
ARBORICULTURAL SURVEY TO BS 5837:2012

Land at Plas Penrhyn, Penrhyn Bay,
Llandudno LL30 3EU

Adra (Tai) Cyfyngedig, Tŷ Coch, Llys y
Dderwen, Parc Menai, Bangor Gwynedd LL57
4BL
adra.co.uk



Applied Ecological Services Ltd
Ramshaw House, Ramshaw
County Durham
DL14 0NG

www.aes-ltd.com
info@aes-ltd.com
01388 835084

Copyright

© Applied Ecological Services Ltd (AES-LTD 2020). All rights reserved.

This document has been provided for your reference by Applied Ecological Services Ltd. No material from this document may be otherwise copied, altered, republished, transmitted or distributed in any way without permission

This document and data contained within it remains the property of AES-LTD until all invoices are paid in full.

Third Party Disclaimer

Any disclosure of this report to a third party is subject to this disclaimer. The report was prepared by AES-LTD using reasonable skill and care at the instruction of, and for the sole benefit of, our client named on the front of the report. It does not in any way constitute advice to any third party who is able to access it by any means. No other warranty, expressed or implied is made as to the professional advice included in this report.

Field Investigations and Data

Where field investigations have been carried out these have been restricted to a level of detail required to achieving the stated objectives of the work. Where any data supplied by the client or from other sources have been used it has been assumed that the information is correct. No responsibility can be accepted by AES-LTD for inaccuracies in the data supplied by any other party.

Data / Report Validity

The report refers, within the limitations stated, to the environment of the site in the context of the surrounding area at the time of the inspections. Environmental conditions can vary and no guarantee is given as to the possibility of changes in the environment of the site and surrounding area at differing times. The details within this report will be determined by a number of factors including; its original purpose, the Client's instructions, passage of time, advances in technology and techniques, changes in legislation etc. and therefore may require future re-assessment.

Note that the recommendations within this report should be reviewed (and reassessed if necessary) should there be any changes to the red line boundary or development proposals upon which this report was based on.

Report Reference & History: Document 1, V1.

Issue Status	Prepared by:	Approved / Date
Draft 1	Adam Winson	03/06/2020
Client issue	Charlotte Mercer M.Sc, B.Sc (Hons)	12/06/2020

CONTENTS

1.0	INTRODUCTION	4
2.0	THE SITE.....	5
3.0	THE TREES.....	6
4.0	SIGNATURE.....	9

Appendix 1: Authors Qualifications & Experience

Appendix 2: Survey Methods & Limitations of Report

Appendix 3: Explanation of Tree Descriptions

Appendix 4: Tree Data

Appendix 5: Tree Constraints Plan

1.0 INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 AES – LTD were instructed by Adra to undertake a detailed survey and assessment of trees located in the redline boundary of the site. The report is required in accordance with BS 5837:2012 Trees in relation to design, demolition and construction – Recommendations, to provide detailed, independent, arboricultural advice on the trees present, in the context of potential development.
- 1.2 The survey took place during May & June 2020. The trees were surveyed visually from the ground using “Visual Tree Assessment” techniques and in accordance with the guiding principles of British Standard 5837:2012. Any additional off-site trees that could impact a new development design have been included in the tree survey parameters.
- 1.3 The tree positions were plotted on Ordnance Survey map base-layer using enhanced GPS technology (1-2m accuracy) and laser distance measurer. Field survey was undertaken by Arboriculturist Dave Farmer FdSc (Arb), MArborA, PTI (Lantra). This report was prepared by Adam Winson Chartered Arboriculturist, MSc, BSc (Hons), MICFor, MArborA. Full qualifications and experience are included within this report. Explanatory details regarding the survey methodology are included within Appendix 2. A full explanation of the tree data can be found at Appendix 3. Full details of all the trees surveyed are found in Appendix 4. For tree locations please refer to the Tree Constraints Plan at Appendix 5.

2.0 THE SITE

- 2.1 The site is located in Penrhyn Bay, a small town on the northern coast of North Wales, in the county borough of Conwy and within the parish of Llandudno. The site is an overgrown field area, situated between residential properties, a large caravan site and a small public park. Trees are generally located close to the boundary lines. The approximate area of the survey is highlighted in the image below (Google Earth, 2018):



3.0 THE TREES

Legal Obligations

- 3.1 Due to the large potential penalties for illegally carrying out work to protected trees, before authorising any tree works a check should be made with the Local Planning Authority to see if the trees are covered by a Tree Preservation Order or if they are within a Conservation Area. If either applies, then statutory permission is required before any works can take place.
- 3.2 When appointing a tree surgeon, only properly qualified and experienced companies should be used, who have adequate Public Liability and Employer's Liability Insurance. All tree work should be carried out according to British Standard 3998:2010 Tree Work - Recommendations.

