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### 1.0 Introduction

1.1 Ascerta has been instructed to carry out a survey of the trees within and immediately adjacent Tan Y Bont, Main Road, Rhosrobin, Wrexham and to assess the potential impact of the development as proposed on trees within / adjacent the site in accordance with British Standard 5837: 2012 Trees in relation to design, demolition and construction - Recommendations.
1.2 The site was visited on $26^{\text {th }}$ January 2021 by Robert Armitage, a competent and qualified arboriculturist with experience of the UK and European arboricultural and landscape industries within the context of the planning system. During the site visit, a survey was carried out of the trees growing both on and immediately adjacent the site to the standards contained within BS5837: 2012.
1.3 This report presents the results of the survey, provides an assessment of the impact of the development and includes recommendations for further actions, where applicable, to mitigate any potential impacts of the development on tree cover within the local landscape.
1.4 Our client's objective is to develop the site by the construction of 219 residential dwellings.

### 2.0 Planning Policy \& Relevant Legislation

2.1 The site lies within the Wrexham County Borough Council administrative area and is subject to the policies contained within its Local Plan. These have been taken into account when writing this report.
2.2 Checks were made with the Local Planning Authority on $29^{\text {th }}$ January 2021 to ascertain whether the site is located within a Conservation Area and/ or whether any of the trees surveyed were subject to any Tree Preservation Orders, but no response was given prior to submission of this report. In advance of the commencement of any works to trees within or adjacent the site, those instructing and proposing to carry out such works should satisfy themselves that all appropriate consents are in place to prevent potential breach of legislation.
2.3 British Standard 5837: 2012 Trees in relation to design, demolition and construction Recommendations provides current recommendations and guidance on the relationship between trees and design, demolition and the construction processes. It sets out the principles and procedures to be applied to achieve a harmonious and sustainable relationship between trees and structures.
2.4 Consideration should also be given to any impacts from the proposed development in respect of the Hedgerow Regulations 1997 and the Forestry Act 1967 (and specifically the potential need for a felling licence), as well as existing UK and European legislation relating to wildlife and nature conservation.
2.5 In accordance with the Hedgerow Regulations 1997, 'important' hedgerows (in the context of the Regulations) should not be removed without a Hedgerow Removal Notice issued by the relevant Local Authority, unless that removal is subject to an appropriate consent under the Town and Country Planning Act 1990. Appropriate checks should be made in advance of the commencement of works to hedgerows to establish the importance or otherwise of the hedgerow and whether there is a requirement for a Hedgerow Removal Notice distinct from any formal planning consent to be granted.
2.6 The revised National Planning Policy Framework, updated on $19^{\text {th }}$ February 2019, sets out the government's planning policies for England and Wales and how these are expected to be applied and has been considered within this report. It provides a Framework within which locally prepared plans for housing and other development can be designed and produced.

### 3.0 Survey \& Survey Methodology

3.1 We have been supplied with a digital copy of the topographical survey map for the site, which satisfies the relevant part of section 4.2 of BS5837: 2012. Features of arboricultural or landscape interest that have been excluded from the original plan (for example trees on or located off site but within a distance from the boundary of the site equal to or less than 12 times the stem diameter of that tree) have been added to the plan manually.
3.2 Thirty-one individual trees, sixteen groups of trees and six hedges were recorded during our survey, the details of which can be found within Appendix 1 to this report and cross referenced with drawing P.1421.21.01 Tree Survey and Tree Removal Plan.
3.3 Our survey of the trees within and adjacent the site was carried out by a qualified and competent arboriculturist in accordance with sections 4.4 and 4.5 of BS5837: 2012 on $27^{\text {th }}$ January 2021 during mild and cloudy weather conditions. Those trees surveyed have been numbered sequentially and the details required by the Standard, including a categorisation in accordance with section 4.5 and Table 1 of the Standard, have been recorded within the Tree Data Tables at Appendix 1.
3.4 Where trees are surveyed that require immediate attention, for example to abate a nuisance, prevent a serious hazard to life or property, or are affected by a pathogen or pest that could cause widespread damage unless it is controlled, notification will be issued to the relevant person or organisation such that appropriate action can be taken.

