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## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

A survey of the existing trees on and adjacent land at Penmaenmawr Road, Llanfairfechan, L33 OPH has been carried out by a suitably qualified and competent Arboriculturist in accordance with British Standard 5837: 2012 Trees in relation to design, demolition and construction - Recommendations.

The purpose of the survey and of this report is to identify the impact of the proposed development of the site on trees, both within and immediately adjacent the site, in accordance with the provisions of BS5837: 2012.

The development of the site will involve the construction of 55 residential dwellings which will require the removal of a number of existing trees and in the absence of suitable controls, also has the potential to have an indirect impact on a number of the trees proposed for retention.

Mitigation for the impact of the development can be provided in the form of the following:

- The erection of protective fencing in advance of the commencement of the development to safeguard the root systems of retained trees;
- The agreement, in advance of the commencement of the development, together with the implementation during the construction phase, of an Arboricultural Method Statement; and
- Arboricultural site supervision where works are proposed within and immediately adjacent root protection areas.

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.


### 1.0 Introduction

1.1 Ascerta has been instructed to carry out a survey of the trees within and immediately adjacent land at Penmaenmawr Road, Llanfairfechan, LL33 OPH 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 $28^{\text {th }}$ September 2022 by Kevin Pope, 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. 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 potentially negative effects of the development on tree cover within the local landscape.

### 2.0 Objectives

2.1 Our client's objective is to develop the site by the construction of 55 residential dwellings.
2.2 Our objectives are as follows:

- Identify what arboricultural features exist presently within and adjacent the site and to record and categorise them in a manner consistent with BS5837: 2012;
- Identify which trees will need to be removed directly as a result of the proposed development of the site;
- Identify any indirect impact from the proposed development on trees proposed for retention;
- Provide an indication of what protection measures can be implemented as part of the development of the site to ensure the physical protection of retained trees;
- Provide recommendations for mitigation and compensation in terms of new planting or enhancement of existing features of arboricultural, landscape or ecological interest or importance; and
- Provide any other recommendations to assist our clients in achieving their objectives whilst satisfying current legislation or policy guidance in relation to the woody vegetation on site.


### 3.0 Planning Policy \& Relevant Legislation

3.1 Planning Policy Wales (PPW) sets out the land use planning policies of the Welsh Government. It is supplemented by a series of Technical Advice Notes (TANs), Welsh Government Circulars, and policy clarification letters, which together with PPW provide the national planning policy framework for Wales. PPW, the TANs, Minerals Technical Advice Notes (MTANs) and policy clarification letters comprise national planning policy.
3.2 The primary objective of PPW is to ensure that the planning system contributes towards the delivery of sustainable development and improves the social, economic, environmental and cultural well-being of Wales, as required by the Planning (Wales) Act 2015, the Well-being of Future Generations (Wales) Act 2015 and other key legislation and resultant duties such as the Socio-economic Duty. A well-functioning planning system is fundamental for sustainable development and achieving sustainable places.
3.3 The site lies within the Conwy Council administrative area and is subject to the policies contained within its Local Plan, which have been considered when writing this report.
3.4 Conwy Council are yet to confirm whether any trees within our survey are statutorily protected by a Tree Preservation Order or if the site is located within a Conservation Area. 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.
3.5 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.
3.6 Notwithstanding the aforementioned policies and legislation, 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.

### 4.0 Survey \& Survey Methodology

4.1 We have been supplied with a digital copy of the topographical survey 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.
4.2 Our assessment of the soils within the site, based on local site conditions, geography, available soil maps and our own experience of soils across the United Kingdom, indicates that the soils on site are likely to contain a clay element, and that this will have a plasticity index in the low range. Any further details or confirmation of the exact nature of soil conditions on site will require further, more rigorous sampling and analysis. It is not however anticipated that the clay content will cause specific issues relating to retention of trees given the impact of the development proposals, providing that consideration is given to this aspect in advance of and during the construction phase of the development. Provision will need to be made for the protection of soil structure in key areas during the construction phase and the repair of any damage post construction. Further details are provided throughout this report and final details can be secured via planning condition.
4.3 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 $28^{\text {th }}$ September 2022 during overcast weather conditions. Those trees surveyed have been numbered sequentially, although for the purposes of this project they have not been tagged. The trees have also been categorised in accordance with section 4.5 and Table 1 of the Standard.
4.4 Where relevant and where the quality of shrub masses and hedges justifies recording, details have been recorded to the tree survey plan and tree data tables.
4.5 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.
4.6 Root Protection Areas for those trees surveyed have been calculated in accordance with the formulas within section 4.6 and Annex C of the Standard and can be found within the tree data tables that accompany this report. The tree data tables also contain a key to abbreviations used and the rationale for determining Root Protection Areas for groups of trees and woodlands (where applicable).

