# ARBORICULTURAL REPORT FOR DEVELOPMENT PURPOSES

At:

## Belle Green Lane, Cudworth, Barnsley

For:
Mr Wood

DATE:
2 August 2014

Acorn ARBORICULTURE

# 1 BACKGROUND

## 1.1 Purpose & Brief

1.1.1 We have been asked to prove arboricultural advice to assist a possible planning application with reference to land at:

- Belle Green Lane, Cudworth, Barnsley

1.1.2 For this purpose it has been determined that the following is required:

- Tree survey to BS: 5837 (2010)
- Tree Constraints Plan to BS: 3837 (2010)
- Tree Protection Plan to BS: 5837 (2010)

1.1.3 This report may therefore form part of planning proposals to develop the subject land.

## 1.2 Documents provided

1.2.1 A site layout plan was provided in hard copy form.

## 1.3 Background Information

1.3.1 A check was made with the Local Planning Authority on the 4 August 2014. This check revealed that there is a TPO on the site - TPO no 12 (A1)

1.3.2 The site is not within a Conservation Area.

1.3.2 No work to trees may therefore be undertaken until the appropriate permissions are granted.

# 2 SURVEY DETAILS

## 2.1 Surveyor/s

Mark Jennings HND Arboriculture

## 2.2 Date of Survey

2.2.1 26 July 2014

## 2.3 Weather Conditions

2.3.1 Dry ground conditions, sunny, no wind, some cloud.

## 2.4 Site Description

2.4.1 This site currently comprises of one detached cottage set within a reasonable sized garden area that extends northwards of the house. The surroundings are generally residential with houses being typical to the area and the period in which they were built.

2.4.2 The southern boundaries of the subject site are defined with hedging whilst the north and east boundaries are made up of brick walling.

2.4.3 The west boundary is more open aspect due to a driveway that heads in a north/south direction up this boundary although there is some vegetation here too.

2.4.4 The garden has a well maintained lawn and conifer hedges that are cut regularly.

2.4.5 The garden is dominated by fruit trees.

## 2.5 Data Collection

2.5.1 Data collection was carried out in accordance with the to BS5837 (2010) methodology and details of this is provided at Appendix 1.

2.5.2 Details of all relevant vegetation was assessed and these details are presented at Appendix 2.

2.5.3 Positions of trees and vegetation are shown in the plans appended to this report.

# 3 TREE DATA SUMMARY

## 3.1 General

3.1.1 There are 28 items of vegetation on this site. This comprises of 23 trees, three groups of trees and two hedges.

3.1.2 The southern boundaries of the subject site are well defined with hedging made up of predominantly of *Ligustrum*, *Crataegus*, and *Syringia*. However the vegetation in total on the site mainly comprises of small scale fruit trees *Prunus, Malus* and *Pyrus* which tend dominate the site. These trees are in varying conditions but generally poor specimens.

3.1.3 *Chamaecyparis*, *Fagus, Philladelphus and Sambuca* are some of the other species present.

3.1.4 Of the vegetation surveyed nine items are considered to be U category. Such trees would not ordinarily be considered a constraint to development and would often be removed on arboricultural grounds.

3.1.5 The remaining items of vegetation are "C" category and would ordinarily not pose a constraint to development.

3.1.6 The age range of the trees and vegetation varies from young, semi-mature to mature.

# 4 DISCUSSION & CONCLUSIONS

## 4.1 The Site

4.1.1 The site comprises of a garden associated with a detached cottage. The garden is reasonable in size and extends to the immediate east of the cottage and up to the north.

4.1.2 Surrounding the site are dwellings typical to the area.

4.1.3 The gardens contain a number of trees, groups and hedges. These have some collective amenity value when viewed from outside the site but this is as a general mass of greenery rather than something significant though.

## 4.2 The Trees

4.2.1 Focussing in of the trees it is apparent that there are no significant specimens and with all the trees are either classed as “U” category or “C” Category.

