

# ARBORICULTURAL REPORT

to BS 5837:2012 at:

Hodsock Woodhouse, Hodsock Lane, Worksop, \$81 0TF

Prepared for: **Eton Construction Ltd** 

Date: January 2023

Reference: AWA5189





# **Contents**

1.	Introducti	on	3
	1.1	Instructions and Brief	3
	1.2	Survey Details	3
2.	The Site		4
	2.1	Location and Description	4
3.	The Trees		5
	3.1	Legal	5
	3.2	Tree Survey Results	5
	3.3	Photographs	8
	3.4	Arboricultural Development Advice	9
4.	Signature		10
Αŗ	pendix 1:	Authors Qualifications & Experience	12
Αŗ	pendix 2:	Survey Methodology and Limitations	13
Αŗ	pendix 3:	Explanation of Tree Descriptions	14
Αŗ	pendix 4:	Tree Data	15
Ar	pendix 5:	Tree Constraints Plan	16



## 1. Introduction

### 1.1 Instructions and Brief

- 1.1.1 We were instructed by Eton Construction Ltd 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 January 2023.
- 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 tree positions were plotted on an Ordnance Survey map base-layer using enhanced GPS technology (1-2m accuracy) and laser distance measurer.
- 1.2.5 This report has been prepared by Mr Adam Winson, Chartered Arboriculturist, MSc, BSc (Hons), MICFor, MArborA, Principal and Director of AWA Tree Consultants Ltd. The tree survey data collection was carried out by Mr Joe Thomas, MSci Biology, Award Level 4 Arboriculture, TechArborA, Arboriculturist at AWA Tree Consultants Ltd.
- 1.2.6 Full 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 and Description

- 2.1.1 The site is located off Hodsock Lane, Worksop, and comprises a detached residential property with gardens. The site is surrounded by agricultural land, other than to the east where a residential property borders.
- 2.1.2 The approximate area of the survey is highlighted in the (2016 Google Earth) image below:





### 3. The Trees

### 3.1 Legal

- 3.1.1 The following advice is for guidance purposes only. Some trees are protected by legislation, and it is essential that the legal status of trees is established prior to carrying out works to them. Unauthorised work to protected trees could lead to prosecution, resulting in enforcement action such as fines or a criminal record. Tree Preservation Orders, Conservation Areas, Planning Conditions, Felling Licences or Restrictive Covenants legally protect many trees in the UK.
- 3.1.2 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.
- 3.1.3 Trees provide a wide range of habitats for many species, some of which are legally protected such as bats, nesting birds, badgers and dormice. It is essential that appropriate care is taken to ensure that this legislation is not contravened.
- 3.1.4 When appointing a tree surgeon, only properly qualified and experienced companies should be used, who have adequate Public Liability and Employer's Liability Insurance.
- 3.1.5 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 36 items of woody vegetation, comprised of 26 individual trees and 10 tree groups or hedges.
- 3.2.2 Of the surveyed trees: 2 trees are retention category `U', 1 tree is retention category `A', 5 trees are retention category `B' and 28 trees, tree groups and hedges are retention category `C' (explanatory details regarding the retention categories are included at Appendix 3).
- 3.2.3 Full details of the surveyed trees, tree groups and hedges are provided in the attached tree data schedule at Appendix 4. General comments are provided below:
- 3.2.4 The significant tree cover within the site consists mainly of trees and tree



groups stretching along the boundaries which provide good screening value from the adjacent land. Within these groups is a species mix of varying age categories. The occasional larger tree is situated throughout these groups. There are fewer trees in the central areas of the site.

