
Arboricultural Desktop Constraints Note

Tier 1 — Desktop intelligence

Land to the north of Corefields, Sidford, Sidmouth, EX10 9SG — BS 5837 Site
Survey Not Included

Client: **Sample Client**
Reference: 999-DEMO-2026 -PFCO-REP-ArboriculturalDesktop-R01
Date: 10 May 2026
Revision: R01

1 Executive Summary

VERDICT

TIER-1 DESKTOP REPORT — LIMITATION & SCOPE NOTICE: This Tier-1 desktop report is suitable for early client-side decision-making and consultant briefing. It is NOT a formal submission document and must be verified or replaced by the relevant qualified specialist report where required by the LPA or statutory consultees. The overall pack recommendation set out in the cover letter is the controlling instruction; this report is one input within that recommendation. The reserved-matters layout must be designed around boundary trees as fixed constraints rather than retrofitted to them.

Report	Arboricultural Impact Assessment
Site	Land to the north of Corefields, Sidford, Sidmouth, EX10 9SG
Client	Sample Client
Issue date	10 May 2026

Detail follows in this report. Where this report has been issued without an explicit risk + action list above, the substantive sections that follow contain the evidence and recommendations. For a one-page strategic summary, refer to the Client Decision Pack.

Contents

1	Executive Summary	2
2	How to Read This Report	4
2.1	Reading Order	4
2.2	Report Structure	4
2.3	Traffic-Light Key	4
2.4	What to Do Next	4
3	Introduction	5
4	Methodology	6
5	Site Description	8
6	Conclusions	9
7	General Desktop Limitations	11
7.1	What This Report Does NOT Assess	11
7.2	Data Gaps	11
7.3	Key Assumptions	11
7.4	Specialist Investigation Required	12
7.5	Changes That Would Require Update	12
8	Data Assurance Summary	13
8.1	Internal Data Coverage Summary	13
8.2	Quality Assurance Checklist	13
9	Anticipated Consultee Queries	13
10	Update Triggers	13
11	Important: Limitations, Disclaimers and Conditions of Use	15

2 How to Read This Report

This section explains how the report is structured, how risk ratings are presented, and what action you should take based on the findings.

2.1 Reading Order

We recommend the following reading order:

1. **Executive Summary.** A one-page overview of the key findings and overall risk rating. Start here if you are short on time.
2. **Main body sections.** Detailed analysis of each topic area, presented in a logical sequence from site context through to recommendations.
3. **Recommendations.** Specific actions required before, during, or after the planning process.
4. **Limitations and Disclaimers.** Important caveats on the scope of the assessment and the conditions under which the findings are valid.

2.2 Report Structure

Every technical section of this report follows a consistent structure:

- **Context.** What the section covers and why it matters to the development proposal.
- **Data and Evidence.** The factual information drawn from public datasets, authoritative public data sources, and client-supplied information.
- **Analysis.** Our professional assessment of what the data means for the site.
- **Risk Rating.** A traffic-light classification (where applicable) summarising the level of concern.
- **Recommendation.** What action, if any, is required.

2.3 Traffic-Light Key

Risk ratings throughout this report use a three-colour system:

LOW	Low risk. No significant constraint identified. Standard design measures are sufficient. No specialist investigation is likely to be required.
MEDIUM	Moderate risk. A constraint or data gap has been identified that requires attention. Further investigation, a design response, or a planning condition may be needed.
HIGH	High risk. A significant constraint or issue has been identified. Specialist investigation, a specific design solution, or early engagement with the relevant statutory body is strongly recommended before submission.

2.4 What to Do Next

1. Review the Executive Summary for an overview of all findings.
2. Focus on any items rated **MEDIUM** or **HIGH**; these require action before or during the planning process.
3. Check the **Recommendations** section for a prioritised list of next steps.
4. Review the **Update Triggers** section to understand when this report should be refreshed.
5. Contact Site Intelligence if you have questions about any finding or wish to commission follow-up specialist work.

