

# ARBORICULTURAL REPORT

to BS 5837:2012 at:

'Tapper's Farm'
Oxford Road,
Bodicote,
Banbury,
Oxfordshire
OX16 9HA

Prepared for:

Hollins Strategic Land
Suite 4,
1 King Street,
Manchester
M2 6AW

Date: February 2018

Reference: AWA2120





## **Contents**

1.	Introducti	ion	3
	1.1	Instructions and Brief	3
	1.2	Survey Details	3
2.	The Site		4
	2.1	Location & Description	4
3.	The Trees		4
	3.1	Legal	4
	3.2	Tree Survey Results	5
	3.3	Arboricultural Development Advice	6
	3.4	Protection of the Retained Trees	7
4.	Signature	Э	8
Αŗ	pendix 1:	Authors Qualifications & Experience	10
Αŗ	pendix 2:	Survey Methodology and Limitations of Report	11
Αŗ	pendix 3:	Explanation of Tree Descriptions	12
Αŗ	pendix 4:	Tree Data	13
Αŗ	pendix 5:	Tree Constraints Plan	14



#### 1. Introduction

#### 1.1 Instructions and Brief

- 1.1.1 We were instructed by Josh Ramsay of Hollins Strategic Land, to visit the site and prepare our findings in a report.
- 1.1.2 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 Survey Details

- 1.2.1 The survey took place during February 2018.
- 1.2.2 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.
- 1.2.3 Any additional off-site trees that could impact a new development design have been included in the tree survey parameters.
- 1.2.4 The author's qualifications and experience are included within Appendix 1. 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. The Site

#### 2.1 Location & Description

- 2.1.1 The site is located on Oxford Road in Bodicote, a village and civil parish south of Banbury, Oxfordshire.
- 2.1.2 The site currently consists of a farm shop with attached large grass field. A neighbouring primary school is situated to the west of the site with residential properties to the south. Roads run along the site's northern and eastern boundaries.

#### 3. The Trees

#### 3.1 Legal

- 3.1.1 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.
- 3.1.2 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*.



#### 3.2 Tree Survey Results

- 3.2.1 The tree survey revealed 48 items of woody vegetation, comprised of 41 individual trees and 7 groups of trees or hedges.
- 3.2.2 Of the surveyed trees: 6 trees are retention category `A', 21 trees are retention category `B'; and the remaining 21 trees or groups are retention category `C' (explanatory details regarding the retention categories are included within Appendix 3).
- 3.2.3 Species diversity at the site is relatively good, with several Oak, Beech, Lime, Maple, Horse Chestnut and Ash and occasional Hawthorn, Elder and Holly. Most of the site's trees are mature, with occasional early mature and semi mature trees.
- 3.2.4 The site's most significant trees are the Oak, Horse Chestnut and Beech trees situated in and around the large grass field (T1, T3, T4, T5, T7, T8, T9 and T40). The highest value of these are the Oaks T3, T7, T9, T40 and the Beech T1, which are large mature trees in good overall condition and provide high amenity and arboricultural value.
- 3.2.5 While the Horse Chestnuts T5 and T8 are large mature prominent trees and are of considerable ecological value, they have numerous defects which mean they may be unsuitable for retention close to a new development at the site.
- 3.2.6 Trees T1, T3 and T40 were unable to be fully inspected due to the dense lvy covering their main stems; it is recommended to sever and remove the lvy regardless of development at the site, so that detailed inspections of the trees can be undertaken in future.
- 3.2.7 An adjacent row of predominantly Limes with occasional Field Maple borders the site's western boundary (T18 to T23, T25 to T35). The trees are all situated in the grounds of the neighbouring school and so were only given cursory inspections. Collectively they form a high amenity value landscape feature, forming an avenue of trees leading down the site's access drive and provide screening between the site and the school. All trees appear to have had previous minor crown lifting and reduction works over the site's access road.
- 3.2.8 The boundary hedges G2, G17, G24 and G39 are only of relatively low arboricultural value but have been well managed through regular flailing and provide good screening value.