- 3.2.5 Species diversity at the site is relatively good. The dominant species is Hawthorn and Cypress, with several Sycamore, Oak, Ash, Hazel, and Willow, with multiple other occasional species. The hedgerows are generally comprised of Hawthorn and Cypress.
- 3.2.6 Most of the trees are semi-mature with only occasional early mature to over-mature trees.
- 3.2.7 The sites most significant tree is T22, a mature Oak. Situated to the south of the site. This tree is prominent throughout the site and surrounding area and provides a moderate level of amenity value.
- 3.2.8 Trees T5, T26, T30, and T36 are significant trees on site with moderate amenity value and good visual value. All are early-mature except T30 which is a mature Weeping Willow. T30 has a prominent position in the landscape and is in good condition, though its age will limit its long-term value.
- 3.2.9 Tree T6 and somewhat T7 have received poor pruning as a result of clearance from the powerline to the south. However, they both are of good visual amenity and are in good structural condition.
- 3.2.10 Trees T20 and T25 are an over-mature Apple and a dead *Prunus sp.* respectively. T20 is in poor condition with major decay and dieback giving it no long-term prospects. T25 is dead so has no prospects. Both are therefore retention category `U'.
- 3.2.11 The remaining trees within the site are of particularly low value and should not pose any significant constraint on the development potential of the site.
- 3.2.12 Many of the Ash trees in the local area show symptoms consistent with Chalara or Ash dieback disease. Once a tree is infected, the disease is usually fatal, either directly or indirectly. While the identified Ash trees may continue to provide landscape and wildlife benefits for some time, their long-term prospects are likely to be limited as a result of Ash dieback.
- 3.2.13 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.
- 3.2.14 The tree Root Protection Area (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.

3.2.15 Some lower value tree, hedge and shrub 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.



## 3.3 Photographs



Photo 1: T5 from north



Photo 2: T1 from south east



Photo 3: Stem of T1 from south west



Photo 4: T4 and T5 from north



Photo 5: T6 and T8 from east



Photo 6: T9 from north east



### 3.4 Arboricultural Development Advice

- 3.4.1 The higher value retention category 'A' and 'B' trees and tree groups should be retained, where possible, and incorporated into any new development design.
- 3.4.2 Where suitable, those category 'C' trees, tree groups and hedges with reasonable future prospects 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.
- 3.4.3 If required by the development proposals, occasional lower value, retention category 'C' trees, tree groups and hedges could be removed, and replacement planting would largely mitigate their losses.
- 3.4.4 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.
- 3.4.5 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 foundations or cantilevered foundations.
- 3.4.6 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 method with a porous final surface.
- 3.4.7 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.
- 3.4.8 The retained trees may require protection by fencing in accordance with BS 5837:2012, during the development phase.
- 3.4.9 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.

Signed

Adam Winson.

Adam Winson, Chartered Arboriculturist, MSc, BSc (Hons), MICFor, ACIEEM

19th January 2023

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, VALID Registered

Adam is the company Director and Principal 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 he 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. Adam has also undertook locum Tree Officer work for several local authorities.

#### Mr James Brown, BSc (Hons) Arboriculture, MArborA, PTI (Lantra), QTRA Registered

James has a BSc (Hons) in Arboriculture, attaining first class honours, as well as being awarded the Institute of Chartered Foresters student award. He is a Professional Member of the Arboricultural Association, an Associate of the Institute of Chartered Foresters, and he is working towards becoming a Chartered Arboriculturist. James joined AWA in 2016, he has several years' experience as an Arboricultural Consultant, he previously worked in Europe's largest container tree nursery and he has experience of local authority Tree Officer work.

#### Dr Felicity Stout, PhD, MA, BA (Hons), Cert Ed Forestry, TechArborA, PTI (Lantra)

Felicity has worked in the tree care profession for the last 10 years. She has a Certificate in Higher Education in Forestry, with a focus on Urban Forestry. She has practical arboricultural contractor experience and is a qualified and experienced social forestry practitioner. Felicity has a PhD in History, with a particular interest in the history of woodland and tree management and she has work published in The Arboricultural Journal on this subject. As well as working at AWA Felicity is the Tree Conservation Officer for the Peak District National Park Authority.

# Mr James Godfrey, BA (Hons), Dip Forestry and Arboriculture Level 4, Cert Arb L3, TechArborA, QTRA Registered

James has extensive arboricultural experience working as a team leader within the public and private sector. By achieving a Distinction Star in the Extended Diploma in Forestry and Arboriculture, James was able to use his knowledge to inform and carry out appropriate maintenance that ensured the long term wellbeing of trees across the UK. During his time at Darlington Borough Council, James provided on site assessment and the management of the remedial works required to ensure safe and suitable retention of trees that provide a multitude of benefits to the urban environment. Currently, James is completing a Foundation Degree in Arboriculture and Tree Management, while working at AWA.

