



## Arboricultural Report

Cala Homes (Chiltern) Ltd

Land at Fewcott Road, Fritwell

**Ref:** 16-0390 3849 06

**Version:** 2

**Date:** June 2016

**Author:** Stephen Westmore MSc BSc (Hons) MArborA  
MICFor

**Reviewer:** Shaun Phillips HNDArb CMS MArborA

**Address:** 7 Astley House  
Cromwell Business Park  
Chipping Norton  
Oxfordshire, OX7 5SR

## Version Control

Version Number	Date of Change	Details of change	Changed By
1	03.06.16	Original report	SW
2	22.06.16	Changes following internal quality control procedure	SW

### **COPYRIGHT ©**

The copyright of this document remains with Lockhart Garratt Ltd. Its contents must not be copied or reproduced in whole or in part for any purpose without the written consent of Lockhart Garratt Ltd.

### **DISCLAIMER**

While all reasonable efforts have been made to identify defects in the subject trees, the statements made in this report do not take into account the effects of extreme weather events, vandalism or accidents, or changes to the site that may affect trees that have taken place since the date of the survey. Lockhart Garratt Ltd does not accept any responsibility in connection with these factors. The comments and observations made within this report will cease to be valid either within two years of the date of the survey (unless specifically stated elsewhere within the report), or when site conditions change or any works to trees take place that have not been specified within this report, whichever is the sooner.

## Purpose of Document

This report has been commissioned to provide an assessment of the trees on land at Fewcott Road in Fritwell, in accordance with the guidelines provided by BS5837:2012 Trees in relation to design, demolition and construction – Recommendations.

It consists of:

- A Tree Survey that records all relevant information about the trees on or adjacent to the site that may be impacted by the proposals. This includes a Tree Constraints Plan that shows the location of the trees on the site irrespective of any development considerations.
- An Arboricultural Impact Assessment to consider the impact that the development proposal may have on the trees. It provides details of how any adverse impact will be mitigated (including indicative protection measures) and includes an Arboricultural Impact Plan. This shows the location of the trees in relation to the proposed development and the above and below ground constraints posed by the trees.
- A draft Arboricultural Method Statement to consider the necessary tree protection measures required for retained trees. This includes an illustration of the tree protection measures on a draft Tree Protection Plan.

The purpose of this report is to demonstrate how the tree constraints have been considered in the design and layout of the site. It also provides the local authority (Cherwell District Council) with the necessary information to assess the tree issues associated with the planning application.

The aim is to present the information in a manner that can easily be understood by people without specific knowledge of tree related matters.

## Executive Summary

This report evaluates the potential impact on existing trees by a residential development at land off Fewcott Road in Fritwell. The proposed development is for the construction of 34 residential dwellings with associated access and ancillary features.

An assessment of the trees on site has been undertaken in accordance with the recommendations of British Standard 5837 (2012) *Trees in relation to design, demolition and construction – Recommendations*.

The boundaries of the site have been identified as containing the most important arboricultural elements of the site. This consists of trees both on and offsite.

The proposed layout will require the removal of three trees and one group, and a 10m section of one hedgerow. Two of these trees would be recommended for removal irrespective of this design proposal due to poor physiological and structural condition. The remaining trees are of low arboricultural quality in that they are not rare species, they offer no cultural value and they have limited significance in the landscape and they are not good examples of their species. The removal of these trees will have no negative impact on the wider community as they are only visible within the site.

In order to mitigate tree loss replacement trees have been proposed as part of this scheme. These trees will provide a net gain in canopy cover, wildlife habitat and amenity value.