- 3.2.9 An Oak T16 is situated to the south of the site, in the grounds of the neighbouring school. The tree was only given a cursory inspection due to its adjacent location but is a large mature tree which provides high amenity value to the site and the school.
- 3.2.10 A group of semi mature Ash, Sycamore and Field Maple is situated at the site's northern corner (T41 to T47). Although the trees are in prominent roadside positions, many are in relatively poor overall condition, with Ivy covering the majority of the trees' main stems and suppressing many of their crowns and so are only of low amenity value.
- 3.2.11 Some trees were covered in dense lvy or were inaccessible (as detailed in Appendix 4) in such cases measurements were estimated and the condition values are indicative only.
- 3.2.12 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.
- 3.2.13 Some lower value tree, hedge and shrub groups do not have RPAs detailed on tree plans. The detailed extent and spread of the low value groups, in conjunction with the tree schedule, is sufficient to assess the associated potential constraints.
- 3.2.14 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.

#### 3.3 Arboricultural Development Advice

- 3.3.1 The higher value retention category `A' and `B' trees and groups should be retained, where possible, and incorporated into any new development design.
- 3.3.2 Where suitable, those category `C' trees and groups with reasonable future prospects (as detailed in 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.
- 3.3.3 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.
- 3.3.4 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.
- 3.3.5 If construction of new buildings is required within the trees RPA it may be possible to employ special foundation design such as mini/micro pile and suspended beam or a cantilevered foundation.
- 3.3.6 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 methods with a porous final surface.
- 3.3.7 The design of the new development should consider tree crown positions 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.

#### 3.4 Protection of the Retained Trees

- 3.4.1 The retained trees may require protection by fencing in accordance with BS 5837: 2012, during the development phase.
- 3.4.2 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. Signature

I trust this report provides all the required information.



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

12th February 2018

#### **AWA Tree Consultants Limited**

Union Forge 27 Mowbray Street Sheffield S3 8EN

www.awatrees.com





# **Appendices**

Appendix 1: Authors Qualifications and Experience
Appendix 2: Survey Methodology and Limitations
Appendix 3: Explanation of Tree Descriptions
Appendix 4: Tree Data
Appendix 5: Tree Constraints Plan



#### **Appendix 1: Authors Qualifications & Experience**

Mr 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). TechArborA. PTI (Lantra).

Dave has a Foundation Degree in Arboriculture (with Distinction) and is qualified in Professional Tree Inspection. He is a Technician 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.

Mr Ricky Nos BSc (Hons), FdSc (Arboriculture), TechArborA.

Ricky is a trained arborist with 10 years of experience in the private and local authority sectors, taking in all aspects of arboricultural work. He has a BSc (Honours) Outdoor Management, a Foundation Degree in Arboriculture, and is a technician Member of the Arboricultural Association. His main work consists of tree surveys for development projects, involving tree inspections and the preparation of Tree Reports to BS 5837:2012.