Tree Survey Results

- 3.3 The tree survey revealed 39 items of woody vegetation, comprised of 27 individual trees and 12 groups of trees or shrubs or hedges. Of the surveyed trees: 4 trees are retention category 'B', and the remaining 35 trees and groups are retention category 'C' (explanatory details regarding the retention categories are included at Appendix 3).
- 3.4 The significant tree cover within the site consists of trees and hedgerows located either along the boundary lines or close to the boundaries in the various neighbouring properties.
- 3.5 The central area of the site contains little of arboricultural significance, generally consisting of tall grass and various small shrubs amongst areas of dense bramble. Species diversity at the site is fair. Species include several Birch, Cherry, Hawthorn, Maple and Willow and the occasional Alder, Apple, Ash, Beech, Oak and Robinia. The hedgerows are generally comprised of Beech, Cypress, Hawthorn, Laurel and Privet. Most of the trees are semi-mature with only the occasional young or early mature tree.
- 3.6 The site's most significant trees are generally located to the south west of the site. The Maples T19, T20 and T21 are larger and more prominent than the trees that surround them

and provide a good level of collective amenity value to the site and surrounding areas to the south and west.

- 3.7 Close to the site entrance is the Ash, T39. This tree provides a reasonable level of amenity value due to its location close to the roadside, however many Ash trees in the wider region are being impacted by Chalara or Ash dieback disease. Once a tree is infected, the disease is usually fatal, either directly or indirectly. While this tree may continue to provide landscape and wildlife benefits for some time, its long-term prospects are likely to be limited as a result of Ash dieback.
- 3.8 The trees and hedges that form the majority of the southern boundary (T6, G9 – G18 and T22) are of low individual value, however they collectively provide comprehensive screening between the site and the neighbouring property.
- 3.9 Beyond the north west corner of the site is the Lawson Cypress group G29. There are sparse or dead areas throughout the crown due to the removal or failure of several limbs and large branches. The boundary fence appears to have been recently repaired following the failure of a large limb. There is potential for future failures and as such the group as a whole has very limited future prospects. The remaining trees and hedges are generally located in adjacent land and are of relatively low value. They collectively provide some limited screening and moderate amenity value. Some trees were covered in dense Ivy and many were inaccessible (as detailed in appendix 4) in such cases measurements were estimated and the condition values are indicative only.
- 3.10 The tree Root Protection Area (RPA) detailed on the Tree Constraints Plan at Appendix 5, has been used as a layout design tool, to inform on the area around a tree where the protection of the roots and soil structure is treated as a priority. Several lower value tree and hedge groups do not have RPAs detailed on tree plans. The detailed extent and spread of these low value groups, in conjunction with the tree schedule, is sufficient to assess the associated potential constraints. The RPA for each tree has been plotted as a polygon centred on the base of the stem. Due to the presence of roads, structures, topography (and past tree management) the RPA is likely to be a simplified representation of the tree roots actual morphology and disposition. However, detailed modifications to the shape of the RPA would largely be based on conjecture and so have been avoided.

Arboricultural Development Advice

- 3.11 The site's central area has no significant trees and so is free of any significant arboricultural impacts for any new development. The higher value retention category 'B' trees and groups should be retained, where possible, and incorporated into any new development design.
- 3.12 Where suitable, those category 'C' trees and groups with reasonable future prospects (as detailed at Appendix 4) should be retained as part of any new development. However, care should be taken to avoid misplaced tree retention. Attempts to retain too many or unsuitable trees on a site can result in excessive pressure on the trees during demolition or construction work, or post-completion demands for their removal.
- 3.13 If required by the development proposals, occasional lower value, retention category 'C' trees and groups could be removed, and replacement planting would largely mitigate their losses. The tree Root Protection Area (RPA), detailed on the Tree Constraints Plan at Appendix 5, should be used as a layout design tool, to inform on the area around a tree where the protection of the roots and soil structure is treated as a priority.
- 3.14 If construction of new buildings is required within the RPA of retained trees it may be possible to employ special foundation design such as mini/micro pile and suspended beam or a cantilevered foundation.
- 3.15 Construction of hard surfaces, for drives and paths, within the RPA can have negative impacts on tree roots. However, the potential negative impacts can often be overcome or minimised by employing a 'no-dig' type construction method with a porous final surface.
- 3.16 The design of the new development should consider the trees crown position in relation to any new dwellings. The dappled shade of a tree is more pleasant than the deep shadow of a building, and some shade from trees may be beneficial. In particular, deciduous trees give shade in summer but allow access to sunlight in winter. Whilst either shade or sunlight might be desirable, depending on the potential use of the area affected, the design should avoid unreasonable obstruction of light and should give adequate provision for future tree growth.