## Table of Contents

<b>1. INTRODUCTION .....</b>	<b>6</b>
Instruction .....	6
Scope .....	6
Site Description.....	6
Limitations.....	6
Statutory Consideration .....	7
<b>2. TREE SURVEY AND CONSTRAINTS .....</b>	<b>8</b>
Tree Survey .....	8
Tree Constraints.....	8
<b>3. ARBORICULTURAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT .....</b>	<b>9</b>
Design Principles .....	9
Development Proposal .....	9
Impact Assessment.....	9
Mitigation through Landscape and Replacement Planting .....	11
Protection of Retained Trees.....	11
<b>4. SUMMARY OF THE ARBORICULTURAL IMPACTS BY THIS DEVELOPMENT PROPOSAL .....</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>5. APPENDICES.....</b>	<b>13</b>
Appendix 1: Tree Survey Criteria (BS5837:2012).....	13
Appendix 2 - Documents Supplied .....	15

### Attachments

Description	Reference	Version
Tree Schedule	15-1370	2
Tree Constraints Plan	D15-1371	2
Arboricultural Impact Plan	D16-0391	2
Draft Arboricultural Method Statement	16-0449	2
Draft Tree Protection Plan	D16-0392	2

## 1. INTRODUCTION

### Instruction

- 1.01. Written instruction was received from Paul McCann (Cala Homes (Chiltern) Ltd) on 10 September 2015 to undertake a tree survey and to prepare an Arboricultural Impact Assessment to supplement a full planning application for a proposed residential development at the site.
- 1.02. The proposal is for 34 residential dwellings with associated access and ancillary features.

### Scope

- 1.03. The survey has been carried out in accordance with the recommendations laid down by *BS5837:2012 Trees in relation to design, demolition and construction*.
- 1.04. The information collected during the survey has been used to assist in the preparation of a report to accompany a planning application. This report includes:
- A schedule of the relevant trees to include basis data and condition assessment
  - An appraisal of the impact that the proposed development may have on the trees and the resulting impact this may have on the local amenity.

### Site Description

- 1.05. The site is located within the village of Fritwell. It is located west of Fewcott Road. The site consists of stables and associated paddocks.
- 1.06. The majority of the arboricultural features are located at the boundaries of the site. These provide a degree of screening to the site and particularly those within the western boundary.

### Limitations

- 1.07. The following limitations apply to this report:
- **Ecology and Archaeology**: Although trees can be a valuable ecological habitat and can grow in archeologically sensitive areas, I have no specialist expertise in these disciplines and this report does not consider those aspects.
  - **Tree Safety**: Whilst every effort has been made to ensure that comments relating to the tree surveyed are accurate, it must be noted that no tree have been climbed, no internal inspections carried out and no excavation of root

areas has taken place. As such this report should not be taken to mean or imply that any of the inspected trees should be considered safe. No tree can be guaranteed to be 100% safe as some defects are not detectable by visual non-climbed, non-invasive inspection. Failure of an apparently healthy tree, either in part or totally may occur as a result of physical or physiological stress.

### **Statutory Consideration**

- 1.08. A simple online search identifies that the site is not within a Conservation Area and there are no trees subject to Tree Preservation Orders within the site.

## 2. TREE SURVEY AND CONSTRAINTS

### Tree Survey

- 2.01. A tree survey was undertaken on 04 September 2015 and a copy of the recorded data can be seen in the tree schedule attached to this report (Ref: 15-1370). This tree schedule has been updated following a site visit on 09 June 2016 and identifies that a single tree has been removed since the original tree survey. The schedule and Tree Constraints Plan (TCP) have been updated to reflect the site change.
- 2.02. The tree survey considered all trees that have the potential to be impacted by any development proposals. This included trees that are outside the application boundary, but within influencing distance. The extent of the tree survey has been marked on the TCP attached to this report (Ref: D15-1371).
- 2.03. The purpose of the tree survey has been to provide guidance to the developer on the existing tree stock and to inform the site design and layout. The results of the survey allow the opportunity to balance the retention of significant trees against the opportunity to enhance the existing tree stock through proactive management.
- 2.04. The tree survey has been undertaken without influence of the proposed site layout and prior to any works being undertaken on the site.

### Tree Constraints

- 2.05. The results of the tree survey are graphically presented on the TCP.
- 2.06. The above ground constraints posed by canopy spread are plotted as a continuous line around the tree.
- 2.07. The below ground constraints posed by the root protection area (RPA) have been plotted as a magenta line with the text RPA inscribed.
- 2.08. A summary of my assessment of the quality of trees, hedges and woodlands that have been identified on the site is summarised in Table 1.

