ECOWORLD
LONDON
CREATING TOMORROW & BEYOND

POPLAR HARCA

Tree Survey and Arboricultural Assessment

ABERFELDY VILLAGE MASTERPLAN

arbeco
Ecology, Tree & Habitat Services

Aberfeldy Village/Arboricultural Impact Assessment/Report for Aberfeldy New Village LLP

Aberfeldy Village

Arboricultural Impact Assessment

Report for Aberfeldy Village LLP

Job Number	T5574		
Author	Fearghus Gage BSc (Hons) MArborA		
Version	Checked by	Approved by	Date
V3.0	Naomi Charman BSc (Hons) MRes MArborA	Wendy McFarlane MA MSc MCIEEM	25/10/21

Arbeco, Tempus Wharf, 33a Bermondsey Wall West, London, SE16 4TQ
T 020 7378 1914 **E**. enquiries@ecologyconsultancy.co.uk **W**. www.ecologyconsultancy.co.uk

Contents

Executive Summary

Arbeco Ltd was commissioned by Aberfeldy New Village LLP to undertake a ground level survey of trees that could be affected by the development of land at Aberfeldy Village (the 'Proposed Development'), and to produce an Arboricultural Impact Assessment for the Proposed Development. A qualitative assessment of each tree was carried out according to British Standard BS 5837:2012, Trees in Relation to Design, Demolition and Construction–Recommendations, focusing on arboricultural values (Categories A1, B1, C1)[1], landscape values (Categories A2, B2, C2) and cultural values (A3, B3, C3) [2].

The main findings of the survey are as follows:

- There were 191 individual trees, 14 groups[3] and three hedges in and adjacent to the proposed development site, each described in Appendix 1 of this report.
- Of the trees surveyed, 46 individuals and one group were attributed Category A status, 101 individuals, ten groups and two hedges were attributed Category B status, 36 individuals, three groups and one hedge were attributed Category C status and eight individuals were attributed Category U status.
- A tree constraints check was carried out on the London Borough of Tower Hamlets online interactive mapping service, and it was confirmed that no trees situated within the site boundaries were subject to Tree Preservation Order or Conservation Area restrictions.
- Root protection areas were calculated in accordance with BS 5837:2012 for each of the surveyed trees and ranged from 2.9m^2 to 430.1m^2 for T123 and T101 respectively.
- Of the trees surveyed, a total of 67 individuals, four groups and two hedges will require removal to facilitate development. Of the medium to high quality trees that would require removal under current proposals, five were attributed Category A status and 39 individuals, two groups and one hedge were attributed Category B status. It is recommended that alternative layouts are considered to enable the retention of more Category A and Category B trees to reduce the impacts to local visual amenity and

[1] Categorisation grading in accordance with BS 5837 2012. Trees suitable for retention: - Category A. Trees of high quality with an estimated remaining life expectancy of at least 40 years.
Category B. Trees of moderate quality with an estimated life expectancy of at least 20 years.
Category C. Trees of low quality with an estimated remaining life expectancy of at least 10 years or young trees with a stem diameter below 150mm.
Category U. Trees of very low quality normally with a life expectancy of less than 10 years or requiring immediate removal due to health and safety concerns.

[2] British Standard BS 5837 2012 recommends that these categories may be further broken down into sub categories A1 A2 A3 pertaining to Arboricultural, Landscape or Cultural values respectively.

[3] The term “group” is intended to identify trees that form cohesive arboricultural features either aerodynamically (e.g. trees that provide companion shelter), visually (e.g. avenues or screens) or culturally, including for biodiversity (e.g. parkland or wood pasture).

ecosystem services including habitat, carbon sequestration, noise attenuation and urban heat island mitigation among many other benefits provided by mature trees.

- Any work to trees should consider the potential presence of protected species, including breeding birds and roosting bats as well as the intrinsic value of the ecosystem services that a mature tree can provide. A Preliminary Ecological Appraisal and any subsequent ecological reports should be consulted prior to the commencement of works.

Introduction

BACKGROUND

1.1 This Arboricultural Impact Assessment (AIA) has been prepared by Arbeco Ltd and is submitted in support of a hybrid planning application for the Aberfeldy Village Masterplan. The hybrid planning application is made in relation to the north of East India Dock Road (A13), east of the Blackwall Tunnel Northern Approach Road (A12) and to the south west of Abbot Road (the "site") on behalf of The Aberfeldy New Village LLP' ("The Applicant"). The hybrid planning application is formed of detailed development proposals in respect of Phase A for which no matters are reserved ("Detailed Proposals"), and outline development proposals for the remainder of the Site, with all matters reserved ("Outline Proposals"). The Detailed Proposals and Outline Proposals together are referred to as the "Proposed Development".

1.2 The purpose of the AIA is to undertake a ground level survey of trees that could be affected by the development of land at the site, and to produce an Arboricultural Impact Assessment for the Proposed Development. A qualitative assessment of each tree was carried out according to British Standard BS 5837:2012, Trees in Relation to Design, Demolition and Construction– Recommendations, focusing on arboricultural values (Categories A1, B1, C1)[4], landscape values (Categories A2, B2, C2) and cultural values (A3, B3, C3)[5].

SCOPE OF REPORT

1.3 This report has been produced in accordance with British Standard BS 5837:2012 Trees in Relation to Design, Demolition and Construction – Recommendations (hereafter referred to as BS 5837:2012). It provides information on the current condition of trees at the site, their suitability for retention, and the above and below ground constraints to development.

1.4 Any clear flaws or hazards have been identified in the Schedule of Trees provided in Appendix 1. Preliminary recommendations for the management of retained trees are

[4] Categorisation grading in accordance with BS 5837 2012. Trees suitable for retention: - Category A. Trees of high quality with an estimated remaining life expectancy of at least 40 years.
Category B. Trees of moderate quality with an estimated life expectancy of at least 20 years.
Category C. Trees of low quality with an estimated remaining life expectancy of at least 10 years or young trees with a stem diameter below 150mm.
Category U. Trees of very low quality normally with a life expectancy of less than 10 years or requiring immediate removal due to health and safety concerns.

[5] British Standard BS 5837 2012 recommends that these categories may be further broken down into sub categories A1 A2 A3 pertaining to Arboricultural, Landscape or Cultural values respectively.

provided, but a full hazard risk assessment comprising a more comprehensive analysis of tree condition and potential risk to target areas is beyond the scope of this report. Any recommendations relating to the management of potentially hazardous trees should be carried out as soon as possible[6].

SITE CONTEXT AND STATUS

1.5 The site is situated in the London Borough of Tower Hamlets in Aberfeldy Village. The southern part of the site is bordered by Blair Street to the south, with the A102 to the west and Abbott Road to the north and east. The northern section of the site is bordered by Lochnagar Street to the north, Nairn Street to the east, the A12 to the west and Abbott road to the south. The Ordnance Survey National Grid reference for the centre of the site is TQ 38448 81369.

DESCRIPTION OF THE PROPOSALS

1.6 The Proposed Development comprises the comprehensive redevelopment of the Site. The Proposed Development will provide new retail and workspace floorspace along with residential dwellings and the pedestrianisation of the A12 Abbott Road vehicular underpass to create a new east to west route. The Development will also provide significant, high quality public realm, including a new Town Square, a new High Street and a public park.

[6] All tree works should be undertaken by a suitably qualified Arboricultural Contractor. No arboricultural works to trees subject to planning constraints shall be carried out without the written consent of the relevant Local Planning Authority (LPA). Any proposed tree works should be undertaken in accordance with British Standard BS 3998:2010 Treework - Recommendations. Works to trees that are the subject of a Tree Preservation Order or within a Conservation Area which are deemed to be dangerous under Regulation 14 of the Town and Country Planning (England) (Regulations) 2012 may under certain circumstances be undertaken without needing to seek the prior written consent of the LPA.

Methodology

TREE SURVEY

1.7 The tree survey was conducted in accordance with BS 5837:2012 the results of which are presented in the Schedule of Trees (Appendix 1) and include a sequential numbering of each tree, species listed by common name; tree dimensions including overall height, canopy spreads measured against the cardinal compass points; crown height; age class; physiological condition; structural condition, life expectancy; root protection areas and preliminary management advice.

1.8 Each tree has been assigned a category grade in accordance with BS 5837:2012 categories A, B, C and U ranging from high to low quality. Definitions of tree quality are provided in Table 2 Appendix 1.

1.9 For the purposes of this report, arboricultural as well as landscape sub-categories have been used in the Schedule of Trees. BS 5837:2012 points out that each sub-category should be given equal weighting when grading trees against these criteria.

1.10 A tree constraints plan is presented in Appendix 2 showing the recommended root protection areas (RPA) for all surveyed trees. Each grading category has been highlighted using the colour key system as described in BS 5837:2012.

1.11 The site was visited on 10 September 2020, weather conditions were dry and sunny.

1.12 All trees likely to be affected by works inside the red line boundary of the site were visually assessed using the Visual Tree Assessment Method (VTA) (Mattheck and Breloer, 1994).

1.13 Stem diameters were measured using diameter tape. Canopy spreads were estimated by pacing and where possible, verified using a laser range finder. Height measurements were taken using a laser clinometer.

1.14 Formal assessments of topography, drainage, service conduits and soil conditions including specific laboratory investigations of soil properties (i.e. plasticity index, moisture content, suction pressure) were not undertaken and are beyond the scope of this report.

DESK STUDY

1.15 A tree constraints check was undertaken on the London Borough of Tower Hamlets online interactive mapping service to search for Tree Preservation Order and Conservation Area restrictions to tree works in and adjacent to the site.

SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS

1.16 Drawing Reference: *Topographical Survey SORO016539* (Sumo Services Ltd, 2019), *Aberfeldy Masterplan - Combined survey_full site* (EcoWorld International, 2020) and *MASTERPLAN GENERAL ARRANGEMENT GROUND FLOOR DWG. NO AVL-LDALSBX-XX-XX-DR-L-0001* (LDA Design, 2021) were provided for the purposes of compiling this report. They include the layout of existing site features, along with a footprint overlay of the proposed development.

1.17 At the time of the site visit, parts of the site were not covered by a topographical survey. As such, an Ordinance Survey map was used in conjunction with GPS tracking to plot the locations of the trees in these areas.

PERSONNEL

1.18 The tree survey was carried out by Fearghus Gage FdSc BSc (Hons) MArborA, an Arboricultural Consultant with over 7 years' experience within the sector, working as both a contractor and private consultant.

LIMITATIONS

1.19 Only preliminary recommendations for tree management are provided. A full hazard risk assessment comprising a more comprehensive analysis of the condition and potential risk to target areas is beyond the scope of this report.

1.20 The trees were inspected at ground level and no decay detection equipment was used. There is therefore a risk that any internal decay that may be present has gone undetected.

1.21 Of the trees surveyed, a total of 36 trees and two groups were situated in areas where access to the main stem/s was not possible, details of which can be found in appendix 1. As such, assumptions have been made relating to dimensions of the main stem/s, and the overall condition is based upon the visible parts of the tree/s only.

1.22 Trees are living organisms and their health and condition change with time. Therefore, this assessment remains valid for 24 months from the date of inspection, or until a severe

storm is experienced, after which time a new inspection is required. For the purpose of this report, a severe storm is defined as a period of violent weather, involving rain, hail, wind, snow, lightning or any combination of these, likely to cause damage to trees.