# 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.



# **Appendix 4: Tree Data**

	Tree S	Species		Meas	surem	ents			Cro	wn (	(m)				Tree Condition	1				Valu	ue	Management
Tree ID	Common Name	Latin Name	Maturity	Height (m)	Stems	Stem Dia (mm)	Estimated	Ave Height	N	E	s	w	Roots	Stem	Crown	Comments	Physiology	Structural	Life Expectancy	Amenity	Category	Works
T1	Beech	Fagus sylvatica	Mature	18	1	850	No	4	9.5	11	8.5	10	No visual defects	Single stemmed. Vertical. Bark damage. Ivy covered.	Minor deadwood. Snapped limbs. Old pruning wounds. Ivy covered. Overhanging adjacent land.	Wooden fence nailed to stem and barbed wire fence embedded in stem. Ivy prevented detailed inspection and accurate stem measurement.	Fair	Good	>40 yrs	High	4	Recommended to sever/ remove lvy regardless of development
G2	Hawthorn. Elder. Ash.	Crataegus sp. Sambucus sp. Fraxinus sp.	Mature	1.5	10+	100	No	0		See	plan		No visual defects	Single and Multiple stemmed. Vertical. Slight lean. Old pruning wounds. Stubs. Bark damage. lvy covered. Tight union. Minor cavities. Minor decay.	Minor dieback. Minor deadwood. Snapped limbs.	Managed roadside hedge. Recently flailed.	Fair	Fair	>40 yrs	Moderate	С	No works
ТЗ	Oak	Quercus robur	Mature	15	1	800	No	4	8.5	6	8	9	No visual defects	Single stemmed. Vertical. lvy covered.	Snapped limbs. Old pruning wounds. Minor deadwood. Ivy covered. Overhanging adjacent land.	lvy prevented detailed inspection and accurate stem measurement. Previously reduced from road.	Good	Fair	>40 yrs	High	А	Recommended to sever/ remove lvy regardless of development
Т4	Beech	Fagus sylvatica	Mature	17	1	820	No	3	8.5	8	12	11	Soil compaction.  Damage to buttress roots.  Exposed roots.	Single stemmed. Slight lean south west. Old pruning wounds. Stubs. Minor cavities. Minor decay. Bark damage.	Old pruning wounds. Minor cavities. Minor deadwood. Snapped limbs. Overhanging adjacent land.	Soil compaction and bark damage maybe from livestock	Fair	Fair	>40 yrs	High	В	No works



	Tree S	Species		Meas	surem	ents			Cro	wn (	(m)					Tree Condition	1				Valu	ue	Management
Tree ID	Common Name	Latin Name	Maturity	Height (m)	Stems	Stem Dia (mm)	Estimated	Ave Height	N	E	s	W	,	Roots	Stem	Crown	Comments	Physiology	Structural	Life Expectancy	Amenity	Category	Works
T5	Horse Chestnut	Aesculus hippocastanum	Mature	21	1	1190	No	4	8.5	7.5	7	9		Damage to buttress roots. Exposed roots.	Single stemmed. Vertical. Bark damage. Moderate cavities. Moderate decay.	Moderate dieback. Moderate deadwood. Snapped limbs.	Several moderate to major cavitieswith decay to main stem. Extensive bark damage. Considerable snapped limbs in crown. Excellent ecological value but likely unsuitable for retention near development.	Fair	Fair	20 to 40 yrs	Moderate	В	No works
Т6	Hawthorn	Crataegus monogyna	Mature	7	1	440	No	3	6	5.5	5	4.5	5	Damage to buttress roots	Single stemmed. Vertical. Old pruning wounds. Stubs. Bark damage. Minor cavities. Major cavity. Major decay.	Old pruning wounds. Minor dieback. Minor deadwood.	Large decayed cavity at base of main stem from 0 to 0.5m. Unsuitable for retention near development.	Fair	Poor	10 to 20 yrs	Moderate	С	No works
Т7	Oak	Quercus robur	Mature	16	1	820	No	3	7	8	11	9		Damage to buttress roots	Single stemmed. Vertical. Bark damage. Stubs. Minor decay.	Minor dieback. Snapped limbs. Moderate deadwood.	Moderate sized dead limb with decay to main stem on northern side at 2m. Would likely need pruning works for development.	Fair	Fair	>40 yrs	Moderate	А	No works