**Table 1 - An overview of tree quality in the surveyed area**

	Category A	Category B	Category C	Category U	Total
<b>Trees</b>	0	6	7	1	14
<b>Hedges</b>	0	0	4	0	4
<b>Groups</b>	0	3	5	1	9
<b>Total</b>	0	9	16	2	27

2.09. Full details of the assessment criteria for the tree survey can be found in Appendix 1.

### **3. ARBORICULTURAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT**

#### **Design Principles**

3.01. The development proposal submitted as part of this application has been directly and indirectly influenced by the existing tree cover on site.

3.02. The default position has been that no buildings will be sited within the tree canopy or root protection area of any retained tree.

3.03. The trees on the site boundaries have been identified as the key arboricultural constraints to this development and have been accommodated wherever possible within the design.

#### **Development Proposal**

3.04. The proposal is for 34 residential dwellings with associated access and ancillary features.

#### **Impact Assessment**

3.05. The impact assessment has been graphically presented by the Arboricultural Implications Plan (AIP) that is attached to this report (Ref: D16-0391).

3.06. The purpose of the AIP is to identify:

- Trees that are to be removed.
- Trees that require facilitation pruning.
- The impacts have been considered (where possible) in terms of arboricultural impact, ecological impacts, and landscape and visual impacts.

#### **Arboricultural Impacts**

3.07. Two trees and one group (T12, T15 and G26) have the potential to be impacted by this design proposal. The rooting environments of these trees will be encroached by new car parking spaces or necessary working space around new properties. In order to ensure these trees remain free from harm specific tree protection measures have been proposed. These are discussed in more detail in Section 3.19 of this report.

3.08. Tree removal and pruning has been limited to that which is necessary to the development of the site. Consideration has been given to species attributes and the tolerance of individual trees to disturbance. Consideration has also been given to the

presence of surrounding trees and features of the site which may have an influence on retained trees.

3.09. Table 2 provides a detailed assessment of those trees being removed.

**Table 2 - Detailed Assessment of Tree Removals**

Tree Number (Species)	Reason for removal	Evaluation of arboricultural impact
T6, T10, & H13 (10m)	These trees require removal because they are within the footprint of proposed buildings or car parking spaces.	None of these trees are of good quality and their removal will not have an adverse impact on the wider community because they are only visible from within the site.
T7 & G11	These trees are recommended for removal due to poor physiological and structural condition.	These trees would be recommended for removal irrespective of this design proposal.

3.10. One tree (T15) will require a minor crown reduction to the southern canopy in order to facilitate sufficient working space to construct one of the new residential properties. A reduction in approximately 2m will be required. This minor reduction will not alter the physiological or structural condition of the tree, provided best practice is adhered to during the works. Therefore, all tree pruning and removal works will be undertaken by a suitably qualified arboricultural contractor in accordance with BS3998:2010 *Tree Works – Recommendations*.

### **Ecological Impacts**

3.11. A detailed ecological assessment of the site has been undertaken (Ref: 15-1426). The impact assessment considered in this report relates specifically to potential loss of habitat and biodiversity through tree or hedgerow removal.

3.12. The ecological report identified boundary hedgerows as a feature of the site, although the overall ecological value of these is low. The loss of a small section of this hedgerow (H13) has been reflected in the landscape plan (see below) which has provided a replacement habitat in an alternative location within the site.

3.13. No other trees within the site have been recorded as of ecological importance and therefore their loss is not discussed further.

### **Landscape and Visual Impacts**

- 3.14. A detailed Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment of the site has been undertaken (Ref: 16-0501). The impact assessment considered in this report relates specifically to visual impact that tree loss may have on the amenity of the site.
- 3.15. Tree loss within the site has not been determined to have an adverse effect on the landscape or visual quality offered by the site and therefore is not considered further.

### **Mitigation through Landscape and Replacement Planting**

- 3.16. Although tree loss is minimal replacement planting has been considered as part of this design proposal. A landscaping plan showing the location of replacement trees will be submitted as a separate report to this one.
- 3.17. The replacement trees are to be planted within the Public Open Space of this development to mitigate the loss of the trees removed as part of this proposal. The replacements will provide a net gain in canopy cover, biodiversity benefit and visual amenity. The details in relation to the planting, protection and maintenance of these trees will be addressed in the landscaping plan and will not be considered further in this report.

