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This report must be read in conjunction with the relevant tree plans and schedule for this school.

A specific Arboricultural Method Statement (AMS) is provided in Appendix 1 to address the process of tree protection at the site of Duston School.

**Attachments**

- Tree Schedule  13-0715/3614/D04 Tree Schedule v1
- Tree Constraints Plan  13-0779/3614/D04 TCP v1
- Arboricultural Implications Plan  13-0780/3614/D04 AIP v1
- Tree Protection Plan  13-0719/3614/D04 TPP v1
1 Duston School

This section should be read in conjunction with the relevant attached tree plans and tree schedule. Only one group of trees (G1) plotted on this plan were identified in the provided topographical survey, all other trees, including trees outside the development boundary, are plotted at estimated locations.

1.1 Arboricultural Implications

The primary arboricultural implications for Duston School are 5 individual trees situated on the southern boundary of the school, but located off-site, and 2 individual trees and 4 groups of trees located within the site boundary.

As part of the development proposal 2 trees outside the development boundary have been proposed for removal, and 3 off-site trees retained. The retention of these 3 trees is of paramount importance as the trees are located outside the school boundary. Of the 2 individual trees within the site, 1 tree is to be removed and the other retained. Of the 4 groups of trees, 2 will require removal and 2 will be retained.

The proposed removal is for 2 groups of trees and 3 individual trees. The first group (G1) consists of 12 mixed broadleaf trees situated within a playing field and the second group (G2) consists of 5 rowan trees situated within the existing car parking area, growing within a liner area of low shrubbery. It has also been noted that the low-level shrubbery below G2 will also require removal as part of the development. As both groups comprise of trees with an average stem diameter of 75mm their loss would not have an adverse impact on the visual amenity of the wider area, and therefore, should not be an influence in determination of this application. Table 1 of BS5837 suggests that all trees below 150mm stem diameter are recorded as Category C trees and Paragraph 4.5.10 notes that the loss of such trees is normally acceptable due to the relative ease of mitigation for the loss through replacement planting.

An individual tree (T6) within the site boundary to be removed is a young Blue Atlas Cedar of C Grade quality, located in the south eastern corner of the site below an existing Multi-Use Games Area (MUGA) facility. The remaining 2 individual trees (T1 & T2) to be removed are located off site, against the southern boundary and consist of a crab apple and common lime. T1 is of Grade C quality in poor physiological condition with a limited useful life expectancy remaining, whereas T2 is of Grade B quality. The proposed layout of the site will require the removal of this tree, with the consent of the landowner. This tree is at a life stage of early maturity and is currently 7m in height. The potential final height of this tree could reasonably achieve 18m with a crown spread of upto 9m. In order to ensure that there is no conflict between the building and the tree canopy, there will be an unreasonable requirement for the canopy to be pruned on a regular basis, which is neither practical nor good practice, creating regular wounds into which pathogens can enter. This tree will therefore be removed and a replacement specimen planting within the grounds of the school in a location that is visible from Berrywood Road. This will ensure that there is ongoing visual amenity from trees to the wider community.

It is important to note that written consent from the appropriate land owner will be required prior to the removal of these trees (T1 & T2).
The extension to the existing car park will require protective fencing around one individual lime tree (T7) and one group of 3 trees (G3). This is due to the movement of construction traffic that will be required for the car park extension and the construction of a new MUGA to the north. Where the new MUGA has been proposed, protective fencing will be required around a clustered group of 14 trees (G4) that are located against the northern site boundary. The protective fencing will not only protect the rooting environment of these trees, but will also minimise the risk of damage to the tree stems and canopies throughout the construction process.

The proposed habitat area, adjacent to the new school building, will require protective fencing to be in place throughout the construction period. This fencing will protect the soil medium from compaction of either pedestrian or vehicular movements, so as to ensure the best possible soil environment for the proposed planting of trees and shrubs. Part of the proposed area is within the RPA of 2 retained trees (T3 and T4), therefore the planting work and habitat creation should be completed using hand tools, under the guidance of an Arboricultural Clerk of Works (ACoW). This is to ensure the retained trees rooting systems and wider rooting environments are not adversely damaged through this process.

The draft utility plan shows that existing utility services will be utilised and no new services will be required; this will not impact on the retained trees.

Initial site access is through an existing gate on the southern side of the site, from Berrywood Road, into a car parking area. Access to the development areas is then through other existing gates, onto the playing fields to the east and scrub area to the west. No trees will be impacted through the use of these access routes.