4.2.2 The majority of the trees are fruit trees which have been poorly pruned in the past, presumably to stimulate fruit production, but the pruning has not been undertaken in accordance with accepted arboricultural practice.

4.2.3 The poor pruning has unfortunately led to a number of structural defects on most of the trees such as loss of limbs, cavities, branch and entire tree failure and, in general, the population in fairly rapid and overall decline.

4.2.4 It is not anticipated that this decline could be realistically rectified by pruning or other arboricultural treatments.

4.2.5 Given the above such trees would not ordinarily pose a constraint to development.

4.2.6 Presently trees designated for removal have been highlighted on the tree constraint plan due to abnormalities and/or structural problems. These trees are T2, T3, T7, T10, T11, T12, T13, T21 and T23 and it is anticipated that their loss would not be reasonably opposed by the local planning authority.

## 4.3 Arboricultural Impact

4.3.1 It is proposed to remove the following trees, to allow the development to be carried out. H1, G1, H2, G2, T1, T4, T5, T6, T8, T9, T14, T15, T16, T17, T19, T22 and H3. Although this is a high number of trees to be removed given the above and the poor

condition of the trees it is considered justified given the circumstances as the alternative would be the further rapid degradation of fruit trees of questionable public amenity value.

4.3.2 Some trees are proposed to be retained. Although these trees are also fairly poor specimens it is accepted that their retention can provide the development some form of treescape to ensure some maturity is afforded, privacy is retained and for some wildlife value. The position of proposed temporary tree protection fencing and the trees being retained is shown on the appended tree protection plan. Given the topography of the site and level of build required, tree protection measures in accordance with BS5837 (2012) is straightforward.

4.3.3 As a TPO protects the majority of the trees on site (Pyrus and Malus) consent would be required before these species are removed. There are a number of trees on this site that are not listed on the first schedule of the TPO so consent from the local planning authority is not required.

4.3.4 Under TPO legislation when making a TPO on fruit trees it has to/should be demonstrated that it is in the interests of amenity to do so. This is due to the type of pruning that has to be carried out on a regular basis, to ensure fruit production is maintained. Under the TPO regulations the pruning of fruit trees does not require Council consent, (irrespective of fruit grown on a commercial basis or private) providing it has been carried out in line with good horticultural practices. It is not clear if these trees have been the subject of fruit production from a commercial perspective in the past but the pruning wounds on the trees would suggest that it was. Nevertheless this requires careful evaluation and advice from the local planning authority should be obtained before working on the Pyrus or Malus trees.

4.3.5 However what is clear from the TPO is that the area of trees protected now bears little reflection to the TPO plan dated 1993. The area (A1) has been eroded to facilitate development surrounding the subject site leaving the remaining trees of limited amenity value and only being visible very locally. It would therefore be strongly questioned whether or not the trees are still worthy of statutory protection and probably a compelling argument could be made that they are not, either during the planning application submission, TPO application or appeal via either of these processes.

4.3.6 Nevertheless due to the number of trees proposed for removal to facilitate development of this site, replanting should be strongly considered to ensure tree cover is retained for the future.

4.3.7 It is recommended that tree planting reflects the new proposed properties and garden areas in which they ought to be planted.

There are a number of newly planted trees that are not part of the TPO, and can be removed without causing any loss to amenity. These are predominantly to the north of the site. These newly planted trees have not been included within the survey??? Are these within the site? If not is it worth mentioning that they can be removed if client has no control over removal? If within the site were they conditioned?

4.3.8 It is considered that the following trees are appropriate for replacement planting in mitigation for the tree removal, and in relation to the new dwellings. Replanting

- Lime – Tilia cordata 'Rancho'
- Silver birch – Betula pendula
- Pine – Pinus sylvestrus 'Fastigiata
- Hornbeam – Carpinus betulus 'Fastigiata
- Elm – Ulmus carpinifolia 'Wredei Aurea
- Mountain ash – Sorbus aucuparia

4.3.9 These species or other can be conditioned with approval and therefore it is anticipated that there will little meaningful short term loss of public amenity but a greater likelihood of an increase in of public amenity through appropriate replanting following approval of the development.