### 5.0 Survey Results \& Impact Assessment

5.1 Existing Tree Cover: 3 individual, 5 groups of trees and 1 hedge were recorded during our survey, the details of which can be found within Appendix 1 to this report and cross referenced with drawing P.1759.22.01 Tree Survey.
5.2 Direct Impact on Trees: The development of the site as proposed will directly require the removal of T1, T2, T3 and G5 (in part).
5.3 Landscape Compensation: Compensation for the loss of trees and the impact on canopy cover can be provided by way of planting new trees at the landscape stage of the project. Where applicable, opportunities for new planting are indicated on the drawings accompanying this report. Given the nature of the proposals, the context of the site in the local landscape and the opportunities for new planting and landscaping, it is considered that in terms of canopy cover, the medium to long term impact of the development will be positive.
5.4 Indirect Impact on Trees: In the absence of suitable controls, the development may well have an indirect impact on a number of trees on the site. Measures are therefore required during the construction phase, as described throughout this report and on supporting drawings, in order to safeguard retained trees for the long-term benefit of the landscape. See paragraph 8.2 for management recommendations for retained trees.
5.5 Hedgerows: 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. In this instance, the development will require the removal of G 5 for which appropriate compensation by way of new planting can be provided at the landscape stage of the project in line with current planning policy and legislation.
5.6 Potential Mitigation for Development Impacts: Mitigation of the direct impacts from the development of the site can be provided in the form of the erection of protective fencing as indicated on the attached drawings and the use of site specific actions adopting modern methods of construction.

### 5.0 Survey Results \& Impact Assessment (Continued)

5.7 Potential for Shading \& Nuisance: Mature trees in urban and suburban areas add significant value and environmental benefits to sites; however, it is acknowledged that some land / property owners are averse to retaining trees close to buildings and areas of public use because of shading and other potential nuisances (leaf / fruit drop for example). Whilst efforts can be made to minimise the impact from shading by trees, it is almost inevitable that in some situations, whether in the short term from existing trees or in the long term from new trees, trees will cast shade on parts of sites, whether that be buildings, garden / open space or other areas of general use during part of the day. Generally, any shade cast from trees will be for relatively short periods and entirely acceptable given the accepted co-existence of large trees in a development context. The acceptability or otherwise of shade is a somewhat subjective issue driven largely by land or property owner / occupier perceptions and in the majority of cases is not necessarily something that should be determined by a local planning authority. We do not consider in this case that shade will be excessive, or that any other ordinary circumstance arising from the presence of trees, for example from leaf or fruit drop, will constitute an unacceptable nuisance.
5.8 Boundary Screening: Trees located adjacent to site boundaries generally make a welcome contribution to the screening of views, however in some cases there may be valid reasons for opening up views to enhance visibility, or to carry out additional planting to screen views. Where applicable, the drawings supporting this report indicate opportunities for management of boundaries in line with project aims and objectives.
5.9 Long Term Spatial Constraints: The proposed layout has been designed to meet the standards set by the local planning authority as well as current best practice guidance. Where applicable, and subject to the possibility of an element of acceptable pruning, there should generally be adequate space between new buildings and trees to limit the potential for future pressure to remove trees. Acknowledgement should however be given to the fact that property owners are largely free to plant trees where they wish, therefore any requirement for future maintenance of existing or future vegetation should not be given any weight in the determining of this application. Whilst it is not possible to predict what actions future occupiers will seek to take in respect of trees within or adjacent sites, the existing layout, together with any vegetation management prescriptions either at this stage or in the future, is considered acceptable from a design perspective.
5.10 Existing Areas of Hard Standing: There are no existing areas of hard standing to be removed on site, therefore there will be no arboricultural implications in this regard.
5.11 Existing buildings/structures to be removed: There are no buildings to be demolished and therefore there are no arboricultural implications associated to demolition.
5.12 Proposed Areas of Hard Standing: Areas where proposed hard surfaces encroach within or are immediately adjacent root protection areas of retained trees are marked on the drawings appended to this report and the extent of precautionary measures required in order to safeguard retained trees are also indicated.