1.2 Tree Protection Scheme

The timing of the construction works and location of site compound has not yet been determined. It is possible that works will take place in the school holidays, if this is not feasible a compound fence will need to be erected to exclude pupils and staff. It is an assumption that the site compound and storage of site equipment will be within the existing car park and therefore will not affect any retained trees. However, consideration needs to be granted to both of these aspects before commencing construction works to ensure tree protection is maintained throughout the development process.

The 4 retained individual trees, 3 of which are off-site, and 2 groups will be protected by fencing. The fencing should be fit for the purpose of excluding any activity, person, material or machine associated with the construction tasks. For a site such as this, Heras fencing (Appendix ) will be sufficient to provide this protection, provided that it is securely attached and cannot be moved. Appendix 2 provides a recommended method of stabilising such a fencing system as detailed by figure 3 of BS5837:2012. The feet must be anchored to the ground and the panels must be joined using a minimum of 2 brackets. Warning signs must be attached to the fencing stating its purpose. Appendix 3 gives an example of such signage.

All fencing must be erected prior to any construction activity commencing, and must not be removed until all construction works have been completed. This means that all construction machinery and materials are removed from the site before the fence is removed. Once the fencing has been erected, there must be no access into the protected area (CEZ). Further details are provided in the Arboricultural Method Statement (AMS) that accompanies this report.
1.3 Administrative Details

The site survey was conducted on 11 and 19 July 2013. The weather at the time of inspections was clear, sunny and visibility was excellent. I was accompanied around the site by a member of school staff and was unaccompanied when surveying trees outside of Duston School boundary.

E-mailed instruction was received on 10 June 2013 from Rowan Parnell of Architecture Initiative to carry out a survey of the trees at Duston School.

The tree plans are derived from the results of the tree survey and following provided information:

Topographical survey 633_001 (Duston School Topographical Survey) prepared by Mantra Services Ltd on 19 June 2013

Layout drawing DT 101 prepared by Architecture Initiative, received by email on 28 June 2013.
Appendices

2  Appendix 1 - Arboricultural Method Statement (AMS)

2.1  Overview

This AMS should be read in conjunction with the Tree Protection Plan (TPP) that is attached to this report.

A copy of this report must be kept on site and be permanently available of the duration of the development. It can be:

- Included in the tender documents to identify and quantify the tree protection and management requirements;
- Used to plan the timing of site operations to minimise the impact on trees, and;
- Referenced on site for practical guidance on how to protect trees.

2.2  Arboricultural Supervision

An arboricultural consultant will be appointed by the developer to act as an Arboricultural Clerk of Works (ACoW), to advise on the tree management for each site where tree protection is required. The consultant will attend:

- The pre-commencement meeting before any works start;
- Regular supervision as agreed; and
- As needed to oversee specific works that could affect trees

Additionally the consultant may have a supervisory input into the following operations:

- Site preparation, including tree works
- Installation, maintenance and removal of barriers
- Installation, maintenance and removal of ground protection
- Installation of new surfaces
- Installation of new structures
- Installation of new landscaping

2.3  Sequencing and timing

Effective tree protection relies upon following a logical sequence of events and arboricultural inspection/supervision.

The retained ACoW’s initial role is to liaise with the developer and LPA to ensure the tree protection measures are fit for purpose and in place before any works commence on the site. Once the site is working that role will switch to monitoring compliance with arboricultural planning conditions and advising on any tree problems that arise or modifications that become necessary.

It is the developer’s responsibility to ensure that details of this AMS and any agreed amendments are known and understood by all site personnel.
The final details of supervision and the frequency of inspection visits will be agreed at the pre-commencement meeting. The supervision arrangement will be sufficiently flexible to allow the supervision of all sensitive works as they occur.

The ACoW will make a record of the visits and these will be attached to the site copy of the AMS for inspection (see Appendix 5). A further copy will be sent to the LPA. The purpose of these written records is firstly to provide proof of compliance that will allow the developer to robustly demonstrate adherence to best practice in the event of any dispute. Secondly it will help the LPA efficiently discharge the relevant planning conditions.

Table 1 - Sequencing and Supervision

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Arboricultural Input Required</th>
<th>Report Section</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Pre-commencement meeting</td>
<td>Attend</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Tree Works</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Tree Protective Fencing</td>
<td>Inspect</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Construction of special surfaces</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Specific tree protection measures</td>
<td>Inspect</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Demolition</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Development Phase</td>
<td>Supervise</td>
<td>2.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Remove temporary surfaces</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>2.11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Remove tree protective fencing</td>
<td>Supervise</td>
<td>2.11.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Landscaping &amp; replacement planting</td>
<td>Discuss with landscape architect</td>
<td>2.11.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.4 Pre-commencement meeting

A pre-commencement site meeting involving a representative of the school, architect, ACoW, contractors and engineers (as appropriate), and relevant LPA officers will be held to ensure that all aspects of the tree protection processes are understood and agreed.