### **Protection of Retained Trees**

- 3.18. The successful retention of those trees that will remain on the site will be dependent upon the quality and maintenance of any protection system that is put in place. Indicative tree protection measures have been considered within this report.
- 3.19. The primary form of protection will be through the use of fencing. The precise form of fencing can vary provided it is fit for purpose and prevents damaging activities within the protected area. The Heras 151 system of fencing is commonly used to provide this level of protection.
- 3.20. The Heras fence panels should be joined using a coupling system such as the Heraslock Anti-tamper coupler, using a minimum of two clamps per panel side, and separated vertically by a distance of 1m. The panels should be secured to the ground using bracing poles or some other suitable form of support that ensures that they are fit for the purpose of excluding site traffic from the protected area and remain rigid and complete.
- 3.21. A combination of permanent and temporary ground protection will also be required to ensure the successful protection of rooting environments of retained trees. A range of systems are available which provide ground protection, but whatever the system used

the end result must be that the existing ground surface remains free from compaction and retains the ability to support root growth from nearby trees. It is recommended that a three-dimensional cellular confinement system is used to provide the required permanent ground protection. The temporary ground protection should consist of load bearing matting that decreases the chances of soil compaction.

- 3.22. A draft Arboricultural Method Statement (Ref: 16-0449) has been prepared. This provides details as to how the necessary tree protection can be implemented. This includes illustrative guidance on a draft Tree Protection Plan (Ref: D16-0392)
- 3.23. The processes of construction are highly unlikely to have a detrimental effect upon the health of the retained trees assuming recommendations made in this report are adhered to at all times by the contractors.

#### **4. SUMMARY OF THE ARBORICULTURAL IMPACTS BY THIS DEVELOPMENT PROPOSAL**

- 4.01. The development proposal is for 34 residential dwellings with associated access and ancillary features.
- 4.02. This development will require the removal of three trees, one group and a 10m section of one hedge. The impact that the loss of these trees will have on the wider community has been considered in arboricultural, ecological and landscape terms. The design proposal has considered these impacts and where necessary mitigation measures have been proposed to ensure that there is no loss to the amenity of the locality.
- 4.03. Tree loss has been limited to that which is necessary to enable the development to take place. Replacement tree planting has been provided as part of the landscape plan. The long term impact of this replacement planting will have a net increase in canopy cover, providing additional habitat and ensuring that the development blends into the local character of the landscape setting.

## 5. APPENDICES

### Appendix 1: Tree Survey Criteria (BS5837:2012)

- 5.01. The assessment of the trees has been carried out in accordance with the guidance provided in Annexe C of BS5837. In summary this requires that any tree on the site with a stem diameter of over 75mm at 1.5m above ground level is recorded.
- 5.02. All observations were made from ground level, without detailed investigation with regard to the general condition of the tree.
- 5.03. Trees that are located outside of the site have been considered as part of this survey, and have been annotated on the accompanying plan as such.
- 5.04. Stem diameter measurements were taken using a girthing tape and in accordance with Annexe D of BS5837. Where access to the base of the tree was not possible for any reason, the diameter has been estimated.
- 5.05. Height, crown spread and canopy clearance measurements are recorded in accordance with the measurement convention detailed in paragraph 4.4.2.6 of BS5837.
- 5.06. The trees are categorised in an order defined in Table 1 of BS5837, a copy of which can be seen in below in Figure 1, but which can be summarised as:
- **A Category** Trees of high quality and value in such a condition as to be able to make a substantial contribution for a minimum of 40 years.
  - **B Category** Trees of moderate quality and value in such a condition as to make a significant contribution for a minimum 20 years.
  - **C Category** Trees of low quality and value currently in adequate condition able to remain until new planting can be established. These trees are expected to remain for a minimum of 10 years. It also includes young trees with a stem diameter less than 150mm measured at 1.5 metres above ground level.
  - **U Category** Trees 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 or forestry management.
- 5.07. Additionally, BS5837:2012 provides subcategories 1-3 within the category system outlined above which indicate the area(s) in which a tree or group retention value lies.
- Mainly arboricultural.
  - Mainly landscape.
  - Mainly cultural, including conservation.