1.23 Although designs have been provided for Aberfeldy Millennium Green, they have been removed from this application and impact to trees within the park boundary has not been considered.

Results

TREE SURVEY

1.24 The results of the tree survey are provided in the Schedule of Trees in Appendix 1. A Tree Constraints Plan illustrating the BS 5837:2012 categories of each tree, their crown spread and RPA is presented in Appendix 2 and photographs of the site are provided in Appendix 5.

1.25 The survey recorded 191 individual trees, 14 groups and three hedges which could potentially be affected by future development. These comprised: apricot *Prunus armeniaca*, butterfly bush *Buddleja davidii*, cabbage palm *Cordyline australis*, callery pear *Pyrus calleryana* 'Chanticleer', cherry laurel *Prunus laurocerasus*, cherry plum *Prunus cerasifera*, common apple *Malus domestica*, common ash *Fraxinus excelsior*, common elder *Sambucus nigra*, common hazel *Corylus avellana*, common horse chestnut *Aesculus hippocastanum*, common plum *Prunus domestica*, common privet *Ligustrum vulgare*, common whitebeam *Sorbus aria*, crab apple *Malus sylvestris*, cut leaf birch *Betula pendula* 'Dalecarlica', *Eucalyptus sp*, European beech *Fagus sylvatica*, European hornbeam *Carpinus betulus*, European pear *Pyrus communis*, European rowan *Sorbus aucuparia*, false acacia *Robinia pseudoacacia*, field maple *Acer campestre*, fig *Ficus carica*, glossy privet *Ligustrum lucidum*, Himalayan birch *Betula utilis* var. *jacquemontii*, Himalayan tree cotoneaster *Cotoneaster frigidus* , Japanese cherry *Prunus serrulata*, large leaved lime *Tilia platyphyllos*, Lawsons cypress *Chamaecyparis lawsoniana*, leyland cypress *Cupressus* x *leylandii*, London plane *Platanus* x *acerifolia*, midland hawthorn *Crataegus laevigata*, Norway maple *Acer platanoides*, oriental plane *Platanus orientalis*, paperbark maple *acer griseum*, pedunculate oak *Quercus robur*, Raywood ash *Fraxinus angustifolia* 'Raywood', Portuguese laurel *Prunus lusitanica*, silver birch *Betula pendula*, small leaved lime *Tilia cordata*, snowy mepsil *Amalanchier lamarckii*, Swedish whitebeam *Sorbus intermedia*, sycamore *Acer pseudoplatanus*, tree of heaven *Ailanthus altissima* , weeping willow *Salix babylonica* and wild cherry *Prunus avium*. The numbers of each species are provided in Table 1.

Table 1: Species key and site frequency for trees potentially affected by development

Species	Frequency		
	Tree	Group	Hedgerow
Apricot	1	-	-
Butterfly bush	2	1	-
Cabbage palm	1	-	-
Callery pear	1	-	-
Cherry laurel	-	-	1
Cherry plum	3	-	-
Common apple	1	-	-
Common ash	2	-	-
Common Elder	3	-	-
Common horse chestnut	5	-	-
Common plum	1	-	-
Common privet	-	-	1
Common whitebeam	3	1	-
Crab apple	2	-	-
Cut leaf birch	1	-	-
Eucalyptus sp.	1	-	-
European hornbeam	9	-	-
European pear	1	-	-
European rowan	13	-	-
False acacia	7	-	-
Field maple	3	-	-
Fig	1	-	-
Glossy privet	1	-	-
Himalayan birch	4	1	-
Himalayan Tree Cotoneaster	-	-	1

Table 1: Species key and site frequency for trees potentially affected by development

Species	Frequency		
	Tree	Group	Hedgerow
Japanese cherry	13	-	-
Large leaved lime	1	-	-
Lawsons Cypress	2	-	-
Leyland cypress	-	1	-
London plane	69	-	-
Midland hawthorn	1	-	-
Mixed species	-	8	-
Norway maple	9	1	-
Oriental plane	2	-	-
Pedunculate oak	2	-	-
Raywood ash	3	-	-
Small leaved lime	4	1	-
Snowy mepsil	1	-	-
Swedish whitebeam	4	-	-
Sycamore	1	-	-
Tree of heaven	4	-	-
Unconfirmed species - dead stem	1	-	-
Wild cherry	8	-	-

1.26 Physiological and structural condition[7] of the majority of surveyed trees was consistent with Category B status (101 individuals, ten groups and two hedges), with 46 individuals and one group assigned Category A status, 36 individuals, three groups and one hedge assigned Category C status and eight individuals assigned Category U status.

[7] Physiological and structural condition are terms used to differentiate between a trees physiological condition i.e. annual growth, vigour, presence of disease etc. as opposed to structural condition relating to branch formation, mechanical strength and integrity.

1.27 Of the trees surveyed, 113 individuals, five groups and three hedges were classified to be at a mature life stage[8], one individual was classified as young, 19 individuals were classified as semi mature and 58 individuals and nine groups were classified as early mature. No trees were found to be in the over mature classification.

1.28 A summary of the number of trees surveyed corresponding to BS 5837:2012 tree quality assessment definitions is provided below in Table 2 below.

Table 2: Grade Classifications

BS 5837:2012 Grades A to U	Trees attributed to each grade	Frequency		
		T	G	H
A	T7, T8, T16, T33, T34, T35, T36, T41, T42, T47, T48, T49, T50, T51, T52, T94, T95, T96, T97, T98, T99, T100, T101, T102, T104, T105, T106, T107, T108, T109, T110, T111, T112, T113, T120, T121, T125, T134, T135, T136, T139, T140, T141, T142, T143, T169, G6	46	1	-
B	T1, T5, T6, T9, T10, T11, T13, T17, T18, T19, T20, T24, T25, T26, T27, T28, T29, T30, T37, T38, T39, T43, T44, T45, T46, T53, T54, T55, T56, T57, T58, T59, T60, T61, T62, T63, T64, T65, T66, T67, T68, T69, T70, T71, T72, T73, T74, T76, T77, T81, T82, T83, T84, T85, T86, T90, T93, T103, T114, T115, T116, T117, T118, T119, T122, T124, T126, T127, T128, T130, T131, T137, T138, T144, T145, T146, T147, T148, T150, T151, T153, T154, T155, T158, T159, T160, T161, T162, T163, T165, T166, T167, T168, T173, T174, T175, T177, T178, T179, T181, T184, G3, G4, G5, G7, G8, G9, G10, G11, G13, G14, H2, H3	101	10	2
C	T2, T3, T12, T14, T15, T21, T22, T23, T31, T32, T40, T75, T78, T79, T80, T88, T89, T92, T123, T129, T132, T133, T149, T152, T156, T157, T170, T171, T172, T176, T180, T183, T185, T187, T188, T191, G1, G2, G12, H1	36	3	1
U	T4, T87, T91, T164, T182, T186, T189, T190	8	-	-

[8] Young. Establishing; usually with good vigour, but as of limited significance within the landscape.
Semi-Mature. Established; normally vigorous and increasing in height. Of increasing landscape significance.
Early Mature. Fully established trees around the middle half of their life span retaining good vigour. Not yet achieved full height and retaining apical dominance.
Mature. Fully established trees retaining moderate vigour. Apical dominance lost but crown still spreading.
Over Mature. Fully mature trees in the last quarter of their usual life expectancy; vigour declining.

DESK STUDY

1.29 It was confirmed that no trees situated within the site boundaries were subject to Tree Preservation Order or Conservation Area restrictions.

ARBORICULTURAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT

1.30 Based on Drawing Reference: *MASTERPLAN GENERAL ARRANGEMENT GROUND FLOOR DWG. NO AVL-LDALSBX-XX-XX-DR-L-0001* (LDA Design, 2021) received from the client on the 11 October 2021, the impact of the proposal on the existing trees has been assessed and all trees that will potentially be affected by the development are listed below in Table 3. Tree numbers in the table correspond to the Schedule of Trees in Appendix 1 and Tree Constraints Plan described in Appendix 2.

1.31 It has been assumed that the height of all construction traffic or goods vehicles accessing the site will be within the standard minimum carriageway clearance of 5m (HSE, 2017).

Table 3: Summary of trees possibly affected by the development

Impact	Reason	BS Cat A	BS Cat B	BS Cat C	BS Cat U
Trees to be removed	Located within development footprint.	T7, T8, T33, T34, T35	T5, T6, T9, T10, T11, T13, T17, T18, T19, T20, T26, T29, T30, T137, T138, T144, T145, T146, T147, T150, T151, T153, T154, T155, T158, T159, T160, T161, T162, T163, T165, T166, T167, T168, T174, T175, T177, T178, T179	T12, T14, T15, T21, T22, T23, T31, T32, T149, T152, T156, T157, T172, T176, T180, T187, T188, T191	T164, T182, T186, T189, T190
Trees which could sustain damage to RPA	Installation of hardstanding.	T41, T47, T48, T49, T50, T95, T96, T97, T98, T99, T100, T101, T102, T104, T105, T136, T142, T143, T169, T193	T37, T38, T39, T43, T45, T46, T53, T54, T57, T58, T62, T66, T103	-	-

Table 3: Summary of trees possibly affected by the development

Impact	Reason	BS Cat A	BS Cat B	BS Cat C	BS Cat U
	Installation of foundations.	T16, T100, T101, T102, T108, T142, T143	-	-	-
	Soil compaction through construction traffic access.	T16, T41, T47, T48, T49, T50, T95, T96, T97, T98, T99, T100, T101, T102, T104, T105, T108, T136, T142, T143, T169, T193	T37, T38, T39, T43, T45, T46, T53, T54, T57, T58, T62, T66, T103, G7	-	-
Trees which could sustain damage to stem or canopy	Impact by construction traffic.	T16, T41, T47, T48, T49, T50, T94, T95, T96, T97, T98, T99, T100, T101, T102, T104, T105, T106, T107, T108, T109, T110, T111, T112, T113, T120, T121, T134, T135, T136, T136, T142, T143, T169, T193	T24, T25, T27, T28, T37, T38, T39, T43, T45, T46, T53, T54, T57, T58, T62, T66, T103, T119, T184, G5, G7, G9, G14	-	-

Tree removal and pruning

1.32 Based on the design proposal, a total of 67 individual trees, four groups and two hedges will require removal to facilitate development works.

1.33 Of the trees to be removed, five were attributed Category A status, 39 individuals, two groups and one hedge were attributed Category B status, 18 individuals, two groups and one hedge were attributed Category C status and five individuals were attributed Category U status.

1.34 The proposed building line will encroach into the southwest canopy extents of T111 and T120 and the northern canopy extents of T102, and the eastern canopy extents of T108,

T109 and T110, all of which will require minor pruning of lateral branches in order to facilitate access.

1.35 Trees T101, T102 and T143 will require crown lifting to facilitate proposed road use.

Trees which could potentially sustain damage to stem, canopy or RPA.

1.36 Development proposals have the potential to indirectly impact the stem, canopy or RPAs of 54 trees and four groups scheduled for retention as displayed in Table 3. In order to ensure that these features are successfully retained during the proposed works, the drafting of specialist tree protection measures as part of an Arboricultural Method Statement will be required prior to works taking place.

1.37 T42 is situated inside a central courtyard of the existing building which is proposed to be demolished. Demolition works around T42 have the potential to cause significant structural damage to the tree. All works should be undertaken under direct arboricultural supervision and in full compliance with the Arboricultural Method Statement.