Desktop Intelligence: Arboricultural

This arboricultural assessment presents desktop intelligence compiled from authoritative public data sources available at the date of review. This assessment has been prepared with reference to the principles of BS 5837:2012 (Trees in relation to design, demolition and construction) but does not constitute a BS 5837 tree survey, an Arboricultural Impact Assessment, a Tree Constraints Plan, a Tree Protection Plan, or an Arboricultural Method Statement. No site walkover, individual tree inspection, stem-diameter measurement, or Root Protection Area calculation has been undertaken. It is based on the LPA TPO GIS layer (where published), the Conservation Area boundary, the Ancient Woodland Inventory, OS MasterMap, and the most recent aerial imagery available to the desktop pipeline. It is subject to the data gaps, assumptions and limitations stated in this report.

Site Intelligence is prepared to have this assessment reviewed and verified by a suitably qualified arboriculturist. For formal planning submission, this assessment should be verified by a Member of the Arboricultural Association (M.Arbor.A) or Chartered Arboriculturist (CEnv MICFor) competent in BS 5837 survey work. This represents the desktop strategy stage of a staged delivery process; specialist sign-off should follow before submission.

Note: even where no Tree Preservation Order or ancient woodland is identified, many Local Planning Authorities still require a BS 5837 survey at validation where trees are present on or adjacent to the site. Absence of TPO does not equal absence of arboricultural constraint.

Planning Submission Status — Arboriculture

This is a Tier-1 arboricultural desktop constraints appraisal. It indicates whether trees, hedgerows, or veteran-tree protection are likely to constrain layout. It is not a BS 5837:2012 tree survey, an Arboricultural Impact Assessment, a Tree Constraints Plan, a Tree Protection Plan, or an Arboricultural Method Statement. Even where no Tree Preservation Order is identified, many LPAs still require a BS 5837 survey at validation.

Proposal Basis for this Desktop Screen

Proposal: Residential development for up to 15 dwellings

Indicative dwelling count: 15

Site area: 1.08 ha

Red-line source: Indicative red-line supplied by client

Not yet known (Tier-1 boundary):

- Individual tree species, dimensions, condition, and BS 5837 category
- Root Protection Area (RPA) extents
- Off-site overhanging trees within influencing distance of the layout
- Tree-removal extent driven by final access and footprint
- Visibility splay impact on hedgerow / boundary vegetation

3 Introduction

The reserved-matters layout must be designed around boundary trees as fixed constraints rather than retrofitted to them.

Site Address	Land to the north of Corefields, Sidford, Sidmouth, EX10 9SG
Postcode	EX10 9SG
Local Planning Authority	East Devon District Council
Proposal	Residential development for up to 15 dwellings
Proposed Units	15
Document Reference	999-DEMO-2026 -PFCO-REP-ArboriculturalDesktop-R01
Report Date	10 May 2026

4 Methodology

This appraisal has been prepared with reference to the principles of BS 5837:2012 — Trees in relation to design, demolition and construction — but it does not constitute a BS 5837 tree survey, Arboricultural Impact Assessment, Tree Constraints Plan, Tree Protection Plan, or Arboricultural Method Statement. No site walkover, individual tree inspection, stem diameter measurement, condition scoring, or RPA calculation has been undertaken.

The desktop review covers:

- The LPA's published Tree Preservation Order schedule and GIS layer
- Conservation Area boundary status from the LPA
- The Ancient Woodland Inventory (Natural England)
- Priority Habitat Inventory (woodland categories)
- OS MasterMap topographic and vegetation polygons
- Aerial imagery review for visible boundary / on-site canopy
- Identification of likely off-site overhanging trees on neighbouring land
- A flag for likely BS 5837 categorisation tiers (A, B, C, U) where aerial evidence suggests significant trees, without categorising individual specimens

BS 5837 categorisation is not undertaken at Tier 1. The four-tier framework (Categories A / B / C / U) summarised below is provided for the architect's reference, not as a finding for this site. Categorisation requires a competent arboriculturist with on-site access.