# APPENDICES

# APPENDIX 1 - SURVEY METHODOLOGY

A visual assessment of each tree was made from ground level in accordance with BS 5837:2005 Trees in relation to construction - Recommendations.

The following information has been collected for each tree and is presented in the spreadsheet at Appendix 1.

Height - measured in metres using a clinometer.

Stem Diameter - measured in millimetres at 1.5m above adjacent ground level.

Spread - the measurement of the branch spread from the stem of the tree to the extent of the canopy in the direction of north, south, east and west.

Crown Clearance - measured from the highest point of the adjacent ground level in metres.

Age Class - described as young, middle aged, mature, over-mature, veteran.

Physiological Condition - classed as good, fair, poor, or dead.

Structural Condition - details of any physical defects and the presence of any decay etc.

Preliminary Management Recommendations - detail of works required including details of further investigations recommended where suspected defects require more detailed assessment and where there is the potential for wildlife habitat.

Estimated Remaining Contribution - expressed in years as; less than 10, 10-20, 20-40 and more than 40.

Category Grading – trees are categorised, in accordance with the cascade chart for tree quality assessment, into one of the following categories;

Trees usually for Removal

Category U
Those in such a condition that any existing value would be lost within 10 years and which should, in the current context, be removed for reasons of sound arboricultural management.

Trees to be Considered for Retention

Category A
Those of high quality and value: in such a condition as to be able to make a substantial contribution (a minimum of 40 years is suggested).

Category B
Those of moderate quality and value: those in such a condition as to make a significant contribution (a minimum of 20 years is suggested).

Category C

Those of low quality and value: currently in adequate condition to remain until new planting could be established (a minimum of 10 years is suggested), or young trees with a stem diameter below 150 mm.

In addition there are three subcategories which should also be applied identifying the main type of value provided by each tree;

1. Mainly arboricultural values
2. Mainly landscape values
3. Mainly cultural values, including conservation

Arboricultural Report at: Belle Green Lane, Cudworth, Bansley

| Item No. | Species | Height (m) | DBH (mm) | Spread (m) | | | | Age Class | Crown Clearance (m) | Physiological condition | LE (years) | Category Grading | Condition | Amenity value |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | N | S | E | W | | | | | | | |
| T1 | Field Maple (Acer Campestre) | 5 | 50-100 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | Y | / | Good | 30 | C | | Low |
| Structural Condition/Notes: Twin stemmed tree, tight branch framework, even crown, no major pruning evident. | | | | | | | | | | | | | Action: No action | |

| Item No. | Species | Height (m) | DBH (mm) | Spread (m) | | | | Age Class | Crown Clearance (m) | Physiological condition | LE (years) | Category Grading | Condition | Amenity value |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | N | S | E | W | | | | | | | |
| T2 | Pear (Pyrus sp.) | 6m | 260-280 | 3 | 4 | 1.5 | 2 | M | / | Poor | 10 | C | | Low |
| Structural Condition/Notes: This is a mature tree of poor form, sparse crown, heavily reduced in the past, some reaction growth present, some crown die-back. This tree should be removed on Arboricultural grounds. Low safe useful life expectancy. | | | | | | | | | | | | | Action: Remove | |

| Item No. | Species | Height (m) | DBH (mm) | Spread (m) | | | | Age Class | Crown Clearance (m) | Physiological condition | LE (years) | Category Grading | Condition | Amenity value |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | N | S | E | W | | | | | | | |
| T3 | Pear (Pyrus sp.) | 8 | 240 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | M | / | Poor | 10 | C | | Low |
| Structural Condition/Notes: This is a mature tree with crown die back, heavily reduced in the past, very sparse crown, very poor form. Remove on Arboricultural grounds. | | | | | | | | | | | | | Action: Remove | |

