# <u>Trees and Construction</u> BS5837 Tree Survey Assessment

- Site: Site off Great George Street
- **Ref:** 19025/A1
- **Client:** The Great George Street Project



(Mail) 2nd Floor | 1 Hunters Walk | Canal Street | Chester | CH1 4EB

0333 123 7080 | info@indigosurveys.co.uk

www.IndigoSurveys.co.uk

Arboricultural Consultant (Author):

Rod Benzies ND Arb, BSc Forestry

- February 2019 -

© Indigo Surveys Ltd 2019



### TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Title	Page
1 2 3	Introduction Site & Application Information Findings & Recommendations	3 4 5 - 9
<b>Appendices</b> Caveat		T

Terms and Definitions	II
Tree data table & Tree Constraints Plan	III

Revision	Description	Date
/	/	/



#### 1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 **Instruction:** This advice has been prepared for The Great George Street project (hereafter; client) and is in respect of the tree related planning considerations at land off Great George Street, L1 5ET (hereafter; site).

As the proposal relates to development works at site, the advice herein is produced in accordance with the British Standard 5837 : 2012 '*Trees in Relation to Design*, *Demolition and Construction - Recommendations*' (hereafter; BS5837).

- 1.2 BS5837: The scope of BS5837 is to provide guidance on how trees and other vegetation can be integrated into construction and development design schemes. The overall aim is to ensure the protection of amenity by trees which are appropriate for retention.
- 1.3 **Scope of this advice:** This advice has been produced in accordance with BS5837 and is intended to demonstrate the site's realistic arboricultural constraints and assist with the design process. The objective is to systematically assess and provide suitable recommendations regarding the proposal's potential impact on trees and vice versa.
- 1.4 Following instruction the consultant surveyed the site on the 01st January 2019 where a site walkover and BS5837 tree survey were carried out; all trees on site and around the application boundary were surveyed from ground level and plotted as either an individual or a tree group.
- 1.5 This advice is subject to caveat at Appendix I, outlines relevant terms and definitions at Appendix II and constitutes the findings of the preliminary site assessment and associated arboricultural recommendations.
- 1.6 The survey data and site observations use the topographical survey to illustrate the surveyed trees in plan format as a 'Tree Constraints Plan' (hereafter; TCP); the TCP and the tree survey data table are at Appendix III.



#### 2. SITE INFORMATION & TREE ASSESSMENT

- 2.1 The site is bounded to the east by Great George Street and to the west are residential access roads and residential properties. The site used to contain residential properties that have been since demolished. A block of flats that has yet to be demolished and is still in situ to the south of the site. Work has commenced on a project to the north of the site, in that, foundations and ground works have been undertaken.
- 2.2 **Proposal:** It is understood that a range of residential proposals are being explored for the site's development with some permissions already in place for the north of the site. No design proposals have been supplied for comment at this stage.
- 2.3 The site requires consideration from an arboricultural perspective due to the presence of trees on and around the site; these trees are deemed to be within impacting distance of the existing property and potential construction area.
- 2.4 <u>The trees</u> -
- 2.4.1 The tree survey and assessment resulted in the BS5837 quality/retention categories of 'B moderate', 'C low' and 'U poor' being attributed to trees/tree groups.
- 2.4.2 There are established features on site of category 'B', the most dominant trees of these being T19, T20, T24, T26, T28, T35, T36 and T42 inclusive. Tree T38, has physiological and other issues which have determined that they are categorised as 'U'. The remaining trees are 'C' class trees. *Note: These trees were part of an the previous residential landscape scheme for the now demolished properties.*
- 2.4.3 No council search/contact has been requested and hence confirmation as to whether any of the trees are protected by Tree Preservation Order was unavailable at the time of writing this advice - please advise if this detail is at your disposal and/or confirm whether a conservation area and TPO check is to be made on your behalf as part of this advice.