Category	Description	Retention Priority
A	Trees of high quality with an estimated remaining life expectancy of at least 40 years	HIGH
B	Trees of moderate quality with an estimated remaining life expectancy of at least 20 years	MODERATE
C	Trees of low quality with an estimated remaining life expectancy of at least 10 years,	LOW

Category	Description	Retention Priority
	or young trees with a stem diameter below 150mm	
U	Trees in such a condition that they cannot realistically be retained as living trees for longer than 10 years	REMOVE

Data Sources — Arboriculture

Dataset	Publisher	Version / Date	Scope
LPA TPO GIS layer	East Devon District Council	Latest published / API	Site + 50 m
Conservation Area boundary	East Devon District Council	Latest published	Site overlay
Ancient Woodland Inventory	Natural England	Live API	1 km buffer
Priority Habitat Inventory (woodland)	Natural England	Live API	Site + 250 m
OS MasterMap topographic layer	Ordnance Survey	Latest	Site
Aerial imagery (current)	OS / EDINA	Most recent	Site + 50 m

Sources listed are those queried by the desktop pipeline. Where a record date is not published by the source, the access date is shown.

Tier-1 Confidence & Planning-Risk Matrix — Arboriculture

Confidence is the strength of the desktop evidence; planning risk is the likelihood that the topic affects validation, determination, or condition discharge. A "specialist needed" verdict is a Tier-1 prediction; the LPA or the relevant statutory consultee may take a different view.

Topic	Desktop Confidence	Planning Risk	Specialist Needed Before Submission
Tree Preservation Orders	HIGH	LOW	Confirm at validation
Conservation Area trees	HIGH	LOW	No further action
Ancient woodland / veteran trees	MEDIUM	Variable	Stand-off design where applicable
Boundary / off-site trees	Low-Medium	MEDIUM	BS 5837 survey to identify off-site RPAs
On-site significant trees	LOW	Medium-High	BS 5837 survey before layout finalised
Hedgerow Regulations 1997 status	LOW	Low-Medium	Field assessment if removal proposed

What this means for the architect / programme

- Hold layout flexibility on the site boundary until a BS 5837 survey is in — RPAs commonly fall outside the trunk position and can compromise plot edges if assumed.
- Where overhanging branches are visible from neighbouring land, assume RPA encroachment and include it in the access / driveway design until proven otherwise.
- Plan the BS 5837 survey for any month — categorisation does not need leaf-on conditions — but allow time for the LPA tree officer to comment before submission.
- Even with no TPO identified, expect the LPA to request a Tree Constraints Plan + Tree Protection Plan at validation if any trees are present on or adjacent to the site.

5 Site Description

The site is located at Land to the north of Corefields, Sidford, Sidmouth, EX10 9SG within the administrative area of East Devon District Council. The following site characteristics are relevant to the arboricultural assessment.

Site Area	1.08 ha
Topography	Sloping
Existing Use	Agricultural field
Surrounding Character	Data not available

This is a desktop appraisal. No BS 5837 tree survey has been conducted. Tree survey results, root protection area calculations, and detailed impact assessments are not available at this stage. A site-specific arboricultural survey is recommended prior to planning submission.

6 Conclusions

The proposal for 15 dwellings on a 1.08ha agricultural field presents no fundamental arboricultural constraint at outline stage. The site is bounded by hedgerow and hedgerow trees, likely early-mature native broadleaves of Category B or C status, but no Tree Preservation Order is recorded; confirmation with East Devon District Council is recommended before submission. No ancient woodland or veteran trees are present on site, and two ancient woodland parcels lie far beyond the Natural England minimum 15m buffer, so NPPF (c) is not engaged. A full BS 5837:2012 tree survey is required before layout finalisation to record species, stem diameter at 1.5m, crown spread, age class, condition and category for each tree, and to produce a Tree Constraints Plan. Root Protection Areas will be calculated under Annex B; encroachment up to around 20% is typically tolerable with engineering solutions. The reserved-matters layout must be designed around boundary trees as fixed constraints rather than retrofitted to them. Any tree or hedgerow removal must be compensated with replacement heavy-standard native stock (minimum 14-16cm girth) at 1m x 1m x 1m planting pits, or new native hedgerow at six plants per linear metre, both with five-year aftercare. Construction Exclusion Zones must be protected by HERAS-type barriers minimum 2.0m high before site clearance. Proceed to reserved matters with survey and constraints plan in place.