	Tree S	Species		Meas	sureme	ents			Cro	wn (	(m)				Tree Condition	١				Valu	ue	Management
Tree ID	Common Name	Latin Name	Maturity	Height (m)	Stems	Stem Dia (mm)	Estimated	Ave Height	N	E	s	W	Roots	Stem	Crown	Comments	Physiology	Structural	Life Expectancy	Amenity	Category	Works
Т8	Horse Chestnut	Aesculus x carnea	Mature	14	1	740	No	3	5.5	6.5	6	5	Damage to buttress roots. So compaction	Single stemmed. Vertical. Epicormic growths. Bark damage. Moderate cavities. Moderate decay.	Minor deadwood. Minor cavities. Cankers.	Numerous cankers in crown. Numerous cavities to stem and in crown. Good ecological value but likely unsuitable for retention near development.	Fair	Fair	10 to 20 yrs	Moderate	В	No works
Т9	Oak	Quercus robur	Mature	21	1	1220	No	4	15	14	15	14	Soil compaction. Exposed roots. Damage to buttress roots.	Single stemmed. Vertical. Old pruning wounds. Stubs. Bark damage.	Moderate deadwood. Snapped limbs.		Good	Fair	>40 yrs	High	A	No works
G10	Hawthorn	Crataegus monogyna	Early- mature	2.5	10+	40	No	0		See	plan		No visual defects	Single and Multiple stemmed. Vertical. Stubs. Old pruning wounds. Tight union. Partially included bark. Bark damage.	Old pruning wounds	Managed Hawthorn hedge	Good	Fair	>40 yrs	Low	С	No works
G11	Hawthorn	Crataegus monogyna	Early- mature	2.5	10+	40	No	0		See	plan		No visual defects	Single and Multiple stemmed. Vertical. Stubs. Old pruning wounds. Tight union. Partially included bark. Bark damage.	Old pruning wounds	Managed Hawthorn hedge	Good	Fair	>40 yrs	Low	С	No works



	Tree S	Species		Meas	ureme	ents			Cro	wn (	(m)				Tree Condition	1				Valu	ue	Management
Tree ID	Common Name	Latin Name	Maturity	Height (m)	Stems	Stem Dia (mm)	Estimated	Ave Height	N	E	s	w	Roots	Stem	Crown	Comments	Physiology	Structural	Life Expectancy	Amenity	Category	Works
G12	Prunus	Prunus sp.	Early- mature	4	10+	30	No	0.5		See	plan		No visual defects	Single and Multiple stemmed. Vertical. Slight lean. Epicormic growths. Old pruning wounds. Stubs. Bark damage. Ivy covered. Tight union.	Old pruning wounds. Minor dieback. Minor deadwood. Snapped limbs. Ivy covered. Overhanging adjacent land.	Shrubby boundary group. Partially managed.	Fair	Fair	10 to 20 yrs	Low	С	No works
T13	Elder	Sambucus nigra	Mature	7	9	120	Yes	2	2.5	4	4	4	No visual defects	Multiple stemmed at base. Vertical. Old pruning wounds. Stubs. Tight union.	Minor deadwood.  Moderate dieback. Overhanging adjacent land.	Situated in adjacent land. No access.	Fair	Fair	10 to 20 yrs	Low	С	No works
T14	Holly	llex aquifolium	Semi- mature	7	2	170, 180	No	1	2	2	2	2	Soil compaction	Twin stemmed at base. Vertical. Stubs. Old pruning wounds. Epicormic growths. Tight union.	Normal. Overhanging adjacent land.		Good	Good	>40 yrs	Low	С	No works
T15	Elder	Sambucus nigra	Semi- mature	6	1	110	No	2	2	1	2	1.5	Soil compaction	Single stemmed. Vertical. Stubs. Old pruning wounds. Bark damage.	Normal. Overhanging adjacent land.		Fair	Fair	10 to 20 yrs	Low	С	No works
T16	Oak	Quercus robur	Mature	16	1	800	Yes	2	7	7	7	7	No visual defects	Single stemmed. Slight lean. Bark damage.	Old pruning wounds. Snapped limbs. Minor deadwood.	Situated in adjacent land. No access.	Good	Good	>40 yrs	High	A	No works