The meeting is where the details of the programme of tree protection will be agreed and finalised, which will then form the basis of any supervision arrangements between the ACoW and the developer.

The ACoW will send a record of the meeting to all parties.

2.5 Tree Removal and Works

The day-to-day running of the site will take full account of the tree protection measures set out in this document. All site personnel will be briefed on the tree protection requirements as part of the site induction procedure.
The tree management has been specifically designed towards doing the minimum work necessary to accommodate the development structures, establish acceptable levels of safety and reduce the destructive impact of existing trees on adjacent, better trees.

All tree works will be carried out by a suitably qualified contractor, and in accordance with BS3998:2010 Tree Works – Recommendations and industry best practice.

2.5.1 Tree Removal
Any trees to be removed are highlighted on the Tree Protection Plan (TPP) by a red, dashed circle around each tree. They have also been highlighted in the attached Tree Schedule with red text.

2.5.2 Tree works
Minor pruning may be necessary to address unanticipated local problems with individual branches.

Any additional works will be assessed and authorised as necessary by the retained ACoW who will liaise as required with the county council senior environmental planner.

2.6 Barriers and Ground Protection

2.6.1 The Construction Exclusion Zone
The primary means of protecting the Root Protection Area (RPA) of trees is through the use of barriers formed by protective fencing. The enclosed area is the Construction Exclusion Zone (CEZ).

The CEZs are to be afforded protection at all times and will be protected by fencing. The type of fencing is detailed in section 2.6.2, below.

No works will be undertaken within any CEZ that causes compaction to the soil or severance of tree roots.

2.6.2 Tree Protective Fencing
A protective fence will be erected around the trees, prior to the commencement of any site works e.g. before any materials or machinery are brought on site, development or the stripping of soil commences.

The fence will have signs attached to it stating that this is a CEZ and that no works are permitted within the fence (see Appendix 3). No notice boards, cables or other services will be attached to any tree.

The fence is to be sited in accordance with the TPP provided for each site. This is shown as a black jagged line with diagonal orange hatching indicating the enclosed CEZ (where necessary).

For a project of this nature, it has been determined that Heras fencing will provide the necessary level of protection to the retained trees. Details of this type of fencing are provided in Appendix , and a method of bracing this type of fence is detailed in Appendix 2.
After the protective fencing has been erected, the ACoW will visit the site, and the local authority Tree Officer will be invited to visit the site. The purpose of these visits will be to check that the fencing has been correctly installed so as to provide protection to the trees.

The ACoW will provide a written report confirming satisfactory completion of this task. A copy of this report will be sent to the local planning authority.

The protective fence may only be removed following completion of all construction works.

2.7 Construction of special surfaces

2.7.1 Temporary Ground Protection
If temporary access is required to a CEZ then access may only be gained after consultation with the Local Planning Authority and following placement of materials that will spread the weight of any vehicular load and prevent compaction to the soil.

For pedestrian movements within any CEZ then a single thickness scaffold board on top of a compressible layer (eg wood chip mulch) laid onto a geotextile fabric may be acceptable.

2.7.2 Permanent hard surfaces within the RPA
No permanent hard surfaces are required within the RPA of any tree retained at any site.

2.7.3 Additional precautions outside the exclusion zone
Any risk from activities outside RPAs but close enough to have an impact will be assessed during the day-to-day running of the site, and appropriate precautions put in place to reduce that risk.

It is a presumption of this report that all RPAs that have been identified for protection but which lie outside of the protective fencing, will be protected from soil degradation at all times during construction activity.

2.8 Specific tree protection measures

2.9 Demolition
There is no demolition work required within or in close proximity to any retained trees on this site.

2.10 Development
Once all trees works and protective fencing have been completed, the developer can commence the on-site preparation works and construction can begin.

2.10.1 Site Storage, Cement Mixing and Washing Points
No storage of materials will take place within a CEZ.

No mixing or storage of materials will take place up a slope where they may leak into a CEZ. Where contours of the site create a risk of polluted water running into RPAs, precautionary measures of using heavy duty plastic sheeting and sandbags with the ability to contain accidental spillage will be put in place to prevent contamination.

2.10.2 Contractors Parking
Contractors parking will be off-site and will not be within or in close proximity to a CEZ.
2.10.3 Utility Services
All utility services will connect internally to the property. There is no requirement for any service to be installed within a CEZ.

