><i>Betula pendula</i>       | 10   | <b>M</b>  | 1 | <b>G</b>  | <b>G</b> |   |  | 3y |          |
| T29  | Ash<br><i>Fraxinus excelsior</i>            | 10   | <b>M</b>  | 1 | <b>VP</b> | <b>F</b> | Ash dieback infection >75% defoliation  | Fell   | -  | <b>M</b> |
| T30  | Cherry laurel<br><i>Prunus laurocerasus</i> | 0-5  | <b>M</b>  | 6 | <b>G</b>  | <b>F</b> | Widely spreading stem structure<br>Evidence of previous management in upper crown   |  | 3y |          |
| T31  | Common pear<br><i>Pyrus communis</i>        | 5-10 | <b>OM</b> | 1 | <b>G</b>  | <b>F</b> | Extended low lateral limb on south side vulnerable to failure   | Reduce end weight of low lateral limb to suitable growth points        | 3y | <b>M</b> |
| T32  | Common pear<br><i>Pyrus communis</i>        | 0-5  | <b>OM</b> | 1 | <b>F</b>  | <b>F</b> | Upper crown lost to storm damage  |  | 3y |          |

|      |  |       |           |    |           |          |  |   |    |          |
|------|--|-------|-----------|----|-----------|----------|--|---|----|----------|
| T33  | Ash<br><i>Fraxinus excelsior</i>                   | 10    | <b>M</b>  | 1  | <b>VP</b> | <b>F</b> | Heavily ivy clad stem hindering visual assessment of key features<br>Co-dominant from 1m<br>Ash dieback infection >50% defoliation   | Fell<br>Consider retaining ivy clad stem as conservation feature<br><br>Possible bat roosts         | -  | <b>L</b> |
| T34  | False acacia<br><i>Robinia pseudoacacia</i>        | 5-10  | <b>EM</b> | 1  | <b>F</b>  | <b>F</b> | Showing signs of stress with minor deadwood and epicormic growth throughout crown<br>Mower damage to base possible cause of dysfunction  |   | 3y |          |
| T35  | Black mulberry<br><i>Morus nigra</i>               | 5-10  | <b>OM</b> | 1  | <b>F</b>  | <b>P</b> | Historic and cultural veteran feature<br>Ivy beginning to colonise crown<br>Main stem and heavily extended low lateral limbs now propped<br>Significant decay and dysfunction throughout structure | Control ivy<br>Reduce some end-weight of extended lateral limbs by thinning 10% of congested growth | 1y | <b>H</b> |
| T36  | Cherry laurel<br><i>Prunus laurocerasus</i>        | 0-5   | <b>EM</b> | 1  | <b>G</b>  | <b>G</b> | Crown maintained   |   | 3y |          |
| G2   | Group of red western cedar<br><i>Thuja plicata</i> | 10-20 | <b>M</b>  | 10 | <b>G</b>  | <b>G</b> | Row of stems maintained at 12m   |   | 3y |          |
| T37  | Ash<br><i>Fraxinus excelsior</i>                   | 5-10  | <b>EM</b> | 1  | <b>VP</b> | <b>F</b> | Ash dieback infection >75% defoliation   | Fell  | -  | <b>L</b> |
| T38  | Ash<br><i>Fraxinus excelsior</i>                   | 5-10  | <b>EM</b> | 1  | <b>VP</b> | <b>P</b> | Ash dieback infection >75% defoliation   | Fell  | -  | <b>L</b> |
| T39  | Monterey cypress<br><i>Cupressus macrocarpa</i>    | 10    | <b>M</b>  | 2  | <b>G</b>  | <b>F</b> | Missing low limb on eastern side to storm damage<br>Multiple co-dominant branch unions throughout crown<br>Evidence of previous height management  | Continue to manage crown at current height  |    |          |
| T40  | Bird cherry<br><i>Prunus padus</i>                 | 5-10  | <b>EM</b> | 1  | <b>G</b>  | <b>G</b> |  |   | 3y |          |
| T41  | Crab apple<br><i>Malus sylvestris</i>              | 0-5   | <b>EM</b> | 1  | <b>G</b>  | <b>G</b> |  |   | 3y |          |
| T42  | Holm oak<br><i>Quercus ilex</i>                    | 0-5   | <b>EM</b> | 1  | <b>G</b>  | <b>G</b> |  |   | 3y |          |
| T43  | Whitebeam<br><i>Sorbus aria</i>                    | 0-5   | <b>EM</b> | 1  | <b>G</b>  | <b>G</b> |  |   | 3y |          |
| T44a | Sweet chestnut<br><i>Castanea sativa</i>           | 5-10  | <b>EM</b> | 1  | <b>G</b>  | <b>G</b> |  |   | 3y |          |