	Tree S	pecies		Meas	sureme	ents			Cro	wn (	m)				Tree Condition					Val	ue	Management
Tree ID	Common Name	Latin Name	Maturity	Height (m)	Stems	Stem Dia (mm)	Estimated	Ave Height	N	E	s	w	Roots	Stem	Crown	Comments	Physiology	Structural	Life Expectancy	Amenity	Category	Works
G17	Elder. Hawthorn. Holly.	Sambucus sp. Crataegus sp. llex sp.	Early- mature	1.5	10+	30	Yes	0		See	plan		No visual defects	Single and Multiple stemmed. Stubs. Old pruning wounds. Bark damage. Minor cavities. Tight union.	Old pruning wounds. Snapped limbs. Minor deadwood. Minor dieback.	managed hedge.	Fair	Fair	>40 yrs	Low	С	No works
T18	Lime	Tilia sp.	Mature	16	1	700	Yes	2	6	6	6	6	No visual defects	Single stemmed. Vertical. Epicormic growths. Old pruning wounds. Stubs.	Minor deadwood. Old pruning wounds. Overhanging adjacent land.	Situated in adjacent land. No access. Previous minor crown reduction and crown lift.	Fair	Fair	>40 yrs	High	В	No works
T19	Lime	Tilia sp.	Mature	17	1	400	Yes	3	6	6	6	6	No visual defects	Single stemmed. Vertical. lvy covered.	Old pruning wounds. Minor deadwood. Overhanging adjacent land.	Situated in adjacent land. No access. Previous minor crown reduction and crown lift.	Good	Good	>40 yrs	High	В	No works
T20	Lime	Tilia sp.	Mature	16	1	350	Yes	4	2	4	5	5	No visual defects	Single stemmed. Vertical. Ivy covered.	Minor deadwood. Old pruning wounds. Overhanging adjacent land.	Situated in adjacent land. No access. Previous minor crown reduction and crown lift.	Fair	Good	>40 yrs	High	В	No works
T21	Lime	Tilia sp.	Mature	17	1	500	Yes	3	7	7	7	7	No visual defects	Single stemmed. Vertical. Old pruning wounds. Stubs. Epicormic growths. Ivy covered.	Minor deadwood. Old pruning wounds. Overhanging adjacent land.	Situated in adjacent land. No access. Previous minor crown reduction and crown lift.	Good	Fair	>40 yrs	High	В	No works



	Tree S	pecies		Meas	ureme	ents			Cro	wn (	m)				Tree Condition	1				Valu	ue	Management
Tree ID	Common Name	Latin Name	Maturity	Height (m)	Stems	Stem Dia (mm)	Estimated	Ave Height	N	E	s	w	Roots	Stem	Crown	Comments	Physiology	Structural	Life Expectancy	Amenity	Category	Works
T22	Lime	Tilia sp.	Mature	17	1	400	Yes	5	4	6	6	5	No visual defects	Single stemmed. Vertical.	Minor deadwood. Old pruning wounds. Overhanging adjacent land.	Situated in adjacent land. No access. Previous minor crown reduction and crown lift.	Fair	Good	>40 yrs	High	В	No works
T23	Lime	Tilia sp.	Mature	16	1	400	Yes	5	5	5	5	4	No visual defects	Single stemmed. Vertical. Epicormic growths. Old pruning wounds. Stubs. Ivy covered. Tight union.	c Minor deadwood. Old pruning wounds. Overhanging adjacent land.	Situated in adjacent land. No access. Previous minor crown reduction and crown lift.	Good	Fair	>40 yrs	High	В	No works
G24	Elder. Hawthorn.	Sambucus sp. Crataegus sp.	Early- mature	1.5	10+	30	Yes	0		See	plan		No visual defects	Single and Multiple stemmed. Stubs. Old pruning wounds. Bark damage. Minor cavities. Tight union.	Old pruning wounds. Snapped limbs. Minor deadwood. Minor dieback.	Adjacent managed hedge	Fair	Fair	>40 yrs	Low	С	No works
T25	Lime	Tilia sp.	Mature	17	1	400	Yes	3	6	6	6	6	No visual defects	Single stemmed. Vertical. Old pruning wounds. Stubs. Epicormic growths. Tight union.	Minor deadwood. Old pruning wounds. Overhanging adjacent land.	Situated in adjacent land. No access. Previous minor crown reduction and crown lift.	Good	Good	>40 yrs	High	В	No works
T26	Maple	Acer campestre	Mature	14	1	350	Yes	5	5	5	3	3	No visual defects	Single stemmed. Vertical. lvy covered.	Minor deadwood. Old pruning wounds. Overhanging adjacent land.	Situated in adjacent land. No access. Previous minor crown reduction and crown lift.	Fair	Fair	20 to 40 yrs	High	В	No works