### Mr Joe Thomas, MSci Biology, Award L4 Arboriculture, TechArborA, QTRA Registered

Joe achieved a first class degree in biology with an integrated Masters (MSci) from the University of Sheffield. Additionally, he has a Level 4 Award in Arboriculture. Joe joined AWA after an Urban Forestry role with the Sheffield and Rotherham Wildlife Trust and Sheffield City Council, where he gained a variety of experience in different aspects of the arboriculture sector.

# Mr James Boyle, HND Level 5 Arboriculture and Urban Forestry, Dip Arboriculture Level 4, TechArborA, QTRA Registered

Jim joined AWA after having worked within the tree care profession for several years, alongside studying at college and university. During this time, he gained a wealth of experience and several professional and practical NPTC qualifications in the tree care industry. Jim has studied Arboriculture and Urban Forestry at Merrist Wood College in Surrey, Plumpton College in Sussex and University of Highlands and Islands in the Scottish Highlands, where he achieved a distinction in the Higher National Diploma Level 5.

### Miss Lucy Garbutt, MSc Animal Behaviour, BSc (Hons) Biology, CIEEM

Lucy recently graduated with a masters degree in Animal Behaviour from the UK's highest rated university, St Andrews of Scotland, immediately following the completion of her BSc degree in Biology from Lancaster University. Lucy moved into arboriculture after previous experience of protected species' surveys with a large environmental consulting company, including surveys of bats, reptiles, and dormice.



# Appendix 2: Survey Methodology and Limitations

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 BS 5837:2012 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.

**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 in 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 unsuitable for retention. These trees are in such a condition that any existing value would be lost within 10 years.

	Tree S	pecies		N	/leasu	rement	ts		Cro	own (	m)				Tree Co	ndition				Va	lue	Management
Tree ID	Common Name	Latin Name	Maturity	Height (m)	Stems	Stem Diameter (mm)	Estimated	Average Height	N	E	s	w	Roots	Stem	Crown	Comments	Physiological	Structural	Life Expectancy	Amenity	Category	Works
G1	Leyland Cypress	X Cupressocyparis leylandii	Semi-mature	7	10	100	No	0.5		See	plan		Limited access around base	Multiple stemmed at 0.5m. Epicormic growths. Old pruning wounds. Stubs	Old pruning wounds. Major dieback. Minor deadwood	Managed Cypress tall hedge	Good	Good	10-20 yrs	Moderate	С	No works required in current site context
T2	Deodar Cedar	Cedrus deodara	Early-mature	12	1	480	No	1.5	5	4.5	4.5	5	No visual defects	Single stemmed. Vertical. Old pruning wounds. Stubs	Old pruning wounds. Minor deadwood	Southern and western crown overhanging garage. A fewminor snapped and hanging limbs	Good	Good	>40 yrs	Moderate	В	No works required in current site context
G3	Yew, Cypress, and Hazel	Taxus baccata, Cupressus sp., Corylus avellana	Semi-mature	4	10	100	No	0		See	plan					ith the occasional Hazel. n. Cypress are recently	Good	Good	20-40 yrs	Low	С	No works required in current site context
G4	Cypress	Cupressus sp.	Newly Planted	3	10	50	No	0.5		See	plan		Exposed roots. Bark damage	Old pruning wounds. Multiple stemmed at base. Epicormic growths. Tight unions. Partially included bark	Minor deadwood. Minor dieback. Old pruning wounds	Newly planted hedge	Good	Good	20-40 yrs	Low	С	No works required in current site context
Т5	Sycamore	Acer pseuodoplatanus	Early-mature	10	2	500, 390	No	4.5	6	6.5	6	6.5	No visual defects. Limited access around base	Twin stemmed at 1m. Vertical. Old pruning wounds. Stubs. Ivy covered. Partially included bark. Tight union	Old pruning wounds. Minor dieback. Minor deadwood	Situated in boundary. Telephone wire goes through northern crown	Good	Fair	20-40 yrs	Moderate	В	No works required in current site context



