PUTTING A VALUE ON THE URBAN FOREST
KEY FINDINGS FROM THE STUDY:

• The replacement cost of Burton’s urban forest is £54.2 million – i.e. what it would cost to replace the trees with others that are structurally identical in the same locations.

• The amenity value of Burton’s urban forest has an estimated value of £1,126 million – i.e. what is considered to be the asset value of the whole stock to the community.

• Carbon storage has an estimated value of £1.23 million with the urban forest storing 19,800 tonnes of carbon.

• The estimated value of carbon sequestration is £44,800 per year or 722 tonnes, through the long term storage of atmospheric carbon dioxide.

• The estimated value of avoided runoff is £21,700 per year or 23,700 m³.

• Pollution removal has an estimated value of £48,800 per year or 23 tonnes of pollutants per year.

The study found that tree cover in Burton is relatively low at 9.4%, compared to other towns and cities that have completed i-Tree surveys (ranging from 11.4% - 17% for other UK locations). The town is also dominated by younger trees with relatively few large mature trees. The number of species is considered to be low, with 50 species recorded. The three most common species were Beech, Hawthorn and Sycamore.

The results of the survey suggest there is considerable scope to develop and enhance Burton’s urban forest and increase the benefits it provides to the town’s communities, economy and environment. The report outlines eight aims to achieve this and offers recommendations on how they could be achieved.

KEY MANAGEMENT AIMS:

1. Increase overall tree cover
2. Develop a more diverse age structure to address the dominance of younger trees
3. Improve species diversity of the urban forest to increase resilience
4. Enhance biodiversity
5. Enhance the sense of place and amenity value
6. Increase the contribution of the urban forest to public health outcomes
7. Increase the contribution of the urban forest to the local economy and maximise opportunities from new developments
8. Increase the contribution of the urban forest to climate change resilience and mitigation

To conserve and enhance Burton’s urban forest the implementation plan identifies the key next steps to achieve these aims. Four priority zones are outlined where planting will provide particular benefit to communities together with a range of actions for new planting and measures to protect the existing tree stock both within the priority zones and the wider area.

Due to the predominantly urban nature the study area it is likely to be challenging to establish tree cover. A modest target of 1% increase in tree cover has therefore been set for the whole project area for this initial period to reflect the challenges. However it is important that this is reviewed and that a long term strategy is maintained to increase tree cover across the town. Burton may then rightly achieve the aspiration to be recognised as the capital of The National Forest.
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Urban Economy
Urban trees can make the place more attractive to live in, increasing the value of properties and attracting investment.

Reducing Storm Water runoff
Holding rainfall in the canopy helps to reduce flash flooding and increases infiltration of water into the soil.

Biodiversity and Habitat
Trees provide a valuable habitat and food for many animal and plant species.

Carbon storage and sequestration
As trees grow they capture atmospheric carbon, reducing this greenhouse gas in the atmosphere and helping to create resilience to climate change.

Aesthetic
Trees can improve the visual amenity through screening and greening developments and providing diversity and a distinctive sense of place.

Energy Savings
Tree canopies can provide shading in summer and also offer wind protection and insulation in winter.

Figure 1
Benefits of the urban forest

Individual trees and woodlands in towns, including street and garden trees, trees in open spaces, woodlands and hedgerows make up the urban forest. Urban forests provide a wide variety of benefits to communities and the local economy which can often go unnoticed or are undervalued. Some of the benefits of urban forests are summarised in Figure 1.
Aims of the study

The aim of the study was to investigate the benefits delivered by the urban forest in a Staffordshire town, and where possible to estimate the financial value of these benefits. The study used a recognised survey and analysis methodology called i-Tree, which has been used in towns and cities in the UK and internationally. Using the outcomes of the i-Tree survey and existing data, a further aim was to develop an implementation plan to identify how the urban forest could be developed to maximise its benefits to society.

The information and recommendations resulting from the project can be used by a range of stakeholders including planners, highway authorities, conservation groups, community groups and the National Forest Company to steer planting and woodland management to the areas which need it most.

It is hoped that this study - the first of its kind in Staffordshire - will act as a pilot for other areas, inspiring other communities to look at the benefits their urban forests could provide.

The study area

Burton is situated within the River Trent corridor and this has shaped the settlement pattern through its floodplain. Also known as the ‘Washlands’, the floodplain dominates the centre of the town and provides a unique feature and valued recreation resource for residents. Surveys carried out on behalf of East Staffordshire Council show that the majority of residents value Burton’s greenspaces but not all use them.

Burton is firmly identified as a brewing town and this has influenced the architecture and character of the town. Many Victorian terraces around the periphery of the town centre have remained more or less intact with no significant post-war clearance / redevelopment schemes taking place for new housing and roads. There has only been modest clearance of Victorian industrial buildings for other uses such as housing and employment uses, so Burton has retained much of its cohesive historic character and form. However, in some areas housing stock is in poor condition associated with pockets of deprivation, economic inactivity and socio-economic problems. The layout of these areas generally has a hard urban form with little soft landscaping, trees and open space.

Burton upon Trent is generally regarded as a moderately densely-developed town, with relatively little green space remaining within it’s built up area and few roadside trees in the town. As the largest town within The National Forest, Burton is a key part of the Forest. This has had, and will continue to have, a profound effect on the town, facilitating the creation of large areas of new publicly accessible woodland within and on the edge of the town.

Burton is set to grow significantly, between 2012-2031 approximately 7000 new homes are proposed on brown and greenfield land, putting pressure on Burton’s important green spaces.

Assessing the value of Burton’s urban forest will enable the Council and other stakeholders to have a better understanding of the benefits trees provide. This will allow for more informed decisions for future management. The strong connection with The National Forest provides greater potential opportunities to take forward the recommendations from this report.

Methodology

The study area covered 2,851 hectares and followed the town boundary plus adjacent housing and strategic urban extension allocations identified by East Staffordshire Borough Council.

The area was stratified using the English Indices of Deprivation which measures the risk of premature death and impairment of quality of life through poor physical or mental health. This provided a framework to relate how the urban forest can contribute to regenerating and improving social and economic influences.

250 plots were randomly selected for survey, representing 0.35% of the survey area. The number of plots allocated to each stratified area was in proportion to the size of each stratum. Following this methodology ensured that both public and private land ownership were included, with a balance of plots for each stratum.

Burton’s trees were surveyed by volunteers in August and September 2016. Access restrictions prevented all the allocated plots being surveyed with 247 of the target 250 plots being completed. This equated to 32 plots in the most deprived stratum, 66 plots in the above average deprivation stratum, 71 plots in the average deprivation stratum, 73 plots in the below average deprivation strata, and 5 plots in the most deprived strata being completed, shown in Figure 2.

Each plot covered 0.04 ha (400m²) and in line with the i-Tree methodology, the following was recorded:

- The type of land use e.g. park, residential
- The different types of ground cover present in the plot e.g. grass, tarmac
- The percentage of the plot:
  - Covered by trees
  - Covered by hedges
  - Covered by grass
  - Covered by tarmac
  - That could have trees planted in it
- Information about trees:
  - The number of trees and their species
  - The size of the trees including height, canopy spread and girth of trunk
  - The health of the trees including the fullness of the canopy
  - The amount of light exposure the canopy receives
- The amount of impermeable surface (e.g. tarmac) under the tree
- The distance of trees from the nearest building
- Information about shrubs with a trunk girth less than 7 cm (species, size and dimensions of shrubs recorded)

Further details on the i-Tree Eco methodology can be found at: www.itreetools.org/resources/manuals.php

1 For the purpose of the project trees with a diameter at breast height (DBH) of 7cm or greater were classified as trees and were surveyed fully. Trees with a DBH less than 7cm were included in the shrub listing.
DATA LIMITATIONS

Taken as a whole, this report presents a statistically robust picture of Burton’s urban forest in 2016. There is, however, potential that any one of the strata may have an under or over-representation of the number of trees or species, age class, etc., due to the limited amount of data collected at the stratum-level.

In particular, the least deprived area covers less than 2% of the survey area. As the number of survey plots was proportional to the area of each stratum data is limited for this stratum. Similarly it is likely there will be other species present in Burton which were not identified during the field campaign.

i-Tree Eco only quantifies certain benefits of trees, as detailed in this report. Other benefits provided including the effect trees have on noise pollution, their role in reducing building energy consumption and secondary effects of pollutants such as acid rain have not been considered as part of this project.

FIGURE 2
THE SURVEY AREA AND SAMPLE PLOTS

You are not permitted to copy, sub-license, distribute or sell any of this data to third parties in any form. Use of this data is subject to the terms and conditions shown at www.staffordshire.gov.uk/maps.

Produced by Staffordshire County Council, March 2017.

1 CTA: Council of Tree and Landscape Appraisers version 9, as incorporated into i-Tree Eco v6.02
2 CAVAT: Capital Asset Value for Amenity Trees, see www.cavattv.org for further details. The Quick Method (QM) has been adopted for the purposes of this study. QM calculates a base value for each tree (trunk size multiplied by CAVAT Unit Value Factor) and adjusts it according to the Community Tree Index (CTI) factor of 100%.