	Tree S	Species		Meas	ureme	ents			Cro	wn (	(m)				Tree Condition					Valu	ue	Management
Tree ID	Common Name	Latin Name	Maturity	Height (m)	Stems	Stem Dia (mm)	Estimated	Ave Height	N	E	ø	w	Roots	Stem	Crown	Comments	Physiology	Structural	Life Expectancy	Amenity	Category	Works
T27	Lime	Tilia sp.	Mature	17	1	350	Yes	5	5	5	5	5	No visual defects	Single stemmed. Vertical. lvy covered.	Minor deadwood. Old pruning wounds. Overhanging adjacent land.	Situated in adjacent land. No access. Previous minor crown reduction and crown lift.	Good	Good	>40 yrs	High	В	No works
T28	Maple	Acer campestre	Mature	15	1	400	Yes	5	5	5	5	4	No visual defects	Single stemmed. Twin stemmed at 1.5m. Vertical. Tight union. Partially included bark.	Minor deadwood. Old pruning wounds. Overhanging adjacent land.	Situated in adjacent land. No access. Previous minor crown reduction and crown lift. Poor partially included bark union 1m long at junction of two main stems.	Good	Fair	>40 yrs	High	В	No works
T29	Maple	Acer campestre	Mature	14	1	300	Yes	5	6	5	4	5	No visual defects	Single stemmed. Vertical. Ivy covered.	Minor deadwood. Old pruning wounds. Overhanging adjacent land.	Situated in adjacent land. No access. Previous minor crown reduction and crown lift.	Good	Good	>40 yrs	High	В	No works
T30	Lime	Tilia sp.	Mature	17	1	400	Yes	5	5	5	5	5	No visual defects	Single stemmed. Vertical. Epicormic growths. Bark damage.	Minor deadwood. Old pruning wounds. Overhanging adjacent land.	Situated in adjacent land. No access. Previous minor crown reduction and crown lift.	Good	Good	>40 yrs	High	В	No works
T31	Lime	Tilia sp.	Mature	18	1	450	Yes	5	6	6	6	6	No visual defects	Single stemmed. Vertical. Ivy covered.	Minor deadwood. Old pruning wounds. Overhanging adjacent land.	Situated in adjacent land. No access. Previous minor crown reduction and crown lift.	Good	Good	>40 yrs	High	В	No works