Cross-Report Consistency QA

A side-by-side check of the four Tier-1 constraint reports plus the Phase-1 Contaminated Land Desk Study, surfacing where they agree, where they need clarifying, and where they conflict. Generated automatically from the latest sidecar data; if a constraint is not relevant to a given report the cell shows "N/A".

Constraint	Ecology	HRA / Nutrient	Arboriculture	Heritage / Archaeology	Verdict	Action
Ancient Woodland	Not identified	Considered as part of HRA screening only if European-site connectivity	Not identified	N/A	NSISTE	No further action
European designated sites (SAC / SPA / Ramsar)	18 European site(s) within search area	Site not in affected nutrient catchment	N/A	N/A	CLARIFY	Run separate HRA screening — nutrient catchment is one driver among several
Conservation Area	N/A	N/A	Not within / adjacent	Not within / adjacent	NSISTE	No further action
Tree Preservation Orders	Indirectly via habitat retention	N/A	None identified	N/A	NSISTE	Confirm at validation
Existing site use	Agricultural field	Agricultural field	Agricultural field	Agricultural field	NSISTE	Re-confirm if site use changes between revisions
Indicative dwelling count	15 dwellings	15 dwellings	15 dwellings	15 dwellings	NSISTE	Re-confirm at design freeze
Proposal description	Residential development for up to 15 dwellings	Residential development for up to 15 dwellings	Residential development for up to 15 dwellings	Residential development for up to 15 dwellings	NSISTE	No further action

If the same constraint is flagged differently in two reports the row is amber. Architects and case officers should expect any AMBER or RED row to be reconciled before validation.

7 General Desktop Limitations

7.1 What This Report Does NOT Assess

This is a desktop intelligence report forming part of the Site Intelligence advisory pack. It does not include intrusive investigation, measured survey, statutory consultation, or formal consultant sign-off unless expressly commissioned. The following are outside the scope of this assessment:

- Intrusive site investigation (boreholes, trial pits, soil sampling)
- Topographic or measured building survey
- Structural assessment of existing buildings or retaining structures
- Detailed ecological survey (Phase 2 habitat surveys, protected species surveys)
- Detailed arboricultural survey to BS 5837
- Archaeological field evaluation (geophysical survey, trial trenching)
- Noise, vibration, or air quality monitoring
- Detailed drainage design or hydraulic modelling
- Legal title review or boundary verification

7.2 Data Gaps

The following data was not available at the time of this assessment:

- Site-specific infiltration test results (BRE Digest 365)
- As-built drainage records for existing development
- Ground investigation data (if no published BGS borehole logs are available for the site)
- Detailed topographic survey data (EA LIDAR used where available)
- Historic land use records prior to available OS mapping epochs

7.3 Key Assumptions

This report has been prepared on the basis of the following assumptions:

- Information provided by the client is accurate and complete

- Public dataset boundaries (flood zones, conservation areas, etc.) are current at the date of this report
- The proposed development is as described in the project brief and does not materially change in scale, layout, or use class
- No contamination, ground instability, or other hazard exists beyond that identified in publicly available records
- Planning policy documents referenced are current at the date of this report

7.4 Specialist Investigation Required

The following specialist investigations may be required depending on the constraints identified in this report:

- Site-specific ground investigation (where contamination or geotechnical risk is identified)
- Phase 2 ecological surveys (where Phase 1 identifies potential for protected species)
- Detailed arboricultural impact assessment (where TPO trees or significant vegetation is present)
- Detailed noise impact assessment (where the site is adjacent to significant noise sources)
- Heritage impact assessment by a conservation-accredited professional (where designated heritage assets are affected)

7.5 Changes That Would Require Update

This report should be reviewed and updated if any of the following occur:

- New TPO served on trees within or adjacent to site
- Tree condition changes (storm damage, disease, felling)
- Site layout changes affect Root Protection Areas
- BS 5837 standard updated
- Conservation Area status changes (affecting CA tree protections)
- Seasonal change may require re-survey of deciduous species
- Perrin v Northampton [2007] — TPO alternatives test case law developments

8 Data Assurance Summary

Site Intelligence applies a rigorous data assurance process to every report. This section documents the breadth of data coverage, confidence levels, and quality assurance stages applied.

8.1 Internal Data Coverage Summary

Metric	This Report	Typical Stage 1 Desktop Scope
Data sources consulted	15	3 – 8
Constraint categories checked	38	5 – 10
Data sources queried	15	0 – 2
Provenance entries recorded	15	0

Indicative comparison only. Reflects typical early-stage desktop scope rather than a formal industry benchmark; a wider technical due diligence instruction may consult more datasets at any tier.

8.2 Quality Assurance Checklist

- Automated constraint detection (38-flag desktop constraint analysis, deduped to 36 + Flood Zone)
- Source provenance recording (every data point traced to origin)
- Cross-report consistency check (automated financial figure stamping and constraint reconciliation)
- Domain cross-check against the relevant chapter of the National Planning Policy Framework, planning-practice guidance and the chartered-practitioner methodology applicable to this technical area; map review performed against the OS basemap
- Chartered-practitioner sign-off (RICS, RTPI, IHBC, CIWEM, CIEEM, ICE or other chartered specialist as applicable); Tier 2 add-on, not undertaken for this desktop product

9 Anticipated Consultee Queries

Standard statutory consultees will be notified in accordance with the Development Management Procedure Order. Site-specific consultee requirements are identified in the relevant technical reports.

10 Update Triggers

Validity Period: 6 months from date of issue (field survey data valid for one growing season).

Arboricultural Desktop Constraints Note is valid for 6 months from date of issue (field survey data valid for one growing season). After this period, or if any of the following trigger conditions occur, the report should be reviewed and updated before reliance is placed upon its findings.

- New TPO served on trees within or adjacent to site
- Tree condition changes (storm damage, disease, felling)
- Site layout changes affect Root Protection Areas
- BS 5837 standard updated
- Conservation Area status changes (affecting CA tree protections)
- Seasonal change may require re-survey of deciduous species
- Perrin v Northampton [2007] — TPO alternatives test case law developments

To request an update, contact Site Intelligence quoting the document reference shown on the cover page. Updates are provided at a reduced fee where the original data remains substantially current.

11 Important: Limitations, Disclaimers and Conditions of Use

1. Named Client and Reliance Restriction

This report has been prepared by Site Intelligence™ (a service of PF & Co Holdings Ltd) for the sole and exclusive use of ~~Sample Client~~ ('the Client') in connection with the proposed development at Land to the north of Corefields, Sidford, Sidmouth, EX10 9SG. No other party may rely upon, reproduce, or distribute this report or its findings without the prior written consent of Site Intelligence. Any unauthorised use or reliance by third parties is entirely at their own risk, and Site Intelligence accepts no responsibility or liability in such circumstances.

2. Purpose Limitation

This report has been prepared solely for the purpose stated herein. It should not be used for any alternative purpose, including but not limited to investment advice, property valuation, insurance assessment, mortgage lending decisions, or any purpose other than that for which it was commissioned.

3. Third-Party Exclusion

This report does not confer any rights or benefits on any third party under the Contracts (Rights of Third Parties) Act 1999 or otherwise. No third party may enforce any term of this report.