Incursions into RPA of trees effected by the development proposal.

1.38 The proposed development will encroach into the RPAs of nine trees to be retained. As displayed in Table 4 below.

Table 4: Proposed hardstanding incursions in RPAs of trees to be retained.

Tree ID	Stem Diameter	Total RPA (m^2)	Area of incursion (m^2)	Area of Incursion (%)
T37	350	55.4	16.4	29.6%
T38	550	136.8	43.0	31.4%
T39	750	254.5	24.8	9.7%
T41	450	91.6	4.2	4.6%
T43	450	91.6	7.4	8.1%
T45	800	289.5	32.4	11.2%
T46	450	91.6	12.0	13.1%
T47	600	162.9	18.8	11.5%
T48	600	162.9	24.6	15.1%
T49	600	162.9	26.5	16.3%

Table 4: Proposed hardstanding incursions in RPAs of trees to be retained.

Tree ID	Stem Diameter	Total RPA (m^2)	Area of incursion (m^2)	Area of Incursion (%)
T50	600	162.9	26.9	16.5%
T53	350	55.4	12.1	21.8%
T54	300	40.7	9.8	24.1%
T57	280	35.5	9.9	27.9%
T58	280	35.5	10.0	28.2%
T62	300	40.7	5.7	14.0%
T66	500	113.1	21.9	19.4%
T95	940	399.7	31.0	7.8%
T96	820	304.2	198.7	65.3%
T97	820	304.2	20.5	6.7%
T98	820	304.2	35.5	11.7%
T99	820	304.2	71.3	23.4%
T100	820	304.2	164.7	54.1%
T101	975	430.1	391.2	91.0%
T102	950	408.3	325.3	79.7%
T103	150	10.2	10.2	100.0%
T104	800	289.5	217.5	75.1%
T105	800	289.5	176.5	61.0%
T136	650	191.1	84.3	44.1%
T142	800	289.5	254.6	87.9%
T143	800	289.5	267.6	92.4%
T169	600	162.9	104.4	64.1%
T193	800	289.5	204.9	70.8%
G7	-	81.5	40.0	49.1%

1.39 The incursion by the proposed new hardstanding inside the RPAs of trees T101, T102 and T143 was calculated to be 91.0%, 79.7% and 92.4% of their total RPAs respectively.

The existing surface comprises majority tarmac with some grassed areas the RPAs of the trees. The proposed change of use within these areas includes the construction of a two-way road to go between the trees. It is likely that ground conditions beneath the existing surfaces will change as a result of the new surface due to increased use and vehicular loading. Any excavations inside the RPAs of these trees have the potential to cause significant damage to the structural and physiological condition of the tree. It has been proposed that the build-up for the hardstanding comprises layered Cellweb TRP, topped with a permeable hardstanding using a no-dig construction methodology. Although this method is intended to protect the existing soil strata from overloading while maintaining gaseous and aqueous exchange capacity, due to the level of RPA incursion, it is likely that these trees will suffer decline following construction.

1.40 The incursion of hardstanding within the RPA of tree T16 totals 7.4%. This level of incursion is proposed to be built up on layered Cellweb TRP, topped with a permeable hardstanding in order to protect the existing soil strata from overloading while maintaining gaseous and aqueous exchange capacity. If installed correctly, under direct arboricultural supervision and in accordance with an Arboricultural Method Statement, this build-up is unlikely to significantly impact the structural or physiological condition of the tree.

1.41 The incursion within the RPAs of trees T37, T38, T39, T41, T43, T45, T46, T47, T48, T49, T50, T53, T54, T57, T58, T62, T66, T95, T96, T97, T98, T99, T100, T104, T105, T136, T142, T169 and T193 and group G7 ranges between 6.7% and 87.9% of their total RPAs. The entirety of their existing RPAs is already made up of hardstanding and the proposals are to replace the existing. It is recommended that existing hardstanding be removed with hand-held tools only, under direct arboricultural supervision. The proposed build-up for the replaced hardstanding should comprise a layer of Cellweb TRP permeable, load bearing cellular confinement system, followed by a layer of permeable hardstanding. If installed correctly, this build-up detail should maintain existing soil structure while remaining permeable to gas and water and as such, will not result in a significant impact to the RPAs of these trees. During the installation of the hardstanding, it has been proposed that in order to protect the RPA of retained trees from overloading, the existing topsoil will be broken up using an air spade and then mixed with Amsterdam tree sand to increase its resistance to soil compaction. Installation of this system will require careful planning and supervision by an Arboricultural Consultant to ensure no accidental damage occurs to the stem, canopy or RPA of the retained trees.

Table 5: Proposed building foundation incursions in RPAs of trees to be retained.

Tree ID	Stem Diameter	Total RPA (m^2)	Area of incursion (m^2)	Area of Incursion (%)
T16	700	221.7	4.8	2.2%
T108	800	289.5	20.8	7.2%
T100	820	304.2	40.0	13.1%
T101	975	430.1	71.2	16.6%
T102	950	408.3	82.0	20.1%
T142	800	289.5	35.9	12.4%
T143	800	289.5	22.5	7.8%

1.42 The proposed building foundation incursion inside the RPA of tree T16 totals 2.2% of its total RPA. This level of incursion is considered to have a negligible effect on the physiological and structural condition of the tree so long as no further incursion takes place. As such, specialist construction methods will not be required in this area.

1.43 The proposed building foundation incursions inside the RPAs of trees T108, T100, T101 and T102 between 7.2 % and 20.1%. It is proposed that the proposed building foundations are constructed using pile foundations with supporting beams extending between piles in order avoid existing tree roots, minimise the footprint of the foundation and maintain the soil structure beneath. During the installation of the building foundations, it has been proposed that in order to protect the RPAs from overloading, the existing topsoil will be broken up using an air spade and then mixed with Amsterdam tree sand to increase its resistance to soil compaction.

Impact on visual amenity and local character

1.44 Trees T7, T8, T33, T34 and T35 were all attributed category A status. Their removal is considered to have a significant impact to local visual amenity.

1.45 Trees T5, T6, T9, T10, T11, T13, T17, T18, T19, T20, T26, T29, T30, T137, T138, T144, T145, T146, T147, T150, T151, T153, T154, T155, T158, T159, T160, T161, T162, T163, T165, T166, T167, T168, T174, T175, T177, T178 and T179 were all attributed category B status. Due to their category and number of trees to be removed, their removal represents a significant impact to local visual amenity.

1.46 While trees T12, T14, T15, T21, T22, T23, T31, T32, T149, T152, T156, T157, T172, T176, T180, T187, T188 and T191, groups G1 and G2 and hedge H1 were all attributed Category C status and therefore considered to be of low visual amenity value, it is understood that the proposed landscaping scheme will address this loss to local visual amenity as a result of their removal.

1.47 Trees T164, T182, T186, T189 and T190 were all attributed category U status and therefore considered to have extremely low visual amenity value with a limited life expectancy. The removal of these trees is considered to have a negligible impact to local visual amenity.

Recommendations

SITE SPECIFIC ISSUES

1.48 All Category A and B trees as described in Table 2 should be given priority consideration for retention during any future development which should take full account of above and below ground constraints, as shown on the Tree Constraints Plan (Appendix 2).

1.49 The current design proposals would require the removal of five high quality Category A trees as well as 39 individual Category B trees and two groups and one Category B hedge. In an area of central London with a dense population, traffic and poor air quality this represents a significant impact to local visual amenity and ecosystem services including habitat, carbon sequestration, noise attenuation and urban heat island mitigation among many other benefits provided by mature trees. Consideration should be given to design change to allow for a higher number of mature trees to be retained.

1.50 It is recommended that a geotechnical specialist/structural engineer undertake a detailed soil investigation to determine the underlying geology and plasticity index which may then inform foundation design. This will be required in areas where specialised construction of pile foundations is recommended within RPAs.

1.51 Category A trees T33, T34 and T35 are intended for retention by the applicant. Under current proposals they would require removal due to inappropriate loading and build up around their RPAs as well as conflict between high sided vehicles and low branches. It is the intention of the applicant to re-design the area immediately surrounding these trees to enable their retention.

1.52 The hard landscaping within Braithwaite Park currently encroaches within the RPAs of several trees to be retained. It is considered that there is ample space within the park to re-design the hand landscaping layout to avoid root protection areas and reduce impacts to trees.

1.53 At the time of this report, finalised layouts for electricity, water and gas services had not been provided. It is recommended that the locations of the proposed services be carefully planned in consultation with the Arboricultural Consultant and wherever possible, existing service pipes and trenches are re-used to avoid the need for excavations inside the RPAs of trees to be retained.

1.54 It is recommended that upon completion of construction works, all trees to be retained are subject to soil amelioration works inside the soft landscaped areas of their RPAs.

Soil amelioration works should include the decompaction of the soil, combined with the inoculation of a mix of beneficial mycorrhizal fungi and plant nutrients to stimulate future fibrous root growth.

TREE WORKS

1.55 Based on the current design proposal the following tree pruning and removal operations would need to be undertaken in order to facilitate development works.

- Trees T5, T6, T7, T8, T9, T10, T11, T12, T13, T14, T15, T17, T18, T19, T20, T21, T22, T23, T26, T29, T30, T31, T32, T33, T34, T35, T137, T138, T144, T145, T146, T147, T149, T150, T151, T152, T153, T154, T155, T156, T157, T158, T159, T160, T161, T162, T163, T164, T165, T166, T167, T168, T172, T174, T175, T176, T177, T178, T179, T180, T182, T186, T187, T188, T189, T190 and T191, groups G1, G2, G3 and G13 and hedges H1 and H3 require removal under current proposals.
- Trees T101, T102 and T143 will require crown lifting to a height of 5m to facilitate proposed road access.
- T102 should have lateral branches in its northern canopy quadrant shortened in length by 2m.
- T111 and T120 should have lateral branches in their southwest canopy quadrants shortened in length by 2m.
- Trees T108, T109 and T110 should have lateral branches in its eastern canopy quadrant shortened in length by 2m.

1.56 Although not specifically required for the purposes of evaluating design proposals and layouts, preliminary recommendations for tree management are provided below.

- Trees T182, T186, 189 and T190 require removal on poor arboricultural merit.
- Remove waste from the base of T187.
- Prune Lawson cypress by 1m in length on branches to allow clearance from adjacent building and to balance the crown.
- All ivy clad trees for which inspection was inhibited should have the ivy severed and be re-inspected by a trained and competent arboriculturalist.
- Monitor dieback in T15. Remove tube around stem.
- Continue the cyclical pollarding of London plane trees T7 and T8.

1.57 All tree works should give due consideration to the potential presence of protected species, including breeding birds and roosting bats. A Preliminary Ecological Appraisal

and any other ecological reports should be consulted prior to the commencement of works.

1.58 Arisings from tree works (e.g. wood piles and standing dead trunks) can provide valuable habitats for wildlife. As such, consideration should be given to their retention on site in areas unlikely to cause issues to public health and safety.

1.59 All tree pruning should be carefully planned and undertaken in accordance with *BS 3998: 2010 Recommendation for Tree Works*.

1.60 Any recommendations highlighting the management of potentially hazardous trees should be reviewed as soon as is practically possible.