Figure 1 - BS5837 Cascade Chart

BRITISH STANDARD		BS 5837:2012
<b>Table 1</b>	<b>Cascade chart for tree quality assessment</b>	
Category and definition	Criteria (including subcategories where appropriate)	Identification on plan
<b>Trees unsuitable for retention (see Note)</b>		
<b>Category U</b> Those in such a condition that they cannot realistically be retained as living trees in the context of the current land use for longer than 10 years	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Trees that have a serious, irremediable, structural defect, such that their early loss is expected due to collapse, including those that will become unviable after removal of other category U trees (e.g. where, for whatever reason, the loss of companion shelter cannot be mitigated by pruning)</li> <li>Trees that are dead or are showing signs of significant, immediate, and irreversible overall decline</li> <li>Trees infected with pathogens of significance to the health and/or safety of other trees nearby, or very low quality trees suppressing adjacent trees of better quality</li> </ul> <p><i>NOTE</i> Category U trees can have existing or potential conservation value which it might be desirable to preserve; see 4.5.7.</p>	See Table 2
<b>1 Mainly arboricultural qualities</b> <b>2 Mainly landscape qualities</b> <b>3 Mainly cultural values, including conservation</b>		
<b>Trees to be considered for retention</b>		
<b>Category A</b> <b>Trees of high quality</b> with an estimated remaining life expectancy of at least 40 years	Trees that are particularly good examples of their species, especially if rare or unusual; or those that are essential components of groups or formal or semi-formal arboricultural features (e.g. the dominant and/or principal trees within an avenue)	Trees, groups or woodlands of significant conservation, historical, commemorative or other value (e.g. veteran trees or wood-pasture)
<b>Category B</b> <b>Trees of moderate quality</b> with an estimated remaining life expectancy of at least 20 years	Trees that might be included in category A, but are downgraded because of impaired condition (e.g. presence of significant though remediable defects, including unsympathetic past management and storm damage), such that they are unlikely to be suitable for retention for beyond 40 years; or trees lacking the special quality necessary to merit the category A designation	Trees with material conservation or other cultural value
<b>Category C</b> <b>Trees of low quality</b> with an estimated remaining life expectancy of at least 10 years, or young trees with a stem diameter below 150 mm	Unremarkable trees of very limited merit or such impaired condition that they do not qualify in higher categories	Trees with no material conservation or other cultural value

## Appendix 2 - Documents Supplied

### Documents Supplied

Document Reference	Date Received	Document Details	Supplied By
6028	02.09.15	Topographical Survey	Groundsurveys Ltd
Sk.01_Rev L	31.05.16	Proposed Layout	Cala Homes (Chiltern) Ltd

BS5837: 2012 Tree Survey

<b>Client:</b> Cala Homes (Chiltern) Ltd	<b>Reference:</b> 15-1370/3829/06 v1
<b>Site:</b> Land off Fewcott Road, Fritwell	<b>Date of survey:</b> 04/09/2015
<b>Surveyor:</b> Steve Westmore	

\*This schedule has been updated following an additional site visit on 09/06/16.

Key to Notations		Age Class		Definition		Category Grading		Sub category	
<b>Stem Dia:</b>	Stem diameter (mm) at 1.5m above ground level	<b>Y</b>	Young	1st 1/3rd of life expectancy		<b>Category</b>		<b>ULE</b>	
<b>C.C.</b>	Height of crown clearance above ground level	<b>EM</b>	Early Mature	2nd 1/3rd of life expectancy		<b>A</b>	High Quality & Value	40+	1
<b>L.B.</b>	Lowest branch height in meters	<b>M</b>	Mature	Final 1/3rd of life expectancy		<b>B</b>	Moderate Quality & Value	20-40	2
<b>D.L.B.</b>	Direction of Lowest Branch	<b>OM</b>	Over Mature	Beyond life expectancy & in natural decline		<b>C</b>	Low Quality & Value	10-20	3
<b>U.L.E.</b>	Useful Life Expectancy of tree in years	<b>V</b>	Veteran	Great age & poss. high conservation value		<b>U</b>	Dead, dying or dangerous	<10	
<b>Physiological condition</b>	<b>Good</b>	No significant health problems		<b>Fair</b>	Symptoms of health that can be remediated		<b>Poor</b>	Significant ill health	
<b>Structural condition</b>	<b>Good</b>	No significant defects		<b>Fair</b>	Significant defects that can be remediated		<b>Poor</b>	Significant defects with no remedy	