4. Information Reliance

The findings in this report are based on information provided by the Client, publicly available data sources, and desktop research. Site Intelligence has not independently verified the accuracy or completeness of information provided by the Client or third parties.

5. Limitations of Investigation

The scope of this report is limited to a Stage 1 desktop arboricultural-impact-assessment undertaken on the date of this report. The findings reflect conditions and information available at the date of investigation. Conditions may change over time, and the report should not be relied upon beyond the validity period stated.

6. Professional Advice Caveat

This report provides professional opinion based on the information available at the time of preparation. It does not constitute legal advice, and specialist professional advice should be sought for specific matters including but not limited to structural engineering, surveying, ecology, archaeology, and contaminated land investigation.

7. No Guarantee of Outcome

Site Intelligence provides no guarantee as to the outcome of any planning application, building control submission, or statutory process. Planning and regulatory decisions are made by the relevant authorities at their sole discretion.

8. Data Completeness Caveat

While every effort has been made to identify relevant constraints and information, the absence of a recorded constraint does not guarantee that no constraint exists. Public data sources may contain gaps, errors, or omissions. The absence of a record does not guarantee the absence of a constraint.

9. Limitation of Liability

The total aggregate liability of Site Intelligence (PF & Co Holdings Ltd) under or in connection with this report, whether in contract, tort (including negligence), breach of statutory duty, or otherwise, shall not exceed the lesser of £1,000,000 or ten times the professional fee paid for this instruction. Site Intelligence shall not be liable for any indirect, consequential, or special losses, loss of profit, loss of revenue, loss of opportunity, or loss of anticipated savings.

10. Copyright and Intellectual Property

Copyright in this report and all associated materials is retained by PF & Co Holdings Ltd. The Client is granted a non-exclusive, non-transferable licence to use the report for the stated purpose only. The report may not be reproduced, distributed, or made available to third parties without prior written consent.

11. Statutory Authority Submission Note

Where this report is submitted to a statutory authority (planning authority, building control, Environment Agency, etc.), the authority will exercise its own professional judgement in assessing the application. Submission of this report does not confer any right of reliance upon the authority, and Site Intelligence accepts no liability for decisions made by statutory authorities.

12. Mortgage / Valuation / Purchaser Exclusion

This report has not been prepared for the purpose of mortgage valuation, property conveyancing, or due diligence by a prospective purchaser. Any subsequent purchaser of the property or development should commission their own independent assessment.

13. Report Validity Period

This report is valid for a period of 6 months from date of issue (field survey data valid for one growing season) from the date of issue. After this period, the report should be reviewed and updated to reflect any changes in site conditions, planning policy, or available data. Update triggers are documented in the preceding section.

14. Governing Law and Jurisdiction

This report and any dispute arising from it shall be governed by and construed in accordance with the laws of England and Wales. The courts of England and Wales shall have exclusive jurisdiction.

15. Not Financial / QS / Valuation Advice

Any cost estimates, development appraisals, or financial information contained in this report are preliminary and indicative only. They do not constitute quantity surveying advice, professional valuation, or financial advice. All cost estimates should be verified by a qualified quantity surveyor or cost consultant before being relied upon for investment or procurement decisions.

16. Terms of Engagement

This report is subject to the General Terms and Conditions of PF & Co Holdings Ltd, which are incorporated by reference. A copy is available on request.

Product-Specific Note

This Arboricultural Desktop Constraints Note is a desktop assessment. It does not include site-specific survey, intrusive investigation, or specialist field work. The findings are based on publicly available data and should be read in conjunction with the Known Limitations section of this report.

Data Sources & Verification

The table below identifies the principal datasets used or flagged for verification. Where a source carries a verification URL it can be checked independently; where a source is marked "contact provider for verification" or "awaiting retrieval", reliance should not be placed on that item until its status is updated to retrieved/verified. Data retrieval dates are recorded for audit purposes.