Protection of Retained Trees

- 3.17 The retained trees may require protection by fencing in accordance with BS 5837:2012, during the development phase.
- 3.18 If required by the Local Planning Authority, an associated Arboricultural Method Statement, detailing protective fencing specifications and construction methods close to the retained trees can be provided.

4.0 SIGNATURE

I trust this report provides all the required information, signed



.....

Adam Winson, Chartered Arboriculturist, MSc, BSc (Hons), MICFor, AIEEM.

APPENDIX 1: AUTHORS QUALIFICATIONS & EXPERIENCE

Adam Winson, Chartered Arboriculturist, MSc, BSc (Hons), MICFor, MArborA, ACIEEM, QTRA Registered.

Adam is the company Director and Principle Consultant. He has a mix of the highest level academic qualifications and relevant work experience. He has worked within the tree care profession for over 20 years, and was awarded an MSc in Arboriculture and Urban Forestry, with distinction. Adam is a Chartered Arboriculturist and a Registered Consultant with the Institute of Chartered Foresters, a Professional Member of the Arboricultural Association and has original research published by the UK Forestry Commission. His work ranges from individual expert tree inspections to managing trees on major multimillion pound housing developments and infrastructure projects. His work often involves trees with preservation orders or litigation, and he has appeared as a tree expert, at planning appeal hearings up to the Crown Court.

Mr James Brown BSc (Hons) Arboriculture, MArborA.

James has a BSc (Hons) in Arboriculture, attaining first class honours, as well as being awarded the Institute of Chartered Forester's Student award. He is a Professional Member of the Arboricultural Association and an Associate of the Institute of Chartered Foresters. James previously worked in Europe's largest tree nursery and has experience of Local Authority tree officer work. His main work consists of tree surveys for development projects and preparing Tree Protection Schemes to BS 5837:2012.

Mr Dave Farmer FdSc (Arb), MArborA, PTI (Lantra).

Dave has a Foundation Degree in Arboriculture (with Distinction) and is qualified in Professional Tree Inspection. He is a Professional Member of the Arboricultural Association and an Associate of the Institute of Chartered Foresters. Dave has many years of experience within the tree care profession, including lecturing in arboriculture. His work focuses on diagnosing potential tree risk problems, and recommending appropriate treatments and work programmes.

APPENDIX 2: SURVEY METHODOLOGY AND LIMITATIONS OF REPORT

The survey was undertaken in accordance with British Standard 5837:2012 Trees in relation to design, demolition and construction – Recommendations. The trees were assessed objectively and without reference to any proposed site layout. The trees were surveyed from the ground using ‘Visual Tree Assessment’ (VTA) methodology. VTA is appropriate and is endorsed by industry guidance. It is used by arboriculturists to evaluate the structural integrity of a tree, relying on observation of trees biomechanical and physiological features. Measurements are obtained using a diameter tape, clinometer, laser distometer and loggers tape. Where this is not practical measurements are estimated. Tree groups have been identified in instances as defined in BS 5837:2012. Shrubs and insignificant trees may have been omitted from the survey.

This report represents a BS5837 tree survey and should not be accepted as a detailed tree safety inspection report; however, tree related hazards are recorded and commented upon where observed, yet no guarantee can be given as to the absolute safety or otherwise of any individual tree. All recommended tree work must be to BS 3998:2010 - ‘Tree Work: Recommendations’.

The findings and recommendations contained within this report are valid for a period of twelve months from the date of survey. The author shall not be responsible for events which happen after this time due to factors which were not apparent at the time, and the acceptance of this report constitutes an agreement with these guidelines and terms.