#### 3. FINDINGS & RECOMMENDATIONS

- 3.1 The following information, as with the prior contents of this report, should be read with the appended tree data table and tree constraints plan (19025/TCP/01).
- 3.2 <u>General Considerations for Tree Retention / Removal</u>
- 3.2.1 'B' Class trees are considered of value both individually and in the landscape and should be retained by design. Proposed encroachment or removal would need to be justifiable and mitigated, although Council resistance would be anticipated.
- 3.2.2 The smaller scale, declining or limited contribution trees are categorised as low quality 'C' category trees. These may be suitable for retention for the most part but should not present a significant constraint to the scheme as mitigation planting can replicate and enhance their contribution.
- 3.2.3 The removal of trees or vegetation may have an impact on the green cover in the first instance, however, the scheme presents a significant enhancement opportunity. Said removals would have no impact on the long-term amenity of the site providing that a well delivered tree planting and landscape scheme is implemented, as this will allow for the selection of native species to enhance amenity and biodiversity.
- 3.3 <u>Tree Protection</u>
- 3.3.1 The design and layout of the site is to incorporate the essential components of retained trees (crown and rooting area) and provide a suitable level of clearance to allow for their long term safe retention, i.e. RPA protection and crown clearance as well as for any new tree(s) being planted.
- 3.3.2 Depending on the level of tree retention/removal, the protection methods for the retained trees is likely to vary. However, it is likely that a combination of construction restrictions be used with protective barrier fencing (to protect RPAs).

The process of site operations will be an important aspect to confirm by way of a construction layout plan, i.e. showing storage areas, parking, delivery area, access routes etc., all outside of RPAs or with a provision for ground protection. As a basis for tree protection the following points will need to be considered:

- Removal of all agreed trees and any agreed pruning works prior to works commencing by a suitably qualified arboricultural contractor;
- Induction of construction personnel regarding the exclusion of works (including access and storage) from the retained trees' RPAs;
- Secure temporary barrier fencing around the site to exclude the retained tree's crowns and RPAs from the working site;



- The storage of materials clear of all retained trees and conditions to ensure no contamination/run-off into soils in proximity to trees or on higher ground;
- For the removal of existing structures and/or hard surfaces from RPAs the works to be undertaken separate to construction, manually and sensitively.

#### 3.4 <u>General Overview</u>

3.4.1 The considerations for trees which are to be retained as part of the proposal need to be addressed in order to ensure their protection. This is to account for the potential impact on retained trees and their growing environment from the proposed development and vice versa (these follow).

#### Tree Works

The tree removals to facilitate the scheme are to be justifiable in the context of the site layout and are to be mitigated by way of a landscape scheme; new tree planting will be required to replace and enhance the site's canopy cover with a general scheme of landscaping in acknowledgement for the removal of poor quality trees.

Any trees which are to be removed should be well indicated to ensure that the retained trees are suitably protected. Hence, all trees which are to be removed are to be marked by a suitably qualified person [spraying the stems with a cross] prior to tree works.

#### Tree Crowns

Taking account of the previous encroachment on structures, providing the previous conditions remain or the clearance is increased this should demonstrate no change of circumstance or an improvement to the existing conditions and should be acceptable.

However, consideration is required for both existing and newly planted trees whereby the proposed construction should take account of trees reaching their full growth potential. It is always prudent to provide adequate clearance from a tree's current crown for future growth, i.e. to allow a tree adequate space to reach maturity without conflicts with new structures.

#### Root Protection Areas (RPA)

As a minimum it would be suitable to consider the outer extents of retained trees' RPAs [up to the previous foundations] as construction exclusion zones and be protected. The root growth extents and consideration for roots as per the RPA's is influenced by level changes and physical barriers.



As above, it is *sometimes* possible to undertake construction activities within the rooting areas of retained trees which requires greater attention to tree protection, foundation designs, phasing of works etc. If it is proposed to undertake works within these areas, more specific advice should be sought from a qualified arboriculturalist with a view to assessing the feasibility of said proposal and forming a suitable method statement.

#### Demolition/Excavation Works

Any removal of existing built structures (including stairways, small outbuildings, retaining walls etc.) or hard surfacing will need to be undertaken with great care where this occurs within or near to the anticipated rooting areas of retained trees.