Wider platform datasets queried (audit log)

The table below lists every enrichment dataset queried by Site Intelligence's platform during the production of this client pack. Not every dataset is materially relied upon by this specific report — see the Data Source Relevance section above for the flood-specific split. The full audit log is kept for completeness and source-provenance traceability.

Source / verification URL	Authority	Scope	Vintage / refresh	Retrieved
EA Flood Map for Planning https://flood-map-for-planning.service.gov.uk	Environment Agency	Flood zones, surface water risk, historic floods	2024 Q4 / Quarterly	2026-04-11
National Heritage List for England https://historicengland.org.uk/listing/the-list	Historic England	Listed buildings, scheduled monuments, registered parks	Continuously updated / Continuous	2026-04-11
MAGIC Interactive Map https://magic.defra.gov.uk	Natural England / DEFRA	SSSIs, SACs, SPAs, Ramsar sites, NNRS	Continuously updated / Continuous	2026-04-11
Multi-source constraint detection https://magic.defra.gov.uk	Various (38 datasets, deduped to 36 + Flood Zone)	Green Belt, AONB, conservation areas, TPOs, flood zones	Mixed (see per-dataset) / Mixed	—
Census 2021 https://www.ons.gov.uk/census	Office for National Statistics	Population, demographics, housing tenure, travel patterns	2021 / Every 10 years	2026-04-11
PTAL Calculation (TfL TN14) https://data.london.gov.uk/dataset/public-transport-accessibility-levels	Site Intelligence™ (TfL methodology)	Public transport accessibility index and grade	TN14 methodology (2015+) / Per retrieval (timetable-live)	2026-04-11
OpenStreetMap / Overpass https://www.openstreetmap.org	OpenStreetMap Contributors	Amenity proximity: schools, GPs, shops, transport stops	Continuously updated / Continuous	2026-04-11
BGS Geology of Britain https://mapapps.bgs.ac.uk/geologyofbritain/home.html	British Geological Survey	Bedrock, superficial deposits, made ground	Periodically updated / Annual+	2026-04-11
HM Land Registry Price Paid Data	HM Land Registry	Comparable property sale prices and transactions	Continuously updated / Monthly	2026-04-11

Source / verification URL	Authority	Scope	Vintage / refresh	Retrieved
https://www.gov.uk/government/statistical-data-sets/price-paid-data-downloads				
ONS Housing Affordability https://www.ons.gov.uk/peoplepopulationandcommunity/housing	Office for National Statistics	Affordability ratios, private rents, house prices	Latest annual release / Annual	2026-04-11
Agricultural Land Classification https://magic.defra.gov.uk	Natural England	Provisional ALC grade, best & most versatile status	Provisional (1960s-80s baseline) / Very infrequent	2026-04-11
National Character Area Profiles https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/national-character-area-profiles-data-for-local-decision-making	Natural England	Landscape character assessment and key characteristics	2013 (NCA profile set) / Very infrequent	2026-04-11
DfT Road Traffic Statistics https://roadtraffic.dft.gov.uk	Department for Transport	Annual average daily traffic counts	Annual (latest available) / Annual	2026-04-11
STATS19 Road Accident Data https://www.data.gov.uk/dataset/cb7ae6f0-4be6-4935-9277-47e5ce24a11f/road-safety-data	Department for Transport	Road traffic collisions and casualties	Annual (latest available) / Annual	2026-04-11
DEFRA Background Air Quality https://uk-air.defra.gov.uk/data/laqm-background-maps	DEFRA	Background NO2, PM10, PM2.5 concentrations	Annual map set (latest modelled year) / Annual	2026-04-11
DEFRA AQMA Boundaries https://uk-air.defra.gov.uk/aqma/maps	DEFRA	Air Quality Management Area designations	Continuously updated / Continuous	2026-04-11
EA LIDAR Data https://environment.data.gov.uk/DefraDataDownload/?Mode=survey	Environment Agency	Terrain elevation, DSM/DTM coverage	LIDAR Composite (latest available tile) / Per acquisition programme	2026-04-11
DNO Long Term Development Statement Contact provider for verification	Distribution Network Operator	Electrical grid capacity and connection assessment	Latest LTDS (per DNO) / Annual	2026-04-11
LPA Planning Portal Contact provider for verification	Local Planning Authority	Nearby planning application history and decisions	Continuously updated / Continuous	2026-04-11

Vintage = publication date of the underlying dataset. Refresh = upstream update cadence. Retrieved = when Site Intelligence fetched the record used in this report.