APPENDIX 3: EXPLANATION OF TREE DESCRIPTIONS

HEIGHT of the tree is measured from the stem base in metres. Where the ground has a significant slope the higher ground is selected.

CROWN HEIGHT is an indication of the average height at which the crown begins and includes information of the first significant branch and direction of growth.

STEM DIAMETER is measured at 1.5 metres above (higher) ground level. Where the tree is multi-stemmed at this point; the diameter is measured close to ground level or else a combined stem diameter is calculated.

CROWN SPREAD is measured from the centre of the stem base to the tips of the branches in all four cardinal points.

AGE CLASS of the tree is described as young, semi-mature, early-mature, mature, or over-mature.

PHYSIOLOGICAL CONDITION is classed as good, fair, poor, or dead. This is an indication of the health of the tree and takes into account vigour, presence of disease and dieback.

STRUCTURAL CONDITION is classed as good, fair or poor. This is an indication of the structural integrity of the tree and takes into account significant wounds, decay and quality of branch junctions.

LIFE EXPECTANCY is classed as; less than 10 years, 10-20 years, 20-40 years, or more than 40 years. This is an indication of the number of years before removal of the tree is likely to be required.

Retention Categories

A (marked **green** on Appendix 5) = retention most desirable. These trees are of very high quality and value with a good life expectancy.

B (marked in blue on Appendix 5) = retention desirable. These trees are of good quality and value with a significant life expectancy.

C (marked in grey on Appendix 5) = trees which could be retained. These trees are of low or average quality and value, and are in adequate condition to remain until new planting could be established.

U (marked in red on Appendix 5) = trees for removal. These trees are in such a condition that any existing value would be lost within 10 years.

TREE DATA

Tree Species		Measurements						Crown (m)				Tree Condition						Value		Management		
Tree ID	Common Name	Latin Name	Maturity	Height (m)	Stems	Stem Diameter (mm)	Estimated	Ave Height	N	E	S	W	Roots	Stem	Crown	Comments	Physiological	Structural	Life Expectancy	Amenity	Category	Works
T1	Cherry	<i>Prunus sp.</i>	Semi-mature	5.5	1	320	No	1	4	3.5	4	4	No visual defects	Multiple stemmed at 2m, Slight lean, Old pruning wounds, Tight union	Old pruning wounds, Minor deadwood		Good	Fair	20 to 40 yrs	Moderate	C	No urgent works required in current site context
G2	Leyland Cypress	<i>X Cuprocyparis leylandii</i>	Semi-mature	3	10+	110 avg	No	0	See Plan				No visual defects	Single stemmed or Multiple stemmed at base, Vertical, Stubs, Tight union	Old pruning wounds, Minor deadwood	Managed boundary hedge, now becoming overgrown.	Fair	Good	20 to 40 yrs	Low	C	No urgent works required in current site context
T3	Birch	<i>Betula pendula</i>	Semi-mature	4	2	100, 90	Yes	1.5	2	2	1.5	1.5	No visual defects	Twin stemmed at 1m, Vertical, Old pruning wounds	No visual defects	Situated in neighbouring property.	Good	Good	>40 yrs	Low	C	No urgent works required in current site context
T4	Birch	<i>Betula pendula</i>	Semi-mature	8	1	210	Yes	2	2.5	2.5	3	3	No visual defects	Single stemmed, Vertical, Old pruning wounds, Epicormic growths	Minor deadwood	Situated in neighbouring property.	Fair	Good	>40 yrs	Low	C	No urgent works required in current site context
T5	Birch	<i>Betula utilis</i>	Semi-mature	8	1	180	Yes	1	3.5	3.5	3.5	3.5	No visual defects, Limited access around base	Single stemmed, Vertical, Old pruning wounds, Epicormic growths, Ivy covered	No visual defects	Situated in neighbouring property, against boundary fence. Ivy and boundary fence prevented detailed inspection of base & lower stem.	Good	Good	>40 yrs	Low	C	No urgent works required in current site context