| Item No. | Species | Height (m) | DBH (mm) | Spread (m) | | | | Age Class | Crown Clearance (m) | Physiological condition | LE (years) | Category Grading | Condition | Amenity value |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | N | S | E | W | | | | | | | |
| T4 | Cercidiphyllum japonicum | 1.6 | / | 1.5 | 1.5 | 1.5 | 1.5 | Y | / | Good | 20+ | C | | Low |
| Structural Condition/Notes: Young tree newly planted, no visible signs of pruning, no abnormalities. | | | | | | | | | | | | | Action: No action | |

| Item No. | Species | Height (m) | DBH (mm) | Spread (m) | | | | Age Class | Crown Clearance (m) | Physiological condition | LE (years) | Category Grading | Condition | Amenity value |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | N | S | E | W | | | | | | | |
| T5 | Damson (Prunus domestica spp.) | 4 | 100 | 1.5 | 1.5 | 1.5 | 1.5 | / | / | Good | 20 | C | | Low |
| Structural Condition/Notes: Multi-stemmed tree, with no visible signs of pruning, tight branch framework. | | | | | | | | | | | | | Action: No action | |

| Item No. | Species | Height (m) | DBH (mm) | Spread (m) | | | | Age Class | Crown Clearance (m) | Physiological condition | LE (years) | Category Grading | Condition | Amenity value |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | N | S | E | W | | | | | | | |
| T6 | Apple (Malus sp.) | 4+ | 210 | 5 | 1 | 4 | 2 | Y | / | Moderate | 10 | C | | Low |
| Structural Condition/Notes: Single stemmed tree sparse crown, heavily reduced in the past, no long term retention value. | | | | | | | | | | | | | Action: No action | |

| Item No. | Species | Height (m) | DBH (mm) | Spread (m) | | | | Age Class | Crown Clearance (m) | Physiological condition | LE (years) | Category Grading | Condition | Amenity value |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | N | S | E | W | | | | | | | |
| T7 | Cherry (Prunus sp.) | 2 | 100 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 0 | Y | / | Poor | 10 | C | | Low |
| Structural Condition/Notes: This is a young stunted tree growing by the wall, low safe useful life expectancy due to this position, tree has grown lop sided. | | | | | | | | | | | | | Action: No action | |

| Item No. | Species | Height (m) | DBH (mm) | Spread (m) | | | | Age Class | Crown Clearance (m) | Physiological condition | LE (years) | Category Grading | Condition | Amenity value |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | N | S | E | W | | | | | | | |
| T8 | Cherry (Prunus sp.) | 2 | 120-130 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 2 | Y | / | Moderate | 10 | C | | Low |
| Structural Condition/Notes: This appears to be a young self-set tree, tight branch framework, some small branch removal in the past, deadwood present within the crown | | | | | | | | | | | | | Action: No action | |

| Item No. | Species | Height (m) | DBH (mm) | Spread (m) | | | | Age Class | Crown Clearance (m) | Physiological condition | LE (years) | Category Grading | Condition | Amenity value |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | N | S | E | W | | | | | | | |
| T9 | Rowan (Sorbus aucuparia) | 6 | 100 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | SM | / | Moderate | 10 | C | | Low |
| Structural Condition/Notes: Semi-mature of age, growing very close to wall competing for light due to its position in relation to the wall and neighbouring trees, therefore tall and slim in form. Deadwood present within the crown. | | | | | | | | | | | | | Action: | |

| Item No. | Species | Height (m) | DBH (mm) | Spread (m) | | | | Age Class | Crown Clearance (m) | Physiological condition | LE (years) | Category Grading | Condition | Amenity value |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | N | S | E | W | | | | | | | |
| T10 | Pear (Pyrus sp.) | / | / | / | / | / | / | / | / | / | / | U | | Low |
| Structural Condition/Notes: This tree has been removed in the past; the trunk has stimulated reaction growth to 2+m in height. This tree should be felled to ground level and the stump treated. Fell on Arboricultural grounds. Tree position very close to boundary wall. | | | | | | | | | | | | | Action: Fell stump | |