2.10.4 Fires
No fires will be lit on this site.

2.10.5 Site Gradient
There will no changes to any levels on this site.

2.10.6 Use of Herbicides
There is no requirement for any herbicide to be used on this site.

2.10.7 Use of Sub-contractors
The main contractor will be responsible for ensuring sub-contractors do not carry out any process or operation that is likely to adversely impact upon any tree on site.

2.10.8 Contingency planning
Water will be kept readily available on site and will be used to flush spilt materials through the soil and avoid contamination to tree roots.

At the time of any spillage the main contractor will contact the retained arboricultural consultant for advice.

2.11 Post Development

2.11.1 Removal of temporary surfaces
All temporary surfaces will remain in place until all construction activity is finished and there is no realistic risk of damage.

Any ground protective measures will be removed progressively, starting at the furthest point from the temporary access road, and working backwards. All operations will take place from on top of the existing temporary surface. This will need to be done carefully to ensure that there is no excavation in the original surface level and there will be no damage to trees.

Once this material has been removed there will be no vehicular access to the site by this route.

2.11.2 Removal of protective fencing
When the development is complete, all drainage and service runs are in place and the main site machinery has been removed, the CEZ protective fencing will be dismantled.

This will be supervised by the retained ACoW to ensure that no damage is done to the protected areas during this process.

2.11.3 Landscaping within the RPA.
The final tidying up and reinstatement can only be carried out when all the protective measures have been removed. This means great care is required by the contractors to observe tree protection measures.
No machines can be used within the RPAs, which specifically excludes rotavators.

All new planting and soil level variations must be agreed and supervised by the retained ACoW.

2.11.4 Replacement planting and transplanting of existing trees

All replacement planting will be undertaken in accordance with the detailed recommendations laid down in Section 7 (Amenity Tree Planting) of BS4428 (1989) – *Code of practice for general landscape operations (excluding hard surfaces)*.

2.12 Responsibilities

It is the responsibility of the main contractor to ensure that the planning conditions attached to planning consent are adhered to at all times and that a monitoring regime in regards to tree protection is adopted on site.

The main contractor will be responsible for contacting the Local Planning Authority at any time issues are raised related to the trees on site.

If at any time pruning works are required permission must be sought from the Local Planning Authority first and then carried out in accordance with BS3998:2010 *Tree Works – Recommendations* and industry best practice.

The main contractor will ensure the build sequence is appropriate to ensure that no damage occurs to the trees during the construction processes. Protective fences will remain in position until completion of ALL construction works on the site.

The fencing and signs must be maintained in position at all times and checked on a regular basis by an on-site person designated that responsibility.

2.13 Completion meeting

Upon completion of all works specified above and all procedures detailed, the ACoW will invite the county council senior environmental planner to meet on site to discuss the process and agree any final remedial works which may be required.

2.14 Contacts

Shows a list of all relevant contacts for this development:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Contact No.</th>
<th>Email</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Landowner/Developer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agent/Architect</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LPA Case Officer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LPA Tree Officer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Manager</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACoW</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecological Consultant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landscape Designer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tree Surgeon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
THIS AMS IS NOT A CONTRACT. THE RETENTION OF A QUALIFIED ARBORICULTURIST FOR SUPERVISION AND MONITORING MUST BE AGREED PRIOR TO THE COMMENCEMENT OF ANY CONSTRUCTION ACTIVITY.

Stephen Westmore BSc (Hons) MSc

24 July 2013.
3 Appendix 2 - Tree Protective Fencing
4 Appendix 2 - Fencing Stabilisation

Figure 3 Examples of above-ground stabilizing systems

a) Stabilizer strut with base plate secured with ground pins

b) Stabilizer strut mounted on block tray
5 Appendix 3 - Fencing Signs

TREES ENCLOSED BY THIS FENCE ARE PROTECTED BY PLANNING CONDITIONS AND/OR ARE THE SUBJECTS OF A TREE PRESERVATION ORDER.

CONTRAVENTION OF A TREE PRESERVATION ORDER MAY LEAD TO CRIMINAL PROSECUTION.

ANY INCURSION INTO THE PROTECTED AREA MUST BE WITH THE WRITTEN PERMISSION OF THE LOCAL PLANNING AUTHORITY.

PROTECTIVE FENCING MUST BE MAINTAINED IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE APPROVED PLANS AND DRAWINGS FOR THIS DEVELOPMENT.