TREE DATA

Tree ID	Tree Species		Maturity	Measurements				Crown (m)				Tree Condition						Value		Management		
	Common Name	Latin Name		Height (m)	Stems	Stem Diameter (mm)	Estimated	Ave Height	N	E	S	W	Roots	Stem	Crown	Comments	Physiological	Structural	Life Expectancy	Amenity	Category	Works
T6	Oak	<i>Quercus robur</i>	Semi-mature	10	1	270	Yes	2	2	2	4.5	3.5	No visual defects, Limited access around base	Single stemmed, Slight lean, Epicormic growths	Unbalanced, Minor deadwood	Growing within boundary hedgerow. Dense undergrowth severely limited visibility of tree and prevented detailed inspection.	Good	Fair	>40 yrs	Moderate	C	No urgent works required in current site context
T7	Robinia	<i>Robinia pseudoacacia</i>	Young	7	1	90	No	2	2	1.5	1.5	1.5	No visual defects	Single stemmed, Vertical, Bark damage	Small / sparse, Minor deadwood	Surrounded by several smaller similar saplings.	Fair	Fair	20 to 40 yrs	Low	C	No urgent works required in current site context
T8	Robinia	<i>Robinia pseudoacacia</i>	Young	7.5	1	80	No	2	1.5	1.5	1.5	1	No visual defects	Single stemmed, Vertical, Stubs	Small / sparse, Minor deadwood	Surrounded by several smaller similar saplings.	Fair	Fair	20 to 40 yrs	Low	C	No urgent works required in current site context
G9	Cherry Laurel, Hawthorn, Leyland Cypress	<i>Prunus sp. Crataegus sp. X Cuprocyparis sp.</i>	Semi-mature	2	10+	60 avg	Yes	0	See Plan				No visual defects, Limited access around base	Single stemmed or Multiple stemmed at base, Vertical, Stubs, Tight union	Old pruning wounds, Minor deadwood	Mixed species hedgerow. Inaccessible due to dense surrounding undergrowth.	Fair	Good	>40 yrs	Low	C	No urgent works required in current site context
G10	Cherry Laurel, Hawthorn, Leyland Cypress	<i>Prunus sp. Crataegus sp. X Cuprocyparis sp.</i>	Semi-mature	1.5	10+	60 avg	Yes	0	See Plan				No visual defects, Limited access around base	Single stemmed or Multiple stemmed at base, Vertical, Stubs, Tight union	Old pruning wounds, Minor deadwood	Mixed species hedgerow. Inaccessible due to dense surrounding undergrowth.	Fair	Good	>40 yrs	Low	C	No urgent works required in current site context

Tree ID	Tree Species		Maturity	Measurements				Crown (m)				Tree Condition						Value		Management		
	Common Name	Latin Name		Height (m)	Stems	Stem Diameter (mm)	Estimated	Ave Height	N	E	S	W	Roots	Stem	Crown	Comments	Physiological	Structural	Life Expectancy	Amenity	Category	Works
T11	Beech	<i>Fagus sylvatica</i>	Semi-mature	10	1	280	No	1.5	3	4	3	2.5	No visual defects	Single stemmed, Vertical	No visual defects	Situated in neighbouring land, against the boundary fence and within the hedgerow.	Good	Good	>40 yrs	Moderate	C	No urgent works required in current site context
T12	Cherry	<i>Prunus sp.</i>	Semi-mature	9.5	1	240	Yes	2.5	3.5	2	3	3	No visual defects, Limited access around base	Single stemmed, Vertical, Old pruning wounds, Stubs, Ivy covered	Minor deadwood	Situated in neighbouring land, against the boundary fence and within the hedgerow. Inaccessible due to dense surrounding undergrowth.	Fair	Good	>40 yrs	Low	C	No urgent works required in current site context
T13	Apple	<i>Malus sp.</i>	Semi-mature	7.5	1	210	Yes	2.5	2.5	2.5	2.5	2.5	No visual defects, Limited access around base	Single stemmed, Vertical, Old pruning wounds, Stubs, Ivy covered	Minor deadwood, Ivy in crown	Situated in neighbouring land, against the boundary fence and within the hedgerow. Inaccessible due to dense surrounding undergrowth.	Fair	Fair	>40 yrs	Low	C	No urgent works required in current site context
T14	Hawthorn	<i>Crataegus monogyna</i>	Semi-mature	6	1	170	Yes	2	2.5	1.5	2	2.5	No visual defects, Limited access around base	Twin stemmed at 2m, Vertical, Stubs, Tight union, Partially included bark	Unbalanced, Minor deadwood	Situated in neighbouring land, against the boundary fence and within the hedgerow. Inaccessible due to dense surrounding undergrowth.	Fair	Fair	>40 yrs	Low	C	No urgent works required in current site context