The CTI factor is a means to reflect in the tree stock’s asset value the relative population density of the local area and thus the relative number of those potentially able to benefit from the local authority trees. CTI bands vary from 100% to 250% for densely populated inner city areas. Burton as a low density area has been calculated at 100%.
It is estimated Burton has a tree cover of 9.4%, equating to a population of 102,400 trees.

Urban forests have a structural and functional value. The structural value is the cost of replacing a tree with a similar tree. The functional value, is a calculation of the variety of environmental functions they can perform.

For Burton these are estimated at:

**STRUCTURAL VALUES:**
- The cost to replace a tree with a similar tree in the same location is estimated at £54.2 million.
- The contribution to the public as an amenity tree is estimated at £1,126 million.
- Carbon Storage is the amount of carbon held in the woody part of the vegetation and is estimated at £1.23 million (19,800 tonnes).

**FUNCTIONAL VALUES:**
- Carbon Sequestration is the amount of carbon dioxide removed from the air by plants and is estimated at £44,800 per year (722 tonnes/year of carbon).
- Avoided Runoff is calculated based on rainfall interception by vegetation. Although tree leaves, branches and bark may intercept rainfall, only rainfall intercepted by leaves is accounted for in the analysis, equating to £21,700 per year (23,700 m³/year).
- Pollution Removal is calculated using local pollution data and is estimated to be £48,800 per year (23 tonnes/year).

Note: Costs are correct at the time of analysis (February 2017); valuations are subject to market conditions and may change in the future.

Pollution removal and avoided runoff estimates are reported for trees and shrubs. All other ecosystem services are reported for trees.
These three species account for 33% of the tree population. The top 11 species are summarised in Figure 3 with a full species list included in Appendix I (note the majority of the Beech were identified in one plot and could therefore be showing an over representation of Beech distribution across Burton).

The three most common species are Beech, Hawthorn and Sycamore. Burton is dominated by younger trees with 40% having a diameter at breast height (DBH) of less than 15 cm and 52% being between 15-50 cm (77% of the population had a DBH of less than 30 cm). This is detailed in Figure 4.

These results emphasise the role that different species and the age structure has in influencing the functional and structural values provided. In particular, i-Tree Eco demonstrates that it is both size (stature) of a tree species and the relative contribution of each species to the total population of the urban forest that are critical in the current delivery of ecosystem services. i-Tree Eco terms this ‘Importance Value’. The importance value (IV) of each of the tree species recorded in the field campaign is present in Appendix I.

An i-Tree Eco study presents a snapshot-in-time of an urban forest – its composition and condition etc. at the time of the survey. This is especially true of IV which highlights those species of greatest importance now. IV is a useful tool in risk analysis, for example to help understand the impact of a particular pest or disease. It can also be useful in planning. A species with a high IV and a high percentage presence in the urban forest may be important now but is less important, especially in the longer term, than a species with a high IV for a relatively low population. Planting more of the latter will more substantially bolster ecosystem service delivery. Oak, lime and beech are frequently represented in the most valuable trees in an urban forest (as reported in other i-Tree Eco surveys), however this pattern does not bear out in Burton with Beech, Sycamore and Ash having the highest IV values.

Table 1: Tree Density and Average for Each of the Four Project Strata

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stratum</th>
<th>Tree Density per ha</th>
<th>Average DBH (cm)</th>
<th>Average Height (m)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Below average deprivation</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average deprivation</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above average deprivation</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most deprived</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
According to the CAVAT Quick Method valuation technique, the amenity value of Burton’s urban forest is valued at £1,126 million. This figure is distinct to the Council of Tree and Landscape Appraisers (CTLA) valuation of £54.2 million.

The CTLA estimation is the cost to replace that tree with another structurally identical in that location, taking into consideration the species, condition and location factors. Unlike CTLA, CAVAT values trees based upon their contribution to the public as an amenity tree.

CAVAT addresses worth more so than value, it reveals trees as assets to be managed and maintained to grow their portfolio of worth. Figure 8 shows the ten most valuable trees in terms of amenity (CAVAT value) revealing sycamore, beech and willow have the highest value, reflecting the predominance of mature sycamore, beech and willow across the sample area.

The land-uses containing the highest proportion of trees according to amenity valuation are park, residential and vacant (Figure 9). The size of Burton’s tree population on vacant land, therefore, represents a valuable asset that should be appropriately protected in planning policy and considered in planning decisions, where possible.

The CAVAT valuation also reveals the importance in terms of amenity valuation of public trees in parks, cemeteries and around multi-family residential/multiple separate housing unit areas and, therefore, the need to appropriate fund the management of this resource.
Conclusions and lessons learnt

The study has provided a greater understanding of Burton’s urban forest and the role it plays in maintaining a healthy environment for residents, visitors and wildlife. The relatively low numbers of trees identified during the survey indicates that there is considerable capacity to expand Burton’s urban forest and the role this can have in environmental, social and economic improvement.

This project has been unique in applying a quantitative value for trees and linking this with environmental, health and deprivation data.

This data provides useful baseline information to direct planting to those areas where communities are likely to see the greatest benefit not only in terms of health and amenity, but also the potential positive outcomes in terms of reduction of crime and of investment.

Allocating quantitative values to tree and shrub populations are useful metrics to show the value of the urban forest. These values cannot be considered in isolation as the values have been applied considering a wide range of variables. Although some trees are better than others for the provision of some services, it is still important to maintain a diverse urban forest.

For example some of the best tree species for pollution and runoff reduction generally have a large leaf surface area. Although these species may be best for improving air quality and holding rainfall in the canopy a broad range of species should be considered to provide resilience to threats from disease and be suitable for the site aspect, soil and amenity.

Not all elements can have a quantitative value applied, this does not mean they are any less important when considering the right tree for the right place.
THE WAY FORWARD

The i-Tree survey gives us a snapshot of Burton’s urban forest in 2016, quantifying the benefits it currently offers to residents and the environment. It has identified many positive attributes but has also identified some key issues that need to be addressed. This section provides a management strategy to identify how the urban forest can be enhanced to maximise the benefits it delivers.

The East Staffordshire Local Plan (2012 – 2031) sets a 20-year vision for Burton which includes:

“Burton upon Trent: will be a positive and ambitious town, which has developed its sub regional status as an economic, retail, leisure and cultural centre... Burton upon Trent will be recognised nationally as the “Capital” of The National Forest, with a high quality and diverse green infrastructure network providing environmental, biodiversity, health, and sustainable transport opportunities...”

This management strategy explores the role that the urban forest can play in achieving this vision.

AIMS

The following aims are based on the outcomes of the i-Tree survey, additional evidence from national datasets and relevant local strategies:

1. Increase the overall tree cover
2. Develop a more diverse age structure to address the dominance of younger trees
3. Improve the species diversity of the urban forest to increase resilience
4. Enhance biodiversity
5. Enhance the sense of place and amenity value
6. Increase the contribution of the urban forest to public health outcomes
7. Increase the contribution of the urban forest to the local economy and maximise opportunities from new developments
8. Increase the contribution of the urban forest to climate change resilience and mitigation

Each aim lists objectives to achieve the specified aim, though many also have the capacity to contribute to multiple aims. Appendix II lists the objectives and highlights the range of aims each objective can contribute to achieving.
AIM 1
INCREASE THE OVERALL TREE COVER

OBJECTIVE: Increase tree cover by creating at least 30 hectares of new planting

The study indicates that the area has a relatively low tree cover. This is recorded as being between 34 to 41 trees per hectare with 9.4% canopy cover. Comparing Burton with other major i-Tree studies carried out in the UK, Burton ranks the lowest, see Table 3.

### Comparative study area in the UK Percentage canopy cover

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Edinburgh</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wrexham</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glasgow</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Torbay</td>
<td>11.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burton Upon Trent</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE 3
CANOPY COVER COMPARISON FROM OTHER UK TOWNS AND CITIES

Increasing tree cover will help to achieve all the aims of this management strategy and is therefore fundamental.

The i-Tree survey indicated that there was 25% plantable space consistent across all strata. This means that some 712 hectares may be available for planting, a large proportion on private land. This estimate has been based on the survey data, which represents less than 1% of the study area and also has not taken into account whether there are any other constraints. Planting proposals should be informed by existing ecological and landscape quality together with any other potential constraints. This includes pests and diseases, proximity to drainage systems, potential impacts on natural water flow, historical features and maintenance requirements. The estimated plantable area should therefore be taken as an indication only.

Recent research by Forest Research is recommending that towns and cities should set a tree cover target of at least 20% (15% for coastal towns) (Doick et al 2017). The average tree cover from the studies shown in Table 3 is 14%. Topography and city layout can have a large influence on tree cover and an aspirational target of 20% for Burton is likely to be extremely challenging.