KEEP OUT!
6 Appendix 5 – Example Site Inspection Record

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site:</th>
<th>Date:</th>
<th>Surveyor:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ref No:</td>
<td>Planning Application No.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developer:</td>
<td>Site Agent:</td>
<td>Contact No:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Was all tree protective fencing in place?</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Give details</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Was CEZ to agreed dimensions</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Give details</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ACTION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Was debris/storage/groundwork evident within CEZ?</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Give details</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ACTION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Was there any evidence of damage to trees?</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Give details</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ACTION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Any amendments proposed to plan</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Give details</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ACTION**

**Signed:**

**Name:**

Consulting arborist for and on behalf of:

Company

**Circulation:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LPA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developer H.O.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site agent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACoW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tree No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Key to Notations**

- **A**: High Quality & Value
- **B**: Medium Quality & Value
- **C**: Low Quality & Value
- **D**: Dead, lying or dangerous
- **U**: Useful Life Expectancy of tree in years

**Definition**

- **Age Class**: Young (<10), Mature (10-40), Early Mature (40-100), Beyond life expectancy & in natural decline
- **Sub category**: Mainly cultural value, Mainly arboricultural value, Mainly landscape value

**Physiological condition**

- **Dead**: No significant defects
- **Died**: No significant health problems
- **Fair**: Symptoms of health that can be remediated
- **Poor**: Significant health problems

**Structural condition**

- **Dead**: No significant defects
- **Died**: No significant health problems
- **Fair**: Significant defects that can be remediated
- **Poor**: Significant defects with no remedy
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tree No.</th>
<th>Tag No.</th>
<th>Species</th>
<th>Botanical Name</th>
<th>H (m)</th>
<th>Stem Dia.</th>
<th>No of Stems</th>
<th>Branch Spread (m)</th>
<th>CC (m)</th>
<th>LB (m)</th>
<th>DLB (m)</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>PC</th>
<th>SC</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>G1</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Maple (Group)</td>
<td>Acer spp.</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 1 1 1 1 1</td>
<td>1 1</td>
<td>South</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td></td>
<td>Small cluster of 12 saplings. Species includes norway maple, rowan, cherry. Wide spaced trees on school field with ties and stakes in tact, majority damaged throw grass mowing or strimming, 7 trees illustrating dieback in the crown and poor growth. Average stem of 75mm dbh. Easily replaced. Noted - to the east of the group is a very low growing linear beech hedgerow against the boundary fence to the car park.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G2</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Rowan / Mountain Ash</td>
<td>Sorbus aucuparia</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 1 1 1 1 2</td>
<td>2 2</td>
<td>North</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td></td>
<td>Young specimens growing within low growing line of shrubs. Tree stakes and ties intact and situated within existing car park area. Pose little quality as group or as individuals and easily replaced. Average stem of 75mm dbh.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G3</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Beech (Group)</td>
<td>Fagus sylvatica spp.</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4 4 4 4 - 1</td>
<td>1 1</td>
<td>East</td>
<td>EM</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td></td>
<td>Small group of 3. one beech and 2 yew. Beech is dominant within group and other 2 trees showing chlorotic growth and are slightly supressed. Understory of elder and low growing shrubs. Tight unisons and bleeding from stems on 2 yew trees. Consider removing these two to allow beech to grow as a long term management option.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G4</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Sycamore</td>
<td>Acer pseudoplatanus</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5 5 5 5 5 - 1</td>
<td>1 1</td>
<td>South</td>
<td>EM</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td></td>
<td>Small clustered group of 14 trees. Including sycamore, midland hawthorn, hawthorn, railway poplar, willow, horse chestnut, rowan and birch. Collectively have screening value from nearby properties, but individually of little note. Evidence of leaf miner on the chestnut. Small pile of bark mulch and various pieces of broken concrete around stem base.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Key to Notations**

- **Stem Dia.:** Stem diameter (mm) at 1.5m above ground level
- **C.C.:** Height of crown clearance above ground level
- **L.B.:** Lowest branch height in meters
- **U.L.E.:** Useful Life Expectancy of tree in years
- **D.L.B.:** Direction of Lowest Branch
- **PC:** Physiological condition
- **SC:** Structural condition
- **ULE:** Useful Life Expectancy
- **Cat.:** Sub category
- **RPA (m2):** RPA Radial distance (m)

**Category Grading**

- **V:** Veteran
- **M:** Mature
- **H:** Healthy
- **EM:** Early Mature
- **LM:** Late Mature
- **LM:** Late Mature
- **DN:** Dead, dying or dangerous

**Category**

- **A:** High Quality & Value
- **B:** Moderate Quality & Value
- **C:** Low Quality & Value

**Evidence of Significant defects**

- **Significant defects with no remedy**
- **Significant defects that can be remediated**
- **Significant ill health**

**Evidence of Significant ill health**

- **Symptoms of health that can be remediated**
- **Significant ill health**