Tree ID	Tree Species		Maturity	Measurements				Crown (m)				Tree Condition						Value		Management		
	Common Name	Latin Name		Height (m)	Stems	Stem Diameter (mm)	Estimated	Ave Height	N	E	S	W	Roots	Stem	Crown	Comments	Physiological	Structural	Life Expectancy	Amenity	Category	Works
T15	Apple	<i>Malus sp.</i>	Semi-mature	6	1	190	Yes	1.5	3.5	3	2.5	1.5	No visual defects, Limited access around base	Multiple stemmed at 2m, Slight lean, Stubs	Unbalanced, Minor deadwood	Situated in neighbouring land, against the boundary fence and within the hedgerow. Inaccessible due to dense surrounding undergrowth.	Good	Fair	>40 yrs	Low	C	No urgent works required in current site context
T16	Elder	<i>Sambucus nigra</i>	Semi-mature	5	9	60 avg	No	1	3.5	2	1	2.5	No visual defects	Multiple stemmed at base, Significant lean, Stubs, Tight union, Bark damage	Minor dieback, Minor deadwood, Unbalanced	Growing from base of hedgerow, leaning to the north.	Fair	Fair	20 to 40 yrs	Low	C	No urgent works required in current site context
T17	Hawthorn	<i>Crataegus monogyna</i>	Semi-mature	5	1	130	Yes	1	2	2	2	1.5	No visual defects, Limited access around base	Single stemmed, Vertical, Stubs, Tight union	Small / sparse, Minor deadwood	Situated in neighbouring land, against the boundary fence and within the hedgerow. Inaccessible due to dense surrounding undergrowth.	Fair	Fair	>40 yrs	Low	C	No urgent works required in current site context
G18	Cherry Laurel, Hawthorn, Leyland Cypress	<i>Prunus sp.</i> <i>Crataegus sp. X</i> <i>Cuprocyparis sp.</i>	Semi-mature	1.5	10+	60 avg	Yes	0	See Plan				No visual defects, Limited access around base	Single stemmed or Multiple stemmed at base, Vertical, Stubs, Tight union	Old pruning wounds, Minor deadwood	Mixed species hedgerow, inaccessible due to dense surrounding undergrowth.	Fair	Good	>40 yrs	Low	C	No urgent works required in current site context

Tree Species		Measurements						Crown (m)				Tree Condition						Value		Management		
Tree ID	Common Name	Latin Name	Maturity	Height (m)	Stems	Stem Diameter (mm)	Estimated	Ave Height	N	E	S	W	Roots	Stem	Crown	Comments	Physiological	Structural	Life Expectancy	Amenity	Category	Works
T19	Maple	<i>Acer campestre</i>	Early-mature	13	1	370	No	1.5	5.5	4.5	4	2	No visual defects	Multiple stemmed at 2m, Vertical, Old pruning wounds, Stubs, Epicormic growths, Tight union, Partially included bark	Slightly unbalanced, Minor deadwood, Snapped / hanging branches	Growing in neighbouring property, against the boundary fence. Large dead branch held in crown at 5m.	Fair	Good	>40 yrs	Moderate	B	No urgent works required in current site context
T20	Maple	<i>Acer platanoides</i>	Early-mature	13	1	430	No	1.5	6	2.5	4	3	No visual defects	Multiple stemmed at 2m, Vertical, Old pruning wounds, Stubs, Tight union, Partially included bark	Slightly unbalanced, Minor deadwood	Growing in neighbouring property, against the boundary fence. High proportion of minor deadwood throughout the crown.	Fair	Fair	>40 yrs	Moderate	B	No urgent works required in current site context
T21	Maple	<i>Acer platanoides</i>	Early-mature	12	1	330	No	1.5	5.5	2.5	4	3.5	No visual defects	Single stemmed, Vertical, Stubs, Old pruning wounds	Slightly unbalanced, Minor deadwood	Growing in neighbouring property, against the boundary fence.	Good	Good	>40 yrs	Moderate	B	No urgent works required in current site context
T22	Hornbeam	<i>Carpinus betulus</i>	Semi-mature	10	1	270	Yes	2	3.5	2	3.5	4	No visual defects, Limited access around base	Twin stemmed at 2m, Vertical, Old pruning wounds	Slightly unbalanced, Minor deadwood	Growing in neighbouring property, against the boundary fence. Inaccessible due to dense surrounding undergrowth.	Good	Good	>40 yrs	Moderate	C	No urgent works required in current site context