| Item No. | Species | Height (m) | DBH (mm) | Spread (m) | | | | Age Class | Crown Clearance (m) | Physiological condition | LE (years) | Category Grading | Condition | Amenity value |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | N | S | E | W | | | | | | | |
| T11 | Pear (Pyrus sp) | 7 | 380 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 3 | M | / | Poor | 10 | U | | Low |
| Structural Condition/Notes: This mature tree has been heavily reduced in the past, the work is not in line with approved Arboricultural/Horticultural practises. The canopy is sparse and the tree has a slight lean. Remove on Arboricultural grounds. | | | | | | | | | | | | | Action: Remove | |

| Item No. | Species | Height (m) | DBH (mm) | Spread (m) | | | | Age Class | Crown Clearance (m) | Physiological condition | LE (years) | Category Grading | Condition | Amenity value |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | N | S | E | W | | | | | | | |
| T12 | Pear (Pyrus sp.) | 6 | 50 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 2 | M | / | Poor | 10 | U | | Low |
| Structural Condition/Notes: This mature tree has been heavily reduced in the past; the work is not in line with approved Arboricultural/Horticultural practises. The canopy is sparse and the majority of growth is concentrated high up. Remove on Arboricultural grounds. Close to boundary wall. | | | | | | | | | | | | | Action: Remove | |

| Item No. | Species | Height (m) | DBH (mm) | Spread (m) | | | | Age Class | Crown Clearance (m) | Physiological condition | LE (years) | Category Grading | Condition | Amenity value |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | N | S | E | W | | | | | | | |
| T13 | Pear (Pyrus sp.) | 7 | 310 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 2 | M | / | Poor | 10 | U | | Low |
| Structural Condition/Notes: Heavily reduced in past, some regrowth high up in the crown but is sparse, very close to wall, limbs showing some die-back. Remove on Arboricultural grounds. | | | | | | | | | | | | | Action: Remove | |

| Item No. | Species | Height (m) | DBH (mm) | Spread (m) | | | | Age Class | Crown Clearance (m) | Physiological condition | LE (years) | Category Grading | Condition | Amenity value |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | N | S | E | W | | | | | | | |
| T14 | Holly (Ilex sp.) | 2 | / | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | Y | / | Moderate | 20 | C | | Low |
| Structural Condition/Notes: Young tree growing very close to hedge and trees, no pruning evident, tree is growing lop-sided due to its position. | | | | | | | | | | | | | Action: No action | |

| Item No. | Species | Height (m) | DBH (mm) | Spread (m) | | | | Age Class | Crown Clearance (m) | Physiological condition | LE (years) | Category Grading | Condition | Amenity value |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | N | S | E | W | | | | | | | |
| T15 | Pear (Prunus sp.) | 6 | 470 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | M | / | Moderate | 10 | | C | Low |
| Structural Condition/Notes: This tree is covered in Ivy growing very close to boundary wall, limited retention value due to this position. The tree is top heavy and the crown hangs over the boundary wall, deadwood present within the canopy. | | | | | | | | | | | | | Action: No action | |

| Item No. | Species | Height (m) | DBH (mm) | Spread (m) | | | | Age Class | Crown Clearance (m) | Physiological condition | LE (years) | Category Grading | Condition | Amenity value |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | N | S | E | W | | | | | | | |
| T16 | Pear (Pyrus sp.) | 6 | 120 | 2 | 1.5 | 3 | 3 | SM | / | Moderate | 20 | C | | Low |
| Structural Condition/Notes: No major defects canopy growing to the floor, no pruning evident evenly shaped crown. | | | | | | | | | | | | | Action: No action | |