This is particularly the case as many of the areas that would most benefit from additional tree cover are heavily urbanised, meaning that planting will be costly and difficult. While 20% cover may therefore be a long term aspiration, for the next five years a modest target of a 1% increase is proposed. This recognises the work required in preparation ahead of any planting and would still achieve significant ecosystem benefits.

The 1% target equates to 30 hectares of land to be planted, to be achieved through a combination of planting whips or standards appropriate to the area. It is recommended the target is reviewed in 5 years with the potential of increasing it when a greater understanding of potential planting areas has been established.

AIM 2
DEVELOP A MORE DIVERSE AGE STRUCTURE TO ADDRESS THE DOMINANCE OF YOUNGER TREES

OBJECTIVES:

i. Survey and create an inventory of veteran trees
ii. Review the use of Tree Preservation Orders to ensure that stature trees are protected as appropriate
iii. Encourage a proportion of all new species selected for planting to have the genetic capacity to grow into a large mature tree
iv. Encourage active management of mature trees

An urban forest needs enough large and mature trees to deliver the widest possible range of environmental benefits in urban areas and enough trees in a number of younger age classes to replace these mature trees as they die.

The i-Tree study indicated that 77% of the tree population of Burton has a DBH (diameter at breast height) of less than 30cm, with only 7.5% with a DBH above 50cm. Research suggests that the ideal DBH range for street and park tree populations should be approximately 40% with a DBH of 0-20cm, 30% with a DBH of 20-40cm, 20% with a DBH of 40-60cm and 10% with a DBH of greater than 60cm (Richards 1983). Figure 10 illustrates that there is some variance across the deprivation classes, although all areas are dominated by younger/smaller trees. It is however acknowledged that the survey included private gardens in addition to street trees and public places and therefore a higher percentage of smaller trees are likely to be experienced.

The species of tree within each age class is also an important consideration for maintaining a healthy diverse age structure. For example an oak with a DBH of 50cm may only be middle aged whereas faster growing species such as willow and poplar may be approaching the end of their safe and useful life expectancy. The largest trees in Burton (i.e. those with a DBH in excess of 50cm) are made up of a mix of slow growing long lived trees and faster growing shorter living species which is summarised in Figure 11.

It is obvious that the imbalance in the Burton age distribution cannot be corrected quickly and that conserving Burton’s existing large trees is of paramount importance wherever possible. Identifying veteran trees across the town is therefore a critical step, plus exploring measures for their appropriate protection and management.
Climate change and pests and diseases present an increasing threat to the urban forest and measures to increase resilience must form part of this strategy. A number of diseases are already present in the UK threatening tree populations. For example, Dutch elm disease was widespread in the UK and has almost killed off the native English elm population. Protecting the urban forest as a whole against these threats can be partially achieved by ensuring a high diversity of tree species. Suggested good practice for urban forests to be resilient to pests and diseases is that no species should exceed 10% of the population, no single genus should comprise more than 20% and no single family should contain more than 30% (Clark et al). Whilst the survey indicates 18% of the population is beech this could be an overestimation due to a plantation with a large number of beech being identified on a single plot. No other species exceeded the 10% threshold.

With increased importation of wood and trees in addition to a climate that is becoming more amenable to the pests and diseases that can travel into the UK on these imports, it is important to build resilience into our urban forests. Threats present and those not yet present in the UK, such as Asian longhorn beetle, could potentially devastate a diverse range of urban trees. UK-wide initiatives such as plant health restrictions are designed to combat these threats, but many pests are difficult to detect (Forestry Commission 2014), as plant health restrictions are designed to combat these threats, many pests are difficult to detect (Forestry Commission 2014), vigilance is key. Monitoring urban trees for signs of pests and diseases helps ensure a fast response to eradicate pests before they become established or widespread. British grown tree stock should be purchased where possible. If purchasing imported trees the nursery should confirm the tree has been appropriately quarantined through provision of a ‘plant passport’.

Table 4 below, gives an overview of current and emerging pests and diseases that can affect Burton’s urban forest, with a focus on those pests and diseases that lead to the death of the tree. It presents the population of the urban forest of Burton at risk from these pests and diseases, the associated amenity value of these trees and the value of the carbon that they store. This information can be used to inform programmes to monitor for the presence and spread of a pest or disease, and strategies to manage the risks that they pose.

An extended risk analysis of the threats posed to Burton’s urban forest and further information on the assessment methodology is included in Appendix IV. Details on the specific pests and diseases are provided in Appendix V - Further information on Pests and Diseases.

### Table 4
SUMMARY TABLE OF THE RISKS OF CURRENT AND EMERGING PESTS AND DISEASES TO BURTON’S URBAN TREES, WITH A FOCUS ON THOSE TREE SPECIES MOST VULNERABLE.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pest/Pathogen</th>
<th>Species affected</th>
<th>Prevalence in the UK</th>
<th>Prevalence in Midlands</th>
<th>Risk of spreading to Burton (risk %)</th>
<th>Population at risk (%)</th>
<th>CAVAT value of sampled trees (£)</th>
<th>Stored carbon value trees (£)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chalara dieback of ash</td>
<td>F. angusticola</td>
<td>Confirmed cases</td>
<td>High - already present</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
<td>115,911</td>
<td>78,876</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dothistroma red band needle blight</td>
<td>Pine species</td>
<td>Significant disease in North of UK</td>
<td>Confirmed in Cannock Forest</td>
<td>High - already present</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>75,085</td>
<td>38,669</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Giant polypore</td>
<td>Quercus spp., Fagus spp., Aesculus spp., Sorbus spp. and Prunus spp.</td>
<td>Common in urban areas</td>
<td>Common in urban areas</td>
<td>High - already present</td>
<td>28.7%</td>
<td>309,905</td>
<td>440,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian longhorn beetle</td>
<td>Many broadleaf species (see Appendix IV)</td>
<td>None (previous outbreaks contained)</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Medium risk - climate may be suitable</td>
<td>61.0%</td>
<td>785,579</td>
<td>576,178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gypsy Moth</td>
<td>Primarily Quercus spp., secondarily Carpinus betulus, F. sylvatica, C. sativa, B. pendula, and Populus spp.</td>
<td>London, Aylesbury and Dorset</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Medium risk - slow spreading</td>
<td>20.5%</td>
<td>419,246</td>
<td>516,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phytophthora kernoviae</td>
<td>F. sylvatica, Ilex aquifolium, Q. robur, G. Ilex</td>
<td>Many SW England and Wales</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Medium risk</td>
<td>24.7%</td>
<td>280,515</td>
<td>415,512</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phytophthora ramorum</td>
<td>Q. cerris, Q. rubra, Q. ilex, F. sylvatica, C. sativa, L. decidua, L. x europaes</td>
<td>Many UK sites, particularly in S Wales and SW England</td>
<td>Some cases reported in the Midlands</td>
<td>High - already present</td>
<td>21.6%</td>
<td>185,823</td>
<td>144,355</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emerald ash borer</td>
<td>F. excelsior, F. angusticola</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Medium risk (imported wood)</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
<td>115,911</td>
<td>78,876</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For an urban forest to be resilient to pests, diseases and climate change a diverse range of species needs to be present. This diversity has two main components, the number of species present and the genetic diversity within the population as a whole. 50 different species were recorded in Burton which is considered low in comparison to the other i-Tree studies. For example Torbay and London (which also had lower canopy cover in comparison to the other UK studies) recorded 102 and 126 species respectively.

While there has traditionally been a focus on native species of local provenance, there is a growing consideration in the light of climate change and increasing pressures from pests and diseases that non-native species may also have a role to play, particularly in urban forests. Native trees are more likely to support a greater amount of biodiversity, however to link to other aims in the strategy non-native trees with a capacity to become large trees at maturity, offering a wider range of ecosystem services could be suitable for some situations. It should also be recognised when selecting species that nursery production methods will mean with some species that all progeny are clonal selections and therefore genetically identical. For example all Sorbus sheeprwater seedlings will be grafted onto Sorbus aucuparia and therefore genetically identical.
AIM 4
ENHANCE BIODIVERSITY

OBJECTIVES:

i. New planting schemes to include species of high biodiversity value
ii. Target new planting to enhance ecological networks

For an urban forest to be resilient to pests, diseases and climate change a diverse range of species needs to be present.

To enhance biodiversity through the urban forest there are two considerations – the wildlife individual trees support, and the contribution the urban forest makes to ecological connectivity.

Trees vary in the number of species they support. Large, mature trees offer unique ecological roles not offered by small, younger trees, and species type can have a large influence on the number of wildlife species supported. For example, a mature oak can host over 420 species of invertebrates, which are a valuable food source to birds and mammals.

Figure 12 provides a summary of trees which support a high number of invertebrates. Selecting trees which support high biodiversity will increase the urban forest’s contribution to nature conservation in Burton. A full list of species which support high numbers of invertebrates is provided in Appendix VI.

Ecological links and networks are vital to create ‘stepping stones’ for wildlife to move through the area, ensuring that populations do not become isolated and therefore vulnerable.

