Greengage

Charlie Ratchford Resource Centre – London Borough of Camden
Tree Survey, Implications Assessment & Constraints Plan – January 2015

QA

Charlie Ratchford Resource Centre - Tree Survey, Implications Assessment & Constraints Plan

Issue/Revision :	Draft	Final
Date:	August 2014	January 2015
Comments:		
Prepared by:	Tom Luck	Tom Luck
Signature:		
Authorised by:	Mitch Cooke	Mitch Cooke
Signature:		
File Reference:	550544tlJul14DV01_AIA_Camden_CRRC	550544tl15jan20FV01_AIA_Camden_CRRC

CONTENTS

1.0 INTRODUCTION

OVERVIEW

1.1 Greengage Environmental LLP were commissioned to undertake an appraisal of trees, hedges and vegetation at Charlie Ratchford Resource Centre in the London Borough of Camden (LB Camden) to the BS 5837:2012 Trees in relation to design, demolition and construction – Recommendations.

1.2 A visit was made to the site on the 5th and 17th July 2014 to survey trees, hedges and vegetation following guidance in the British Standard. The crowns and stems were inspected from the ground using the 'Visual Tree Assessment (VTA)' method; no invasive techniques were used at this stage.

1.3 The purpose of this report is to provide an assessment of the arboricultural value of the trees based on their current quality and to provide recommendations, to help inform any initial design and site layout considerations for a proposed re-development of the assessment site.

1.4 The survey focused on the trees, hedges and vegetation within the site, and directly adjacent to the assessment site, that would be directly affected by any proposed development. The report also indicates any trees requiring removal on the grounds of sound arboricultural management and those that would not be considered a major constraint to any development that may occur on the site.

1.5 During the survey 25 individual trees and 2 groups were recorded. The appended arboricultural data tables (Appendix 1.0) contain details of all the surveyed vegetation falling within the scope. The data was recorded using ArborTrail survey software and a trupulse laser for height data.

LIMITATIONS

1.6 This report includes information on only the trees that were inspected and the condition they were observed in at the time of survey. The condition of trees can change, and as such any findings from this report should be held valid to inform for purposes of development for no longer than 12 months from the survey date.

1.7 No guarantee can be given for the structural integrity of any trees on site as a full hazard assessment has not been made.

2.0 METHODOLOGY

2.1 Trees, tree groups and woodlands have been considered following evaluation into one of four categories (U, A, B, C) based on tree quality as outlined in British Standard 5837 (2012) which has been followed. Categorisation of trees, following the British Standard, gives an indication as to the trees' importance in relation to the site and the local landscape and also, the overall value and quality of the existing tree stock on site. This allows for informed decisions to be made concerning which trees should be removed or retained, should development occur. For a tree to qualify under any given category it should fall within the scope of that category's definition. In the categories A, B, C which collectively deal with trees that should be a material consideration in the development process, there are three sub-categories which are intended to reflect arboricultural, landscape and cultural values respectively. Category U trees are those which would be lost in the short-term for reasons connected with their poor physiological or structural condition. They are, for this reason, not usually considered in the planning process.

2.2 In assigning trees to the A, B or C categories the presence of any serious disease or tree related hazards are taken into account. If the disease is considered fatal and / or irremediable, or likely to require sanitation for the protection of other trees it may be categorised as U, even if they are otherwise of considerable value.

2.3 Category (A) – trees whose retention is most desirable and is of high quality and value. These trees are considered to be in such a condition as to be able to make a lasting contribution (a minimum of 40 years) and may comprise:

- Trees which are particularly good examples of their species especially rare or unusual, or essential components of groups or of formal or semi-formal arboricultural features (e.g. the dominant and/or principal trees within an avenue);
- Trees, groups or woodlands which provide a definite screening or softening effect to the locality in relation to views into or out of the site, or those of particular visual importance (e.g. avenues or other arboricultural features assessed as groups); and
- Trees or groups or woodlands of significant conservation, historical, commemorative or other value (e.g. Veteran or wood-pasture trees).

2.4 Category (B) – are trees whose retention is considered desirable and are of moderate quality and value. These trees are considered to be in such a condition as to make a significant contribution (a minimum of 20 years) and may comprise:

- Trees that might be included in the high category but because of their numbers or slightly impaired condition (e.g. presence of remediable defects including unsympathetic past management and minor storm damage), are downgraded in favour of the best individuals;
- Trees present in numbers such that they form distinct landscape features and attract a higher collective rating than they would as individuals. Individually these

trees are not essential components of formal or semi-formal arboricultural features, or trees situated mainly internally to the site and have little visual impact beyond the site; and

- Trees with clearly identifiable conservation or other cultural benefits.