| Item No. | Species | Height (m) | DBH (mm) | Spread (m) | | | | Age Class | Crown Clearance (m) | Physiological condition | LE (years) | Category Grading | Condition | Amenity value |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | N | S | E | W | | | | | | | |
| T17 | Cherry (Prunus sp.) | 6 | 12 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 2 | SM | / | Moderate | 10 | C | | Low |
| Structural Condition/Notes: This tree is a triple leader that has been pruned in the past, decay is present within one of the limbs due to this pruning work. | | | | | | | | | | | | | Action: No action | |

| Item No. | Species | Height (m) | DBH (mm) | Spread (m) | | | | Age Class | Crown Clearance (m) | Physiological condition | LE (years) | Category Grading | Condition | Amenity value |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | N | S | E | W | | | | | | | |
| T18 | Pear (Pyrus sp.) | 6 | 550 | 2 | 5 | 3.5 | 4 | M | / | Moderate | 10 | C | | Low |
| Structural Condition/Notes: Slight lean, lop sided crown due to buildings, dense crown, stubs throughout the crown, has been pruned in the past. One of the best conditioned Pyrus tree on this site. Deadwood present within the crown. | | | | | | | | | | | | | Action: No action | |

| Item No. | Species | Height (m) | DBH (mm) | Spread (m) | | | | Age Class | Crown Clearance (m) | Physiological condition | LE (years) | Category Grading | Condition | Amenity value |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | N | S | E | W | | | | | | | |
| T19 | Pear (Pyrus sp.) | 7+ | 340 | 1.5 | 2.5 | 1 | 2 | M | / | Moderate | 10 | C | | Low |
| Structural Condition/Notes: Single stem, ivy on the trunk, evidence of past pruning within the crown, slight lean, deadwood present within the crown. | | | | | | | | | | | | | Action: No action | |

| Item No. | Species | Height (m) | DBH (mm) | Spread (m) | | | | Age Class | Crown Clearance (m) | Physiological condition | LE (years) | Category Grading | Condition | Amenity value |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | N | S | E | W | | | | | | | |
| T20 | Pear (Pyrus sp.) | 5+ | 320 | 3 | 4 | 2 | 4 | M | / | Poor | 10 | C | | Low |
| Structural Condition/Notes: Triple leader, cavities present due to poor pruning techniques, pruned in the past, fruit small indicative of stress and old age. Deadwood present within the crown. | | | | | | | | | | | | | Action: No action | |

| Item No. | Species | Height (m) | DBH (mm) | Spread (m) | | | | Age Class | Crown Clearance (m) | Physiological condition | LE (years) | Category Grading | Condition | Amenity value |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | N | S | E | W | | | | | | | |
| T21 | Pear (Pyrus sp.) | 5-6 | 430 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 3 | M | / | Poor | 10 | U | | Low |
| Structural Condition/Notes: This tree is covered in ivy, reduced in the past, sparse crown, major decay, splits in a number of limbs. Deadwood present within the canopy, remove on arboricultural grounds. | | | | | | | | | | | | | Action: Remove | |

| Item No. | Species | Height (m) | DBH (mm) | Spread (m) | | | | Age Class | Crown Clearance (m) | Physiological condition | LE (years) | Category Grading | Condition | Amenity value |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | N | S | E | W | | | | | | | |
| T22 | Beech (Fagus sylvatica) | 6+ | 160 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 | Y | / | Good | 20+ | C | | Low |
| Structural Condition/Notes: This is a young tree with an even crown, no major pruning works evident, growing well, some deadwood present within the canopy. | | | | | | | | | | | | | Action: No action | |

| Item No. | Species | Height (m) | DBH (mm) | Spread (m) | | | | Age Class | Crown Clearance (m) | Physiological condition | LE (years) | Category Grading | Condition | Amenity value |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | N | S | E | W | | | | | | | |
| T23 | Pear (Pyrus sp.) | 7 | 330 | 1.5 | 4 | 3.5 | 2.5 | M | / | Good | 20 | C | | Low |
| Structural Condition/Notes: Twin leader, heavily reduced in the past some re growth, sparse crown, fruit present but small indicative of age, lack of proper pruning, and stress. This tree should be removed on Arboricultural grounds. | | | | | | | | | | | | | Action: No action | |