### 4.0 Potential Arboricultural Impacts

4.1 Table 1 below shows the trees that will need to be removed to facilitate the development of the site.

Table 1: Trees to be Removed

| T. No. | Species | $\frac{\mathrm{HT}}{(\mathrm{~m})}$ | $\frac{\text { Stem }}{\frac{\text { DBH }}{(\mathrm{mm})}}$ | Cat Grade | Reason |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| H1 | Hawthorn, Holly, Elder and Blackthorn | 2.5 | \#150 | B2/C2 | To accommodate the development proposal. |
| H5 (in part) | Hawthorn, Holly, Blackthorn, Hazel and Elder | 1.5 | \#200 | 2.40 |  |
| T3 | Oak | 6 | 510 | B2/C2 |  |
| T4 | Oak | 9 | 730 | B2 |  |
| T5 | Oak | 8 | 700 | B2 |  |
| T6 | Oak | 9 | \#800 | B2 |  |
| G5 (in part) | Blackthorn, Hawthorn and Goat Willow | 4 | \#200 | C2 |  |
| G9 (in part) | Crack willow, Goat Willow and Birch | 8 | \#200 | C2 |  |
| G14 | Sycamore, Alder, Hawthorn, Holly and Goat Willow | 4-7 | \#150 | C2 |  |
| T25 | Oak | 10.5 | \#560 | C2 |  |
| T26 | Oak | 14 | \#950 | A1/B1 |  |
| T27 | Oak | 14 | 1020 | B1/C1 |  |
| T28 | Sycamore | 8.5 | \#480 | C2 |  |
| T29 | Oak | 14 | 880 | B1 |  |
| T30 | Sycamore | 14 | $\begin{gathered} \text { \#580+ } \\ 350+ \\ 350+ \\ 350 \end{gathered}$ | B2/C2 |  |
| G16 (in part) | Hawthorn and Sycamore | 4-9 | \#200 | C2 |  |

4.2 Table 2 below shows trees that are proposed for retention within the development that have the potential to be impacted by the development proposals.

Table 2: Summary of Potential Impacts to Retained Trees

| $\begin{gathered} \text { T. } \\ \underline{\text { No. }} \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Species | $\frac{\mathrm{HT}}{(\mathrm{~m})}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \frac{\text { Stem }}{\text { DBH }} \\ & (\mathrm{mm}) \end{aligned}$ | Cat <br> Grade | Potential Impact |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| T1 | Sycamore | 12.5 | $\begin{gathered} \# 580+ \\ 480 \end{gathered}$ | B1 | The construction of the road along that boundary. |
| G4 | Oak, Goat Willow and Wild Cherry | $\begin{aligned} & 12- \\ & 15 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \# 350 \\ \text { ave } \end{gathered}$ | B2 | Canopy pruning away from the proposed road. |
| T11 | Oak | 14 | 890 | A1 | The construction of new hoggin footpath |
| T24 | Ash | 11 | $\begin{gathered} \# 460+ \\ 400+ \\ 380 \end{gathered}$ | B2 | The construction of new parking bays. |
| G6 | Oak | 16 | 590 | A2/B2 | The construction of new parking bays. |
| T31 | Oak | 12 | \#630 | B1 | The construction of a new footpath and canopy pruning. |

### 5.0 Tree Protection Measures

5.1 Based on the proposed layout and those trees proposed for retention, Table 3 below provides suitable protection measures/ mitigation to minimise the potential impacts to retained trees as stated at 4.2.

Table 3: Potential Impacts to Retained Trees \& Proposed Protection Measure / Mitigation

|  | Potential Impact / Work Stage | Affecting | Protection Measure / Mitigation | Description / Specification and Procedure |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Construction Phase |  |  |  |
| 1 | Proposed areas of hard standing | T1 and T31 | - Careful excavations | Machinery and plant to be located outside the root protection areas and excavations carried out slowly and progressively within and immediately adjacent root protection areas. |
|  |  |  | - Root pruning | Exposed roots to be pruned cleanly back to the soil surface as promptly as possible using hand tools appropriate to the task (secateurs / pruning saw). |
|  |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { T24, T11 } \\ \text { and G6 } \end{gathered}$ | - Specialised surface design/ geotextiles and plastic permeable paving grid | Surfaces to be constructed using a suitable plastic permeable paving grid where specified (Cellweb). There must be strictly no excavations beyond or deeper than the agreed / permitted extents in order to preserve as much root zone and live roots as possible. |
| 2 | Canopy pruning | G4 and T31 | - Pruning in accordance with British Standard | Works to be carried out by a suitably qualified, competent tree surgeon. No large diameter, main branches to be removed. Pruning works to be carried out in accordance with BS3998:2010 Tree Work: Recommendations. |