Tree No.	Tag No.	Species	Botanical Name	H (m)	Stem Dia.	No of Stems	Branch Spread (m)				CC (m)	LB (m)	DLB (m)	Age	PC	SC	Comments	Recommendations	ULE	Cat.	RPA (m2)	RPA Radial distance (m)
							N	E	S	W												
1	G1	Hawthorn (Group)	<i>Crataegus spp.</i>	6.5	190	1	3	3	3	2	-	-	North	EM	Fair	Fair	Offsite group of x1 hawthorn, x2 elm and x1 elder - unable to take accurate measurements. All ivy clad and widely spaced and provides marginal low level screening value.	None.	10-20	C2	18	2
2	T2	Sycamore	<i>Acer pseudoplatanus</i>	13.5	260	1	6	7	7	6	2	-	North	M	Good	Fair	Offsite tree of x14 stems from old coppice stool. Prominent boundary tree with debris and farm machinery stored at base south (within site).	Remove debris from beneath canopy and consider decompaction measures to improve rooting environment.	40+	B1	28	3
3	T3	Elm	<i>Ulmus sp.</i>	6	90	1	1	1	1	2	2	3	East	Y	Fair	Fair	Offsite tree of little significance.	None.	10-20	C1	5	1
4	T4	Elm	<i>Ulmus sp.</i>	5.5	158	3	3	3	3	3	3	1	East	EM	Fair	Fair	Unable to access - all measurements estimated. Insignificant tree with debris stored at base.	None.	10-20	C1	10	2
5	G5	Apple (Group)	<i>Malus spp.</i>	6	200	1	3	3	3	3	2	-	South	M	Fair	Poor	Linear group of x2 elder, x1 hawthorn and x3 crab apple. Majority ivy clad and leaning due west. Group forms marginal low quality screen to neighbouring site. Overall little retention value.	If retained, remove x2 dead elder at northern end.	10-20	C2	18	2
6	T6	Sycamore	<i>Acer pseudoplatanus</i>	11.5	418	3	4	4	4	4	3	1	South	M	Good	Fair	x3 stems from base with included union. Debris stored at base and unlikely to be suitable for retention due to structural defects.	If retained remove debris from around base of tree.	10-20	C1	82	5
7	T7	Elder	<i>Sambucus nigra</i>	3.5	292	3	3	2	2	3	2	1	North	M	Poor	Fair	Multi stemmed from base and suppressed by larger tree due east.	Remove.	>10	U	41	4
8	H8	Elder	<i>Sambucus nigra</i>	2.5	150	1	2	2	2	2	-	-	South	M	Fair	Poor	Linear hedge of elder and hawthorn. Not actively managed and densely ivy clad. Generally poor and forms partial low level screen to neighbouring site.	Remove and replace.	10-20	C2	10	2
9	T9	Hawthorn (Common)	<i>Crataegus monogyna</i>	5.5	203	3	3	3	3	3	2	1	West	M	Good	Fair	Offsite tree - all measurements estimated. Multi stemmed from base.	None.	20-40	C1	18	2
10	T10	Sycamore	<i>Acer pseudoplatanus</i>	10	247	3	3	3	4	4	2	1	East	M	Good	Fair	Offsite tree - all measurements estimated. Stem bifurcates at 1.5m with included union, retention category down graded due to structural defects but otherwise reasonable quality tree.	None.	10-20	C1	28	3
11	G11	Elder	<i>Sambucus nigra</i>	5.5	230	1	4	3	3	3	1	2	East	M	Poor	Poor	Offsite group - all measurements estimated. Western tree has partially failed and group is overall poor.	None.	>10	U	23	3
12	T12	Ash (Common)	<i>Fraxinus excelsior</i>	16	636	3	6	6	6	6	3	1	East	M	Good	Fair	Offsite tree - all measurements estimated. Stem trifurcates at base and is partially ivy clad. Tree is growing on old boundary wall.	None.	20-40	B1	177	8
13	H13	Blackthorn	<i>Prunus spinosa</i>	2	80	1	2	2	2	2	-	-	South	EM	Fair	Fair	Linear hedgerow which hasn't been managed. Group provides marginal habitat value and green corridor network.	None.	20-40	C3	3	1