### 5.0 Survey Results \& Impact Assessment (Continued)

5.13 Proposed Buildings Located Adjacent / Within Root Protection Areas: There are no areas within the proposed development where proposed buildings encroach within, or are located immediately adjacent to the Root Protection Areas of retained trees. There is therefore no need in this instance for special construction methodologies over and above the proposed arrangements for tree protection as outlined elsewhere in this report in order to safeguard trees from the impacts of construction works.
5.14 Proposed Drainage \& Domestic Services: At the planning application stage of the project, details of proposed drainage arrangements and provision of utility services are generally not known. During the installation process however, general guidance can be obtained from the National Joint Utilities Group Publication Guidelines for the Planning, Installation and Maintenance of Utility Apparatus in Proximity to Trees - Volume 4 such as to minimise the impact of works on retained trees.
5.15 Working Space During the Construction Phase: The site is of a size such that there will be adequate working space throughout the construction phase, with little if any potential impact on retained trees. However, it is essential that construction exclusion zones created to safeguard retained trees are not breached without prior consideration and implementation of control measures to limit any potentially negative impacts on trees.
5.16 Access Facilitation Pruning: There may be a limited number of areas within the site where an element of access facilitation pruning may be required, as indicated on the attached drawings. Providing that these works are controlled and carried out to a minimum of the standards as contained within BS3998: 2010 Tree work - Recommendations, then the visual impact of the work will be minimal and will not detract from the overall landscape value of the site. Our preliminary recommendations for arboricultural works are stated within the Tree Data Tables at Appendix 1 to this report.
5.17 Protection of Planting Areas: It is often desirable to fence off areas that are to be newly planted to protect the soil structure for future planting. In this case, parts of the site that could be planted up at the landscaping stage of the project are effectively excluded from construction activities by the tree protection fencing and therefore there is no need to erect additional fencing to protect the soil structure.
5.18 Requirement for an Arboricultural Method Statement: Provided that protective fencing is erected in advance of the commencement of the development and retained intact throughout the construction phase, there should be no specific requirement for an Arboricultural Method Statement in this case. The erection of protective fencing in accordance with a suitable tree protection plan should however be subject to a suitably worded condition attached to the planning consent notice.

### 5.0 Survey Results \& Impact Assessment (Continued)

5.19 Planning for New Landscaping: If not considered carefully at the design stage, new planting and landscaping can have an adverse impact on existing trees and cause long term problems for the built environment. Care should be taken in the design of new landscapes to prevent physical damage to retained trees during the planting process, and to ensure that schemes are designed to survive and thrive rather than compete for resources. Similarly, new trees and shrubs should not be planted where they will cause damage to structures, either directly or indirectly in the future. Table A1 at Annex A of the Standard gives advice on minimum distances for new trees from structures to avoid direct damage from future tree growth. Further advice should be sought from the project arboriculturist and a suitably qualified and experienced engineer as to the potential indirect impact of trees on structures in the long term (from clay shrinkage subsidence).

### 6.0 Tree Protection Measures

6.1 Based on the proposed layout and those trees proposed for retention, the drawings attached to this report show our preliminary recommendations for the physical protection of retained trees throughout the construction phase. The plans indicate the location of protective barriers, as well as the specification for construction of the protective fencing in accordance with Figures $2 \& 3$ of the Standard. These barriers will form construction exclusion zones around the retained trees. Provided that these measures are implemented in advance of, and throughout the course of the construction phase, there should be no specific requirement for an Arboricultural Method Statement.

### 7.0 Summary of Impacts \& Potential Mitigation Factors

7.1 Table 1 below summarises the impacts of the development as proposed on tree cover within and immediately adjacent the site. Comments are also provided on potential mitigation, compensation or special measures required to minimise the impact of the development and safeguard trees proposed for retention.