MITIGATION

1.61 Outline tree planting details have been provided in the Design and Access Statement (DAS) (ECOWorld London, 2021). The tree planting outlined in the DAS is considered to reduce the impact of tree removal on site but does not go as far as to wholly mitigate it. Emphasis should be given to mature tree retention in this area rather than mitigation following removal.

1.62 It is recommended that a substantial scheme of soft landscaping is submitted, including tree planting details which address the loss of visual public amenity where tree removal is unavoidable. The tree selection should be appropriate to the site and chosen from a species palette in accordance with local tree planting policies and in accordance with any recommendations provided in a PEA and any subsequent ecology reports.

1.63 The design of any new planting and landscaping proposals should be based upon a soil analysis which considers pH and any nutrient deficiencies or imbalances.

1.64 The planting detail has been considered as part of the wider landscape design proposal. Species selected are native and/or of proven ecological value (ECOWorld London, 2021).

1.65 Often the need for future remedial pruning or tree removal can be avoided through careful species selection and planning during the design of the mitigation planting scheme.

1.66 The positioning of mitigation planting in relation to new or existing buildings should take full account of the final canopy height and spread of all trees included in the planting scheme. Buildings should ideally be located a sufficient distance from the predicted canopy line and RPA to avoid future pressure to undertake remedial pruning or tree removal.

1.67 In an urban setting such as this site, tree planting will not always be successful, and it is expected that some trees may not survive into maturity. It is recommended that specifications on aftercare and maintenance, including irrigation, as well as protection and formative pruning during establishment as well as replacement for un-established trees are included as part of the finalised tree planting strategy. Recommendations should be appropriate to the proposed planting and should be in compliance with Section 11 of BS 8545:2014 *Trees from nursery to establishment in the landscape- Recommendations.*

ISSUES FOR THE ARBORICULTURAL METHOD STATEMENT

1.68 The positioning of new buildings should take into consideration the maximum canopy height and width of all trees to be retained. Buildings should ideally be located beyond the RPAs of the trees to be retained and allow sufficient distance from the existing canopy line to avoid future pressure to undertake remedial pruning or tree removal. Where the location of buildings inside the RPA is unavoidable, special engineering of foundations will be required and presented in a future method statement.

1.69 In order to minimise disturbance in the RPAs of retained trees, excavation into the soil or soil regrading should not be a requirement of finalised construction layouts, existing levels should remain intact and should be protected from overloading to prevent soil compaction.

1.70 Protective fencing should be installed in accordance with figure 2 of BS 5837:2012 to enable the safe retention of trees to be retained. The positioning of tree protection and the establishment of construction exclusion zones (CEZ) should initially be based upon the root protection areas as described in Appendix 1 and should be in place prior to the commencement of works.

1.71 All works should be undertaken from outside the RPA wherever possible. Where working in an RPA is unavoidable, ground protective measures fully compliant with section 6.2 of BS 5837: 2012 and agreed by the consulting arboriculturalist should be used.

1.72 Where construction of new buildings or hardstanding inside RPAs is likely to significantly impact a trees physiological or structural condition, specialist methods of construction should be developed and specified as part of the Arboricultural Method Statement.

References

British Standard Institute (BSI) (2012). *BS 5837:2012 Trees in Relation to Design Demolition and Construction-Recommendations*. BSI, London.

British Standard Institute (BSI) (2010). *BS 3998:2010 Recommendation for Tree Works*. BSI, London.

British Standard Institute (BSI) (2014). *BS 8545:2014 Trees: from nursery to independence in the landscape - Recommendations*. BSI, London.

Department for Communities and Local Government (2014). *Planning Practice Guidance on Tree Preservation Orders and trees in conservation areas.*

ECOWorld International (2020). *Aberfeldy Masterplan - Combined survey_full site*.

ECOWorld London (2021). *Design and Access Statement: The Masterplan.*

LDA Design (2021). *MASTERPLAN GENERAL ARRANGEMENT GROUND FLOOR DWG. NO AVL-LDALSBX-XX-XX-DR-L-0001*.

Lonsdale, D. (1999). *Research for Amenity Trees No.7: Principles of Tree Hazard Assessment and Management*. HMSO

Mattheck and Breloer (1994). HMSO London. Research for Amenity Trees No 4; *The Body Language of Trees.*

Sumo Services Ltd (2019). *Topographical Survey SORO016539*.

Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended).

Town and Country Planning (Tree Preservation) (England) Regulations 2012.

Appendix 1: Schedule of Trees

Table 1: Schedule of Trees and Tree Quality Assessment*

* See Table 3 for key to terms
** See Table 2 for definitions of categories

No	Species	Ht.	S	St. 1.5m	Canopy Spread				Cr. Cl	Ls	SC	PC	Comments /Observation	Preliminary Management Advice	LE	Cat **	RPAm ^{2}	RPA *r*
					N	S	E	W										
T1	Raywood ash	7.5	1	250	3	2	3	3	2.5	EM	Fair	Good	Bifurcates at 1m. Minor occluding wounds on stem.	No Immediate works required.	20-40	B2	28.3	3
T2	Raywood ash	6	1	120	2	2	2	2	2	SM	Good	Good	Good form. Watering pipe at base.	No Immediate works required.	40+	C1	6.5	1.4
T3	Raywood ash	6	1	120	2	2	2	2.5	2	SM	Good	Good	Minor lean west.	No Immediate works required.	40+	C1	6.5	1.4
T4	Unconfirmed species - dead stem	4	1	180	1	1	1	1	3	EM	Poor	Poor	Dead stem with branches pruned to 1m in all canopy extents. No retention value for wildlife as not a significant size.	Remove and replace.	0-10	U	14.7	2.2
T5	Wild cherry	9	1	460	4	5	4	4	4	M	Fair	Fair	Previously pruned with some rot from pruning wounds.	No Immediate works required.	20-40	B2	95.7	5.5
T6	Wild cherry	9	1	460	5	4	4	5	4	M	Fair	Fair	Previously pruned with some rot from pruning wounds. Very recently had some of the stump growth re-pruned. Starting to establish pollard knuckles.	No Immediate works required.	20-40	B2	95.7	5.5

Table 1: Schedule of Trees and Tree Quality Assessment*

* See Table 3 for key to terms
** See Table 2 for definitions of categories

No	Species	Ht.	S	St. 1.5m	Canopy Spread				Cr. Cl	Ls	SC	PC	Comments /Observation	Preliminary Management Advice	LE	Cat **	RPAm ^{2}	RPA *r*
					N	S	E	W										
T7	London plane	18	1	945	4	4	4	4	8	M	Good	Good	Large specimen and successful pollard. Re-pollarded within the last year with approximately 1.5m regrowth from pollard knuckles. Minor curling of leaves in upper canopy.	Continue cyclical pollard.	40+	A1	404	11.3
T8	London plane	16	1	860	4	4	6	3	7	M	Good	Good	Leaning east but structurally sound. Mature pollard that has been re-pollarded writhing the last year.	Continue cyclical pollard.	40+	A1	334.6	10.3
T9	Wild cherry	4	1	560	4	3	4	4	5	M	Fair	Fair	Bifurcates at 3m. Recently pruned back to pollard points with some growth left. Appears to have withstood previous harsh pruning.	-	20-40	B2	141.9	6.7
T10	Apricot	9	1	500	3	6	3	5	4	M	Fair	Fair	Apricot tree. Grape vine growing through canopy with lots of grapes. Some snapped branches and deadwood.	-	20-40	B2	113.1	6

Table 1: Schedule of Trees and Tree Quality Assessment*

* See Table 3 for key to terms
** See Table 2 for definitions of categories

No	Species	Ht.	S	St. 1.5m	Canopy Spread				Cr. Cl	Ls	SC	PC	Comments /Observation	Preliminary Management Advice	LE	Cat **	RPAm ^{2}	RPA *r*
					N	S	E	W										
T11	Common plum	6	1	320	5	2	3	2	2	M	Fair	Good	Plum. Growing behind garden fence so access limited. Pushing up against a section of fence that has previously been cut to accommodate the stem. Growth biased north.	-	20-40	B2	46.3	3.8
T12	Lawsons Cypress	4	1	120	1	1	1	1	1	SM	Good	Good	Behind garden fence, access limited.	-	20-40	C1	6.5	1.4
T13	False acacia	9	1	500	3	3	3	3	2.5	M	Good	Good	Behind garden fence so access limited. Previously pollarded with lots of regrowth and epicormic.	-	20-40	B2	113.1	6
T14	Common Elder	6	1	150	3	2	2	3	1	M	Fair	Good	Behind garden fence so access limited.	-	20-40	C1	10.2	1.8
T15	Norway maple	7	1	450	1	4	2	3	3	M	Fair	Poor	Previously pruned to stumps. Regrowth weak and browning. Mildew on leaves. Tube wrapped around stem up to 1.5m.	Monitor dieback. Remove tube around the stem.	10-20	C1	91.6	5.4
T16	London plane	14	1	700	5	5	5	5	5	M	Good	Good	Mature pollard in good condition.	-	40+	A1	221.7	8.4
T17	London plane	14	1	640	3	4	3	3	8	M	Good	Good	Mature pollard in good condition.	-	40+	B1	185.3	7.7

Table 1: Schedule of Trees and Tree Quality Assessment*

* See Table 3 for key to terms
** See Table 2 for definitions of categories

No	Species	Ht.	S	St. 1.5m	Canopy Spread				Cr. Cl	Ls	SC	PC	Comments /Observation	Preliminary Management Advice	LE	Cat **	RPAm ^{2}	RPA *r*
					N	S	E	W										
T18	Small leaved lime	7	1	280	3	3	3	3	2	EM	Good	Good	Minor basal growth. Yellowing leaves - may be due to autumnal conditions.	-	40+	B2	35.5	3.4
T19	Large leaved lime	8	1	410	2	2	2	2	5	M	Good	Good	Mature pollard in good condition.	-	40+	B2	76	4.9
T20	Lawsons Cypress	8	1	400	4	4	3	4	3.5	M	Fair	Good	Growing against building to the east.	Prune away from building to get 1m clearance.	20-40	B2	72.4	4.8
T21	Common Elder	6	1	150	2	2	2	2	1	M	Fair	Fair	Growing in the shade of and through the canopy of neighbouring Lawsons cypress.	-	10-20	C1	10.2	1.8
T22	Wild cherry	7	1	550	5	5	4	6	3	M	Fair	Fair	Previously heavily pruned to stumps with regrowth recently re-cut with some left. Appears to be coping with minimal rot so far. Some exposed surface roots.	-	10-20	C1	136.8	6.6
T23	Field maple	4.5	1	115	2	1	1	2	2	SM	Fair	Fair	Growing from street pit. Watering pipe at base.	-	10-20	C1	6	1.4
T24	False acacia	10	1	450	2	2	2	3	3	M	Fair	Good	Mature pollard in fair condition. Growing form behind garden fence so access limited.	-	20-40	B2	91.6	5.4