5.2 On the basis of the above and the contents of this report, it is considered appropriate that an Arboricultural Method Statement be prepared to demonstrate how trees proposed for retention can be suitably safeguarded. The Arboricultural Method Statement can be secured by way of an appropriately worded planning condition attached to the consent for the development and should be adopted as a control document by site personnel.
5.3 In addition to the erection of protective fencing, the attached drawings show areas where it would be beneficial to agree an Arboricultural Method Statement between the project arboriculturist, design \& construction teams and the local planning authority tree officer. The method statement will need to address and make allowance for the following:

- All forms of access required to the site;
- Site cabins and storage areas;
- Proposed parking for site personnel;
- Phasing of works;
- Space required for excavations (including foundation excavations);
- Any required special construction techniques (for example provision of porous surfaces);
- The location and construction methodology for installation of services in close proximity to retained trees \& hedges;
- Any changes in ground levels and any resulting requirement for retaining structures;
- Proposed root zone enhancement measures;
- Working space for cranes, plant and scaffolding; and
- Management of waste products within the site.
5.4 Over and above the physical tree protection measures that should form the basis for the tree protection method statement, the following details should be provided within the Arboricultural Method Statement:
- Protection of the soil structure within the proposed planted areas (where applicable);
- Planting operations within the root protection areas of retained trees;
- Any required / additional precautions outside of construction exclusion zones in relation to the treatment \& landscaping of garden or open space areas;
- System of arboricultural site monitoring / schedule of site visits and resulting actions.


### 6.0 Conclusions \& Recommendations

6.1 The proposals to develop the site by the construction of 219 residential dwellings will directly require the removal of $\mathrm{H} 1, \mathrm{H} 5$ (in part), T3, T4, T5, T6, G5 (in part), G9 (in part), G14, T25, T26, T27, T28, T29, T30 and G16 (in part).
6.2 In the absence of suitable controls, the development also has the potential to have an indirect impact on T1, G4, T11, G6 T24 and T31 that are proposed for retention as part of the development of the site. However, suitable protection measures as listed in Table 3 and summarised below will ensure trees are sufficiently protected throughout the entire course of the development.
6.3 Protection of retained trees from the impacts of the development proposals can be provided by:

- The erection of protective fencing in advance of the commencement of the development in the locations shown;
- The agreement, in advance of the commencement of the development, together with the implementation during the construction phase, of an Arboricultural Method Statement;
- The use of suitable geotextiles and plastic permeable paving grids for new hard surfaces within root protection area of T24; and
- Root pruning procedures where excavations are located within and immediately adjacent root protection areas of retained trees.
6.4 Compensation for the impact of the development, together with landscape and biodiversity enhancements can be achieved by way of the following:
- The planting of trees, shrubs and where applicable hedges as part of a comprehensive landscape scheme to replace any vegetation lost and to integrate the development into the wider landscape; and
- The use of a mixture of native and ornamental species within planting schemes, where those species are suited to the site and local landscape.
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Site: Tan Y Bont, Main Road, Rhosrobin, Wrexham Client: Castle Green Homes
Brief: Tree Survey to BS5837:2012

Surveyor: Survey Date:

Survey Conditions:

Robert Armitage
$27^{\text {th }}$ January 2021
Mild and cloudy
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 he cost of quality development. Where trees are to be lost to accommodate a development, recommendations will be made such as to provide suitable mitigation and compensation, and to integrate the development into the wider landscape.
ey to Abbreviations \& Headings
T. No.: Tree number (T = Tree, G - Group, W = Woodland, H = Hedge, Cpt. = Compartment) Ht Crown Clearance: Canopy ground clearance
Structural Condition: Description of any observed defects
Cat. Grade: Tree quality assessment in accordance with BS5837: 2012
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| $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { T. } \\ & \text { No } \end{aligned}$ | Species | $\begin{gathered} \hline \mathrm{Ht} \\ (\mathrm{~m}) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Stem } \\ & \text { DBH } \\ & (\mathrm{mm}) \end{aligned}$ | RPA Radius | Branch Spread |  |  |  | Ht Crown Clearance (m) | $\begin{gathered} \text { Age } \\ \text { Class } \end{gathered}$ | $\mathbf{P}$Condition | Structural Condition \& General Comments | Preliminary Recommendations (not to be actioned without a valid planning consent) | Est. (yrs) | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \text { Cat } \\ \hline \text { Grade } \end{array}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | (m) | N | S | E | W |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| G4 | Oak, Goat Willow and Wild Cherry | 12-15 | $\begin{gathered} \# 350 \\ \text { ave } \end{gathered}$ | 4.20 | 4.5 | 4.5 | 4.5 | 4.5 | 2 | Y/EM | F | Predominantly self-seeded Oaks with occasional taller emerging Wild Cherries. Canopies generally overhang site boundary by 4 m but plenty of scope to prune back with minor impacts to trees. Valuable screening group. | Canopies to be pruned in accordance with BS3998:2010 Tree <br> Work: <br> Recommendations. No large diameter branches to be removed to achieve a suitable clearance from the proposed new road. | 40+ | B2 |
| T3 | Oak | 6 | 510 | 6.12 | 2 | 6 | 5 | 3 | 1.5 | EM | F | Canopy bias away from adjacent larger tree. Together with T4, forms one overall canopy. Not a particularly good example of species. | Remove to accommodate development proposals. Plant replacement tree elsewhere on site at the landscaping stage of the project. | 30+ | B2/C2 |
| T4 | Oak | 9 | 730 | 8.76 | 7 | 2 | 5.5 | 6 | 2 | M | F | Canopy bias away from tree to south. Significant Ivy colonisation. | Remove to accommodate development proposals. Plant replacement tree elsewhere on site at the landscaping stage of the project. | 30+ | B2 |
| T5 | Oak | 8 | 700 | 8.40 | 5 | 6 | 4 | 8 | 2 | EM/M | F | Squatly formed Oak. Waterlogged ground around base. Regular small diameter dead wood. | Remove to accommodate development proposals. Plant replacement tree elsewhere on site at the landscaping stage of the project. | 30+ | B2 |
| T6 | Oak | 9 | \#800 | 9.60 | 6 | 7 | 6 | 5 | 2 | M | F | Canopy appears in good vigour. lvy beginning to colonise main stem and scaffold branches. | Remove to accommodate development proposals. Plant replacement tree elsewhere on site at the landscaping stage of the project. | 30+ | B2 |
| G5 | Blackthorn, Hawthorn and Goat Willow | 4 | \#200 | 2.40 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 0 | Y/EM | F/P | Continuation of H 1 but become expansive and unmaintained. Occasional Goat Willow scrub. | Remove to accommodate development proposals. Plant replacement tree elsewhere on site at the landscaping stage of the project. | 30+ | C2 |

 he cost of quality development. Where trees are to be lost to accommodate a development, recommendations will be made such as to provide suitable mitigation and compensation, and to integrate the development into the wider landscape.

Key to Abbreviations \& Headings
T. No.: Tree number ( $\mathrm{T}=$ Tree, G - Group, $\mathrm{W}=$ Woodland, $\mathrm{H}=$ Hedge, Cpt. = Compartment

Stem DBH (Diameter at Breast Height): Measured at 1.5 m above ground level*
Ht Crown Clearance: Canopy ground clearance
Structural Condition: Description of any observed defects
Cat. Grade: Tree quality assessment in accordance with BS5837: 2012

Ht: Approximate height of tree from ground level in metres
Branch Spread: Extent of canopy spread in metres to each of the four cardinal points P (Physiological) Condition: $\mathrm{G}=\mathrm{Good}, \mathrm{F}=$ Fair, $\mathrm{P}=$ Poor, D $=$ Dead Est. (yrs): Estimated remaining contribution in years
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 he cost of quality development. Where trees are to be lost to accommodate a development, recommendations will be made such as to provide suitable mitigation and compensation, and to integrate the development into the wider landscape.
ey to Abbreviations \& Heading
T. No.: Tree number ( $\mathrm{T}=$ Tree, G - Group, $\mathrm{W}=$ Woodland, $\mathrm{H}=$ Hedge, Cpt. = Compartment)