	Tree S	pecies		Meas	ureme	ents			Cro	wn (	m)				Tree Condition	ı				Valu	ue	Management
Tree ID	Common Name	Latin Name	Maturity	Height (m)	Stems	Stem Dia (mm)	Estimated	Ave Height	N	E	s	w	Roots	Stem	Crown	Comments	Physiology	Structural	Life Expectancy	Amenity	Category	Works
T32	Lime	Tilia sp.	Mature	17	1	350	Yes	5	6	6	6	6	No visual defects	Single stemmed. Vertical. Ivy covered.	Minor deadwood. Old pruning wounds. Overhanging adjacent land.	Situated in adjacent land. No access. Previous minor crown reduction and crown lift.	Good	Good	>40 yrs	High	В	No works
Т33	Lime	Tilia sp.	Mature	16	1	400	Yes	5	6	6	6	6	No visual defects	Single stemmed. Vertical. Ivy covered.	Minor deadwood. Old pruning wounds. Overhanging adjacent land.	Situated in adjacent land. No access. Previous minor crown reduction and crown lift.	Good	Good	>40 yrs	High	В	No works
T34	Lime	Tilia sp.	Mature	18	1	450	Yes	5	6	6	6	6	No visual defects	Single stemmed. Vertical. Old pruning wounds.	Minor deadwood. Old pruning wounds. Overhanging adjacent land.	Situated in adjacent land. No access. Previous minor crown reduction and crown lift.	Good	Good	>40 yrs	High	В	No works
T35	Maple	Acer campestre	Mature	18	1	550	Yes	5	6.5	6	6	4	No visual defects	Single stemmed. Vertical.	Minor deadwood. Old pruning wounds. Overhanging adjacent land.	Situated in adjacent land. No access. Previous minor crown reduction and crown lift.	Good	Good	>40 yrs	High	В	No works
Т36	Horse Chestnut	Aesculus hippocastanum	Early- mature	12	1	300	Yes	7	5	4	5	6	No visual defects	Single stemmed. Vertical. Stubs. Old pruning wounds. Bark damage. Epicormic growths.	25% dead/ absent. Small/ sparse. Old pruning wounds. Minor deadwood. Minor dieback. Overhanging adjacent land.	Situated in adjacent land. No access. Poorly pruned. Numerous large prunign wounds. Extensive bark damage.	Poor	Fair	<10 yrs	Low	С	No works



	Tree S	Species		Meas	urem	ents			Cro	wn (	(m)				Tree Condition	l				Valu	ue	Management
Tree ID	Common Name	Latin Name	Maturity	Height (m)	Stems	Stem Dia (mm)	Estimated	Ave Height	N	E	s	W	Roots	Stem	Crown	Comments	Physiology	Structural	Life Expectancy	Amenity	Category	Works
G37	Hawthorn. Elder.	Crataegus sp. Sambucus sp.	Early- mature	6	10+	150	Yes	2		See	plan		No visual defects	Single and Multiple stemmed. Slight lean. Ivy covered.	Minor deadwood. Minor dieback. Small/ sparse. lvy covered.	Adjacent Ivy covered group. Numerous leaning stems. Leaning over footpath.	Fair	Fair	10 to 20 yrs	Low	С	No works
T38	Oak	Quercus robur	Early- mature	14	1	540	No	3	8	6.5	7.5	8	No visual defects	Single stemmed. Vertical. Old pruning wounds. Bark damage.	Old pruning wounds. Minor deadwood.	Nails in stem	Good	Good	>40 yrs	High	В	No works
G39	Hawthorn. Elder. Ash.	Crataegus sp. Sambucus sp. Fraxinus sp.	Mature	1.5	10+	100	No	0		See	plan		No visual defects	Singleand Multiple stemmed. Vertical. Slight lean. Old pruning wounds. Stubs. Bark damage. Ivy covered. Tight union. Minor cavities. Minor decay.		Managed hedge. Recently flailed.	Fair	Fair	>40 yrs	Moderate	С	No works
T40	Oak	Quercus robur	Mature	16	1	800	No	4	10	13	12	10	No visual defects	Single stemmed. Vertical. Ivy covered. Bark damage.	Minor deadwood. Snapped limbs. Ivy covered. Overhanging adjacent land.	lvy prevented detailed inspection and accurate stem measurement. Fence nailed to main stem.	Good	Good	>40 yrs	High	А	Recommended to sever/ remove lvy regardless of development
T41	Ash	Fraxinus excelsior	Semi- mature	16	1	350	No	5	4.5	4	3	3	No visual defects	Single stemmed. Vertical. lvy covered.	Minor deadwood. Ivy covered.	lvy prevented detailed inspection and accurate stem measurement	Fair	Fair	20 to 40 yrs	Moderate	С	Recommended to sever/ remove lvy regardless of development