Table 1: Schedule of Trees and Tree Quality Assessment*

* See Table 3 for key to terms
** See Table 2 for definitions of categories

No	Species	Ht.	S	St. 1.5m	Canopy Spread				Cr. Cl	Ls	SC	PC	Comments /Observation	Preliminary Management Advice	LE	Cat **	RPAm ^{2}	RPA *r*
					N	S	E	W										
T25	False acacia	10	1	450	2	2	2	3	3	M	Fair	Good	Mature pollard in fair condition. Growing form behind garden fence so access limited.	-	20-40	B2	91.6	5.4
T26	False acacia	10	1	450	2	2	2	3	3	M	Fair	Good	Mature pollard in fair condition. Growing form behind garden fence so access limited.	-	20-40	B2	91.6	5.4
T27	False acacia	10	1	450	2	2	2	3	3	M	Fair	Good	Mature pollard in fair condition. Growing form behind garden fence so access limited.	-	20-40	B2	91.6	5.4
T28	False acacia	10	1	450	2	2	2	3	3	M	Fair	Good	Mature pollard in fair condition. Growing form behind garden fence so access limited.	-	20-40	B2	91.6	5.4
T29	False acacia	10	1	450	2	2	2	3	3	M	Fair	Good	Mature pollard in fair condition. Growing form behind garden fence so access limited.	-	20-40	B2	91.6	5.4
T30	Norway maple	12	1	500	7	5	6	5	4	M	Good	Good	Growing on roadside behind wall. Access limited.	-	40+	B1	113.1	6
T31	Norway maple	8	1	480	1	3	2	3	4	M	Fair	Poor	Pruned heavily to stumps with prolific regrowth.	-	10-20	C1	104.2	5.8

Table 1: Schedule of Trees and Tree Quality Assessment*

* See Table 3 for key to terms
** See Table 2 for definitions of categories

No	Species	Ht.	S	St. 1.5m	Canopy Spread				Cr. Cl	Ls	SC	PC	Comments /Observation	Preliminary Management Advice	LE	Cat **	RPAm ^{2}	RPA *r*
					N	S	E	W										
T32	Norway maple	8	1	480	1	3	3	1	4	M	Fair	Poor	Pruned heavily to stumps with prolific regrowth. Rot visible from stumps.	-	10-20	C1	104.2	5.8
T33	London plane	18	1	940	5	8	8	8	3	M	Good	Good	Historic pollard. Very good condition.	-	40+	A1	399.7	11.3
T34	London plane	18	1	850	5	5	8	8	3	M	Good	Good	Historic pollard. Very good condition. Growing over house to the north.	-	40+	A1	326.9	10.2
T35	London plane	17	1	790	8	8	8	8	3	M	Good	Good	Pavement cracking at base.	-	40+	A1	282.3	9.5
T36	London plane	15	1	800	5	5	5	5	7	M	Good	Good	Slightly raised pavement at base.	-	40+	A2	289.5	9.6
T37	London plane	10	1	350	4	4	4	4	3	EM	Good	Good	Growing in park exercise area.	-	40+	B2	55.4	4.2
T38	London plane	10	1	550	5	5	5	5	2.5	M	Good	Good	Growing in park exercise area.	-	40+	B1	136.8	6.6
T39	London plane	14	1	750	4	4	5	4	7	M	Good	Good	Roadside with minor pavement lift. Recently re-pollarded	-	40+	B1	254.5	9
T40	London plane	3	1	90	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5	1.5	Y	Good	Good	Recently planted.	-	20-40	C1	3.7	1.1
T41	London plane	12	1	450	6	6	6	6	4	M	Good	Good	On boundary of park.	-	40+	A2	91.6	5.4

Table 1: Schedule of Trees and Tree Quality Assessment*

* See Table 3 for key to terms
** See Table 2 for definitions of categories

No	Species	Ht.	S	St. 1.5m	Canopy Spread				Cr. Cl	Ls	SC	PC	Comments /Observation	Preliminary Management Advice	LE	Cat **	RPAm ^{2}	RPA *r*
					N	S	E	W										
T42	London plane	12	1	450	6	6	6	6	4	M	Good	Good	On boundary of park.	-	40+	A2	91.6	5.4
T43	London plane	12	1	450	6	6	6	6	4	M	Good	Good	On boundary of park.	-	40+	B2	91.6	5.4
T44	London plane	12	1	450	6	6	6	6	4	M	Good	Good	On boundary of park.	-	40+	B2	91.6	5.4
T45	London plane	12	1	800	3	3	3	3	2	SM	Good	Good	On boundary of park.	-	40+	B2	289.5	9.6
T46	London plane	9	1	450	4	4	1	4	2.5	M	Good	Good	Growing over boundary garden fence.	-	40+	B2	91.6	5.4
T47	London plane	14	1	600	6	6	6	6	4	M	Good	Good	Roadside with minor pavement lift. Recently re-pollarded	-	40+	A1	162.9	7.2
T48	London plane	14	1	600	6	6	6	6	4	M	Good	Good	Roadside with minor pavement lift. Recently re-pollarded	-	40+	A1	162.9	7.2
T49	London plane	14	1	600	6	6	6	6	4	M	Good	Good	Roadside with minor pavement lift. Recently re-pollarded	-	40+	A1	162.9	7.2
T50	London plane	14	1	600	6	6	6	6	4	M	Good	Good	Roadside with minor pavement lift. Recently re-pollarded	-	40+	A1	162.9	7.2
T51	London plane	14	1	800	4	4	4	4	6	M	Good	Good	Recently re-pollarded	-	40+	A2	289.5	9.6

Table 1: Schedule of Trees and Tree Quality Assessment*

* See Table 3 for key to terms
** See Table 2 for definitions of categories

No	Species	Ht.	S	St. 1.5m	Canopy Spread				Cr. Cl	Ls	SC	PC	Comments /Observation	Preliminary Management Advice	LE	Cat **	RPAm ^{2}	RPA *r*
					N	S	E	W										
T52	London plane	14	1	800	4	4	4	4	6	M	Good	Good	Recently re-pollarded	-	40+	A2	289.5	9.6
T53	European hornbeam	8	1	350	4	4	4	4	2	EM	Good	Good	Growing in park flower bed.	-	40+	B1	55.4	4.2
T54	European hornbeam	6	1	300	4	4	5	5	2	EM	Good	Good	Growing in park flower bed. Pruned on north side away from footpath.	-	40+	B1	40.7	3.6
T55	European hornbeam	6	1	300	4	4	4	4	3	EM	Good	Good	Symmetrical tree with good form.	-	40+	B2	40.7	3.6
T56	European hornbeam	6	1	280	4	4	4	4	3	EM	Good	Good	Symmetrical tree with good form.	-	40+	B2	35.5	3.4
T57	European hornbeam	6	1	280	4	4	4	4	3	EM	Good	Good	Symmetrical tree with good form. Growing from within park hedge.	-	40+	B2	35.5	3.4
T58	European hornbeam	6	1	280	4	4	4	4	3	EM	Good	Good	Symmetrical tree with good form. Growing from within park hedge.	-	40+	B2	35.5	3.4
T59	European hornbeam	6	1	280	4	4	4	4	3	EM	Good	Good	Symmetrical tree with good form.	-	40+	B2	35.5	3.4
T60	European hornbeam	6	1	280	4	4	4	4	3	EM	Good	Good	Symmetrical tree with good form.	-	40+	B2	35.5	3.4

Table 1: Schedule of Trees and Tree Quality Assessment*

* See Table 3 for key to terms
** See Table 2 for definitions of categories

No	Species	Ht.	S	St. 1.5m	Canopy Spread				Cr. Cl	Ls	SC	PC	Comments /Observation	Preliminary Management Advice	LE	Cat **	RPAm ^{2}	RPA *r*
					N	S	E	W										
T61	London plane	14	1	800	4	4	4	4	6	M	Good	Good	Recently re-pollarded. Minor basal growth.	Remove basal growth away from tree.	40+	B2	289.5	9.6
T62	Japanese cherry	4	1	300	4	3	4	4	2	EM	Fair	Good	Japanese cherry. In flower bed if park boundary. With water pipe. Some branches with acute unions.	-	20-40	B2	40.7	3.6
T63	Japanese cherry	4	1	300	4	3	4	4	2	EM	Fair	Good	Japanese cherry. In flower bed if park boundary. With water pipe.	-	20-40	B2	40.7	3.6
T64	Japanese cherry	4	1	300	4	3	4	4	2	EM	Fair	Good	Japanese cherry. In flower bed if park boundary. With water pipe. Partially pushed up against lamp post.	-	20-40	B2	40.7	3.6
T65	Japanese cherry	4	1	300	4	3	4	4	2	EM	Fair	Good	Japanese cherry. In flower bed if park boundary. With water pipe. Partially pushed up against lamp post.	-	20-40	B2	40.7	3.6
T66	Japanese cherry	6	1	500	4	3	4	4	2	EM	Fair	Good	Japanese cherry. In flower bed if park boundary. Acute union at 3m	-	20-40	B2	113.1	6
T67	Japanese cherry	4	1	300	4	3	4	4	2	EM	Fair	Good	Japanese cherry. In flower bed if park boundary.	-	20-40	B2	40.7	3.6
T68	Himalayan birch	7	1	200	2	2	2	2	2	EM	Good	Good	Good quality with wire fence and posts protecting at base.	-	40+	B2	18.1	2.4

Table 1: Schedule of Trees and Tree Quality Assessment*

* See Table 3 for key to terms
** See Table 2 for definitions of categories

No	Species	Ht.	S	St. 1.5m	Canopy Spread				Cr. Cl	Ls	SC	PC	Comments /Observation	Preliminary Management Advice	LE	Cat **	RPAm ^{2}	RPA *r*
					N	S	E	W										
T69	Himalayan birch	7	1	200	2	2	2	2	2	EM	Good	Good	Good quality with wire fence and posts protecting at base.	-	40+	B2	18.1	2.4
T70	Himalayan birch	7	1	200	2	2	2	2	2	EM	Good	Good	Good quality with wire fence and posts protecting at base.	-	40+	B2	18.1	2.4
T71	London plane	12	1	360	5	5	5	5	3	EM	Good	Good	Protective cage around stem.	-	40+	B2	58.6	4.3
T72	London plane	10	1	420	6	5	5	5	2.5	EM	Good	Good	Protective cage around base. Starting to outgrow base, bark bulging over.	-	40+	B2	79.8	5
T73	London plane	12	1	360	5	5	5	5	3	EM	Good	Good	Slightly raised brick paving at base.	-	40+	B2	58.6	4.3
T74	London plane	12	1	360	5	5	5	5	3	EM	Good	Good	Slightly raised brick paving at base.	-	40+	B2	58.6	4.3
T75	Crab apple	4.5	1	130	2	3	3	2	1	SM	Good	Good	Fruit laden and in good health.	-	40+	C1	7.6	1.6
T76	Pedunculate oak	11	1	350	3	3	3	3	3	EM	Good	Good	Slightly thin canopy.	-	40+	B2	55.4	4.2
T77	Pedunculate oak	11	1	350	3	3	3	3	3	EM	Good	Good	Dense canopy, good form.	-	40+	B2	55.4	4.2
T78	European rowan	5	1	180	2	2	2	2	2.5	SM	Fair	Fair	Occluding wounds at base. Likely a trimmer damage.	-	10-20	C1	14.7	2.2

