REPORT - WHITEHILL BURIAL GROUND

The tree survey (see tree survey attached to this report) was provided to the Landscape architect, along with the consultant arboriculturist's recommendation of clearing a small area, to thin some Nordic Spruce along the boundary, and to remove a dead ash. This will allow for better access as well as a larger area for burials.



The landscape architect revised the plan. It is now in keeping with expectations of a natural burial ground as well as in-line with the approved business plan. (See final plan attached to this report.)

A specialist tree surgeon was asked to propose a plan in which the designated trees would be addressed, but also in a way that would allow for reuse of the larger tree trunks for potential use as benches, and to create the log-pile area for wildlife. He has put forward a quote for the works.

In addition, some basic clearing will need to be done to prepare the first area for burials. The subsequent areas will be developed and planted over time.

The initial tree work and the clearing will need a budget of about £3,750. £2,310 of this was already funded by the Councillor Priority Grant received from Oxfordshire County Council (Cllr K Bulmer). The work was not able to commence until autumn because of nesting birds, but we must do this work as soon as possible (as agreed in the grant application).

It is **PROPOSED** that the council:

- 1. NOTE the tree survey of the new Natural Burial Ground section.
- 2. APPROVE final landscape design for the Natural Burial Ground section.
- 3. APPROVE the tree works and clearing works to be done (as outlined above) and allocate a budget for this of £3,750 (excl VAT) (£2,310 from the grant received and £1,440 from the designated EMR)
- 4. To delegate to the Clerk or the Burial Ground Clerk to approve the final quotes for the works listed above.

Cllr Bryan Urbick 2nd September 2025

4



Tree	Species	**	Stem		Crown	spread		Physiological condition	Structural	Age	Observations/ Management recommendations	Life	Category
no		Height	diameter	North	South	East	West		condition			expectancy	
T1	Wild cherry	16	180	1	3	3	1	G	G	M		40+	С
T2	Wild cherry	16	130	2	1	3	1	G	G	M		40+	С
Т3	Wild cherry	8	110	3	0	4	2	G	F	M	Squirrel damage to main stem. Poorly formed and suppressed.	10 - 20	С
T4	Wild cherry	17	220	2	1	0	6	G	G	M	Competition for light has led to a one sided form.	40+	С
T5	Norway maple	17	430	5	5	5	5	G	G	M	Ivy establishing on stem needs to be removed.	40+	B1 + B2
Т6	Wild cherry	18	470	1	3	3	4	G	F	M	Bifurcating stem has developed a cavity and is a potential weakness.	20 - 40	B2
T7	Wild cherry	17	160	4	0	3	0	G	F	M	Leaning stem.	20 - 40	С
Т8	Norway maple	17	590	4	5	6	6	G	G	M	Ivy on stem needs severing.	40+	B1 + B2
Т9	Beech	18	430	1	6	6	4	G	G	M		40+	B1 + B2
T10	Whitebeam	16	460	3	2	4	4	G	G	M	Some animal damage to bark. Ivy on stem needs severing.	40+	B1 + B2
T11	Norway maple	15	530	3	5	6	6	G	G	M	Roots girdling around the base of the tree (old container grown tree)	40+	B1 + B2
T12	Norway maple	15	410	4	3	4	6	G	G	M		40+	B1 + B2

Tree	Species	Height	Stem diameter		Crown	spread		Physiological condition	Structural condition	Age	Observations/ Management recommendations	Life	Category
no				North	South	East	West			Age		expectancy	Category
T13	Ash	15	400	5	4	5	5	P	P	M	Extensive animal damage to lower stem has ring barked the tree.	<10	U
T14	Norway maple	16	540	6	6	6	7	G	G	M	Ivy on stem needs severing.	40+	B1 + B2
T15	Wild cherry	17	230 230	5	1	4	1	G	G	M	A twin stemmed tree with a tightly formed union at the base.	20 - 40	B2
T16	Field maple	17	190	1	0.5	1	0.5	F	F	M		40+	C
T17	Wild cherry	17	410	8	4	5	2	G	G	M		40+	B1 + B2
T18	Field maple	17	220	4	0	1	2	G	G	M		40+	C
T19	Field maple	17	5 x 120	4	0.5	0.5	1	F	F	M	Squirrel damage to upper stem	40+	C
T20	Field maple	17	130 80	0	2	2	0	G	F	M		40+	С
T21	Field maple	16	140 70 70	2	1	4	1	F	F	M	Squirrel damage to upper stem	40+	С
T22	Field maple	17	190 300 200 190	3	2	4	2	G	G	M	Squirrel damage to upper stem	40+	B1 + B2
T23	Common lime	18	330	4	1	4	4	G	G	M		40+	B1 + B2
T24	Hawthorn	4	210	2	3	3	2	G	G	M		40+	C

Tree	Species	Height	Stem		Crown	spread		Physiological condition	Structural	Age	Observations/ Management recommendations	Life	Category
no			diameter	North	South	East	West		condition	Age		expectancy	
T25	Goat willow	16	590 480	6	6	6	5	F	G	М	Deadwood appearing in the crown	20 - 40	B2
T26	Goat willow	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	Dead	-	U
T27	Field maple	18	310 280	5	2	3	5	G	G	M		40+	B1 + B2
T28	Goat willow	17	230	7	0	1	4	F	F	M		20 - 40	С
T29	Goat willow	14	340	3	0	2	1	P	F	M	Deadwood appearing in the crown	10 - 20	С
T30	Norway spruce	12	290	2	2	3	1	G	G	М		40+	B2
T31	Norway spruce	12	390	2	3	3	3	G	G	M		40+	B1 + B2
T32	Norway spruce	10	350	3	3	2	2	G	G	M		40+	B1 + B2
T33	Norway spruce	9	300	2	2	2	2	G	G	М		40+	B2
T34	Norway spruce	12	310	3	1	2	1	G	G	M		40+	B2
T35	Oak	11	210	0	4	2	4	G	F	M/A	Partly suppressed by surrounding Norway spruce	40+	B2
T36	Oak	10	220	4	4	4	4	G	G	M/A		40+	B1 + B2

Tree no	Species	Height	Stem diameter	Crown spread				Physiological	Structural	1 100	Observations/Management recommendations	Life	C-+
				North	South	East	West	condition	condition	Age	Observations/ Management recommendations	expectancy	Category
T37	Oak	9	280	2	3	2	3	G	G	M/A		40+	B1 + B2
G1	Norway spruce	11	240	3	3	2	2	F	F	M/A	A plantation of young trees in need of thinning out	40+	В2