	Tree S	pecies		N	leasu	rement	is		Cro	own (	m)				Tree Co	ndition				Va	lue	Management
Tree ID	Common Name	Latin Name	Maturity	Height (m)	Stems	Stem Diameter (mm)	Estimated	Average Height	N	Ε	s	w	Roots	Stem	Crown	Comments	Physiological	Structural	Life Expectancy	Amenity	Category	Works
Т6	Silver Birch	Betula pendula	Early-mature	16	1	370	No	4	3	2.5	3.5	4	No visual defects	Single stemmed. Vertical. Old pruning wounds. Stubs. Ivy covered. Epicormic growths	Old pruning wounds. Minor dieback. Minor deadwood	Situated on raised area of ground. Pruning wounds to southern crown to clear from telephone wire, some cuts have lead to minor decay in the tips of branches of southern canopy	Fair	Good	20-40 yrs	Moderate	С	No works required in current site context
Т7	Silver Birch	Betula pendula	Early-mature	16	1	390	No	4	4	4	4	2	No visual defects	Single stemmed. Vertical. Old pruning wounds. Stubs. Ivy covered. Epicormic growths	Old pruning wounds. Minor dieback. Minor deadwood	Situated on raised area of ground. Pruning wounds to southern crown to clear from telephone wire	Good	Good	20-40 yrs	Moderate	С	No works required in current site context
Т8	Scots Pine	Pinus sylvestris	Semi-mature	16	1	410	No	1.5	2.5	2.5	3	3	No visual defects	Single stemmed. Vertical. Old pruning wounds. Stubs. Ivy covered	Old pruning wounds. Minor deadwood	lvy prevented detailed inspection. New exposure due to removed trees	Good	Good	20-40 yrs	Low	С	No works required in current site context
Т9	Common Oak	Quercus robur	Semi-mature	13	1	390	No	2	4.5	4	2.5	5	No visual defects	Single stemmed. Vertical. Old pruning wounds. Stubs	Minor deadwood	Wood chippings recently piled at the base of the stem. Bird box on stem	Good	Good	>40 yrs	Low	С	No works required in current site context
T10	Holly	llex aquifolium	Semi-mature	4.5	3	100	No	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	No visual defects	Multiple stemmed at base. Vertical. Old pruning wounds. Ivy covered. Tight union. Partially included bark	No visual defects	Tight stem possibly partially included bark	Good	Good	20-40 yrs	Low	С	No works required in current site context



	Tree S	pecies		N	leasui	rement	s		Cro	wn (	m)				Tree Co	ndition				Val	lue	Management
Tree ID	Common Name	Latin Name	Maturity	Height (m)	Stems	Stem Diameter (mm)	Estimated	Average Height	N	E	s	w	Roots	Stem	Crown	Comments	Physiological	Structural	Life Expectancy	Amenity	Category	Works
T11	Ash	Fraxinus excelsior	Semi-mature	10	1	200	No	6	2	2.5	2	2.5	No visual defects	Single stemmed. Vertical. Ivy covered	Minor dieback	lvy prevented detailed inspection. Wood chip pile situated to 0.5m north of the stem. Minor Ash dieback disease	Fair	Fair	10-20 yrs	Low	O	No works required in current site context
T12	Norway Maple	Acer platanoides	Semi-mature	10	1	260	No	2	2	2.5	3	3.5	No visual defects	Single stemmed. Vertical. Old pruning wounds. Ivy covered	Minor deadwood	Wood chip pile situated 1m north of the stem. Ivy prevented detailed inspection	Good	Good	20-40 yrs	Low	O	No works required in current site context
T13	Himalayan Tree- Cotoneaster	Cotoneaster frigidus	Semi-mature	4	10	50	No	0.5	1.5	2.5	1.5	2	No visual defects	Multiple stemmed at base. Vertical. Old pruning wounds. Stubs. Tight union. Ivy covered	Minor deadwood	Some dead limbs. Ivy prevented detailed inspection	Fair	Fair	10-20 yrs	Low	C	No works required in current site context
T14	Plum	Prunus Domestica	Early-mature	5	4	200, 150, 80, 80	No	0.5	3	1.5	4.5	3	No visual defects	Multiple stemmed at 0.5m. Vertical. lvy covered. Tight union. Partially included bark. Old pruning wounds. Stubs	Old pruning wounds. Minor dieback. Minor deadwood	Northern crown topped at 4.5m. Ivy prevented detailed inspection	Good	Fair	10-20 yrs	Low	O	No works required in current site context
T15	Plum	Prunus Domestica	Over Mature	7.5	5	200, 200, 180, 160, 100	No	1.5	4	3.5	4.5	4	No visual defects. Limited access around base	Multiple stemmed at 1 m. Old pruning wounds. Stubs. lvy covered. Tight union. Partially included bark	Moderate dieback. Minor deadwood. Decay fungi	Phellinus pomaceus in crown on southern and western lower branches. Lower crown dead but upper crown healthy. Tight included bark at 1m. lvy prevented detailed inspection	Fair	Fair	10-20 yrs	Low	С	No works required in current site context