Ht Crown Clearance: Canopy ground clearance
Structural Condition: Description of any observed defects
Cat. Grade: Tree quality assessment in accordance with BS5837: 2012
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Ht: Approximate height of tree from ground level in metres
Branch Spread: Extent of canopy spread in metres to each of the four cardinal points Est. (yrs): Estimated remaining contribution in year

Site: Tan Y Bont, Main Road, Rhosrobin, Wrexham
Client: Castle Green Homes
Brief: Tree Survey to BS5837:2012

Surveyor: Survey Date:

Survey Conditions:

Robert Armitage
$27^{\text {th }}$ January 2021
Mild and cloudy

Ascerta
Landscape | Trees | Ecology

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Page 4 of 8 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { T. } \\ & \text { No } \end{aligned}$ | Species | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \mathrm{Ht} \\ & (\mathrm{~m}) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Stem } \\ & \text { DBH } \\ & (\mathrm{mm}) \end{aligned}$ | RPA Radius | Branch Spread |  |  |  | Ht Crown Clearance (m) | $\begin{gathered} \text { Age } \\ \text { Class } \end{gathered}$ | $\mathbf{P}$Condition | Structural Condition \& General Comments | Preliminary Recommendations (not to be actioned without a valid planning consent) | Est. (yrs) | Cat |
|  |  |  |  | (m) | N | S | E | W |  |  |  |  |  |  | Grade |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| T11 | Oak | 14 | 890 | 10.68 | 8.5 | 13 | 9 | 10 | 3 | M | F/G | Relatively good example of species. Small area of missing bark on lower stem but no active decay. Waterlogged ground around base of stem. | No works required at this stage. | 40+ | A1 |
| G9 | Crack Willow, Goat Willow and Birch | 8 | \#200 | 2.40 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 0 | Y/EM | F | Dense group of multi-stemmed Willows around waterlogged ground. Low arboricultural importance. | Remove specified section to accommodate development proposals. Plant replacement tree elsewhere on site at the landscaping stage of the project. | 30 | C2 |
| T12 | Oak | 18 | \#680 | 8.16 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 2 | EM/M | F/G | Well balanced canopy. Unable to inspect thoroughly for dense vegetation. Canopy appears in good vigour. | No works required at this stage. | 30+ | B1 |
| T13 | Oak | 13 | 890 | 10.68 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 3 | M | F | Basal cavity that extends up main stem. Not considered a significant defect. Canopy appears full and in good vigour. | No works required at this stage. | 30 | A1/B1 |
| T14 | Oak | 14 | \#640 | 7.68 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 8 | 3 | M | F | Relatively good example of species. Some small diameter dead wood. Bifurcates at 2 m . | No works required at this stage. | 40 | B1 |
| T15 | Oak | 11 | 1100 | 13.20 | 6.5 | 6.5 | 6.5 | 6.5 | 2E | M | F | Large main leader previously removed with decay into main stem. Large cavity on main leader that extends over half the diameter. | No works required at this stage. | 40 | B1 |
| T16 | Oak | 16 | 580 | 6.96 | 6.5 | 6.5 | 5 | 6.5 | 5 | M | F/G | Slight canopy bias away from adjacent Oak. Some small diameter dead wood. | No works required at this stage. | 40 | B1 |
| T17 | Oak | 15 | \#900 | 10.80 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 3 | M | F | Unable to inspect stem base for dense Holly at base. Some large diameter dead wood. Prominent landscape feature. | No works required at this stage. | 40+ | A1/B1 |

 he cost of quality development. Where trees are to be lost to accommodate a development, recommendations will be made such as to provide suitable mitigation and compensation, and to integrate the development into the wider landscape.
ey to Abbreviations \& Headings