Table 1: Schedule of Trees and Tree Quality Assessment*

* See Table 3 for key to terms
** See Table 2 for definitions of categories

No	Species	Ht.	S	St. 1.5m	Canopy Spread				Cr. Cl	Ls	SC	PC	Comments /Observation	Preliminary Management Advice	LE	Cat **	RPAm ^{2}	RPA *r*
					N	S	E	W										
T79	European rowan	5	1	180	2	2	2	2	2.5	SM	Fair	Fair	Occluding wounds at base. Likely a trimmer damage.	-	10-20	C1	14.7	2.2
T80	Midland hawthorn	5	1	150	0.5	3	2	2	2	EM	Fair	Good	Leaning south.	-	10-20	C1	10.2	1.8
T81	Common horse chestnut	7	1	380	2.5	3	2	3	3	EM	Good	Fair	Leaf miner.	-	20-40	B2	65.3	4.6
T82	Common horse chestnut	7	1	380	3	3	3	2	3	EM	Good	Fair	Leaf miner.	-	20-40	B2	65.3	4.6
T83	London plane	12	1	730	3	3	3	3	7	M	Good	Good	Recently re-pollarded.	-	40+	B1	241.1	8.8
T84	Common horse chestnut	6	1	380	3	3	3	3	3	EM	Good	Fair	Leaf miner.	-	20-40	B2	65.3	4.6
T85	Common horse chestnut	6	1	380	3	3	3	3	3	EM	Good	Fair	Leaf miner.	-	20-40	B2	65.3	4.6
T86	Common horse chestnut	7	1	510	4	4	4	4	3	EM	Good	Fair	Leaf miner.	-	20-40	B2	117.7	6.1
T87	Japanese cherry	4.5	1	200	2.5	2.5	2.5	2.5	2.5	EM	Fair	Poor	Japanese cherry. Sparse canopy and dead twigs	-	0-10	U	18.1	2.4
T88	Japanese cherry	4.5	1	310	2.5	2.5	2.5	2.5	2.5	EM	Fair	Fair	Japanese cherry. Some exposed surface roots.	-	10-20	C1	43.5	3.7

Table 1: Schedule of Trees and Tree Quality Assessment*

* See Table 3 for key to terms
** See Table 2 for definitions of categories

No	Species	Ht.	S	St. 1.5m	Canopy Spread				Cr. Cl	Ls	SC	PC	Comments /Observation	Preliminary Management Advice	LE	Cat **	RPAm ^{2}	RPA *r*
					N	S	E	W										
T89	Japanese cherry	4.5	1	310	2.5	2.5	2.5	2.5	2.5	EM	Fair	Fair	Japanese cherry. Some exposed surface roots.	-	10-20	C1	43.5	3.7
T90	Japanese cherry	4.5	1	400	3	3	3	3	2.5	EM	Fair	Fair	Japanese cherry. Some exposed surface roots.	-	20-40	B2	72.4	4.8
T91	Japanese cherry	3	1	200	1	1	1	1	1	EM	Poor	Fair	Japanese cherry. Some exposed surface roots. Crown break at 1m has rot visible.	-	0-10	U	18.1	2.4
T92	Japanese cherry	4	1	300	2	2	1	2.5	2	SM	Fair	Fair	Slight lean west.	-	10-20	C1	40.7	3.6
T93	Wild cherry	12	1	550	4	4	3	4	3	M	Good	Good	Growing over adjacent buildings to the east and west.	-	20-40	B2	136.8	6.6
T94	London plane	16	1	940	5	5	8	5	7	M	Good	Good	Recently re-pollarded.	-	40+	A1	399.7	11.3
T95	London plane	16	1	940	5	5	5	5	7	M	Good	Good	Recently re-pollarded.	-	40+	A1	399.7	11.3
T96	London plane	18	1	820	7	7	5	5	8	M	Good	Good	Recently re-pollarded.	-	40+	A1	304.2	9.8
T97	London plane	18	1	820	7	7	5	5	8	M	Good	Good	Recently re-pollarded.	-	40+	A1	304.2	9.8
T98	London plane	18	1	820	7	7	5	5	8	M	Good	Good	Recently re-pollarded.	-	40+	A1	304.2	9.8

Table 1: Schedule of Trees and Tree Quality Assessment*

* See Table 3 for key to terms
** See Table 2 for definitions of categories

No	Species	Ht.	S	St. 1.5m	Canopy Spread				Cr. Cl	Ls	SC	PC	Comments /Observation	Preliminary Management Advice	LE	Cat **	RPAm ^{2}	RPA *r*
					N	S	E	W										
T99	London plane	18	1	820	7	7	5	5	8	M	Good	Good	Recently re-pollarded.	-	40+	A1	304.2	9.8
T100	London plane	18	1	820	7	7	5	5	8	M	Good	Good	Recently re-pollarded.	-	40+	A1	304.2	9.8
T101	London plane	16	1	975	5	5	5	5	6	M	Good	Good	Recently re-pollarded.	-	40+	A1	430.1	11.7
T102	London plane	18	1	950	6	6	6	6	6	M	Good	Good	Recently re-pollarded. Located in locked up playground. Base inaccessible.	-	40+	A1	408.3	11.4
T103	Small leaved lime	7	1	150	2	2	2	2	3.5	SM	Good	Good	Good quality with resin bound gravel at base up to stem.	-	40+	B2	10.2	1.8
T104	London plane	18	1	800	6	6	6	6	8	M	Good	Good	Mature pollard.	-	40+	A1	289.5	9.6
T105	London plane	18	1	800	6	6	6	6	8	M	Good	Good	Mature pollard.	-	40+	A1	289.5	9.6
T106	London plane	18	1	800	6	6	6	6	8	M	Good	Good	Mature pollard.	-	40+	A1	289.5	9.6
T107	London plane	18	1	800	6	6	6	6	8	M	Good	Good	Mature pollard.	-	40+	A1	289.5	9.6
T108	London plane	18	1	800	6	6	6	6	8	M	Good	Good	Mature pollard.	-	40+	A1	289.5	9.6

Table 1: Schedule of Trees and Tree Quality Assessment*

* See Table 3 for key to terms
** See Table 2 for definitions of categories

No	Species	Ht.	S	St. 1.5m	Canopy Spread				Cr. Cl	Ls	SC	PC	Comments /Observation	Preliminary Management Advice	LE	Cat **	RPAm ^{2}	RPA *r*
					N	S	E	W										
T109	London plane	18	1	800	6	6	6	6	8	M	Good	Good	Mature pollard.	-	40+	A1	289.5	9.6
T110	London plane	18	1	800	6	6	6	6	8	M	Good	Good	Mature pollard.	-	40+	A1	289.5	9.6
T111	London plane	16	1	800	6	6	6	4	8	M	Good	Good	Mature pollard.	-	40+	A1	289.5	9.6
T112	London plane	12	1	710	4	4	4	4	5	M	Good	Good	Mature pollard.	-	40+	A1	228	8.5
T113	London plane	12	1	710	4	4	4	4	5	M	Good	Good	Mature pollard.	-	40+	A1	228	8.5
T114	London plane	12	1	750	4	4	4	4	5	M	Good	Good	Mature pollard.	-	40+	B1	254.5	9
T115	European hornbeam	10	1	520	5	5	5	5	2.5	M	Good	Good	Growing in church yard. Recent pruning of basal growth.	-	40+	B1	122.3	6.2
T116	Wild cherry	7	1	400	3	3	3	3	3	M	Good	Good	No access, dimensions estimated.	-	20-40	B2	72.4	4.8
T117	Fig	6	1	200	3	3	3	3	2	M	Good	Good	Fig. In private garden. No access.	-	40+	B2	18.1	2.4
T118	Small leaved lime	7	1	150	2	2	2	2	3.5	SM	Good	Good	Good quality with resin bound gravel at base up to stem.	-	40+	B2	10.2	1.8

Table 1: Schedule of Trees and Tree Quality Assessment*

* See Table 3 for key to terms
** See Table 2 for definitions of categories

No	Species	Ht.	S	St. 1.5m	Canopy Spread				Cr. Cl	Ls	SC	PC	Comments /Observation	Preliminary Management Advice	LE	Cat **	RPAm ^{2}	RPA *r*
					N	S	E	W										
T119	Oriental plane	6	1	180	2.5	2.5	2.5	2.5	3	SM	Good	Good	Resin bound gravel up to base. Good form.	-	40+	B2	14.7	2.2
T120	London plane	16	1	800	6	6	6	4	8	M	Good	Good	Mature pollard.	-	40+	A1	289.5	9.6
T121	London plane	16	1	800	6	6	6	4	8	M	Good	Good	Mature pollard.	-	40+	A1	289.5	9.6
T122	Himalayan birch	6	1	150	2	2	2	2	2	EM	Good	Good	Inaccessible - located within schoolyard.	-	20-40	B2	10.2	1.8
T123	Common ash	5	1	80	2	2	2	2	2	SM	Good	Good	Self-seeded	-	20-40	C1	2.9	1
T124	Small leaved lime	12	1	400	3	3	3	3	2	EM	Good	Good	Inaccessible - located within schoolyard.	-	40+	B2	72.4	4.8
T125	Sycamore	13	1	600	7	7	7	7	5	M	Good	Good	Inaccessible - located within schoolyard.	-	40+	A1	162.9	7.2
T126	London plane	12	1	500	4	4	4	4	3	M	Good	Good	Slightly raised paving at base.	-	40+	B1	113.1	6
T127	London plane	12	1	500	4	4	4	4	3	M	Good	Good	Slightly raised paving at base.	-	40+	B1	113.1	6
T128	London plane	8	1	350	4	2	3	3	3	M	Good	Good	Slightly raised paving at base.	-	40+	B1	55.4	4.2

Table 1: Schedule of Trees and Tree Quality Assessment*

* See Table 3 for key to terms
** See Table 2 for definitions of categories

No	Species	Ht.	S	St. 1.5m	Canopy Spread				Cr. Cl	Ls	SC	PC	Comments /Observation	Preliminary Management Advice	LE	Cat **	RPAm ^{2}	RPA *r*
					N	S	E	W										
T129	London plane	8	1	350	3	2	5	3	3	M	Fair	Poor	Leaning east. Very sparse foliage.	-	10-20	C2	55.4	4.2
T130	London plane	8	1	350	4	2	3	3	3	M	Good	Good	Slightly raised paving at base.	-	40+	B1	55.4	4.2
T131	London plane	8	1	350	4	2	3	3	3	M	Good	Good	Slightly raised paving at base.	-	40+	B1	55.4	4.2
T132	Common ash	8	1	200	3	3	3	3	3	EM	Fair	Good	Inaccessible - located within schoolyard.	-	10-20	C1	18.1	2.4
T133	Wild cherry	7	1	200	2	2	2	2	3	EM	Poor	Fair	Inaccessible - located within schoolyard.	-	20-40	C1	18.1	2.4
T134	London plane	14	1	650	4	4	4	4	4	M	Good	Good	Mature pollard.	-	40+	A1	191.1	7.8
T135	London plane	14	1	650	4	4	4	4	4	M	Good	Good	Mature pollard.	-	40+	A1	191.1	7.8
T136	London plane	14	1	650	4	4	4	4	4	M	Good	Good	Mature pollard.	-	40+	A1	191.1	7.8
T137	London plane	14	1	520	6	6	6	6	4	M	Good	Good	Mature pollard. Graffiti on stem.	-	40+	B1	122.3	6.2
T138	London plane	14	1	520	6	6	6	6	4	M	Good	Good	Mature pollard. Graffiti on stem.	-	40+	B1	122.3	6.2