The dense nature of built development in Burton means that, aside from the river and canal there is low ecological connectivity in the town.

A string of Sites of Biological Importance (SBIs - Local Wildlife Sites of county value) indicate the importance of the River Trent floodplain through Burton. Scalpcliffe Hill Local Nature Reserve and SBI supports a small area of ancient woodland, species-rich grassland and scattered mature trees, including recently planted woodland. The Nature Reserve is connected to the Trent Valley Washlands and to further greenspace but the greenspace corridor does not link to open countryside.

The Trent and Mersey Canal represents another north/south corridor. Associated with the canal are small areas of scrub and grassland but it is mainly tightly surrounded by built development. These green corridors support such species as bats, otters, kingfishers, snipe, skylarks and rare insect species.

Winshill and Stapenhill, to the east of the Trent, support a network of open spaces of various kinds, including sports pitches, cemeteries, allotments and informal greenspace. There is a good proportion of mature gardens with tree cover. The western side of the town is more densely developed with green spaces being smaller, more isolated and with less tree cover.

The East Staffordshire Local Plan Planning for Change Green Infrastructure Study Update 2013 includes a Vision for 2021 that:

Burton upon Trent will be an attractive, green town with large areas of developing urban woodland, easily recognisable as the capital of The National Forest. This reputation, along with the realisation of the benefits provided by the River Trent, will make it a very desirable place to live and work with large areas of well-managed accessible woodland within cycling distance of the town.

The Green Infrastructure Study recognises the paucity of tree cover in Burton and the scope to improve ecological value. It recommends a Multi-Functional Parks Project to introduce features such as trees, ponds, rough grassland areas, interpretation boards and land art to provide a range of values for wildlife and community. There is potential for measures carried out under a strategic approach such as this to be funded by Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) or s106 payments from new development.

Figure 13 shows the green corridors where priority should be given to providing greater linkages for wildlife. Within these and elsewhere consideration of existing biodiversity value is required before planting is planned. Information can be obtained from Staffordshire Ecological Record, Staffordshire Wildlife Trust, Staffordshire County Council Environmental Advice Team and Burton Conservation Volunteers.
The landscape of Burton is characterised by flat topography with visual links of the landform and land uses of surrounding areas. Typically the landscape is characterised by trees associated with waterside planting, along the river and dyke courses. The predominantly pastoral farming on the floodplain gives way to areas of arable cropping on higher ground. Hedgerow pattern varies from irregular to small areas with straight hedgerows and a regular pattern, with variable woodland cover.

The landscape of the town is visually contained by built development which tends to occur adjacent to the floodplain and this, along with pressures relating to development, considerably change the character of the landscape.

The town contains several mature woodland blocks, these include the ancient Scalpley Wood, which forms part of Scalpcliffe Hill Local Nature Reserve and Waterloo Clump.

The CAVAT valuation of £1,126 million for Burton reveals the importance of public trees in terms of amenity valuation in parks, cemeteries and public spaces.

The National Forest Company and partner organisations are increasing the town’s tree cover through the planting of areas of former grassland or agricultural land and the effects of this planting will become more noticeable as the trees mature, in particular in and adjacent to the Trent corridor where significant areas of new woodland have been planted.

Green spaces have also been shown to reduce crime levels particularly in deprived communities (Bell et al.). The East Staffordshire Local Plan Green Infrastructure Study identifies key green spaces, which is summarised in Figure 14.

Woodland planting has a key role to play and priority should be given to identifying suitable areas for planting within the identified key green spaces and consideration given to species selection in character with the landscape such as black poplars within the river floodplain.
Urban forests can bring a range of benefits for physical and mental health and wellbeing by reducing pollution levels, buffering noise and providing green spaces for exercise. These can all assist in reducing stress, anxiety and mental fatigue and providing cleaner air.

Research has found that particulate levels on tree-lined streets can be up to 60% lower than those without trees. Street trees have also been associated with a lower prevalence of asthma in children (Lovasi et al.). A study which classified the population of England on the basis of income deprivation and exposure to green space found that health inequalities related to income deprivation were lower in populations living in the greenest areas. It also concluded socio-economic inequalities were reduced in neighbourhoods with good access to greenspace (Mitchell et al.).

In Burton it is estimated that each year trees and shrubs remove 23 tonnes of air pollution (ozone, carbon monoxide, nitrogen dioxide, sulphur dioxide and particulate matter less than 2.5 microns (PM2.5)). Despite this, air pollution levels remain high in and around the town centre as shown in Figures 15 and 16 which illustrate the levels of nitrous oxides and PM 2.5 in Burton. Planting in the areas of highest pollution should be considered a priority where improving air quality is the primary aim.

Trees with a large leaf area achieve the highest pollution capture. A large total leaf surface area can occur because a species has a dense canopy or because the leaf surface is ‘rough’ (lots of ridges or hairs) (Nature Conservancy). Mature willow, oak, sycamore and ash currently provide the greatest pollution capture for Burton.

Protecting buildings from harsh weather conditions can improve living conditions and help keep people healthier throughout the year. Trees can play an important part by controlling the temperature of buildings through providing summer shading and protection from wind in the winter. The benefits trees can deliver for human health are outlined above. The greatest benefits are always associated with the largest trees but it is the population as a whole which delivers the full range of benefits. It should also be noted whilst evergreen trees generally have lower annual pollution removal in comparison to some deciduous species, they do remove pollution all year round when deciduous trees are not in leaf.

The density of planting can also be important in high pollution areas. In addition to capturing pollution trees can reduce air circulation, trapping pollution in and under the canopy. Care should therefore be taken when planting trees near major emission sources to ensure enough spacing between tree canopies to allow wind flow between trees (Nature Conservancy).
Nitrogen Oxides background concentration. Annual mean (µg m⁻³ as NO₂) 2012

The annual mean is the average concentration of a pollutant measured over one year. Nitrogen dioxide has a variety of environmental and health impacts. It is a respiratory irritant which may exacerbate asthma and possibly increase susceptibility to infections. The UK meets the 2010 ceilings for emissions in EU and international legislation to reduce emissions of nitrogen oxides. The revised Gothenburg Protocol requires the UK to reduce nitrogen oxides by 55 per cent compared to 2005 emissions by 2020.

PM2.5 background concentration. Annual mean (µg m⁻³) 2012

The annual mean is the average concentration of a pollutant measured over one year. Airborne PM includes a wide range of particle size and different chemical constituents. It consists of both primary components, which are emitted directly into the atmosphere, and secondary components, which are formed within the atmosphere as a result of chemical reactions. Of greatest concern to public health are the particles small enough to be inhaled into the deepest part of the lung. The revised Gothenburg Protocol requires the UK to reduce emissions of PM2.5 by 30 per cent compared to 2005 emissions by 2020.
AIM 7
INCREASE THE CONTRIBUTION OF THE URBAN FOREST TO THE LOCAL ECONOMY AND MAXIMISE OPPORTUNITIES FROM NEW DEVELOPMENTS

OBJECTIVES:

i. Ensure that all development proposals take into consideration tree cover by retention of existing trees and mitigation planting.
ii. Incorporate planting of trees capable of becoming larger mature specimens into new developments where appropriate
iii. Prepare a planting guide for new developments
iv. Support the regeneration and improvement of areas through amenity planting

Urban forests can make areas more attractive places to live and as such can contribute to the urban economy by attracting inward investment. Places landscaped with trees have been shown to increase the value of properties (Cabe). Educational and business outcomes can also improve as people concentrate better after spending time in nature, or even looking at scenes of nature (Forestry and Woodlands Advisory Committee).

Research in Glasgow showed regeneration using green infrastructure of a run-down area (negative aesthetics and perception) caused house prices to increase by 111% (Gen Consulting). Figure 17 identifies the most deprived areas. Planting in these areas could contribute to the multiple benefits urban forests can have in regenerating deprived communities.

Urban forest can be used not only to enhance and regenerate existing places, but should also be considered when planning new developments. The East Staffordshire Local Plan has allocated large areas of land for development within or adjacent to the study area, with a proposal to develop 7000 new homes between 2012-2031. A high percentage of the current tree population (17%) is on land identified as being vacant which could become the focus for development, potentially threatening some 17,415 trees. The construction of new homes should also be regarded as an opportunity to incorporate suitable planting schemes and should be consistent with East Staffordshire Local Plan Strategic Policy 26. This policy specifies new developments should include significant amounts of new planting to reflect their location within The National Forest. This alone will make a substantial contribution to increasing canopy cover in the town over the life of the project.

Other key national and local policies encouraging planting and good design include Neighbourhood Plans, Chapter 1 of the East Staffordshire Design Guide and Section 7 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

Space for tree planting in most new developments is at a premium with the streets or gardens only having the capacity to support small ornamental trees. Space for large canopy species such as oak, beech and lime is rarely included in new smaller scale developments although there is greater capacity in urban extensions. Inclusion of tree planting within strategic open space for new major housing and industrial development is therefore of key importance if larger canopy tree cover in Burton is to be maintained and increased. As the town expands, inclusion for new/retained green infrastructure, connecting to the existing network, will be essential if the vision is to be attained.