He Crown Clearance: Canopy ground clearance
Structural Condition: Description of any observed defects
Cat. Grade: Tree quality assessment in accordance with BS5837: 2012
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Ht: Approximate height of tree from ground level in metres Branch Spread: Extent of canopy spread in metres to each of the four cardinal points Est. (yrs): Estimated remaining contribution in years
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| $\begin{aligned} & \text { T. } \\ & \text { No } \end{aligned}$ | Species |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Page 5 of 8 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | $\begin{gathered} \mathrm{Ht} \\ (\mathrm{~m}) \end{gathered}$ | Stem DBH (mm) | RPA Radius | Branch Spread |  |  |  | Ht Crown Clearance (m) | Age Class | P Condition | Structural Condition \& General Comments | Preliminary Recommendations (not to be actioned without a valid planning consent) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Est. } \\ & \text { (yrs) } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Cat } \\ \hline \text { Grade } \end{gathered}$ |
|  |  |  |  | (m) | N | S | E | W |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| T18 | Sycamore | 11 | \#800 | 9.69 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 8 | 2 | M | F/P | Canopy appears in slightly reduced vigour. Small section of Kretzschmaria duesta at base. Dense epicormic. | No works required at this stage. | 10+ | C1 |
| G10 | Oak, Goat Willow, Ash, Sycamore, Hawthorn and Elder | 5-13 | $\begin{gathered} \text { \#350 } \\ \text { ave } \end{gathered}$ | 4.20 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 2 | Y/EM | F | Predominantly self-seeded Oak along existing boundary embankment. Provide good screening in areas. Canopies overhang boundary fence in a limited number of areas. Some Goat Willows will require harsh pruning. All trees relatively similar aged. Becomes denser towards northern end. Most trees set back from boundary fence by $2-3 \mathrm{~m}$. | No works required at this stage. | 30+ | B2 |
| G11 | Norway Maple, <br> Field Maple, <br> Sycamore and <br> Beech  <br>   | 14 | $\begin{gathered} \text { \#350 } \\ \text { ave } \end{gathered}$ | 4.20 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 2.5 | Y/EM | F | Elongated Sycamore and Norway Maple. Becomes dense. Only small diameter branch tips overhang site boundary. Provides valuable screening. | No works required at this stage. | 40+ | B2/C2 |
| T19 | Oak | 11.5 | 520 | 6.24 | 4 | 7 | 6.5 | 6.5 | 3S | EM/M | F | Well balanced canopy. Emerging from maintained hedge. | No works required at this stage. | 40+ | B1 |
| H3 | Hawthorn, <br> Sycamore and Hazel | 3.5 | \#200 | 2.40 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | Y/EM | F | Previously maintained at 1.5 m now left to grow. Predominantly Hawthorn and Hazel. Provides valuable screening. | No works required at this stage. | 30 | B2 |
| H4 | Hawthorn and Holly | 4.5 | \#200 | 2.40 | 1.5 | 1.5 | 1.5 | 1.5 | 0 | Y/EM | F | Discontinuous hedge. Low value. | No works required at this stage. | 20 | C2 |
| T20 | Turkey Oak | 8.5 | 390 | 4.68 | 4.5 | 4.5 | 4.5 | 4.5 | 3 | EM | F | Developing well. | No works required at this stage. | 40+ | B2 |

