

**Head Office**

46 St Peter Street

Tiverton | EX16 6NR

T 0845 643 1161**E** office@jp-associates.co.uk**W** www.jp-associates.co.uk

Date 24 January 2019
Ref: D14 359 01 03

Fao Luke Salter

Salter Property
Cliff Barton
Sowden Lane
Lympstone
Exmouth
EX8 5HB

Dear Luke,

Re; Update to arboricultural constraints report for HB Land, Hill Barton.

Further to your instruction we have now returned to the HB Land at Hill Barton to re-survey the hedges and I can now report the following.

Please refer to the attached hedge survey schedule and plan.

The whole of the Hill Barton development has previously been approved under the Hill Barton outline consent and the Monkerton and Hill Barton Masterplan study which was allocated for development under Exeter's previous local plan.

As part of the supporting information for the previous phase 1 application we produced an arboricultural constraints report (Ref: D11 55 04 dated June 2014) that covered the whole of the Hill Barton development area. I further understand that reserved matters applications and revised full planning applications are now being submitted for further phases of the development. As the tree survey (on which the original report was based) is now somewhat out of date we were instructed to return to site to re-survey the trees and hedges to ensure that the tree protection plans for the later applications are based on accurate and up to date information.



Having now returned to site I can confirm that while the hedges on the HB Land may have naturally grown a little and while a number of further elms will have succumbed to Dutch elm disease, the hedges are very similar to the original survey and report. As such there is no need to produce a new constraints report.

The attached information has been revised to reflect the current condition of the hedges and this information will be used to inform our discussions with the project team through the design of the layout.

The arboricultural consultancy process culminates with the production of a tree protection plan and arboricultural method statement (if needed) that will be submitted as part of the supporting information for the revised planning application and then approved under the consent when granted.

I should point out that the original constraints report emphasised that one of the most significant issues was the management of the various hedges that contain large amounts of elm, here follows the relevant text from the original report that remains the most significant issue.

"2.9 The other significant arboricultural features of the site are the various hedges that divide and border the fields. While the agricultural fields have remained in production, the hedges have not been closely managed for some time and most now will need remedial management work.

2.9.1 While the hedges do hold some arboricultural interest, elm has become very dominant and this has led to the hedges being rather monotonous – which is a feature of hedges that have not been closely managed - and there is little to distinguish one hedge from any other. For this reason this report has not particularly categorized the hedges or surveyed them in any detail; the information presented in the appended survey plan and schedule is for identification purposes only.

2.10 The dominance of elm also leads to a greater risk of Dutch elm disease and as most of the trees are now at the height where they are more susceptible there is a real risk that the disease could rather decimate the hedges over the next few years. Indeed some hedges are beginning to have numbers of dead and dying trees."

The report went on to recommend that the following management work should be carried out to any sections of the existing hedges that were retained in the development proposals.

"3.8 As outlined above the hedges are dominated by elm and several of the hedges now contain very few other species. The dominance of the elm presents a greater risk of the site becoming blighted with Dutch elm disease and that the effects would be exaggerated.

3.8.1 Some hedges, notably HY, already contain significant numbers of dead trees and there is a strong possibility that the disease will take a strong hold over the next few years.

3.9 As there is little merit or differences between the hedges, the most sustainable solution will be to allow other design factors to determine the layout and then apply a programme of remedial management works to the retained hedges that will increase the species diversity and present them in a condition more appropriate to their revised urban location.

3.9.1 Management works would include coppicing of all the elm, selectively kill 40% of the elm (by applying a Glyphosate based herbicide to the regrowth) and then supplementing the hedges with new planting of mixed native species mix of (say) hawthorn 35%, blackthorn 25%, hazel 20%, holly 10%, spindle 5%, honeysuckle 2.5%, dog rose 2.5%."

These management recommendations remain current and should be applied to any sections of the hedges that are retained in the HB Land layout.

I strongly suggest that we make a swift start to the hedge management if we are to avoid potential conflicts with bird nesting, unless we are not expecting to make a start on the development until later in the year.

I trust that these details are clear, please just get in touch if you have any comments or queries.

Yours sincerely,



Jeremy Peirce
JP Associates