Figure 17 identifies potential and proposed developments. These development sites provide key opportunities for tree planting to form a key part of the development designs.

Potential and Proposed Development Sites

© Copyright East Staffordshire District Council 2017. You are not permitted to copy, sublicense, distribute or sell any of this data to third parties in any form. Use of this data is subject to the terms and conditions shown at www.staffordshire.gov.uk/maps.
AIM 8
INCREASE THE CONTRIBUTION OF THE URBAN FOREST TO CLIMATE CHANGE RESILIENCE AND MITIGATION

OBJECTIVES:
1. Plant species which will be resilient to the changing climate
2. Plant species which provide adaptation measures to reduce the impacts of a changing climate
3. Plant species with the ability for high carbon storage and sequestration

The UK weather is getting more extreme. Over the last decade, we have seen a record heatwave, record cold winters and record flooding. The outcomes of climate change are largely unknown. Predictions forecast more abnormal, violent and unpredictable weather events coupled with an increase in day and night temperatures.

The urban forest can help to provide adaptation measures to reduce the effects of climate change impacts through:

1. Reducing surface runoff
Surface runoff can be a cause for concern in urban areas as it can lead to localised flooding and contribute to pollution of watercourses. Figure 18 identifies the areas most susceptible to surface water flooding. The canopies of trees and shrubs intercept precipitation, while their root systems promote infiltration and storage in the soil. One hundred mature trees can capture over one million litres of rainwater each year. For every 5% of tree cover in a community, storm water run-off can be reduced by 2%. It is estimated Burton’s trees reduce run-off by 23,700 cubic meters a year by holding rainfall in the canopy. Elm, oak, willow and sycamore are the species providing the greatest runoff capture in Burton.

Tree planting should be considered as part of an overall surface water reduction strategy. For example the opportunity should be taken when tree planting to retrofit other forms of sustainable drainage systems (SUDS) where possible, such as swales, ponds, depressions to hold back water etc. However, tree planting schemes should also take into account that Burton has a complex network of culverts, open watercourses, diverted channels, sluices, pumps and basins and these require to be kept clear of tree roots and debris to allow clear flows.
ii. Carbon storage

The term carbon storage refers to the quantity of carbon currently held in tree tissue (roots, stems, and branches). Carbon storage depends not only on the number of trees present, but also their characteristics. The mass of the tree is extremely important as larger trees store more carbon throughout their lives. Total carbon storage for Burton’s trees is estimated at 19,800 tonnes. The largest trees surveyed in Burton’s were oak and willow which also have been calculated to be storing the greatest amount of carbon. For example, one of the surveyed oak trees is calculated to be storing 1,810 kg of carbon, 10 times the average amount of carbon stored in Burton’s trees. This emphasises the importance of retaining mature trees.

iii. Carbon sequestration

The carbon sequestration rate refers to the estimated annual amount of carbon removed by trees. It is estimated Burton’s trees sequester 722 tonnes of carbon a year. One of Burton’s mature oaks is sequestering the largest amount of carbon at 66 kg per year. Beech, birch, willow and sycamore also have high levels of carbon sequestration relative to the tree size.

iv. Cooling air temperatures

Towns and cities tend to have higher temperatures than rural areas due to lower levels of vegetation and the increased presence of built structures absorbing heat - a phenomenon termed the urban heat island effect. Heat-related stress from heat islands accounts for around 1,100 premature deaths per year in the UK. An estimated 8–11 extra deaths occur each day for each degree increase in air temperature during UK summer heatwaves (Doick and Hutchings). The occurrence and intensity of extreme heat events is set to increase under a changing climate, and these may be more readily experienced in urban areas. Tree species with a high leaf area are particularly effective through casting denser shade (Nature Conservancy), with large trees providing the greatest influence on air and surface temperatures. Research suggests that even moderate (10%) increases in tree and shrub canopy cover within cities can aid adaptation to the adverse effects projected under a changing climate and counter a projected 2 °C increase in ambient temperatures (Gill et al. 2007).

v. Energy consumption

Large deciduous trees around buildings can reduce energy use in buildings by acting as a wind break and allowing sunlight to penetrate buildings during winter months and provide shade during the summer. Evergreen trees can provide similar benefits, although creates more shading in winter.

As an example, in the US the shade effect of trees can lower the surface temperature of an outside wall by 17°C, lowering indoor air temperatures by 0.5°C and air-conditioning costs by 25–80%. At UK latitudes, trees on the west-facing side of a building provide good amounts of shade in summer and comparatively little in winter. Identical trees positioned on the south-facing side of a building cast relatively more shade in winter, a trend contrary to that required to reduce energy consumption (Santamour), considerations pertinent to any strategy to increase Burton’s tree canopy cover.

To mitigate against the worst effects of predicted climate changes the tolerances of trees to be planted need to be considered. The characteristics to withstand flooding, tolerate heat, especially reflected heat and to provide shade are all of paramount importance.

**Implementation Plan 2017-2022**

The aims and objectives provide a framework for managing Burton’s urban forest. This section identifies some specific actions that are recommended to conserve the urban forest and maximise its benefits to the community. The implementation plan considers the study area as a whole, but also identifies priority zones (see figure 19) where actions can be targeted to have the greatest positive impact. Implementation details are provided for the first 5 years in Table 5. It is anticipated these will be reviewed and refreshed for years 5-10.

Table 5. Implementation actions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Action Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>Plant 1000 new trees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>Build a arboretum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>Increase tree diversity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>Implement a tree care plan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Given there are multiple aims for the management strategy and local conditions vary across Burton, specific recommendations about species selection and locations have not been provided as these need to be balanced with other priorities. For example, priorities for Trent floodplain habitats include grassland and wetlands and increased woodland planting may not be appropriate. A range of trees with information on how these may contribute to the aims is provided in Appendix III as a guide.

This plan will be delivered by the Burton Tree project steering group which includes the following organisations: East Staffordshire County Council, Staffordshire County Council, the National Forest Company, Staffordshire Wildlife Trust and Burton Conservation Volunteers.

Total carbon storage for Burton trees is estimated at 19,800 tonnes.
# TABLE 5
## FIVE YEAR IMPLEMENTATION PLAN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTION</th>
<th>WHERE</th>
<th>DELIVERY YEAR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1. SURVEY AND ASSESSMENT</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1 Survey open spaces</td>
<td>Priority zones</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engage volunteers to survey publicly owned land to identify potential areas for planting (whips and standards)</td>
<td>Study area</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2 Survey veteran trees</td>
<td>Study area</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engage volunteers to identify the location and general health of veteran trees on publicly owned land</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3 Tree Preservation Orders (TPO)</td>
<td>East Staffordshire</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review TPOs and protect trees as appropriate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2. PLANT</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1 Planting schedule for publicly owned land</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.1 New Planting Schedule</td>
<td>Priority zones</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Produce and implement a collaborative phased plan of planting areas (whips and standards) consistent with the aims of the management strategy. Engage with volunteers for planting whips in open spaces</td>
<td>Study area</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.2 Amenity planting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify retrofitting opportunities in association with street improvements to support the regeneration and improvement of areas</td>
<td>Priority zones</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2 Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.1 Awareness raising</td>
<td>Study area</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop and implement media plan (all partners)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.2 Planting guide for developers and highways</td>
<td>East Staffordshire</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design a toolkit for tree selection, planting and maintenance for use by developers and highways</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.3 Planting guide for residents</td>
<td>Study area</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop guidance for residents on planting and managing trees</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.4 School projects</td>
<td>Study area</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design a learning plan for schools on seed collecting and planting and encourage participation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3 Planting projects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3.1 Tree Planting scheme</td>
<td>Study area</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop a free tree planting scheme and promote to local residents in the winter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3.2 Buy a tree for Christmas</td>
<td>Study area</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual promotional campaign to encourage gifting trees for Christmas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3.3 Street names</td>
<td>Study area</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify streets with tree names and investigate opportunity to encourage planting related to the street name</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4 Project branding</td>
<td>Study Area</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Display the ‘Burton Tree Project’ brand for trees planted in association with this project</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3. MANAGE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1 Procurement</td>
<td>Study area</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensure all tree stock purchased has been appropriately quarantined</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4. EVALUATE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1 Review implementation plan</td>
<td>Study area</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review implementation plan and schedule resurvey at year 10 using i-Tree-Eco methodology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Priority zones should be considered as a priority for planting, subject to a full assessment on competing priorities and identification of any constraints to planting.

These areas are:

ZONE 1 – CENTRAL BURTON – HIGHEST PRIORITY AREA FOR PLANTING

This zone contains areas of deprivation, high levels of pollution, areas prone to surface water flooding and an important green corridor. Planting in this area should be considered the highest priority. This is a heavily urbanised area and the potential for larger scale woodland planting is limited. The area also falls within a green infrastructure corridor and the potential to provide better linkages should be investigated. Priority should be to protect and enhance the current trees and to investigate the potential for new planting of street trees and urban green spaces. Residents and businesses could also contribute through planting on their private land.