 he cost of quality development. Where trees are to be lost to accommodate a development, recommendations will be made such as to provide suitable mitigation and compensation, and to integrate the development into the wider landscape.
ey to Abbreviations \& Headings
T. No.: Tree number ( $\mathrm{T}=$ Tree, G - Group, $\mathrm{W}=$ Woodland, $\mathrm{H}=$ Hedge, Cpt. = Compartment) Ht Crown Clearance: Canopy ground clearance
Structural Condition: Description of any observed defects
Cat. Grade: Tree quality assessment in accordance with BS5837: 2012
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|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Page 6 of 8 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { T. } \\ & \text { No } \end{aligned}$ | Species | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \mathrm{Ht} \\ & (\mathrm{~m}) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Stem } \\ & \text { DBH } \\ & (\mathrm{mm}) \end{aligned}$ | RPA Radius | Branch Spread |  |  |  | Ht Crown Clearance (m) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Age } \\ & \text { Class } \end{aligned}$ | $\mathbf{P}$Condition | Structural Condition \& General Comments | Preliminary Recommendations (not to be actioned without a valid planning consent) | Est. <br> (yrs) | $\begin{gathered} \text { Cat } \\ \hline \text { Grade } \end{gathered}$ |
|  |  |  |  | (m) | N | S | E | W |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| T21 | Turkey Oak | 8.5 | \#350 | 4.20 | 3 | 5 | 3 | 3 | 3 | Y/EM | F | Not a particularly good example of species. Hawthorn at base. Developing a canopy bias | No works required at this stage. | 30 | C2 |
| H5 | Hawthorn, Holly, Blackthorn, Hazel and Elder | 1.5 | \#200 | 2.40 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | EM | F/G | Well maintained, dense <br> established hedge along  <br> boundary.  | Remove specified section to accommodate development proposals. Plant replacement tree elsewhere on site at the landscaping stage of the project. | 40 | A2/B2 |
| H6 | Blackthorn and Hawthorn | 1 | \#100 | 1.20 | 0.5 | 0.5 | 0.5 | 0.5 | 0 | EM | F | Discontinuous sections of hedging. Low value. | No works required at this stage. | 20 | C2 |
| T22 | Turkey Oak | 14 | $\begin{gathered} \# 650+ \\ 500 \end{gathered}$ | 9.84 | 6.5 | 6.5 | 6.5 | 6.5 | 3E | M | F | Twin stem from base. Wide, expansive canopy. Relatively good example of species. | No works required at this stage. | 40 | B1 |
| G12 | Goat Willow and English Oak | 9 | $\begin{gathered} \# 350+ \\ 350+ \\ 300 \end{gathered}$ | 6.94 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 1 | EM | P | Low value Goat Willow scrub in poor condition. Canopy overhangs boundary quite significantly. One canopy bias 9 m Oak. | No works required at this stage. | 30 | C2 |
| T23 | Goat Willow | 8.5 | $\begin{gathered} \# 450+ \\ 450+ \\ 450+ \\ 450 \end{gathered}$ | 10.80 | 5.5 | 5.5 | 5.5 | 5.5 | 3.5E | EM | F | Not a particularly arboriculturally important tree. Some saprophytic fungal growth on dead limbs. Canopy appears in normal vigour. | No works required at this stage. | 20+ | C2 |
| G13 | Sycamore, Oak, Goat Willow and Hawthorn | 11 | \#300 | 3.60 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 1 | Y/EM | F | Occasional self-seeded trees along railway boundary. All relatively low value trees. | Prune branch tips back towards boundary as necessary. | 30+ | C2 |
| T24 | Ash | 11 | $\begin{gathered} \# 460+ \\ 400+ \\ 380 \end{gathered}$ | 8.61 | 4.5 | 4.5 | 4.5 | 4.5 | 3E | EM | F | Three stems from base. Canopy appears in good vigour. Well balanced canopy. Relatively good example of species. | No works required at this stage. | 20+ | B2 |

 he cost of quality development. Where trees are to be lost to accommodate a development, recommendations will be made such as to provide suitable mitigation and compensation, and to integrate the development into the wider landscape.
ey to Abbreviations \& Headings

Ht Crown Clearance: Canopy ground clearance
Structural Condition: Description of any observed defects
Cat. Grade: Tree quality assessment in accordance with BS5837: 2012
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 he cost of quality development. Where trees are to be lost to accommodate a development, recommendations will be made such as to provide suitable mitigation and compensation, and to integrate the development into the wider landscape.
ey to Abbreviations \& Headings

Ht Crown Clearance: Canopy ground clearance
Structural Condition: Description of any observed defects
Cat. Grade: Tree quality assessment in accordance with BS5837: 2012

Ht: Approximate height of tree from ground level in metres Branch Spread: Extent of canopy spread in metres to each of the four cardinal points Est. (yrs): Estimated remaining contribution in yea

 the cost of quality development. Where trees are to be lost to accommodate a development, recommendations will be made such as to provide suitable mitigation and compensation, and to integrate the development into the wider landscape.

Key to Abbreviations \& Headings
T. No.: Tree number ( $\mathrm{T}=$ Tree, $\mathrm{G}-\mathrm{Group}, \mathrm{W}=$ Woodland, $\mathrm{H}=$ Hedge, Cpt. = Compartment) Stem DBH (Diameter at Breast Height): Measured at 1.5 m above ground level*
Ht Crown Clearance: Canopy ground clearance
Structural Condition: Description of any observed defects
Cat. Grade: Tree quality assessment in accordance with BS5837: 2012
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