Table 1: Schedule of Trees and Tree Quality Assessment*

* See Table 3 for key to terms
** See Table 2 for definitions of categories

No	Species	Ht.	S	St. 1.5m	Canopy Spread				Cr. Cl	Ls	SC	PC	Comments /Observation	Preliminary Management Advice	LE	Cat **	RPAm ^{2}	RPA *r*
					N	S	E	W										
T139	London plane	19	1	800	6	6	6	6	8	M	Good	Good	Historic pollard. Very good form.	-	40+	A1	289.5	9.6
T140	London plane	19	1	800	6	6	6	6	8	M	Good	Good	Historic pollard. Very good form.	-	40+	A1	289.5	9.6
T141	London plane	19	1	800	6	6	6	6	8	M	Good	Good	Historic pollard. Very good form.	-	40+	A1	289.5	9.6
T142	London plane	19	1	800	6	6	6	6	8	M	Good	Good	Historic pollard. Very good form.	-	40+	A1	289.5	9.6
T143	London plane	19	1	800	6	6	6	6	8	M	Good	Good	Historic pollard. Very good form.	-	40+	A1	289.5	9.6
T144	Swedish whitebeam	5	1	250	3	3	3	3	3	EM	Good	Good	Swedish whitebeam. Growing from pyracantha hedge line.	-	20-40	B2	28.3	3
T145	Swedish whitebeam	7	1	450	4	4	4	4	3	M	Good	Fair	Small amount of deadwood visible. Dead wasps next attached to stem at 3m.	-	20-40	B2	91.6	5.4
T146	Swedish whitebeam	7	1	430	4	4	4	4	3	M	Good	Good	Swedish whitebeam. Minor pruning wounds occluding.	-	20-40	B2	83.6	5.2
T147	Swedish whitebeam	7	1	430	4	4	4	4	3	M	Good	Good	Swedish whitebeam. Minor pruning wounds occluding.	-	20-40	B2	83.6	5.2
T148	Japanese cherry	6	1	400	3	3	3	4	2.5	M	Fair	Good	Japanese cherry. Base inaccessible due to garden fence.	-	20-40	B2	72.4	4.8

Table 1: Schedule of Trees and Tree Quality Assessment*

* See Table 3 for key to terms
** See Table 2 for definitions of categories

No	Species	Ht.	S	St. 1.5m	Canopy Spread				Cr. Cl	Ls	SC	PC	Comments /Observation	Preliminary Management Advice	LE	Cat **	RPAm ^{2}	RPA *r*
					N	S	E	W										
T149	Eucalyptus sp	12	1	400	2	4	4	2	1	M	Fair	Good	Planted very close to adjacent building. Canopy touching building to the west.	May require removal to prevent damage to building foundations and exterior.	40+	C1	72.4	4.8
T150	Norway maple	8	1	300	3	3	3	3	2.5	EM	Good	Good	Behind garage. Base inaccessible.	-	20-40	B2	40.7	3.6
T151	Norway maple	8	1	300	3	3	3	3	2.5	EM	Good	Good	Behind garage. Base inaccessible.	-	20-40	B2	40.7	3.6
T152	Norway maple	7	1	250	3	3	3	3	2.5	EM	Good	Good	Suppressed by neighbours.	-	20-40	C1	28.3	3
T153	Tree of heaven	8	1	300	3	3	3	3	2.5	EM	Good	Good	Tree of heaven. Base inaccessible.	-	20-40	B2	40.7	3.6
T154	Norway maple	8	1	300	3	3	3	3	2.5	EM	Good	Good	Good form, growing from planted bed.	-	20-40	B2	40.7	3.6
T155	European rowan	7	1	200	2	2	2	2	2	M	Good	Good	Good form. Growing from planted bed.	-	20-40	B2	18.1	2.4
T156	European rowan	5	1	200	2	2	2	2	2	M	Fair	Good	Acute unions at crown break.	-	10-20	C1	18.1	2.4
T157	European rowan	5	1	200	2	2	2	2	2	M	Fair	Good	Acute unions at crown break.	-	10-20	C1	18.1	2.4

Table 1: Schedule of Trees and Tree Quality Assessment*

* See Table 3 for key to terms
** See Table 2 for definitions of categories

No	Species	Ht.	S	St. 1.5m	Canopy Spread				Cr. Cl	Ls	SC	PC	Comments /Observation	Preliminary Management Advice	LE	Cat **	RPAm ^{2}	RPA *r*
					N	S	E	W										
T158	European rowan	7	1	200	2	2	2	2	2	M	Good	Good	Good form. Growing from planted bed.	-	20-40	B2	18.1	2.4
T159	Cut leaf birch	7	1	180	3	3	3	3	2	EM	Good	Good	Cut leaf birch. Growing from hedge.	-	20-40	B2	14.7	2.2
T160	European rowan	7	1	200	2	2	2	2	2	M	Good	Good	Good form. Growing from planted bed.	-	20-40	B2	18.1	2.4
T161	European rowan	7	1	200	2	2	2	2	2	M	Good	Good	Good form. Growing from planted bed.	-	20-40	B2	18.1	2.4
T162	European rowan	7	1	200	2	2	2	2	2	M	Good	Good	Good form. Growing from planted bed.	-	20-40	B2	18.1	2.4
T163	European rowan	7	1	200	2	2	2	2	2	M	Good	Good	Good form. Growing from planted bed.	-	20-40	B2	18.1	2.4
T164	European rowan	5	1	200	1	2	2	2	2	M	Fair	Poor	Poor form, sparse foliage.	-	0-10	U	18.1	2.4
T165	European rowan	7	1	200	2	2	2	2	2	M	Good	Good	Good form. Growing from planted bed.	-	20-40	B2	18.1	2.4
T166	European rowan	7	1	200	2	2	2	2	2	M	Good	Good	Good form. Growing from planted bed.	-	20-40	B2	18.1	2.4
T167	Snowy mepsil	7	1	400	4	4	4	4	2	M	Good	Good	Amelanchier. Base inaccessible due to garden fence.	-	20-40	B2	72.4	4.8

Table 1: Schedule of Trees and Tree Quality Assessment*

* See Table 3 for key to terms
** See Table 2 for definitions of categories

No	Species	Ht.	S	St. 1.5m	Canopy Spread				Cr. Cl	Ls	SC	PC	Comments /Observation	Preliminary Management Advice	LE	Cat **	RPAm ^{2}	RPA *r*
					N	S	E	W										
T168	Norway maple	8	1	550	6	6	6	6	3	M	Good	Good	Large occluding wound at base.	-	40+	B1	136.8	6.6
T169	London plane	16	1	600	5	2	5	5	6	M	Good	Good	Historic pollard.	-	40+	A1	162.9	7.2
T170	Cherry plum	7	1	140	2	2	2	2	4	SM	Good	Good	Resin bird gravel at base up to stem.	-	40+	C1	8.9	1.7
T171	Cherry plum	7	1	140	2	2	2	2	4	SM	Good	Good	Resin bird gravel at base up to stem.	-	40+	C1	8.9	1.7
T172	Cherry plum	7	1	140	2	2	2	2	4	SM	Good	Good	Resin bird gravel at base up to stem.	-	40+	C1	8.9	1.7
T173	Field maple	6	1	150	2.5	2.5	2.5	2.5	2.5	EM	Good	Good	Resin bound gravel at base up to stem.	-	20-40	B2	10.2	1.8
T174	Common whitebeam	5	1	200	3	3	3	3	2.5	EM	Good	Good	Growing from within planter bed.	-	40+	B2	18.1	2.4
T175	Common whitebeam	5	1	200	3	3	3	3	2.5	EM	Good	Good	Growing from within planter bed.	-	40+	B2	18.1	2.4
T176	Common whitebeam	5	1	220	2	3	3	2	3	EM	Fair	Good	Slight lean west.	-	20-40	C1	21.9	2.6
T177	Crab apple	7	1	300	2	3	3	3	2	M	Good	Good	Located behind garden wall - access limited.	-	40+	B2	40.7	3.6

Table 1: Schedule of Trees and Tree Quality Assessment*

* See Table 3 for key to terms
** See Table 2 for definitions of categories

No	Species	Ht.	S	St. 1.5m	Canopy Spread				Cr. Cl	Ls	SC	PC	Comments /Observation	Preliminary Management Advice	LE	Cat **	RPAm ^{2}	RPA *r*
					N	S	E	W										
T178	European pear	6	1	200	2	2	2	2	2	EM	Good	Good	Located behind garden wall - access restricted. Healthy fruit visible.	-	20-40	B2	18.1	2.4
T179	Callery pear	6	1	300	2	2	2	2	2	EM	Good	Good	Callery pear. Located behind garden wall - access limited.	-	20-40	B2	40.7	3.6
T180	Cabbage palm	5	1	150	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5	3.5	EM	Good	Good	Cabbage palm. Located behind garden wall - access limited.	-	20-40	C1	10.2	1.8
T181	Oriental plane	6	1	180	2.5	2.5	2.5	2.5	3	SM	Good	Good	Oriental plane. Resin bound gravel up to base. Good form.	-	40+	B2	14.7	2.2
T182	Tree of heaven	4	2	180; 100	1	3	3	2	2.5	SM	Poor	Fair	Growing from metal fence posts and will likely fail in the coming years.	Remove.	0-10	U	19.2	2.5
T183	Tree of heaven	6	2	120; 100	2.5	2	4	3	2.5	EM	Fair	Good	-	-	10-20	C1	11	1.9
T184	Common apple	5	2	180; 200	2	4	3	3	1	M	Good	Good	Growing in churchyard.	-	40+	B2	32.8	3.2
T185	Field maple	7	2	150; 150	3	3	3	3	3	M	Fair	Good	Bifurcates at 1m with acute union.	-	10-20	C1	20.4	2.5
T186	Tree of heaven	4	3	150; 80;80	2	2	2	2	2	SM	Poor	Fair	Growing from metal fence posts and will likely fail in the coming years.	Remove.	0-10	U	16	2.3

Table 1: Schedule of Trees and Tree Quality Assessment*

* See Table 3 for key to terms
** See Table 2 for definitions of categories

No	Species	Ht.	S	St. 1.5m	Canopy Spread				Cr. Cl	Ls	SC	PC	Comments /Observation	Preliminary Management Advice	LE	Cat **	RPAm ^{2}	RPA *r*
					N	S	E	W										
T187	Wild cherry	8	3	200; 100; 150	3	3	4	4	2	EM	Fair	Fair	Large pile of waste including tyres and mattresses at base.	Remove waste from base.	10-20	C1	32.8	3.2
T188	Glossy privet	8	4	120; 120; 120; 160	2.5	4	5	5	2	M	Fair	Fair	Behind fence so access limited. Pushing up against building to the north. Slightly sparse foliage.	-	10-20	C1	31.1	3.1
T189	Butterfly bush	4	4	100; 100; 100; 100	4	2	3	0	1	M	Poor	Fair	Buddleja growing from fence. Poor form and will become a nuisance.	Remove.	0-10	U	18.1	2.4
T190	Butterfly bush	4	4	100; 100; 100; 100	4	2	3	0	1	M	Poor	Fair	Buddleja growing from fence. Poor form and will become a nuisance.	Remove.	0-10	U	18.1	2.4
T191	Common elder	7	5	100; 100; 100; 100; 100	3	3	3	3	1	M	Good	Good	Inaccessible due to private garden.	-	10-20	C1	22.6	2.7
T192	London plane	7	1	610	3	3	3	3	4	M	Good	Good	Well maintained pollard	No immediate works required.	40+	A2	168.3	7.3
T193	London plane	16	1	800	6	6	6	6	8	M	Good	Good	Mature pollard.	No immediate works required.	40+	A1	289.5	9.6