TREE DATA

Tree Species		Measurements						Crown (m)				Tree Condition							Value		Management	
Tree ID	Common Name	Latin Name	Maturity	Height (m)	Stems	Stem Diameter (mm)	Estimated	Ave Height	N	E	S	W	Roots	Stem	Crown	Comments	Physiological	Structural	Life Expectancy	Amenity	Category	Works
T23	Hawthorn	<i>Crataegus monogyna</i>	Semi-mature	8	4	120, 120, 100, 80	Yes	2.5	2.5	2	1	2	No visual defects, Limited access around base	Multiple stemmed at base, Significant lean, Bark damage, Tight union, Partially included bark, lvy covered	Unbalanced, Small / sparse, Minor deadwood	Growing along boundary line. Inaccessible due to dense surrounding undergrowth.	Fair	Fair	>40 yrs	Low	C	No urgent works required in current site context
G24	Hawthorn	<i>Crataegus monogyna</i>	Semi-mature	6	10+	90 avg	Yes	1	See Plan				No visual defects, Limited access around base	Multiple stemmed, Vertical, Stubs, Tight union	No visual defects	Growing along boundary line. Inaccessible due to dense surrounding undergrowth. Occasional Cherry sapling.	Good	Fair	>40 yrs	Low	C	No urgent works required in current site context
T25	Cherry	<i>Prunus sp.</i>	Semi-mature	6	1	220	Yes	2	2.5	3	3.5	2.5	No visual defects, Limited access around base	Multiple stemmed at 1.5m, Vertical, Old pruning wounds, Epicormic growths, Tight union	Stubs, Minor deadwood	Growing along boundary line. Inaccessible due to dense surrounding undergrowth.	Good	Fair	>40 yrs	Low	C	No urgent works required in current site context
T26	Cherry	<i>Prunus sp.</i>	Semi-mature	6.5	1	320	Yes	1	5	4.5	3	2	No visual defects, Limited access around base	Multiple stemmed at 1.5m, Slight lean, Old pruning wounds, Stubs, Epicormic growths, Tight union, Partially included bark, Minor cavities	Unbalanced, Minor dieback, Minor deadwood, Stubs	Growing along boundary line. Inaccessible due to dense surrounding undergrowth.	Fair	Fair	20 to 40 yrs	Low	C	No urgent works required in current site context

TREE DATA

Tree ID	Tree Species		Maturity	Measurements				Crown (m)				Tree Condition				Value		Management				
	Common Name	Latin Name		Height (m)	Stems	Stem Diameter (mm)	Estimated	Ave Height	N	E	S	W	Roots	Stem	Crown	Comments	Physiological	Structural	Life Expectancy	Amenity	Category	Works
T27	Rowan	<i>Sorbus aucuparia</i>	Semi-mature	6.5	1	120	No	1	1.5	2	2	1.5	Soil compaction	Single stemmed, Vertical, Old pruning wounds, Stubs, Epicormic growths	Unbalanced, Small / sparse, Stubs, Minor deadwood	Situated in neighbouring property. Heavily pruned back from static caravan. Lower branches pressing against fence.	Fair	Fair	20 to 40 yrs	Low	C	No urgent works required in current site context
T28	Cherry	<i>Prunus sp.</i>	Young	5	1	80	No	1.5	1.5	1	1	1	Soil compaction	Single stemmed, Vertical, Epicormic growths, Tight union	Small / sparse	Situated in neighbouring property. Heavily pruned back from static caravan. Lower branches pressing against fence.	Fair	Fair	10 to 20 yrs	Low	C	No urgent works required in current site context
G29	Lawson Cypress	<i>Chamaecyparis lawsoniana</i>	Early-mature	10	10+	250 avg	No	1	See Plan				Soil compaction	Multiple stemmed at 1.5m, Vertical, Old pruning wounds, Stubs, Bark damage, Tight union	Small / sparse, Unbalanced, Minor deadwood	Linear group forming a single canopy, situated in neighbouring property. Various areas of sparse or dead crown, exposed due to the removal or failure of several large branches. Previously topped at 7m.	Fair	Fair	10 to 20 yrs	Low	C	No urgent works required in current site context
T30	Willow	<i>Salix caprea</i>	Semi-mature	10	2	240, 210	Yes	2	1.5	2	3	3.5	No visual defects, Limited access around base	Twin stemmed at 1m, Significant lean, Stubs, Bark damage	Unbalanced, Snapped /hanging branches	Surrounded by dense undergrowth.	Fair	Fair	20 to 40 yrs	Low	C	No urgent works required in current site context