Said works should adhere to the RPA restrictions, be undertaken manually with hand held non mechanical tools and ensure that existing ground levels are retained.

#### Hard Landscape Works

As with previously mentioned arboricultural restrictions to demolition/construction, the proposed works should avoid retained trees' RPAs. However, where ground works are proposed within RPAs, construction methods [for hard surfacing, walls etc.] should retain the existing ground levels, be undertaken sensitively and using a no dig design.

Elsewhere, conversion of soft surfaced areas within RPAs to hard surfaced walkways, parking areas etc., will need to utilise a no-dig product to ensure no negative impact on the tree roots and/or growing conditions.

3.4.2 For any proportion of tree removal, new tree planting is to be integrated into a landscape scheme. The new trees should be of a suitable volume, species, scale, in suitably prepared planting locations with adequate space for future growth and development and enhance the site's long term amenity contribution.

#### Planting Species and Volume

New tree planting should incorporate a range of species, select mixed characteristics and take account of the availability of space, i.e. concentrate on selecting suitable scale species based on the ultimate growth extents.

Depending on the volume and quality of trees to be removed, new tree planting should directly proportionate; a 1:1 removal to replacement ratio is considered suitable.



#### Planting Specification

A detailed specification should be included within a landscape scheme (could form part of planning conditions). This should outline the proposed tree species, stock selection, location, planting process and ongoing maintenance (watering, mulch and pruning).

#### Planting Location

The new planting sites should take account of the future growth potential of the chosen species and should allow for the amenity space to be utilised, minimise the potential conflict with structures and facilitate the contribution to amenity from the site.

Based on the residential use of the site, good tree planting space is anticipated. It is necessary however to consider and avoid future canopy/shade conflicts. Smaller scale fastigiate species could be selected for the front gardens and trees with individual characteristics and biodiversity contribution could be selected for the rear gardens.

#### 3.5 <u>Additional Details</u>

- 3.5.1 The surveyed trees have been subject to a detailed inspection and the arboricultural considerations detailed within this advice. The advice herein is intended to guide a suitable design in consideration for the site's valuable amenity assets.
- 3.5.2 Where retained trees are avoided and removed trees are mitigated, the considerations herein may form part of tree related planning conditions. These are detailed within an arboricultural method statement (AMS) based on the approved scheme.

However, anticipated impacts on trees, encroachment of crowns, RPA incursion or proposed construction near trees will likely require a detailed AMS to support the planning application and should be requested where present within the design.

3.5.3 Further to the above, the finer details of layout, design detail to accommodate trees and any proposed new tree planting are to be illustrated within a landscape plan. This is to include the exact details of hard and soft landscape works, RPA sections (where surface works are proposed) and details of new tree planting location, species, stock selection, installation and maintenance; to be undertaken by the appointed landscape architect with the full support of the arboricultural consultant (where required).



3.5.4 Hence, further to the supply of the proposed site plan for the planning application, this will be reviewed as an arboricultural implications assessment (AIA) to inform AMS 'considerations'. Where this advice is accounted for, this will enable the arboricultural constraints to be managed effectively, i.e. phased works, tree protection fences etc.

#### This concludes our advice.



The Great George Street Project | **CLIENT** Site off Great George Street L1 5ET| **SITE** 19025/A1 | **REF** 11/02/2019 | **DATE** 

# Appendix I

## Caveat

Any and all information supplied to Indigo Surveys Ltd by/on behalf of the client is assumed to be accurate unless otherwise informed. | This advice is limited to the observations made on the date of inspection as detailed herein and any deletion, editing or alteration will result in the advice being null and void in its entirety. | This advice in its entirety may be deemed null and void if remedial works are undertaken on any area of the site, on or after the date of the survey. | No liability is assumed by the author or by Indigo Surveys Ltd for any misuse, misinterpretation or misrepresentation of this advice. | This advice is not valid in adverse or unpredictable weather conditions or for any failure due to 'force majeure' or unpredictable events. | No responsibility is assumed either by the author of this advice or by Indigo Surveys Ltd for any legal matters that may arise as a consequence. | Neither the author nor Indigo Surveys Ltd will be required to attend court or give testimony as part of this advice does not form part of this agreement.