Table 1: Summary of the impacts of the development on trees within / adjacent the site.

| Issue | Affecting | Mitigation / Compensation / Special Procedures |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Trees / hedges to be removed | T1, T2, T3 \& G5 (in part) | Appropriate compensation can be provided by way of new / replacement planting at the landscape stage of the project. Biodiversity enhancements can also be achieved through the landscape proposals. |
| Indirect physical impact on retained trees | G1, G3 \& G5 | Tree protection fencing should be erected to an agreed specification in advance of the commencement of the development. |
| Provision of new hard surfaces | G1 | Careful excavations with an element of root pruning when necessary. Works in this area to be overseen by project arboriculturist. |
| Construction of new buildings/structures | G3 | Sections of foundations within and immediately adjacent root protection areas to be excavated carefully, with machinery located outside of RPAs. |
| Provision of drainage / services | Unknown | Where existing services cannot be utilised, NJUG principles must be adopted to and adhered to. |
| Access Pruning | G1 \& G3 | All pruning works should be carried out to a minimum of the standards contained within BS3998: 2010 Tree work - Recommendations. |
| Protection <br> proposed <br> areas of <br> planting <br> Pro  | POS area to the south of site | These areas should be fenced off at the start of the development for the protection of soil structure. |
| Protective Fencing | To be erected to an agreed specification in advance of the commencement of the development and retained in-situ throughout the course of the construction phase. |  |

7.2 On the basis of the above and the contents of this report, we do not consider the production of an Arboricultural Method Statement necessary at this stage. The erection of tree protection fencing in advance of the commencement of the development, ensuring it is retained in-situ throughout the entire construction phase, with works carried out carefully within the influencing distance of retained trees, should ensure no particular adverse impact on retained trees from the proposed development.

### 8.0 Conclusions \& Recommendations

8.1 The direct and indirect impacts on tree cover as a result of the development proposals are outlined within this report and mitigation proposed accordingly that seeks where possible to satisfy local and national planning guidance and policy. Where trees are proposed for removal, replacement planting should be undertaken as part of a landscape strategy for the site in line with local plan requirements and to integrate the development into the surrounding landscape. Arrangements for the safeguarding and physical protection of retained trees should be agreed and implemented in a manner consistent with current best arboricultural management practices to minimise any potentially negative effects on long term tree cover.
8.2 We recommend that the landscape proposal prepared for the site includes, where feasible, provision for the planting of a mixture of native as well as ornamental trees, shrubs and hedges, implemented as a condition of planning consent. We also recommend that tree protection measures are implemented in accordance with finalised versions of the drawings appended to this report.
8.3 Due to the condition of all retained trees, G1 in particular, we recommend a management plan be prepared to minimise the risk of any potential hazards in the future. G1 consists of multiple over mature Ash trees in significant decline and with evidence of the fungal fruiting body Innonotus hispidus on multiple stems and branches. Options may include the felling of all hazardous trees and replanting of an alternative species in a similar location or using this opportunity to retain the trees in a safe manner preserving the microhabitats within them whilst also planting new specimens to enhance the existing biodiversity. Any hazardous trees can be thoroughly inspected, then a decision made as to whether they should be reduced or left as habitat poles with the option of carving.

### 9.0 References

Planning Policy Wales;

British Standard 5837: 2012 Trees in relation to design, demolition and construction Recommendations;
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Site: Land at Penmaenmawr Road, Llanfairfechan,

## Survey

Conditions:

## Ascerta

Landscape | Trees | Ecology

| $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { T. } \\ & \text { No } \end{aligned}$ | 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) | $\begin{gathered} \text { Age } \\ \text { Class } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \mathrm{P} \\ \text { Condition } \end{gathered}$ | 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 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| T1 | Oak | 10.0 | 700 | 8.40 | 4.0 | 7.8 | 8.0 | 8.0 | 2.0 | EM | Fair | Canopy bias to west. Minor deadwood. Ivy clad stem. Previously pruned away from neighbouring property. Emerging from brick wall. | Remove to accommodate  <br> development proposals  <br> (subject to tree owner <br> approval). Replace with | <30 | C1 |
| H1 | Mixed species | 2.0 | 70 | 0.84 | 0.5 | 0.5 | 0.5 | 0.5 | 0.0 | EM | Fair | Clipped hedgerow. Mainly bramble. | Remove small overgrown section to the north of hedge. | <20 | C2 |
| T2 | Oak | 11.5 | 980 | 11.76 | 8.0 | 8.2 | 8.2 | 5.2 | 1.0 | M | Fair | Significant deadwood. Area of basal decay but surrounded by good reactionary growth. Beginning to die back. | Remove to <br> developmentaccommodate <br> proposals.Replace withsuitable <br> specimen at the landscaping <br> stage of the project. | 20+ | C1 |
| T3 | Ash | 16.0 | 1540 | 15.00 | $\begin{gathered} 10 . \\ 3 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 11 . \\ 0 \end{gathered}$ | 9.1 | 8.4 | 1.5 | OM | Poor | Minor deadwood. Evidence of Innonotus hispidus fruiting body on North leading stem at 7 m above ground level. NW leader with large banana crack. Evidence or previously failed limbs. | Remove to accommodate development proposals. Replace with suitable specimen at the landscaping stage of the project. | <20 | C1 |
| G1 | Ash, Oak | 21.0 | 1500 | 15.00 | 8.0 | 6.0 | $\begin{gathered} 10 . \\ 0 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 11 . \\ 0 \end{gathered}$ | 2.0 | OM | Fair /Poor | Significant deadwood. All Ash with evidence of Innonotus hispidus and evidence of failed leaders and branches. Oaks with minor deadwood. | Group would benefit from a management plan to minimise hazards of defective trees. | <30 | B2 /C2 |
| G2 | Sycamore, Beech, Oak, Pine, Ash | 20.0 | 1000 | 12.00 | 7.0 | 7.0 | 7.0 | 7.0 | 2.5 | EM /M | Good | Good vigour. Form and condition typical of tree species. Prominent tree within location. Good example of species. Rubble and wood stored within RPAs. | No works required at this stage. | <40 | A2 /B2 |

 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.
ey to Abbreviations \& Headings
T. No.: Tree number (T = Tree, G - Group, W = Woodland, 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 Est. (yrs): Estimated remaining contribution in years
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Surveyor: Survey Date:

## Survey

Conditions:

## Ascerta

Landscape | Trees | Ecology

| $\begin{aligned} & \text { T. } \\ & \text { No } \end{aligned}$ | 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) | Age Class | Condition | Structural Condition \& General Comments | Preliminary Recommendations (not to be actioned without a valid planning consent) | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Est. } \\ & \text { (yrs) } \end{aligned}$ | Cat |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | (m) | N | S | E | W |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| G3 | Pine, Beech, Oak, Ash | 17.0 | 900 | 10.80 | $\begin{gathered} 10 . \\ 0 \end{gathered}$ | 8.0 | 7.0 | 7.0 | 2.5 | M | Good /Fair /Poor | Good vigour. Form and condition typical of tree species. Prominent landscape feature. Good examples of species. Minor deadwood. Innonotus hispidus present on Ash. Bark necrosis and failed stems evident. | Ash would benefit from a management plan. Prune Oak back by $1-2 m$ if necessary to allow more working space (See plan). | 30+ | B2 |
| G4 | Pine, Larch, Oak | 14.0 | 550 | 6.60 | 4.0 | 5.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 3.0 | EM | Fair | Minor deadwood. Main leader on Oak snapped out. Adjacent stream and gate to main road. | No works required at this stage. | 20+ | C2 |
| G5 | Hawthorn, Goat <br> Willow, Ash, <br> Sycamore  | 2-7 | 250 | 3.00 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 0.0 | Y /EM | Fair | Ivy colonised stems. Mixed roadside boundary group consisting mainly of $2-4 m$ young shrubs. | Remove specified section to facilitate access to site. Replace with suitable specimens at the landscaping stage of the project. | <20 | 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.
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

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, $\mathrm{P}=\mathrm{Poor}, \mathrm{D}=$ Dead Est. (yrs): Estimated remaining contribution in year
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