TREE DATA

Tree ID	Tree Species		Maturity	Measurements				Crown (m)				Tree Condition				Value		Management				
	Common Name	Latin Name		Height (m)	Stems	Stem Diameter (mm)	Estimated	Ave Height	N	E	S	W	Roots	Stem	Crown	Comments	Physiological	Structural	Life Expectancy	Amenity	Category	Works
T31	Willow	<i>Salix fragilis</i>	Early-mature	8	1	450	Yes	2	4	5.5	4	4.5	No visual defects, Limited access around base	Multiple stemmed at 2m, Significant lean, Old pruning wounds, Stubs, Epicormic growths, Bark damage, Tight union	Unbalanced, Moderate deadwood	Situated in neighbouring land. Dense undergrowth and piles of green waste limited access and visibility. Heavily pruned back from telephone wires.	Poor	Fair	10 to 20 yrs	Low	C	No urgent works required in current site context
G32	Willow	<i>Salix caprea</i>	Early-mature	12	6	340 avg	Yes	1	4	4	4	6	No visual defects, Limited access around base	Multiple stemmed at base, Significant lean, Stubs, Epicormic growths, Ivy covered	Minor deadwood	2/3 trees forming a single crown. Dense ivy & brambles around the base and up the main stems severely limited the visibility of base, stems and lower crown, preventing detailed inspection.	Fair	Fair	20 to 40 yrs	Low	C	No urgent works required in current site context
G33	Alder, Dogwood, Willow	<i>Alnus sp. Cornus sp. Salix sp.</i>	Semi-mature	8	10+	100 avg	Yes	1	See Plan				No visual defects, Limited access around base	Single stemmed or Multiple stemmed at base, Vertical, Stubs, Ivy covered	Small / sparse, Minor deadwood	Dense ivy & brambles around the base and up the main stems severely limited the visibility of base, stems and lower crown, preventing detailed inspection.	Fair	Fair	>40 yrs	Low	C	No urgent works required in current site context

Tree ID	Tree Species		Maturity	Measurements				Crown (m)				Tree Condition							Value		Management	
	Common Name	Latin Name		Height (m)	Stems	Stem Diameter (mm)	Estimated	Ave Height	N	E	S	W	Roots	Stem	Crown	Comments	Physiological	Structural	Life Expectancy	Amenity	Category	Works
G34	Beech	<i>Fagus sylvatica</i>	Semi-mature	1.5	10+	50 avg	No	0	See Plan				No visual defects	Multiple stemmed at base, Vertical	Old pruning wounds	Managed boundary hedge.	Fair	Good	>40 yrs	Low	C	No urgent works required in current site context
G35	Beech	<i>Fagus sylvatica</i>	Semi-mature	2	10+	50 avg	No	0	See Plan				No visual defects	Multiple stemmed at base, Vertical	Old pruning wounds	Managed boundary hedge, full of brambles.	Fair	Good	>40 yrs	Low	C	No urgent works required in current site context
G36	Beech	<i>Fagus sylvatica</i>	Semi-mature	1.5	10+	50 avg	No	0	See Plan				No visual defects	Multiple stemmed at base, Vertical	Old pruning wounds	Managed boundary hedge.	Fair	Good	>40 yrs	Low	C	No urgent works required in current site context
T37	Alder	<i>Alnus glutinosa</i>	Semi-mature	7	1	230	No	1.5	2	2.5	2.5	2.5	No visual defects	Single stemmed, Vertical, Epicormic growths	No visual defects		Good	Good	>40 yrs	Low	C	No urgent works required in current site context
G38	Privet	<i>Ligustrum vulgare</i>	Semi-mature	2	10+	30 avg	No	0	See Plan				No visual defects	Multiple stemmed at base, Vertical	Old pruning wounds	Managed boundary hedge, full of brambles.	Fair	Good	>40 yrs	Low	C	No urgent works required in current site context
T39	Ash	<i>Fraxinus excelsior</i>	Semi-mature	13	1	430	No	1.5	4.5	5	5	4	Soil compaction, Exposed roots	Twin stemmed at 1.5m, Vertical, Old pruning wounds, Stubs, Tight union, Minor cavities	Minor deadwood		Fair	Good	20 to 40 yrs	Moderate	B	No urgent works required in current site context