# Appendix II

## **Terms and Definitions**

"*Arboriculturist*" - person who has, through relevant education, training and experience, gained expertise in the field of trees in relation to construction.

*"Competent Person"* - person who has training and experience relevant to the matter being addressed and an understanding of the requirements of the particular task being approached.

*"Topographical survey"* - an accurately measured land survey undertaken to show all relevant existing site features. *A method of carrying out topographical surveys is given in RICS specification* Surveys of land buildings and utility services at scales of 1:500 and larger.

"*BS5837 Tree survey*" - should be undertaken by an arboriculturist to record information about the trees on or adjacent to a site. The results of the tree survey, including material constraints arising from existing trees that merit retention, should be used (along with any other relevant baseline data) to inform feasibility studies and design options. For this reason, the tree survey should be completed and made available to designers prior to and/or independently of any specific proposals for development.

*"Tree categorisation method"* - trees should be categorised in accordance with the BS5837 cascade chart by an arboriculturist. This is to identify the quality and value (in a non-fiscal sense) of the existing tree stock, allowing informed decisions to be made concerning which trees should be removed or retained in the event of development occurring.

*"Root protection area (RPA)"* - layout design tool indicating the minimum area around a tree deemed to contain sufficient roots and rooting volume to maintain the tree's viability, and where the protection of the roots and soil structure is treated as a priority, shown as an arboricultural constraint in m<sup>2</sup>. The radius is calculated using the BS5837 calculation method. An arboriculturist may change the shape of an RPA but not reduce its area.

"*Arboricultural implications assessment*" - a study, undertaken by an arboriculturist, to identify, evaluate and possibly mitigate the extent of direct and indirect impacts on existing trees that may arise as a result of the implementation of any site layout proposal.

"*Arboricultural method statement*" - methodology for the implementation of any aspect of development that is within the root protection area, or has the potential to result in loss of or damage to a tree to be retained.

*"Tree protection plan"* - a scale drawing, informed by descriptive text where necessary, based upon the finalised proposals, showing trees for retention and illustrating the tree and landscape protection measures.



The Great George Street Project | **CLIENT** Site off Great George Street L1 5ET| **SITE** 19025/A1 | **REF** 11/02/2019 | **DATE** 

**Appendix III** 

Data Table:As appended (BS5837 Tree Survey Key & Table)

**Tree Constraints Plan:** 

As appended (19025/TCP/01)