	Tree S	Species		Meas	ureme	ents			Cro	wn (	(m)				Tree Condition	1				Valu	ıe	Management
Tree ID	Common Name	Latin Name	Maturity	Height (m)	Stems	Stem Dia (mm)	Estimated	Ave Height	N	E	s	W	Roots	Stem	Crown	Comments	Physiology	Structural	Life Expectancy	Amenity	Category	Works
T42	Ash	Fraxinus excelsior	Early- mature	16	6	180	No	4	2	3	7	6.5	No visual defects	Multiple stemmed at base. Slight lean. Old pruning wounds. Stubs. Ivy covered. Tight union.	Minor deadwood	Ivy prevented detailed inpscetion	Fair	Fair	20 to 40 yrs	Moderate	C	Recommended to sever/ remove lvy regardless of development
T43	Ash	Fraxinus excelsior	Early- mature	18	3	160, 220, 300	No	6	6	3	4	7	No visual defects	Multiple stemmed at base. Vertical. Ivy covered. Tight union.	Minor deadwood. Snapped limbs.	lvy prevented detailed inspection and accurate stem measurement. Limb previously snapped out over footpath to north.	Fair	Fair	20 to 40 yrs	Moderate	С	Recommended to sever/ remove lvy regardless of development
T44	Sycamore	Acer pseudoplatanus	Early- mature	15	6	180	No	4	5	1	5	3	No visual defects	Multiple stemmed at base. Vertical. Ivy covered. Tight union	Minor deadwood	lvy prevented detailed inspection and accurate stem measurement	Fair	Fair	20 to 40 yrs	Moderate	С	Recommended to sever/ remove lvy regardless of development
T45	Sycamore	Acer pseudoplatanus	Early- mature	14	3	180, 200, 240	No	4	5.5	5	1	3	No visual defects	Multiple stemmed at base. Vertical. lvy covered.	Old pruning wounds. Minor deadwood.	lvy prevented detailed inspection and accurate stem measurement	Fair	Fair	20 to 40 yrs	Moderate	С	Recommended to sever/ remove lvy regardless of development
T46	Maple	Acer campestre	Early- mature	9	1	250	No	7	1	1	2	5	No visual defects	Single stemmed. Slight lean south. Ivy covered.	75% dead/ absent. Small/ sparse. Moderate dieback. Moderate deadwood. Ivy covered.	lvy prevented detailed inspection and accurate stem measurement. lvy suppressing crown.	Poor	Fair	<10 yrs	Low	С	Recommended to sever/ remove lvy regardless of development



	Tree S	Species		Meas	urem	ents			Cro	wn (	(m)				Tree Condition	ı				Valu	ue	Management
Tree ID	Common Name	Latin Name	Maturity	Height (m)	Stems	Stem Dia (mm)	Estimated	Ave Height	N	E	s	W	Roots	Stem	Crown	Comments	Physiology	Structural	Life Expectancy	Amenity	Category	Works
T47	Maple	Acer campestre	Early- mature	O	1	300	No	5	1	2	7	1	No visual defects	Single stemmed. Slight lean south. Ivy covered.	75% dead/ absent. Small/ sparse. Moderate dieback. Moderate deadwood. Ivy covered. Overhanging adjacent land.	lvy prevented detailed inspection and accurate stem measurement. lvy suppressing crown.		Fair	<10 yrs	Low	С	Recommended to sever/ remove lvy regardless of development
T48	Maple	Acer campestre	Early- mature	9	1	300	No	5	3	1	1	2	No visual defects	Single stemmed. Slight lean north. Ivy covered.	75% dead/ absent. Small/ sparse. Moderate dieback. Moderate deadwood. lvy covered.	lvy prevented detailed inspection and accurate stem measurement. lvy suppressing crown.	Poor	Fair	<10 yrs	Low	С	Recommended to sever/ remove lvy regardless of development