ZONE 2

This zone experiences high levels of pollution and includes the A38 and Derby Road, it has several areas prone to surface water flooding and falls within an important green corridor. The area is a mix of residential, industrial and agricultural. Mature tree cover is already present along the A38 corridor. There is the potential for a range of planting within this zone.

ZONE 3

This zone experiences high levels of pollution and includes the A38, it has several areas prone to surface water flooding and falls within an important green corridor. The area is predominantly a mix of agricultural and industrial. Existing planting in this area is sparse and the potential for more extensive woodland planting may be possible. There is a large scale housing and employment development proposed. Outline permission has been granted discussions over the detail of individual landscaping schemes are ongoing and will be approved through reserved matters over the coming years.

ZONE 4

This area contains an area of high deprivation, an important green corridor and areas prone to surface water flooding, especially within the residential areas. There is a mix of residential, industrial and agricultural land use. The agricultural land falls mostly on floodplain for the River Trent which may limit the potential for large scale planting in this zone. Priority should be to protect and enhance the current trees and to investigate the potential for new planting of street trees and urban greenspaces. Residents and businesses could also contribute through planting on their private land.
### APPENDIX 1

**FULL SPECIES LIST, BY ‘IMPORTANCE VALUE’**

**TREES AND SHRUBS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scientific Name</th>
<th>Common Name</th>
<th>Percent Population</th>
<th>Importance Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fagus sylvatica</td>
<td>Common beech</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>27.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acer pseudoplatanus</td>
<td>Sycamore</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>17.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fraxinus excelsior</td>
<td>Common ash</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>15.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crataegus monogyna</td>
<td>Hawthorn</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>13.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Betula pendula</td>
<td>Silver birch</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>12.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quercus robur</td>
<td>English oak</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>11.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ulmus glabra</td>
<td>Wych elm</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>11.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acer platanoides</td>
<td>Norway maple</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salix spp. (generic)</td>
<td>Willow spp</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cupressocyparis leylandii</td>
<td>Leyland cypress</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salix fragilis</td>
<td>Crack willow</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acer campestre</td>
<td>Field maple</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ilex aquifolium</td>
<td>Common holly</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cupressus sempervirens</td>
<td>Italian cypress</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pinus spp. (generic)</td>
<td>Pine spp</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cotoneaster</td>
<td>Cotoneaster spp</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malus spp. (generic)</td>
<td>Apple spp</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salix caprea</td>
<td>Goat willow</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Populus alba</td>
<td>White poplar</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tilia x europaea</td>
<td>Common lime</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sorbus aucuparia</td>
<td>Rowan</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cupressus</td>
<td>Cypress spp</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texus baccata</td>
<td>English yew</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prunus spinosa</td>
<td>Blackthorn</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prunus laurocerasus</td>
<td>Cherry laurel</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pinus sylvestris</td>
<td>Scots pine</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Populus nigra ‘Italica’</td>
<td>Lombardy poplar</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salix purpurea</td>
<td>Purple Osier willow</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quercus petraea</td>
<td>Sessile oak</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prunus avium</td>
<td>Sweet cherry</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sambucus nigra</td>
<td>Purple Elder</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carpinus</td>
<td>Hornbeam spp</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salix alba</td>
<td>White willow</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sorbus aria</td>
<td>Whitebeam</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alnus x fallacina</td>
<td>Alder</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prunus spp. (generic)</td>
<td>Cherry spp</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scientific Name</th>
<th>Common Name</th>
<th>Percent Population</th>
<th>Importance Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Salix x sepulcralis Simonkai</td>
<td>Weeping willow</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fagus sylvatica ‘Purpurea’</td>
<td>Copper beech</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abies spp. (generic)</td>
<td>Fir spp</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Picea abies</td>
<td>Norway spruce</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catalpa bignonioides</td>
<td>Southern catalpa</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chamaerops spp. (generic)</td>
<td>Fan palm spp</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ligustrum spp. (generic)</td>
<td>Privet spp</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Viburnum spp. (generic)</td>
<td>Viburnum spp</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buddleja spp. (generic)</td>
<td>Butterfly Bush</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prunus cerasifera</td>
<td>Cherry plum</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pyracantha koidzumii</td>
<td>Formosa firethorn</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eucalyptus obliqua</td>
<td>Messmate stringybark</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Araucaria araucana</td>
<td>Monkey puzzle tree</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robinia spp. (generic)</td>
<td>Robinia spp</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alnus spp. (generic)</td>
<td>Alder spp</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eugenia monticola</td>
<td>Bird Cherry</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camellia japonica</td>
<td>Camellia</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syringa vulgaris</td>
<td>Common lilac</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acer spp. (generic)</td>
<td>Maple spp</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reynosia uncinata</td>
<td>Sloe</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### APPENDIX 2

**SUMMARY OF MANAGEMENT STRATEGY AIMS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aim 1: Increase overall tree cover</th>
<th>Aim 2: Develop a more diverse age structure</th>
<th>Aim 3: Improve the species diversity to increase resilience</th>
<th>Aim 4: Enhance biodiversity</th>
<th>Aim 5: Enhance the sense of place and amenity value</th>
<th>Aim 6: Increase the contribution of the urban forest to public health outcomes</th>
<th>Aim 7: Increase the contribution of the urban forest to the local economy and maximise opportunities from new developments</th>
<th>Aim 8: Increase the contribution of the urban forest to climate change resilience and mitigation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Increase tree cover by creating at least 30 hectares of new planting</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survey and create an inventory of veteran trees</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review the use of Tree Preservation Orders to ensure that trees stature trees are protected as appropriate</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encourage a proportion of all new species selected for planting to have the genetic capacity to grow into a large mature tree</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design for species diversity in line with good practice for resilience</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purchase British grown trees where possible. Any imported species should have been appropriately quarantined</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New planting schemes to include species of high biodiversity value</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target new planting to enhance ecological networks</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locate planting to improve green spaces</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respect the landscape character in planting design and species selection</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use planting to buffer new development to maintain the wider landscape qualities</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhance the sense of place, particularly in more deprived parts of the town through increasing tree cover</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase ‘greenness’ in residential areas to improve mental health and wellbeing</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seek to plant trees which have the greatest capacity to capture pollution in the urban centre where air quality is poorest</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explore initiatives to encourage residents to increase tree and shrub cover in gardens</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensure that all development proposals take into consideration tree cover by retention of existing trees and mitigation planting.</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incorporate planting of trees capable of becoming larger mature specimens into new developments where appropriate</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prepare a planting guide for new developments</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support the regeneration and improvement of areas through amenity planting</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plant species which will be resilient to the changing climate</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plant species which support adaptation measures to reduce the impacts of a changing climate</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plant species with the ability for high carbon storage and sequestration</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMMON NAME</td>
<td>BOTANICAL NAME</td>
<td>NATIVE</td>
<td>PRESENT IN BURTON NOW</td>
<td>SUITABLE STREET TREE</td>
<td>SUITABLE FOR HEDGE PLANTING AS HEDGEROW SHRUB</td>
<td>SIZE AT MATURITY</td>
<td>LONG LIVED TREES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field Maple</td>
<td>Acer campestre</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔/M</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norway Maple</td>
<td>Acer platanoides</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sycamore</td>
<td>Acer platanoides</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red Maple</td>
<td>Acer rubrum</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horse Chestnut</td>
<td>Amelanchier arborea</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European Alder</td>
<td>Alnus glutinosa</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snowy Mespil</td>
<td>Amelanchier arborea</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silver Birch</td>
<td>Betula pendula</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birch</td>
<td>Betula pubescens</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European Hornbeam</td>
<td>Carpinus betulus</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweet Chestnut</td>
<td>Castanea sativa</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European Filbert (Hazelnut)</td>
<td>Corylus avellana</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
- "✔" indicates suitability for the conditions listed.
- "S/M" indicates suitable for smaller or medium gardens.
- "L" indicates suitable for larger gardens or parks.
- "M" indicates suitable for medium-sized gardens.
- "S" indicates suitable for small gardens.
- "Streetwise" indicates a recommended variety for street planting.
Appendix 4
PESTS AND DISEASES –
AN ASSESSMENT OF RISK TO BURTON’S TREES

Pests and diseases are a serious threat to urban forests. Severe outbreaks have occurred within living memory, with Dutch Elm Disease killing approximately 30 million trees in the UK (Webber 2010). Climate change may exacerbate this problem, ameliorating the climate for some pests and diseases (Forestry Commission 2014). Assessing the risk pests and diseases pose to urban forests is of paramount importance.

A risk matrix was used to determine the potential impact of a pest or disease should it become established in the urban tree population of Burton on a single genus (Table 1) and for multiple genera (Table 2).

Tables 3 provides an impact assessment of the potential impact on Burton’s trees from pests and diseases currently present in the UK. Table 4 considers known pests and diseases not currently known to be in the UK, although considered to be a potential threat.