Table 1: Schedule of Trees and Tree Quality Assessment*

* See Table 3 for key to terms
** See Table 2 for definitions of categories

No	Species	Ht.	S	St. 1.5m	Canopy Spread				Cr. Cl	Ls	SC	PC	Comments /Observation	Preliminary Management Advice	LE	Cat **	RPAm ^{2}	RPA *r*
					N	S	E	W										
G1	Mixed species	7	1	300	3	3	3	3	1	EM	Fair	Fair	Inaccessible group due to site fencing. Only assessed from the outside to largely estimated. Comprised of sycamore, silver birch, buddleja.	No immediate works required.	10-20	C1	40.7	3.6
G2	Butterfly bush	4	1	150	1	1	1	1	0	EM	Fair	Fair	Large inaccessible group of low lying scrub. Looks to be predominantly buddleja.	No immediate works required.	10-20	C1	10.2	1.8
G3	Norway maple	10	1	350	3	3	3	3	3	M	Good	Good	Uniform group lining the roadside.	No immediate works required.	40+	B2	55.4	4.2
G4	Mixed species	6	1	200	3	3	3	3	2	EM	Good	Good	Paperbark maple and crab apple in planted bed.	No immediate works required.	20-40	B2	18.1	2.4
G5	Mixed species	6	1	300	2	2	2	2	2	EM	Good	Good	Common lime, field maple, rowan, silver birch.	No immediate works required.	20-40	B2	40.7	3.6
G6	Small leaved lime	11	1	350	3	3	3	3	2.5	EM	Good	Good	Group of 19 relatively uniform individuals.	No immediate works required.	40+	A2	55.4	4.2
G7	Mixed species	5	1	200	2	2	2	2	1	EM	Good	Good	Group of Portuguese laurel, small leaved lime and Swedish whitebeam.	No immediate works required.	20-40	B2	18.1	2.4
G8	Common whitebeam	5	1	200	3	3	3	3	2.5	EM	Good	Good	Group of 5 individuals.	No immediate works required.	40+	B2	18.1	2.4

Table 1: Schedule of Trees and Tree Quality Assessment*

* See Table 3 for key to terms
** See Table 2 for definitions of categories

No	Species	Ht.	S	St. 1.5m	Canopy Spread				Cr. Cl	Ls	SC	PC	Comments /Observation	Preliminary Management Advice	LE	Cat **	RPAm ^{2}	RPA *r*
					N	S	E	W										
G9	Mixed species	10	1	350	3	3	3	3	3	EM	Good	Good	Inaccessible group. Within school grounds. Hornbeam, silver birch, wild cherry.	No immediate works required.	20-40	B2	55.4	4.2
G10	Mixed species	12	1	400	3	3	3	3	4	M	Good	Good	Group inaccessible located within schoolyard. Wild cherry, Lawsons cypress, tree of heaven, hornbeam.	No immediate works required.	40+	B2	72.4	4.8
G11	Mixed species	8	1	300	2	2	2	2	3	EM	Good	Good	Inaccessible- located within schoolyard. Beech, Himalayan birch and wild cherry.	No immediate works required.	40+	B2	40.7	3.6
G12	Leyland cypress	7	1	350	2	2	3	3	3	M	Fair	Fair	Group of 6 on school fence interior. Basses inaccessible. All topped to 7m. Regrowth unlikely.	No immediate works required.	20-40	C1	55.4	4.2
G13	Mixed species	10	1	300	3	3	3	3	1	M	Fair	Fair	Inaccessible due to private garden. Mixed group of Rowan, bay, weeping willow, hazel, elder.	No immediate works required.	20-40	B2	40.7	3.6
G14	Himalayan birch	9	1	250	3	3	3	3	2	M	Good	Good	Group inside school grounds. Bases inaccessible.	No immediate works required.	20-40	B2	28.3	3
H1	Cherry laurel	2	1	130	1	1	1	1	0	M	Good	Good	Laurel hedge on raised wall planter.	No immediate works required.	20-40	C1	7.6	1.6
H2	Common privet	4	1	150	2	2	2	2	0	M	Good	Good	Privet hedge. Forming effective screen.	No immediate works required.	40+	B2	10.2	1.8

Table 1: Schedule of Trees and Tree Quality Assessment*

* See Table 3 for key to terms
** See Table 2 for definitions of categories

No	Species	Ht.	S	St. 1.5m	Canopy Spread				Cr. Cl	Ls	SC	PC	Comments /Observation	Preliminary Management Advice	LE	Cat **	RPAm ^{2}	RPA *r*
					N	S	E	W										
H3	Himalayan tree cotoneaster	2	1	150	1	1	1	1	0	M	Good	Good	Boundary hedge. Forming effective screen.	No immediate works required.	40+	B2	10.2	1.8

Table 2: BS: 5837 2012 Tree Quality Assessment Definitions

TREES FOR REMOVAL		
Category & Definition	**Criteria**	**Identification on Plan**
Category U Those in such a condition that they cannot realistically be retained as a living tree in the context of the current land use for longer than 10 years.	• Trees that have a serious, irremediable structural defect such that their early loss is expected due to collapse, including those that will become unviable after removal of other U category trees (i.e. Where for whatever reason the loss of companion shelter cannot be mitigated by pruning) • Trees that are dead or are showing signs of significant immediate or irreversible overall decline. • Trees infected with pathogens of significance to the health and or safety of other trees nearby by or very low quality trees suppressing adjacent trees of better quality.	RED

TREES TO BE CONSIDERED FOR RETENTION				
Category & Identification	**1 Mainly arboricultural values**	**2 Mainly landscape values**	**3 Mainly cultural values including conservation**	**Identification on plan**
Category A Trees of High Quality with an estimated remaining life expectancy of at least 40 years	Trees that are a particularly good example of their species, especially if rare or unusual, or essential components of groups or of formal or semi-formal arboricultural features e.g. the dominant and/or principal trees in an avenue)	Tree groups or woodlands of particular visual importance as arboricultural and/or landscape features.	Tree groups or woodlands of significant conservation historical, commemorative or other value (e.g. veteran trees or wood pasture)	GREEN

TREES TO BE CONSIDERED FOR RETENTION				
Category & Identification	**1 Mainly arboricultural values**	**2 Mainly landscape values**	**3 Mainly cultural values including conservation**	**Identification on plan**
Category B Trees of moderate quality with an estimated remaining life expectancy of at least 20 years.	Trees that might be included in the high category but are downgraded because of impaired condition (e.g. presence of remediable defects including unsympathetic past management and minor storm damage).	Trees present in numbers, usually as groups or woodlands such that they attract a higher collective rating than they might as individuals: or trees occurring as collectives but situated so as to make little visual contribution to the wider locality.	Trees with material conservation or other cultural benefits.	BLUE
Category C Trees of a low quality with an estimated remaining life expectancy of at least 10 years or young trees with a stem diameter below 150mm	Unremarkable trees of very limited merit or such impaired condition that they do not qualify in higher categories.	Trees present in groups or woodlands but without this conferring on them significantly greater landscape value and/or trees offering low or only temporary/transient landscape benefits.	Trees with no material conservation or other cultural benefits.	GREY

Table 3: Key Schedule of Trees

Column Heading	Explanation
Tree No	Sequential number corresponding to number on plan.
Species	English names.
Ht.	Height in metres.
S	Number of main stems.
St. 1.5 (Stem Diameter)	Stem diameter when measured in accordance with Annex C of BS 5837:2012.
NSEW	Crown radius in metres to cardinal points of the compass.
Cr. Cl. (Crown Clearance)	Height in metres between the ground and underside of canopy.
Ls.	Life stage definitions. Y= Young. SM = Semi-mature. EM = Early mature. M = Mature. OM = Over mature.
SC	Brief description of structural condition.
PC	Brief description of physiological condition.
Preliminary Advice	Preliminary tree works advice and recommendations.
LE	Estimated remaining useful life contribution in years. <10, 10+, 20+ and 40+ yr.
Cat. (Category)	Categorisation grading in accordance with BS 5837 2012. Trees suitable for retention: - Category A trees of high quality and amenity value. Category B trees of moderate quality and amenity value. Category C trees of low quality or amenity value. British Standards BS 5837:2012 recommends that these categories may be further broken down into sub-categories A1 A2 A3 pertaining to Arboricultural, Landscape or Cultural values respectively.
RPA m^2	Root Protection Area (RPA). Indicative area around a tree measured in m^2 and calculated in accordance with Annex C of BS 5837:2012 deemed to contain sufficient rooting volume to maintain the viability of a tree and where the protection of roots and soil structure is treated as a priority.
RPA *r*	Root Protection Area (RPA) radius calculation centred on the base of the tree and calculated in accordance with Annex C of BS 5837:2012

Appendix 2: Tree Constraints Plan

arbeco
Ecology, Tree & Habitat Services

Job title	Aberfeldy Village Job no. T5574
Client	Aberfeldy New Village LLP
Map title	Tree Constraints Plan
Section: 1 of 7	Scale (at A3) 1:600
Date of survey	10/09/2020
Surveyor	Fearghus Gage

Drawn	Approved	Date
FG	NC	19/11/2020

Legend

- Crown spread of category C - Trees with low quality and value
- Crown spread of category B - Trees with moderate quality and value
- Crown spread of category A - Trees with high quality and value
- Crown spread of category U - Trees of poor quality
- Root Protection Area (RPA)
- Crown spread of Category A groups
- Crown spread of Category B groups
- Crown spread of Category C groups
- Crown spread of Category U groups

N

This plan is provided solely for the purpose of supporting the description of the arboricultural features of the site as contained in the accompanying report

arbeco
Ecology, Tree & Habitat Services

Job title	Aberfeldy Village Job no. T5574
Client	Aberfeldy New Village LLP
Map title	Tree Constraints Plan
Section: 2 of 7	Scale (at A3) 1:600
Date of survey	10/09/2020
Surveyor	Fearghus Gage
Drawn: FG / Approved: NC / Date: 19/11/2020	

Legend

- Crown spread of category C - Trees with low quality and value
- Crown spread of category B - Trees with moderate quality and value
- Crown spread of category A - Trees with high quality and value
- Crown spread of category U - Trees of poor quality
- Root Protection Area (RPA)
- Crown spread of Category A groups
- Crown spread of Category B groups
- Crown spread of Category C groups
- Crown spread of Category U groups

N

This plan is provided solely for the purpose of supporting the description of the arboricultural features of the site as contained in the accompanying report

arbeco
Ecology, Tree & Habitat Services

Job title	Aberfeldy Village Job no. T5574
Client	Aberfeldy New Village LLP
Map title	Tree Constraints Plan
Section: 3 of 7	Scale (at A3) 1:600
Date of survey	10/09/2020
Surveyor	Fearghus Gage
Drawn: FG	Approved: NC — Date: 19/11/2020

Legend

- Crown spread of category C - Trees with low quality and value
- Crown spread of category B - Trees with moderate quality and value
- Crown spread of category A - Trees with high quality and value
- Crown spread of category U - Trees of poor quality
- Root Protection Area (RPA)
- Crown spread of Category A groups
- Crown spread of Category B groups
- Crown spread of Category C groups
- Crown spread of Category U groups

N

This plan is provided solely for the purpose of supporting the description of the arboricultural features of the site as contained in the accompanying report