TF	REE SURVEY IN ACCORDA	NCE	WITH E	BRIT	<b>ISH</b>	I ST	ANI	DARD	5837:2	2012 'TREE	S IN RELA	TION T	O DESIO	GN, DEMOLITION & CONSTRUCTIO	N - RE	ECOMMENDATIONS'	
	CLIENT:	The Great	George Street I	Project		,	PROJI	ECT REF:	19025/1				SITE:	Site off Great George Street L1 5ET			
	CONTACT:	/				5	SURVE	EY DATE:	1 Febru	ary 2019		ARB CONSULTANT: Rod Benzies ND Arb BSc Forestry					
TREE REF. #	SPECIES	AGE	HEIGHT (in m)	C/ N	ANOP - S -	Y(in E-	m) W		RPA (in m)	CLEARANCE (in m)	1st BRANCH (in m)	VITALITY	LIFE EXPEC.	NOTES	BS CAT.	MANAGEMENT	
T1	Hornbeam, Carpinus betulus, Carpinaceae	EM	6	2	2	2	2	270	3.2	0.5	0.5	Fair	20-40	Council maintained street tree. Fastigiate habit	B 1		
T2	Hornbeam, Carpinus betulus, Carpinaceae	EM	6	2	2	2	2	270	3.2	0.5	0.5	Fair	20-40	Council maintained street tree. Fastigiate habit	B 1		
Т3	Hornbeam, Carpinus betulus, Carpinaceae	EM	6	2	2	2	2	270	3.2	0.5	0.5	Fair	20-40	Council maintained street tree. Fastigiate habit. Co-dominant branch structure	B 1		
T4	Hazel, Corylus spps, Betulaceae	EM	5	2	2	2	2	290	3.5	0.5	0.5	Fair	20-40	Council maintained street tree. Co- dominant branch structure. Set in raised planting pit (1m)	B 1		
T5	Hazel, Corylus spps, Betulaceae	EM	5	2	2	2	2	160	1.9	0.5	0.5	Fair	20-40	Council maintained street tree. fastigiate habit. Co-dominant branch structure. Set in raised planting pit (1m)	B 1		
T6	Hazel, Corylus spps, Betulaceae	EM	5	2	2	2	2	160	1.9	0.5	0.5	Fair	20-40	Council maintained street tree. fastigiate habit. Co-dominant branch structure. Set in raised planting pit (1m)	B 1		
Τ7	Hazel, Corylus spps, Betulaceae	EM	5	1	1	1	1	75	0.9	0.5	0.5	Fair	20-40	Council maintained street tree. fastigiate habit. Co-dominant branch structure. Set in raised planting pit (1m)	B 1		
Т8	Hazel, Corylus spps, Betulaceae	EM	4	1	1	1	1	100	1.2	0.5	0.5	Fair	20-40	Council maintained street tree. fastigiate habit. Co-dominant branch structure. Set in raised planting pit (1m)	B 1		
Т9	Hazel, Corylus spps, Betulaceae	EM	4	1	1	1	1	150	1.8	0.5	0.5	Fair	20-40	Council maintained street tree. fastigiate habit. Co-dominant branch structure. Set in raised planting pit (1m)	C 1		

T10	Hazel, Corylus spps, Betulaceae	EM	4	1	1	1	1	160	1.9	0.5	0.5	Fair	20-40	Council maintained street tree. fastigiate habit. Co-dominant branch structure. Set in raised planting pit (1m)	C 1	
T11	Hazel, Corylus spps, Betulaceae	EM	4	1	1	1	1	160	1.9	2.5	2.5	Fair	20-40	Council maintained street tree. fastigiate habit. Co-dominant branch structure. Set in raised planting pit (1m)	C 1	
T12	Hazel, Corylus spps, Betulaceae	EM	4	1	1	1	1	160	1.9	2.5	2.5	Fair	20-40	Council maintained street tree. fastigiate habit. Co-dominant branch structure. Set in raised planting pit (1m)	C 1	
T13	Hazel, Corylus spps, Betulaceae	EM	4	1	1	1	1	120	1.4	2.5	2.5	Fair	20-40	Council maintained street tree. fastigiate habit. Co-dominant branch structure. Set in raised planting pit (1m)	C 1	
T14	Hazel, Corylus spps, Betulaceae	EM	4	1	1	1	1	120	1.4	2.5	2.5	Dead	20-40	Council maintained street tree. fastigiate habit. Co-dominant branch structure. Set in raised planting pit (1m)	U	
T15	Hazel, Corylus spps, Betulaceae	EM	4	1	1	1	1	170	2.0	2.5	2.5	Fair	20-40	Council maintained street tree. fastigiate habit. Co-dominant branch structure. Set in raised planting pit (1m)	C 1	
T16	Hazel, Corylus spps, Betulaceae	EM	4	1	1	1	1	100	1.2	2.5	2.5	Fair	20-40	Council maintained street tree. fastigiate habit. Co-dominant branch structure. Set in raised planting pit (1m)	C 1	
T17	Cherry, Prunus (species), Rosaceae	Y	5	2	3	3	3	170;016	2.9	2	2.5	Fair	20-40	Included bark in main fork. In close proximity to building	C 2	
T18	Whitebeam, Sorbus aria, Rosaceae	М	5	3	3	3	3	330	4.0	1.5	2.5	Fair	20-40	Minor damage at the base. Sucker growth around the base.	C 2	
T19	Cherry, Prunus (species), Rosaceae	М	6	4	4	3	4	330	4.0	1.5	2.5	Good	20-40	Good overall condition	B 1	