|      |   |      |    |   |    |   |  |  |    |   |
|------|---|------|----|---|----|---|--|--|----|---|
| G3   | 9x Greengage<br><i>Prunus domestica</i> Subsp.                        | 5-10 | OM | 1 | F  | F | Group of 9 aging greengage in reasonable condition for age class   |  | 3y |   |
| T44  | Ash<br><i>Fraxinus excelsior</i>                                      | 10   | M  | 1 | VP | P | Moribund and over adjacent highway   | Fell   | -  | H |
| T45  | Cappadocian maple<br><i>Acer cappadocicum</i>                         | 5-10 | EM | 3 | G  | F | Some damage from vascular stress following death of branch on eastern stem   |  | 3y |   |
| T46  | Field maple<br><i>Acer campestre</i>                                  | 5-10 | M  | 1 | G  | G |  |  | 3y |   |
| T47  | Ash<br><i>Fraxinus excelsior</i>                                      | 10   | EM | 1 | VP | P | Ash dieback infection >75% defoliation   | Fell   | -  | L |
| T48  | Ash<br><i>Fraxinus excelsior</i>                                      | 10   | EM | 4 | VP | P | Ash dieback infection >75% defoliation   | Fell   | -  | L |
| T49  | Ash<br><i>Fraxinus excelsior</i>                                      | 10   | M  | 1 | VP | P | Ash dieback infection >75% defoliation   | Fell   | -  | L |
| T50  | Ash<br><i>Fraxinus excelsior</i>                                      | 10   | OM | 1 | VP | P | Large open basal cavity on east side with associated <i>Ganoderma applanatum</i> brackets around defect and on southern side of stem<br>Ash dieback infection >50% defoliation | Fell<br>Retain stem as conservative feature<br><br>Possible bat roosts | -  | M |
| T51  | Norway maple 'Crimson King'<br><i>Acer platanoides</i> 'Crimson King' | 5-10 | EM | 1 | F  | F | Co-dominant break of stems from 1.5m<br>Some minor deadwood at extremities of crown  |  | 3y |   |
| T52  | Greengage<br><i>Prunus domestica</i> Subsp.                           | 5-10 | M  | 1 | G  | P | Awkward collection of co-dominant primary stem features  |  | 3y |   |
| T53  | Greengage<br><i>Prunus domestica</i> Subsp.                           | 5-10 | M  | 2 | G  | F |  |  | 3y |   |
| T54  | Common lime<br><i>Tilia x europaea</i>                                | 0-5  | Y  | 1 | G  | G |  |  | 3y |   |
| T55  | Common lime<br><i>Tilia x europaea</i>                                | 0-5  | Y  | 1 | G  | G |  |  | 3y |   |
| T56  | Hornbeam<br><i>Carpinus betulus</i>                                   | 0-5  | Y  | 1 | G  | G |  |  | 3y |   |
| T57  | Ash<br><i>Fraxinus excelsior</i>                                      | 10   | EM | 1 | F  | G | Thinly foliated, suspected early onset ash dieback infection but not confirmed   | Monitor condition  | 1y |   |
| T58  | Ash<br><i>Fraxinus excelsior</i>                                      | 10   | EM | 1 | VP | F | Ash dieback infection >50% defoliation   | Fell   | -  | L |
| T58a | Ash<br><i>Fraxinus excelsior</i>                                      | 10   | M  | 1 | VP | F | Ash dieback infection >50% defoliation   | Fell   | -  | L |

|     |   |      |    |    |    |   |   |  |    |   |
|-----|---|------|----|----|----|---|---|--|----|---|
| T60 | Bay<br><i>Laurus nobilis</i>                              | 5-10 | M  | 10 | G  | G |   |  | 3y |   |
| T61 | Ash<br><i>Fraxinus excelsior</i>                          | 10   | M  | 1  | VP | F | Ash dieback infection >50% defoliation  | Fell   | -  | L |
| T62 | Dark-leaf cherry plum<br><i>Prunus cerasifera</i> 'Nigra' | 5-10 | M  |    | F  | P | Limb lost in central crown to recent storm damage<br>Awkward lower stem structure<br>Low lateral limbs on south side vulnerable to failure  | Reduce end weight of low lateral limbs on south side | 3y | M |
| T63 | Tibetan cherry<br><i>Prunus serrula</i>                   | 0-5  | EM | 1  | F  | G | Thinly foliated   |  | 3y |   |
| T64 | Prunus pp.<br><i>Prunus</i> Spp.                          | 5-10 | EM | 1  | G  | F | Co-dominant from 1m   |  | 3y |   |
| G4  | 3x beech<br><i>Fagus sylvatica</i>                        | 20   | M  | 3  | G  | G | Group of 3 beech stems in close row possibly lapsed hedgerow<br>Ivy colonising stems<br>Felled stump in group showing <i>Kretzschmaria deusta</i> fruiting bodies<br>No evidence of <i>Kretzschmaria deusta</i> on adjacent trees | Monitor  | 1y |   |



- KEY:**
-  - Scheduled Tree
  -  - Unsurveyed Tree or Shrub
  -  - Unsurveyed Hedgerow

The Tree Retention Categories symbols shown in the key are for reference and may not always be present on the plan.

This drawing has been prepared in accordance with the scope of Southern Tree Surveys' appointment with its client and is subject to the terms and conditions of that appointment.

Southern Tree Surveys accepts no liability for any use of this drawing other than by its client and only for the purposes for which it was prepared and provided.

If received electronically it is the recipient's responsibility to print this drawing to the correct scale. Refer to written dimensions where provided.

© Copyright Southern Tree Surveys. This drawing is issued on the condition it is not reproduced, retained or disclosed to any unauthorised person, either wholly or in part without the written consent of Southern Tree Surveys.





Southern Tree Surveys  
 Pear Tree Cottage  
 West Lavington  
 Devizes, Wiltshire  
 SN10 4NQ  
 t: 01380 816199  
 e: seb@southerntreesurveys.co.uk

|                                      |           |                 |
|--------------------------------------|-----------|-----------------|
| Project:<br>Church Westcote Manor    |           |                 |
| On behalf of:<br>Ben & Linda Holmes  |           |                 |
| Drawing title:<br>Tree Location Plan |           |                 |
| Drawing number:<br>STS-190-01        | Rev:      | Date:<br>May 22 |
| Scale:<br>1:750 @ A3                 | DB:<br>SM | CB:<br>RM       |