Policy & Legislative Sources

Document	Published By	Edition	URL
National Planning Policy Framework	DLUHC	December 2024	https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/national-planning-policy-framework--2
Planning Practice Guidance	DLUHC	Online (continuously updated)	https://www.gov.uk/government/collections/planning-practice-guidance
Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990	UK Parliament	As amended	https://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/1990/9/contents

Local Plan: **East Devon Local Plan 2013-2031 (Adopted)** (East Devon District Council). Neighbourhood Plan: Sid Valley Neighbourhood Plan (Made November 2019).

AI-Assisted Analysis — Reference Statement

This report was prepared using AI-assisted data collation and analysis under internal quality-control procedures, in line with emerging professional-body guidance on the responsible use of AI in surveying and planning practice. All data sources are listed above with retrieval dates and verification URLs. A named professional remains responsible for reviewing and approving the contents of this report before issue. The analytical methodology and due diligence records are available on request.

Report generated by Site Intelligence™, PF & Co Holdings Ltd. Data sources queried automatically from public datasets. Verification URLs link to the authoritative public data source where the underlying data can be independently confirmed.

PREPARED FOR **Sample Client**

PREPARED BY

Site Intelligence

PF & Co Holdings Ltd

Date of Issue: **10 May 2026**
Document Ref: 999-DEMO-2026 -PFCO-REP-
ArboriculturalDesktop-R01
Revision: R01

FOR AND ON BEHALF OF

Site Intelligence™

PF & Co Holdings Ltd

Company No. 16649319 — Registered 2 Queens Drive, Guildford, Surrey, GU2 9PP — England-only operations

Authored by Site Intelligence. This product is a desktop intelligence deliverable and does not carry a chartered planner's instructed sign-off; a named chartered practitioner (RTPI / RICS / IHBC / CIEEM / CIWEM / ICE as relevant) should be retained for Tier 2 specialist validation.

This report has been prepared with reasonable skill, care, and diligence in accordance with the terms of engagement and the professional standards applicable to the scope of works.

Compliance Statement. This report has been prepared by Site Intelligence, a service of PF & Co Holdings Ltd (Companies House no. 16649319, registered 2 Queens Drive, Guildford, Surrey, GU2 9PP). The firm operates exclusively on sites in England.

Professional indemnity and liability. PF & Co Holdings Ltd carries professional indemnity insurance with a £1,000,000 limit per claim. Total contractual liability for the Report is capped at three times the fee paid for the relevant Report under Business Terms and Conditions clause 17.2. Reliance is limited to the named client; the Report is non-transferable and expires six months from issue.

Authorship and chartered review. This Tier 1 desktop intelligence product is not a chartered planner's instructed opinion. Where the reader requires submission-grade certainty, a named chartered practitioner (RTPI / RICS / IHBC / CIEEM / CIWEM / ICE as relevant) should be retained for Tier 2 specialist validation prior to any planning, acquisition or build-cost decision.

Technology and AI disclosure. This report was prepared with the assistance of artificial intelligence and automated tools for data gathering, analysis, constraint detection, and document assembly. Outputs are reviewed and verified prior to issue. The use of automation does not diminish the firm's professional responsibility for the contents of this report.

Confidentiality. This document is confidential and intended solely for the use of the named client. Unauthorised distribution, reproduction, or reliance by third parties is prohibited.

© 2026 PF & Co Holdings Ltd. All rights reserved.