| Item No. | Species | Height (m) | DBH (mm) | Spread (m) | | | | Age Class | Crown Clearance (m) | Physiological condition | LE (years) | Category Grading | Condition | Amenity value |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | N | S | E | W | | | | | | | |
| H1 | Lilac, Privet, Elder, Hawthorn, Stags Horn Sumach | 3m | 50 - 150 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | M | / | Good | 20 | C | | Low |
| Structural Condition/Notes: This hedge has been regularly pruned, although the lilac and elder has grown quicker which means there is a difference in height. Stags Horn sumach is also present, this is a young tree growing in the shade of the hedge which would suggest that it is self-set with a low life expectancy. | | | | | | | | | | | | | Action: | |

| Item No. | Species | Height (m) | DBH (mm) | Spread (m) | | | | Age Class | Crown Clearance (m) | Physiological condition | LE (years) | Category Grading | Condition | Amenity value |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | N | S | E | W | | | | | | | |
| H2 | Cypress (Chamaecyparis sp.) | 3m | 100 - 150 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | Y | / | Poor | 20 | C | | Low |
| Structural Condition/Notes: This is a young hedge that has been regularly pruned. No major deformities. | | | | | | | | | | | | | Action: No action | |

| Item No. | Species | Height (m) | DBH (mm) | Spread (m) | | | | Age Class | Crown Clearance (m) | Physiological condition | LE (years) | Category Grading | Condition | Amenity value |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | N | S | E | W | | | | | | | |
| H3 | Cypress (Chamaecyparis sp.) | 4+ | 100 - 150 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | SM | / | Moderate | 20+ | C | | Low |
| Structural Condition/Notes: No major defects canopy growing to the floor, no pruning evident evenly shaped crown. | | | | | | | | | | | | | Action: No action | |

| Item No. | Species | Height (m) | DBH (mm) | Spread (m) | | | | Age Class | Crown Clearance (m) | Physiological condition | LE (years) | Category Grading | Condition | Amenity value |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | N | S | E | W | | | | | | | |
| G1 | Elder, Philladelphus | 2m | 20-100 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | M | / | Good | 10+ | C | | Low |
| Structural Condition/Notes: Young trees no visible pruning evident, in the shade of the hedge. | | | | | | | | | | | | | Action: No action | |

| Item No. | Species | Height (m) | DBH (mm) | Spread (m) | | | | Age Class | Crown Clearance (m) | Physiological condition | LE (years) | Category Grading | Condition | Amenity value |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | N | S | E | W | | | | | | | |
| G2 | Damson (Prunus domestica spp.) | 6-9m | 50-190 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 3 | M | / | Moderate | 20+ | C | | Low |
| Structural Condition/Notes: These trees are probably self-set, 11m in length, no major pruning works have been carried out to them. They are multi-stemmed and growing competitively with each other. The crowns are dense and there are lots of crossing branches present. . | | | | | | | | | | | | | Action: No action | |

# APPENDIX 5 – GENERAL GUIDELINES AND TERMS AND CONDITIONS

1. All tree work should be carried out by qualified Arboricultural Contractors with at least £1 Million Public Liability Insurance cover.

2. Tree work must be carried out to BS 3998 which specifies recommendations for tree work.

3. The acceptance of this report constitutes an agreement with the terms and guidelines listed within this report.

4. No liability can be accepted by the consultant in respect of the trees unless the recommendations within this report are carried out under his supervision. Nor shall the consultant be responsible for events which happen after the time of the survey due to factors which were not evident at the time.

5. Tree work is inherently dangerous and should only be undertaken by insured, qualified contractors the following contractor is suitably qualified and insured to carry out tree works.

6. An appropriately qualified contractor to undertake work to trees is Salter Tree Services (Wayne Salter) on: 01226 384854 or mobile 07967 203471

We trust that this report provides all the necessary information although if further advice is needed please do not hesitate to contact us.

Signed……

For and on behalf of: