

Appendix 2

Ref: TPO 916 Cypress Leylandii, St Katherine's Way "T1" 29th May 2015
Re. objections raised by Aspect Tree Consultancy:

- 1 Removal of this tree would have a significant detrimental impact on the community. Specifically an extra 1Kg of particulate pollution will be dumped into the atmosphere each year, especially in the grounds of Victoria Court.
- 2 The Horse Chestnut and Walnut are not evergreen trees and do nothing to clean the air during the winter. The Horse Chestnut is young and the Walnut is also a small tree. There is no significant impact from these trees on pollution and little screening benefit.
- 3 This statement has no logic whatsoever. The removal of CO₂ and particulates is a huge benefit and Cypress Leylandii is one the best species for this.
- 4 This is a generalised statement which could be said to be true of any tree near a building. With regard to "shading" there is no one to the North of this tree besides me. It is a large tree. That is what is needed to absorb pollution and screen the residents of Victoria Court from the ever increasing flow of heavy traffic. More large trees are needed in our town.
- 5 As already stated the other trees do not provide any screening or pollution absorption and have a lesser public amenity.
- 6 I was told that the decision on the Cypress Leylandii was made by "Asset Management" at DCH and the reason for felling it was because it might damage a wall. There is no present visible damage to the wall that could be caused by the Cypress.

DETAIL

- 1) I am in general agreement with the description which notes that the tree is healthy.

The Horse Chestnut is to the west. To the east, immediately is a Rowan (I think) which is omitted from the text. Then some ten yards from the Cypress is one of three Walnut trees. This Walnut has been pruned badly and unnecessarily by DCH when they took back the entire verge with a hedge trimmer.

- 2) Part of the government guidelines are quoted omitting any part referring to pollution mitigation. These are guidance notes and local authorities are given discretion.
- 3) The author expresses his opinion. He doesn't like Cypress Leylandii. DCH have said to me that they should be "eradicated from the planet". They are the best particulate remover. Plant more by your roads.

Pollution and Climate Change Mitigation

The author is wrong. The impact of "one individual tree over another" is measurable and hugely significant. The study by Professor Gail Taylor at Southampton University has shown that large trees are better at absorbing pollution than small ones and that one of the best is Cypress Leylandii because of its fine leaf structure.

Aspect say that "Trees are particularly beneficial as interceptors of particulate pollution at "hot spots" where the receptor is close to the source of emissions; frequently first floor windows immediately adjacent to a section of congested highway"

This Cypress is adjacent to what is now a very busy main road, St Katherine's way, which is clogged with static nose-to-tail traffic at rush hours and all day on bank holidays and in the high season, especially on what are called "changeover days". In other words this tree is in a "Hot Spot" exactly,

and doing a very good job. Trees such as Cypress Leylandii are known as "hyperaccumulators" because of the impressive amount of toxins they remove. There is software available to calculate the monetary value of this particular tree:

Yearly ecosystem services		Value
Energy conserved	1243.78 kWh	£49.75
Stormwater intercepted	9877.30 litres	£4.35
Air pollutants removed	0.84 kgs	£9.25
Carbon dioxide reduced	146.59 kgs	£7.76
Total CO ₂ stored to date	1544.95 kgs	£81.74

Size, future growth and life expectancy

Here the author enters the realm of conjecture with photographs of structural damage which he admits may not be caused by the tree. The boundary wall is in poor condition, suffering from lack of maintenance. This was a fact DCH were made aware of by the Judge at the trial in 2013. The Court surveyor said the wall needs repairing and painting. The crack shown in Aspect's photograph is thirty feet from the Cypress. This is the section of wall directly beneath the tree:



DCH have another Cypress that failed. It was a different tree in a different set of circumstances. No doubt it came down during recent gales, unlike the tree in question which I maintain must be deeply rooted. The author claims "*it is feasible that [the root structure] has been contained within the confines of the planting bed*". It is not feasible. We are being asked to accept that a tree which is thirty-five feet tall could have withstood the gales of winter 2014 (80+mph) with little more than three feet of root depth. I am certain in my own mind that the roots are not "socketed" within the planting bed but have descended down at least to the water course that runs below it and probably very much deeper.

The shadow cast by the tree affects only me. It passes my front door between 4.00pm and 5.00pm. Directly to the north of the tree at the gable end of the other block are three disused garages and no

windows. The courtyard between the two blocks of flats is not affected and will not be affected in the future, it faces directly south and only when the sun has moved far to the west is any shadow cast across the courtyard, when the building themselves create the shade in any case. This is entirely spurious reasoning.



Presence of other trees

The Horse Chestnut is shaded by the Cypress for a few hours first thing in the morning. The rest of the day it enjoys full sun and always flowers in abundance. The mature Walnut is too far away to be affected and there is another tree between it and the Cypress which could be felled. I have no idea what a "feature tree" is.

Expediency

Again, DCH told me that this decision had come from Asset Management over concerns about the retaining wall. The wall needs repairing, not the tree felling. The decision to make a TPO is entirely expedient.

Conclusion

From the point of view of the residents at Victoria Court the Horse Chestnut and the Walnut are not "superior trees". They are not evergreen, they are small and do nothing to screen us from the road or absorb pollution. If you would give me the benefit of the doubt in representing my neighbours I can say that most of us do not want the Cypress felled and four of us are extremely upset by the idea, contrary to the unsupported claims by DCH.

In recent months a huge number of mature trees have been felled in Totnes to make way for various developments. The Council will be aware of these. In my immediate area between ten and twenty trees were recently felled at the Grove School, a mature Sycamore taken down and the construction at the Shippon, behind Victoria Court, meant that a large mature Ash was felled along with other shrubs. That is a significant reduction in CO₂ and particulate removal for these streets which are also seeing a substantial increase in traffic flow.

Tony Dale