### Table 1
**Risk matrix used for the probability of a pest or disease becoming prevalent in the Burton urban forest on a single genus (one or more species).**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pest/Pathogen</th>
<th>Species affected</th>
<th>Prevalence in the UK</th>
<th>Prevalence in Midlands</th>
<th>Risk of spreading to Midlands</th>
<th>Population at risk (%)</th>
<th>CAVAT value of sampled trees (£)</th>
<th>Stored carbon value trees (£)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Giant polypore</td>
<td>Primarily Quercus spp., Fagus spp., Acer spp., Aesculus spp., Prunus spp.</td>
<td>Common in urban areas</td>
<td>Common in urban areas</td>
<td>High – already present</td>
<td>28.7%</td>
<td>309,905</td>
<td>440,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chalara dieback of ash</td>
<td>Fraxinus excelsior, F. angustifolia</td>
<td>Cases across the UK</td>
<td>Confirmed cases in Midlands</td>
<td>High – already present</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>115,911</td>
<td>78,876</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gypsy Moth</td>
<td>Primarily Quercus spp., secondarily Carpinus betulus, F. sylvatica, C. avellana, B. pendula and P. avium</td>
<td>London, Aylesbury and Dorset</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Medium risk – slow spreading</td>
<td>30.5%</td>
<td>419,246</td>
<td>516,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phytophthora kernoviae</td>
<td>F. sylvatica, Ilex aquifolium, Q. robur, Q. ilex</td>
<td>Mainly SW England and Wales</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Medium risk</td>
<td>24.7%</td>
<td>280,515</td>
<td>415,512</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phytophthora ramorum</td>
<td>Q. cerris, Q. rubra, Q. ilex, F. sylvatica, C. avellana, C. decidua, L. europaea</td>
<td>Many UK sites, particularly in S Wales and SW England</td>
<td>Some cases reported in the Midlands</td>
<td>High – already present</td>
<td>21.6%</td>
<td>185,823</td>
<td>144,355</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phytophthora kernoviae</td>
<td>F. sylvatica, Ilex aquifolium, Q. robur, Q. ilex</td>
<td>Mainly SW England and Wales</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Medium risk</td>
<td>24.7%</td>
<td>280,515</td>
<td>415,512</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acute oak decline</td>
<td>Quercus robur, pedunculosa</td>
<td>SE England, Midlands, East Anglia, Welsh border</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>High – already present</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td>81,752</td>
<td>274,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oak processersomy moth</td>
<td>Quercus spp.</td>
<td>Southern England</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Medium, small colonies are containable</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td>81,752</td>
<td>274,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doliostroma (red band) needle blight</td>
<td>Pinus nigra spp.</td>
<td>Northern England</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>High – already present</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>23,108</td>
<td>10,664</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phytophthora alni</td>
<td>Alnus spp.</td>
<td>Riparian ecosystems in the UK</td>
<td>Present on river systems</td>
<td>High – already present</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>9,770</td>
<td>4,551</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**TABLE 4**

**PEST AND DISEASES NOT CURRENTLY IN THE UK: IMPACT ASSESSMENT FOR BURTON’S URBAN FOREST**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pest/Pathogen</th>
<th>Species affected</th>
<th>Prevalence in the UK</th>
<th>Prevalence in Midlands</th>
<th>Risk of spreading to Midlands</th>
<th>Population at risk (%)</th>
<th>CAVAT value of sampled trees (£)</th>
<th>Stored carbon value trees (£)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spruce bark beetle</td>
<td>Picea spp.</td>
<td>Mainly W. England, Southern Scotland and Wales</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Medium risk</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>2,435</td>
<td>874</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian longhorn beetle</td>
<td>Many broadleaf species (see Appendix IV)</td>
<td>None (previous outbreaks contained)</td>
<td>Common in urban areas</td>
<td>Medium risk – climate may be suitable</td>
<td>81.0%</td>
<td>786,579</td>
<td>576,178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oak Wilt</td>
<td>Quercus spp.</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Medium risk</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td>81,752</td>
<td>274,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elm yellows</td>
<td>Ulmus spp.</td>
<td>None (outbreak in 2014)</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Medium risk</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>24,944</td>
<td>15,723</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Xylella fastidiosa</td>
<td>Quercus rubra; Ulmus glabra; Platanus occidentalis and Quercus rubra</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Medium risk</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
<td>88,286</td>
<td>287,933</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phytophthora sikkimensis</td>
<td>Alnus spp.</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Medium risk</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>9,770</td>
<td>4,551</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**APPENDIX 5**

**FURTHER INFORMATION ON THE PESTS AND DISEASES**

**ACUTE OAK DECLINE**

Acute oak decline (AOD) affects mature trees (>50 years old) of both native oak species (common oak and sessile oak). Over the past four years, the reported incidents of stem bleeding, a potential symptom of AOD, have been increasing. The incidence of AOD in Britain is un-quantified at this stage but estimates put the figure at a few thousand affected trees. The condition seems to be most prevalent in the Midlands and the South East of England as far west as Wales. So far there are no confirmed cases in Staffordshire and as the disease spreads slowly acute oak decline poses a medium risk to the Burton’s urban forest.

**ASIAN LONGHORN BEETLE**

Asian Longhorn Beetle (ALB) is a major pest of Burton’s urban forest.

**Chalara dieback of Ash**

Ash dieback, caused by the fungus *Hynenoscyphus fraxineus*, targets common and narrow leaved ash. Young trees are particularly vulnerable and can be killed within one growing season of symptoms becoming visible. Older trees take longer to succumb, but can die from the infection after several seasons. *H. fraxineus* was first recorded in the UK in 2012 in Buckinghamshire and has now been reported across the UK, including in urban areas. Ash dieback poses a threat to 5.2% of Burton’s urban forest.

**Dothistroma needle blight**

Dothistroma (red band) needle blight is the most significant disease of coniferous trees in the North of the UK. The disease causes premature needle defoliation, resulting in loss of yield and, in severe cases, tree death. It is now found in many forests growing susceptible pine species, with Corsican, lodgepole and, more recently, Scots pine all being affected. While there are no reported cases of red band needle blight on urban trees, 0.6% of Burton’s urban forest is potentially at threat from it.

**Elm yellows**

Elm yellows (*E. twig* or *E. leaf* is a disease of elm trees caused by a type of bacteria known as a phytoplasma. The disease is not present in the UK although we had an outbreak in 2014. The disease causes a range of symptoms that could include yellowing, dwarving and premature shedding of leaves, formation of "witches’ brooms" at the tips of twigs and branches, early opening of buds, and in some occasions reddish colouration of the foliage. In very susceptible elms the phloem (inner bark) of the tree is attacked (hence the other name of the diseases: elm phloem necrosis), effectively girdling and stopping the flow of water and nutrients. Elm yellows disease can be spread by insects such as leafhoppers, and by the movement of infected plants. Symptoms can easily be confused for symptoms of Dutch elm disease (DED). However, trees affected by DED will die back and die rapidly, whereas EY could be expected to cause symptoms which do not result in the death of the tree. Elm yellows can affect healthy elm trees that are resistant DED. If Elm yellows become established in the UK it would pose a threat to 18% of Burton’s urban forest.
EMERALD ASH BORER
There is no evidence to date that emerald ash borer (EAB) is present in the UK, but the increase in global movement of imported wood and wood packaging poses a significant risk of its accidental introduction. EAB has been reported in Russia and is moving West and South at a rate of 30-40km per year, perhaps aided by vehicles (Straw et al. 2013). EAB has had a devastating effect in the USA due to its accidental introduction and could add to pressures already imposed on ash trees from diseases such as Chalara dieback of ash. Emerald Ash borer poses a potential future threat to 5.2% of Burton’s urban forest.

GIANT POLYPORE
Giant polypore (Meripilus giganteus) is a fungus that can cause internal decay in trees without any external symptoms (Schmidt 2006), causing trees to potentially topple or collapse (Adlam 2014). Giant polypore predominantly affects hardwoods such as horse chestnut, beech, cherry, mountain ash and oak. 28.7% of Burton’s urban forest could be vulnerable to giant polypore.

SWEET CHESTNUT BLIGHT
Sweet chestnut blight is a fungal infection affecting sweet chestnut (Castanea sativa and C. dentata). Q. robur, Q. petraea and Q. ilex may also be infected, though in these species it is rarely fatal.

OAK PROCESSIONARY MOTH
Established breeding populations of oak processionary moth (OPM) have been found in South and West South London and in Berkshire. It is thought that OPM has been spread on nursery trees. The outbreak in London is now beyond eradication, whereas efforts to stop the spread out of London and to remove those in Berkshire are underway. The caterpillars cause serious defoliation of oak trees and the foliage of affected trees rapidly wilts and turns brown. Some of the dead leaves can persist on the trees for long periods. Occasionally individual leaves may become brown from the leaf apex, with the base of the leaf remaining green. Some diffuse staining may be observed in the outermost xylem ring. Local spread of C. fagaracem is from tree to tree through root connections or root grafts, resulting in expanding infection centres. Above ground and over longer distances, the speed of spread is dependent on the availability and effectiveness of suitable insect vectors. In urban areas where susceptible oaks are abundant, the impact on property or other social values has also been significant. In central Texas, for instance, oak wilt has caused considerable decline in urban and rural property values through landscape degradation, shade loss and a resulting decline in amenity and garden Lawson Cypress.