	Tree S	pecies		N	/leasu	rement	s		Cro	own (ı	m)				Tree Co	ndition				Va	lue	Management
Tree ID	Common Name	Latin Name	Maturity	Height (m)	Stems	Stem Diameter (mm)	Estimated	Average Height	N	E	s	w	Roots	Stem	Crown	Comments	Physiological	Structural	Life Expectancy	Amenity	Category	Works
G16	Leyland Cypress	X Cupressocyparis leylandii	Semi-mature	8.5	10	100	No	0.5		See	plan		Exposed roots. Bark damage	Old pruning wounds. Multiple stemmed at base. Epicormic growths. Bark damage. Tight unions. Partially included bark. Minor decay	Minor deadwood. Minor dieback. Old pruning wounds	Northern end lower in height and less developed crowns due to shading. Provides good screening from adjacent property	Good	Fair	10-20 yrs	MoT	O	No works required in current site context
G17	Hawthorn, Hazel, Ash, Oak, Beech, and Elder	Crataegus monogyna, Corylus avellana, Fraxinus excelsior, Quercus petrea, Fagus sylvatica, Sambucus nigra	Semi-mature	6	10	200	Yes	1		See	plan		with occasional with occasiona stem diameter	early-mature Haw Il Hazel, Ash, Oak with a group aver e limited root grow	thorn. Group com , Beech, and Elde age of 15cm. Tree	dary. Mostly semi-mature aposed of mainly Hawthorn ar. Largest stems at 25cm as situated to south of the ue to the stream. Provides ent land	Fair	Fair	20-40 yrs	Low	С	No works required in current site context
G18	Ash, Sycamore, Hazel, and Elder	Fraxinus excelsior, Acer pseuodoplatanus, Corylus avellana, Sambucus nigra	Semi-mature	8	10	150	No	1	5	4.5	4	4	Exposed roots. Bark damage	Old pruning wounds. Multiple stemmed at base. Epicormic growths. Bark damage. Tight unions. Partially included bark. Minor decay	Minor deadwood. Minor dieback. Old pruning wounds	Two ash, two Sycamore, Hazel and Elder forming a group. Some minor Ash dieback disease on the Ash	Fair	Fair	10-20 yrs	Low	С	No works required in current site context
T19	Weeping Willow	Salix chrysocoma	Semi-mature	6	3	250, 200, 150	No	0.5	6	3.5	4	5	Exposed roots	Multiple stemmed at 0.5m. Old pruning wounds. Stubs	Minor deadwood	Powerline above Eastern crown	Good	Fair	>40 yrs	Low	С	No works required in current site context