BS5837: 2012 Tree Survey

Key to Notations												
		Age Class		Definition			Category Grading					
Stem Dia:	Stem diameter (mm) at 1.5m above ground level	Y	Young	1st 1/3rd of life expectancy			Category					
C.C.	Height of crown clearance above ground level	EM	Early Mature	2nd 1/3rd of life expectancy			A	High Quality & Value	40+	1	Mainly arboricultural value	
L.B.	Lowest branch height in meters	M	Mature	Final 1/3rd of life expectancy			B	Moderate Quality & Value	20-40	2	Mainly landscape value	
D.L.B.	Direction of Lowest Branch	OM	Over Mature	Beyond life expectancy & in natural decline			C	Low Quality & Value	10-20	3	Mainly cultural value	
U.L.E.	Useful Life Expectancy of tree in years	V	Veteran	Great age & poss. high conservation value			U	Dead, dying or dangerous	<10			
Physiological condition		Good	No significant health problems			Fair	Symptoms of health that can be remediated			Poor	Significant ill health	
Structural condition		Good	No significant defects			Fair	Significant defects that can be remediated			Poor	Significant defects with no remedy	

Tree No.	Tag No.	Species	Botanical Name	H (m)	Stem Dia.	No of Stems	Branch Spread (m)				CC (m)	LB (m)	DLB (m)	Age	PC	SC	Comments	Recommendations	ULE	Cat.	RPA (m2)	RPA Radial distance (m)
							N	E	S	W												
14	G14	Hawthorn (Group)	<i>Crataegus spp.</i>	7	220	1	3	3	3	3	1	-	South	M	Good	Fair	Offsite group of hawthorn and elder that forms edge of small shelterbelt and habitat area. Evidence of compaction at base from horses but otherwise good quality group.	None.	20-40	B2	23	3
15	T15	Ash (Common)	<i>Fraxinus excelsior</i>	11.5	410	1	5	4	6	6	2	4	South	M	Fair	Good	Offsite tree - all measurements estimated.	None.	20-40	B1	72	5
16	G16	Hawthorn (Group)	<i>Crataegus spp.</i>	7	170	1	3	3	3	3	2	2	East	EM	Good	Good	Offsite group - all measurements estimated. Mixed species of hawthorn, elder, elm, ash, field maple, sycamore, cherry, hazel and blackthorn. Trees share mutual canopy and provides good vegetative screen to new offsite properties.	Provide minimum 3.5m buffer for future root growth.	40+	B2	14	2
17	T17	Ash (Common)	<i>Fraxinus excelsior</i>	9.5	430	1	4	3	3	3	2	4	East	M	Fair	Fair	Offsite tree - all measurements estimated. Stunted growth for species and age.	None.	10-20	C1	82	5
18	G18	Sycamore	<i>Acer pseudoplatanus</i>	7	140	1	2	2	2	2	1	1	East	EM	Good	Fair	Offsite group - all measurements estimated. Consists of sycamore, birch and hawthorn. Tress shares mutual canopy and provides partial screen to new offsite properties.	Provide minimum 3.5m buffer for future root growth.	10-20	C2	10	2
19	T19	Sycamore	<i>Acer pseudoplatanus</i>	16	658	2	6	5	5	6	2	1	East	M	Good	Fair	Tree on corner of site. Good example of species but evidence of included bark at stem union. Downgraded due to structural defect.	None.	40+	B1	191	8
20	H20	Hawthorn (Group)	<i>Crataegus spp.</i>	5	130	1	2	2	2	2	-	-	North	EM	Fair	Fair	Linear hedgerow of hawthorn, blackthorn, elder, apple and sycamore. Numerous gaps and unmanaged.	Hedgerow management regime needed and supplementary planting.	10-20	C2	7	2
21	T21	Sycamore	<i>Acer pseudoplatanus</i>	14	430	1	5	4	4	4	2	2	West	M	Good	Fair	Electric fence attached to tree and open cavity at base north to 1.5m with significant reaction wood. Otherwise fairly prominent tree.	If retained reinspect for health and safety purposes.	20-40	B1	82	5
22	T22	Narrow-Leaved Ash	<i>Fraxinus angustifolia</i>	12	520	1	5	3	6	7	1	1	West	M	Good	Fair	Offsite tree - all measurements estimated. Tree is located east of ditch and canopy extends into site. Evidence of x2 hanging branches at 5m west.	Remove hanging branch and provide offset to accommodate root growth.	20-40	B1	125	6
23	H23	Blackthorn	<i>Prunus spinosa</i>	5	160	1	3	3	3	3	1	-	North	M	Good	Fair	Boundary group of blackthorn and hawthorn that forms dense screen to offsite access drive. Provides dense habitat corridor.	Consider hedgerow management plan.	20-40	C2	10	2
24	G24	Sycamore	<i>Acer pseudoplatanus</i>	7	270	1	3	3	3	3	1	1	North	EM	Good	Fair	Offsite group - all measurements estimated. Consists of sycamore, ash, hawthorn, field maple, elm and blackthorn. Soil banded at base north and shares mutual canopy. Provides vegetative screen offsite.	Remove soil bund to benefit root spread.	20-40	B2	34	3
25	G25	Sycamore	<i>Acer pseudoplatanus</i>	6	309	3	4	4	4	4	-	1	West	M	Fair	Fair	Offsite group - all measurements estimated. Historically pollarded at 1.5m (?).	None.	20-40	C2	41	4