OAK WILT
It is caused by the fungus Ceratocystis fagaracem and is currently only known to be present in the UK, although Eurosia, oak wilt has been described in the USA and Canada. Eurosia is susceptible and can be killed by the disease. It causes a vascular wilt disease which has resulted in the mortality of many thousands of native oak species in the north and midland parts of the UK. Phytophthora alni (alder weevil) and Ceratocystis fagaracem have resulted in the decline of Lawson Cypress and other fastigiate species of conifers in midland and southern England. The foliage of affected trees rapidly wilts and turns brown. Some of the dead leaves can persist on the trees for long periods. Occasionally individual leaves may become brown from the leaf apex, with the base of the leaf remaining green. Some diffuse staining may be observed in the outermost xylem ring. Local spread of C. fagaracem is from tree to tree through root connections or root grafts, resulting in expanding infection centres. Above ground and over longer distances, the speed of spread is dependent on the availability and effectiveness of suitable insect vectors. In urban areas where susceptible oaks are abundant, the impact on property or other social values has also been significant. In central Texas, for instance, oak wilt has caused considerable decline in urban and rural property values through landscape degradation, shade loss and a resulting decline in amenity and garden Lawson Cypress.

PHYSOPHTHORA ALNI
Phytophthora alni affects all alder species in Britain which was first discovered in the country in 1996. Phytophthora alni is now widespread in the riparian ecosystems in the UK where alder commonly grows. On average, the disease incidence is highest in southeast England. Phytophthora alni has also been found in some of the alder populations that occur along English rivers. Phytophthora alni poses a threat to 0.6% of Burton’s urban forest.

PHYSOPHTHORA KERNOVIAE
Phytophthora kernoviae (PK) was first discovered in Cornwall in 2003. The disease primarily infects rhododendron and bilberry (Vaccinium) and can cause lethal stem cankers on beesch. PK has not been found in the Midlands. Phytophthora kernoviae is deemed to pose a risk to 24.7% of Burton’s urban forest and also affects many of the shrub species identified in the survey.

PHYSOPHTHORA LATERALIS
The main host of Phytophthora lateralis is Lawson Cypress (Chamaecyparis lawsonia). It has also been discovered on an outbreak of P. kernoviae in southern England. It is caused by the fungus Ceratocystis fagaracem and is currently only known to be present in the UK, although Eurosia, oak wilt has been described in the USA and Canada. Eurosia is susceptible and can be killed by the disease. It causes a vascular wilt disease which has resulted in the mortality of many thousands of native oak species in the north and midland parts of the UK. Phytophthora alni (alder weevil) and Ceratocystis fagaracem have resulted in the decline of Lawson Cypress and other fastigiate species of conifers in midland and southern England. The foliage of affected trees rapidly wilts and turns brown. Some of the dead leaves can persist on the trees for long periods. Occasionally individual leaves may become brown from the leaf apex, with the base of the leaf remaining green. Some diffuse staining may be observed in the outermost xylem ring. Local spread of C. fagaracem is from tree to tree through root connections or root grafts, resulting in expanding infection centres. Above ground and over longer distances, the speed of spread is dependent on the availability and effectiveness of suitable insect vectors. In urban areas where susceptible oaks are abundant, the impact on property or other social values has also been significant. In central Texas, for instance, oak wilt has caused considerable decline in urban and rural property values through landscape degradation, shade loss and a resulting decline in amenity and garden Lawson Cypress.

PHYSOPHTHORA RAMORUM
Phytophthora ramorum was first found in the UK in 2002 and primarily affects species of oak (Turkey oak, Red oak and Holm oak), beech and sweet chestnut. However, it has also been known to occasionally infect European and hybrid larch and kills Japanese larch, Rhododendron is a major host, which aids the spread of the disease. A few cases have been identified in the Midlands. Phytophthora ramorum poses a threat to 21.6% of Burton’s urban forest.

PHYSOPHTHORA SISIKIOYENSI
Phytophthora sikiyounensis is a recently described species in the USA, isolated from stem lesions of Umbellularia californica and tanoak (Nothocarpus densiflorus) and from soil and stream water, in south-west Oregon. It has also been recorded as an aggressive pathogen of alders in urban environments. It has been reported causing stem lesions on Italian alder (Alnus cordata) in California, it was isolated from cankers on planted black alder (Alnus glutinosa) in Australia and it was detected in the UK on European alder (Alnus incana) causing stem bleeding cankers. The symptoms are similar to those caused by P. alni. If Phytophthora sikiyounensis became established in the UK it would pose a threat to 0.6% of Burton’s urban forest.

XYLELLA FASTIDIOSA
Xylella fastidiosa is a bacterium that affects its host plants by invading their water-conducting systems and blocks or restricts the movement of water and nutrients through the plant, resulting in wilting, stunting, dieback or death. There are different subspecies of X. fastidiosa X. fastidiosa spp. multiplex has a wide host range that include British native pedunculate oak (Quercus robur) and wych elm (Ulmus glabra), as well as plane (Platanus orientalis) and northern red oak (Q. rubra). Xylella is exclusively transmitted by xylem-fluid feeding insects from the Cacallidae and Ceropidae families. There are several species of insects in the UK which could vector (spread) X. fastidiosa, including the common frog hopper (Philaeus spumarius). The symptoms on infected trees are marginal leaf scorch (browning) often showing a yellow edge to the browned areas, wilting of foliage, dieback of branches and death. If Xylella fastidiosa became established in the UK it would pose a threat to 0.65% of Burton’s urban forest.

GREAT SPRUCE BARK BEEFETE
The great spruce bark beetle (Dendroctonus micans) damages spruce trees by tunnelling into the bark of the living trees to lay its eggs under the bark, and the developing larvae tunnel down into the inner woody layers. This weakens the tree, and in some cases can kill the tree. The great spruce bark beetle poses a threat to 0.6% of Burton’s urban forest.

GYPSY MOTH
Gypsy moth (GM), Lymantria dispar, is an important defoliator of a very wide range of trees and shrubs in mainland Europe, where it periodically reaches outbreak numbers. It can cause tree death if successive, serious defoliation occurs on a single tree. A small colony has persisted in northeast London since 1995 and a second breeding colony was found in Aylesbury, Buckinghamshire in the summer of 2005. Aside from these disparate colonies, GM range in Europe does not reach as far North as the UK. Some researchers suggest that the climate in the UK is currently suitable for GM should it arrive here and that it would become more so if global temperatures rise (Vanhanen et al., 2007). However, the spread of gypsy moth in the USA has been slow, invading less than a third of its potential range (Morin et al., 2005). If GM spread to the Midlands, it would pose a threat to 30.5% of Burton’s urban trees.
APPENDIX 6

Biodiversity benefits of different tree species

The number of species on insects associated with British trees: a re-analysis (Kennedy and Southwood)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Common Name</th>
<th>Scientific Name</th>
<th>Beetles</th>
<th>Flies</th>
<th>True Bugs</th>
<th>Wasps and Sawflies</th>
<th>Moths and Butterflies</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Willow spp</td>
<td>Salix spp</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English oak &amp; Sessile oak</td>
<td>Quercus robur &amp; Quercus petraea</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>432</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birch</td>
<td>Betula</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>334</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common Hawthorn</td>
<td>Crataegus monogyna</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poplar spp</td>
<td>Populus spp</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scots pine</td>
<td>Pinus sylvestris</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blackthorn</td>
<td>Prunus spinosa</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European alder</td>
<td>Alnus glutinosa</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elm</td>
<td>Ulmus</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European crabapple Malus sylvestris</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>118</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European filbert</td>
<td>Corylus avellana</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common beech</td>
<td>Fagus sylvatica</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norway spruce</td>
<td>Picea abies</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common ash</td>
<td>Fraxinus excelsior</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rowan</td>
<td>Sorbus aucuparia</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lime</td>
<td>Tilia</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field maple</td>
<td>Acer campestre</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European hornbeam Carpinus betulus</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>51</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sycamore</td>
<td>Acer pseudoplatanus</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European larch</td>
<td>Larix decidu</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common juniper</td>
<td>Juniperus communis</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fir spp</td>
<td>Abies</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweet chestnut</td>
<td>Castanea sativa</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common holly</td>
<td>Ilex aquifolium</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horsechestnut</td>
<td>Aesculus hippocastanum</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English walnut</td>
<td>Juglans regia</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English yew</td>
<td>Taxus baccata</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holly oak</td>
<td>Quercus/live ilex</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black locust</td>
<td>Robinia</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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