	Tree S	pecies		N	leasui	rement	:s		Cro	own (	m)				Tree Co	ndition				Va	lue	Management
Tree ID	Common Name	Latin Name	Maturity	Height (m)	Stems	Stem Diameter (mm)	Estimated	Average Height	N	Ε	S	w	Roots	Stem	Crown	Comments	Physiological	Structural	Life Expectancy	Amenity	Category	Works
T20	Apple	Malus sp.	Over Mature	4	1	300	No	1	3	3.5	0.5	0.5	No visual defects	Single stemmed. Slight lean. Stubs. Bark damage. Major decay	50% dead / absent. Major dieback. Minor deadwood	Stem leans slightly to the north east	Decline	Poor	<10 yrs	Low	U	No works required in current site context
G21	Apple, Oak, Hazel, and Yew	Malus sp., Quercus sp., Corylus avellana, Taxus baccata	Semi-mature	7.5	10	100	No	1.5		See	plan		Mixed group of	11 / /	el, and Yew. All se ature Apple	mi-mature except for one	Fair	Fair	10-20 yrs	Low	С	No works required in current site context
T22	Common Oak	Quercus robur	Mature	17	1	750	Yes	3.5	6.5	6.5	7	7	Exposed roots	Single stemmed. Vertical. Old pruning wounds. Stubs. Ivy covered	Old pruning wounds. Moderate deadwood. Overhanging adjacent land	Large Oak. Stream immediately to north of stem. Exposed roots on banking. Crown overhangs adjacent agricultural land. Limited access prevented detailed insepection and accurate stem measurement. Some moderate deadwood in the crown but no target	Good	Good	>40 yrs	Moderate	А	No works required in current site context
G23	Hawthorn, Sycamore, Oak, Elder, Hazel, Ash, Yew and Blackthorn	Crataegus sp., Acer sp., Quercus sp., Sambucus sp., Corylus sp., Fraxinus sp., Taxus sp., Prunus sp.	Semi-mature	12	10	150	Yes	1		See	plan		mature. Group of Oak, Elder, Ha diameter with a	composed of mair izel, Ash, Yew, an group average of d root growth to the	lly Hawthorn and d Blackthorn. Lar 15cm. Trees situa	ary. Semi-mature to early- Sycamore with occasional gest stems at 25cm stem ated to south of the stream e stream. Provides good t land	Fair	Fair	20-40 yrs	Low	С	No works required in current site context
T24	Silver Birch	Betula pendula	Early-mature	13	1	300	No	4	5	5	3	5	Damage to buttress roots	Single stemmed. Vertical. Old pruning wounds. Stubs. Ivy covered	Minor deadwood	lvy prevented detailed inspection of stem. Recently exposed due to removed trees	Good	Fair	20-40 yrs	Low	С	No works required in current site context



	Tree S	pecies		N	/leasu	rement	s		Cro	wn (	m)				Tree Co	ndition				Va	lue	Management
Tree ID	Common Name	Latin Name	Maturity	Height (m)	Stems	Stem Diameter (mm)	Estimated	Average Height	N	E	s	W	Roots	Stem	Crown	Comments	Physiological	Structural	Life Expectancy	Amenity	Category	Works
T25	Prunus	Prunus sp.	Dead	2	1	150	No	na		De	ead			Dead	d standing tree		Dead	Dead	Dead	Low	U	No works required in current site context
T26	Sycamore	Acer pseuodoplatanus	Early-mature	15	1	660	No	3	6	8	6	7	No visual defects. Limited access around base	Single stemmed. Vertical. Old pruning wounds. Stubs. Ivy covered	Minor deadwood	lvy prevented detailed inspection	Good	Fair	20-40 yrs	Moderate	В	No works required in current site context
T27	Common Hawthorn	Crataegus monogyna	Early-mature	6	2	150, 100	No	2	2	2	3	3.5	No visual defects. Limited access around base	Twin stemmed at 0.5m. Old pruning wounds. Stubs. Ivy covered. Tight union	Minor deadwood	Stream immediately to south of stem	Fair	Fair	20-40 yrs	Low	С	No works required in current site context
T28	Common Hawthorn	Crataegus monogyna	Early-mature	6	10	100	No	2	4	4	4	4	No visual defects. Limited access around base	Twin stemmed at 0.5m. Old pruning wounds. Stubs. Ivy covered. Tight union	Minor deadwood	Stream immediately to south of stem. Leaning over stream	Fair	Fair	20-40 yrs	Low	С	No works required in current site context
T29	Common Hawthorn	Crataegus monogyna	Early-mature	6	3	200, 150, 100	No	2	4	3	2.5	3	No visual defects. Limited access around base	Twin stemmed at 0.5m. Old pruning wounds. Stubs. Ivy covered. Tight union	Minor deadwood	Stream immediately to south of stem	Fair	Fair	20-40 yrs	Low	С	No works required in current site context