BS5837: 2012 Tree Survey

Key to Notations									
		Age Class		Definition		Category Grading			
Stem Dia:	Stem diameter (mm) at 1.5m above ground level	Y	Young	1st 1/3rd of life expectancy		Category		ULE	Sub category
C.C.	Height of crown clearance above ground level	EM	Early Mature	2nd 1/3rd of life expectancy		A	High Quality & Value	40+	1 Mainly arboricultural value
L.B.	Lowest branch height in meters	M	Mature	Final 1/3rd of life expectancy		B	Moderate Quality & Value	20-40	2 Mainly landscape value
D.L.B.	Direction of Lowest Branch	OM	Over Mature	Beyond life expectancy & in natural decline		C	Low Quality & Value	10-20	3 Mainly cultural value
U.L.E.	Useful Life Expectancy of tree in years	V	Veteran	Great age & poss. high conservation value		U	Dead, dying or dangerous	<10	
Physiological condition		Good	No significant health problems		Fair	Symptoms of health that can be remediated		Poor	Significant ill health
Structural condition		Good	No significant defects		Fair	Significant defects that can be remediated		Poor	Significant defects with no remedy

Tree No.	Tag No.	Species	Botanical Name	H (m)	Stem Dia.	No of Stems	Branch Spread (m)				CC (m)	LB (m)	DLB (m)	Age	PC	SC	Comments	Recommendations	ULE	Cat.	RPA (m2)	RPA Radial distance (m)
							N	E	S	W												
26	T26	Ash (Common)	<i>Fraxinus excelsior</i>	7.5	321	3	6	4	3	5	2	1	West	M	Fair	Fair	Offsite tree - all measurements estimated. Debris stored at base and stem trifurcates at base with an uneven canopy.	None.	10-20	C1	48	4
27	G27	Hawthorn (Group)	<i>Crataegus spp.</i>	4	180	1	3	3	3	3	1	-	North	EM	Fair	Poor	Offsite group which is widely spaced. Consists of hawthorn, elder and elm. Debris stored at base and growing on bank of ditch. Overall little retention value.	None.	10-20	C2	14	2