T20	Norway Maple, Acer platanoides, Aceraceae	М	10	4	4	4	4	470	5.6	1.5	2.5	Good	20-40	Good overall condition	B 1	
T21	Norway Maple, Acer platanoides, Aceraceae	М	10	2	4	2	2	280	3.4	1.5	2.5	Fair	10_20	Sub-dominant suppressed trees	C 2	
T22	Norway Maple, Acer platanoides, Aceraceae	М	10	2	4	4	2	320	3.8	1.5	2.5	Fair	20-40	Bowl shaped crown lost a main leader stem. Co-dominant stem	C 2	
T23	Norway Maple, Acer platanoides, Aceraceae	М	10	2	2	4	3	310	3.7	1.5	2.5	Fair	20-40	Bowl shaped crown. Co-dominant stem	C 2	
T24	Norway Maple, Acer platanoides, Aceraceae	М	10	3	3	5	4	440	5.3	1.5	2.5	Fair	20-40	Co-dominant stem. Co-dominant branch structure	B 2	
T25	Hazel, Cherry, Prunus (species), Rosaceae	м	6	3	2	4	4	440	5.3	1.5	2.5	Fair	20-40	Co-dominant stem. Co-dominant branch structure	C 2	
T26	Cherry, Prunus (species), Rosaceae	М	8	5	4	5	5	460	5.5	2	2.5	Good	20-40	Co-dominant branch structure. Bifurcated stem	B 2	
T27	Cherry, Prunus (species), Rosaceae	м	8	5	4	5	5	460	5.5	2	2.5	Fair	20-40	Co-dominant branch structure. Bifurcated stem. Basal Bark Damage	C 2	
T28	Norway Maple, Acer platanoides, Aceraceae	М	8	4	4	4	4	490	5.9	2	2.5	Good	20-40	Good overall condition	B 2	
T29	Norway Maple, Acer platanoides, Aceraceae	М	8	4	4	2	2	430	5.2	2	2.5	Fair	20-40	Bifurcates below 3m	C 2	

Т30	Norway Maple, Acer platanoides, Aceraceae	М	8	4	4	2	3	430	5.2	2	2.5	Fair	20-40	Bowed misshapen main stem	C 2	
T31	Norway Maple, Acer platanoides, Aceraceae	М	8	4	4	4	4	460	5.5	2	2.5	Fair	20-40	Bowed misshapen main stem. Healed bark damage scars on lower main stem	C 2	
T32	Norway Maple, Acer platanoides, Aceraceae	М	8	4	4	4	4	430	5.2	2	2.5	Fair	20-40	Bowed misshapen main stem. Major branch emanates from below 1.5m. included bark in main fork	C 2	
Т33	Rowan, Sorbus (species) Rosaceae	М	7	2	2	2	2	270	3.2	2	2.5	Fair	20-40	included bark in main fork. fastigiate habit. landscape buffer planting	C 2	
T34	Rowan, Sorbus (species) Rosaceae	М	7	2	2	2	2	340	4.1	2	2.5	Fair	20-40	Included bark in main fork. Fastigiate habit. landscape buffer planting. Tension ridges on main stem	C 2	
T35	Norway Maple, Acer platanoides, Aceraceae	М	10	6	5	6	3	530	6.4	2	2.5	Good	20-40	landscape buffer planting. Sub dominant side branch.	B 2	
Т36	Norway Maple, Acer platanoides, Aceraceae	М	10	6	5	3	5	530	6.4	2	2.5	Good	20-40	landscape buffer planting. Sub dominant side branch. Part of contiguous group	B 2	
T37	Bird Cherry, Prunus padus, Rosaceae	М	11	6	3	5	5	540	6.5	2	2.5	Fair	20-40	Self seeded. Unsighted assessment. Bifurcated stem	C 2	
Т38	Bird Cherry, Prunus padus, Rosaceae	М	11	6	3	5	5	540	6.5	2	2.5	Poor	<10	Self seeded. Unsighted assessment. bifurcated stem. Significant areas of bark damage	U	
Т39	Norway Maple, Acer platanoides, Aceraceae	М	11	2	4	4	5	300	3.6	2	2.5	Fair	20-40	Co-dominant branch structure	C 2	