	Tree S	pecies		N	/leasu	rement	ts		Cro	own (ı	m)				Tree Co	ndition				Va	lue	Management
Tree ID	Common Name	Latin Name	Maturity	Height (m)	Stems	Stem Diameter (mm)	Estimated	Average Height	N	E	s	W	Roots	Stem	Crown	Comments	Physiological	Structural	Life Expectancy	Amenity	Category	Works
Т30	Weeping Willow	Salix chrysocoma	Mature	17	1	980	No	1	9	7	6	12	No visual defects	Single stemmed. Slight lean. Old pruning wounds. Stubs. Minor decay	Minor deadwood. Well developed crown. Old pruning wounds	Large example of species. Some tear outs in crown and two large pruning wounds on south of stem at 4m with minor decay. Swing attached to lower minor branch. Rooting area has been mulched with wood chippings	Good	Fair	20-40 yrs	Moderate	В	No works required in current site context
T31	Common Ash	Fraxinus excelsior	Semi-mature	5	2	150, 50	No	1	2	2	2	2	No visual defects	Single stemmed. Vertical. Old pruning wounds. Stubs	Minor deadwood. Minor dieback	Minor Ash dieback disease	Good	Good	10-20 yrs	Low	С	No works required in current site context
G32	Hawthorn, Elder, Blackthorn	Crataegus monogyna, Sambucus nigra, Prunus	Semi-mature	5		0	No	1		See	plan			e in crowns. Occas		onal Elder and Blackthorn, vthorns. Good screening Il land	Good	Good	20-40 yrs	Low	С	No works required in current site context
G33	Common Hawthorn	Crataegus monogyna	Semi-mature	3	10	100	No	0		See	plan		Exposed roots. Bark damage	Old pruning wounds. Multiple stemmed at base. Epicormic growths. Bark damage. Tight unions. Partially included bark. Minor decay	Minor deadwood. Minor dieback. Old pruning wounds	Semi-managed Hawthorn hedge	Good	Fair	20-40 yrs	Low	С	No works required in current site context



		Tree S	pecies		N	leasu	rement	is		Cro	own (	m)				Tree Co	ndition				Va	lue	Management
Heelb	Tree ID	Common Name	Latin Name	Maturity	Height (m)	Stems	Stem Diameter (mm)	Estimated	Average Height	N	E	s	w	Roots	Stem	Crown	Comments	Physiological	Structural	Life Expectancy	Amenity	Category	Works
T	34	Lawson Cypress	Chamaecyparis lawsoniana	Semi-mature	10	1	300	No	0	3	3	3	3	No visual defects. Limited access around base	Single stemmed. Vertical. Old pruning wounds. Stubs. Tight union. Partially included bark	Minor deadwood	Limited access prevented detailed inspection and accurate stem measurement	Good	Fair	20-40 yrs	Low	С	No works required in current site context
T	35	Lawson Cypress 'Golden Wonder'	Chamaecyparis lawsoniana 'Green Spire'	Semi-mature	10	2	150, 100	No	0	2	2	2	2	No visual defects. Limited access around base	Inruning wounds	Minor deadwood	Limited access prevented detailed inspection and accurate stem measurement	Good	Fair	20-40 yrs	Low	С	No works required in current site context
T	36	Common Yew	Taxus baccata	Early-mature	10	1	500	No	1	5	5	5	5	No visual defects. Limited access around base	Single stemmed. Vertical. Old pruning wounds. Stubs. Ivy covered	Minor deadwood	North western crown overhanging shed. Limited access and ivy prevented detailed inspection and accurate stem measurement	Good	Good	>40 yrs	Moderate	В	No works required in current site context