T40	Elderberry, Sambucus nigra, Adoxaceae	М	8	2	2	2	2	230	2.8	2	2	Fair	40+	Multi stem. Self seeded	С 3	
T41	Bird Cherry, Prunus padus, Rosaceae	М	8	4	4	4	4	500	6.0	2	2	Poor	<10	Co-dominant branch structure. significant stem damage	С 3	
T42	Common Ash, Fraxinus excelsior, Oleaceae	М	10	5	6	5	6	530	6.4	2	2	Good	20-40	Co-dominant branch structure. Situated On Raised Bed	B 2	
G1	Common Ash, Fraxinus excelsior, Oleaceae	Y	5	0	0	0	0	110	1.3	0	2.5	Fair	20-40	Self seeded	С 3	
G2	Cherry, Prunus (species), Rosaceae	Y	6	0	0	0	0	75	0.9	0	2.5	Fair	20-40	Self seeded scrub area	С 3	
			1				•		1							

TREE SURVEY 'KEY	' - B	RITISH STANDARD 5837:2012 'TREES IN RELATION TO DESIGN, DEMOLITION & CONSTRUCTION - RECOMMENDATIONS'
TPO/CA	-	On client request: presence of Tree Preservation Orders (TPO) / site location within a Conservation Area (CA) & date checked;
TREE REF. #	-	Tree reference number: tag or plan number (T - individual tree, G - group of trees/shrubs, H - hedge);
SPECIES	-	Genus, species and/or common name;
AGE	-	Age classification (NP - new planting, Y - young, EM - Early-Mature, SM - semi mature, M - mature, LM - late mature, OM - over mature);
HEIGHT (in m)	-	Approximate height of tree in metres;
CANOPY (in m) N - S - E - W	-	Approximate branch spread in metres of the four principal compass points;
STEM (in mm)	-	Stem diameter in millimetres: measured in accordance with s.4.6 of BS5837;
RPA (in m)	-	Circle radius of the Root Protection Area: calculated using the stem diameter (single/multiple stem variant, as outlined within BS5837);
CLEARANCE (in m)	-	Crown clearance in metres above the adjacent ground level;
IST BRANCH (in m)	-	Clearance in metres to first significant branch and direction of growth (where relevant);
VITALITY	-	Physiological condition typically gauged from canopy cover and annual extension growth (good, fair, poor, dead);
ESTIMATED REMAINING CONTRIBUTION	-	Approximate number of years a tree will continue to contribute without the need for oppressive arboricultural intervention, categorised in years as <10, 10-20, 20 - 40 and >40;
NOTES	-	Structural and physiological condition observations;
	-	BS5837 tree quality assessment category: resulting from structural/physiological condition and remaining contribution (approximate useful life expectancy);
	-	Standard retention category U: in such a condition that any existing value would be lost within 10 years;
BS CAT	-	Standard retention category A: high quality and value, in such a condition as to be able to make substantial contribution of 40 + years;
Bo cal.	-	Standard retention category <b>B</b> : moderate quality and value, in such a condition as to make a significant contribution of 20+ years;
	-	Standard retention category C: low quality and value, currently in adequate condition to remain until new planting could be established 10+ years;
	-	Standard retention sub-category, mainly due to: 1- Arboricultural values, 2- Landscape values, 3- Cultural values, including conservation;
MANAGEMENT	-	Preliminary management recommendations (as appropriate);
	-	Within the survey schedule denotes an estimate



FROM DRAWING The original of this drawing was produced in colour - a monochrome copy should not be relied upon.





















FROM DRAWING The original of this drawing was produced in colour - a monochrome copy should not be relied upon.

 $\langle \rangle$ 

