2.5 Category (C) – are trees that could be retained and are considered to be of low quality and value. These trees are in an adequate condition to remain until new planting could be established (a minimum of ten years) or are young trees with a stem diameter below 150mm and may comprise:

- Trees not qualifying 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 screening benefit; and
- Trees with very limited conservation or other cultural benefits.

2.6 Category (U) – trees for removal are those trees in such a condition that any existing value would be lost within 10 years and which should in the current context be removed for reasons of sound arboricultural management. Trees within this category are:

- 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 category U trees;
- Trees that are dead or are showing signs of significant, immediate or irreversible overall decline; and
- Trees infected with pathogens of significance to the health and or/safety of other trees nearby trees or very low quality trees suppressing adjacent trees of better quality.

2.7 Species has been recorded by common name and recorded as such in the Arboricultural Data Tables in Appendix 1.0. Height has been estimated in meter and stem diameters have been measured at 1.5 metres above ground level and recorded in millimetres. Crown spreads have been measured in half meters and taken to the point of greatest spread unless the crown has presented a pronounced asymmetrical form and therefore measurements have been taken for the four cardinal points. The measurements have always been considered in the following sequence, North, East, South, and West, and therefore appear as such within the Arboricultural Data Tables.

2.8 In the assessment particular consideration has been given to the following when deciding the most appropriate British Standard Category and Sub-Category allocation:

a. the health, vigour and condition of each tree;

b. the presence of any structural defects in each tree and its life expectancy;

c. the size and form of each tree and its suitability within the context of the proposed scheme; and

d. the location of each tree relative to existing site features, e.g. its value as a screen or as a skyline feature.

2.9 Age class is assessed according to the age class categories referred to in BS 5837.

- YNG : Young trees up to five years of age;
- SM : Semi-mature, trees less than 1/3 life expectancy;
- EM: Early mature, trees 1/3 – 2/3 life expectancy;
- M : Mature trees over 2/3 life expectancy;
- OM : Over mature – declining or moribund trees of low vigour; and
- V : Veteran - Characteristics have been noted where a tree exhibits certain characteristic features of veteran trees.

2.10 The overall condition of the tree, or group of trees, has been referred to as one of the following. A more detailed description of condition has been noted in the Tree Schedule and discussed in the Tree Assessment Report.

- Good: A sound tree, trees, needing little, if any, attention;
- Fair: A tree, trees, with minor but rectifiable defects or in the early stages of stress, from which it may recover;
- Poor: A tree, trees, with major structural and physiological defects or stressed such that it would be expensive and inappropriate to retain; and
- Dead: A tree, trees, no longer alive. However, this could also apply to those trees that are dying and will be unlikely to recover, or are / have become dangerous.

2.11 Major defects or diseases and relevant observations have also been recorded under Structural Condition. The assessment for structural condition has included inspection of the following defects:

- The presence of fungal fruiting bodies around the base of the tree or on the stem, as they could possibly indicate the presence of possible internal decay;
- Soil cracks and any heaving of the soil around the base indicating possible root plate movement;
- Any abrupt bends in branches and limbs resulting from past pruning, as it may be an indication of internal weakness and decay;
- Tight or weak 'V' shaped unions and co-dominant stems;
- Hazard beam formations and other such biomechanical related defects (as described by Claus Mattheck, Body Language of Trees HMSO Research for Amenity Trees No. 4 1994);

- Cavities as a result of limb losses or previous pruning;
- Broken branches;
- Storm damage;
- Canker formations;
- Loose bark;
- Damage to roots;
- Basal, stem or branch / limb cavities;
- Crown die-back;
- Abnormal foliage size and colour;
- Any changes to the timing of normal leaf flush and leaf fall patterns; and
- Other pathological diseases affecting any part of the tree.
- Major defects or diseases and relevant observations have also been recorded. Dead wood has been defined as the following:
- Twigs and small branch material up to 5cm in diameter;
- Minor dead wood 5cm to 10cm in diameter; and
- Major dead wood 10cm in diameter and above.

2.12 The survey was completed from ground level only, aerial inspection of trees was not undertaken. Investigations as to the internal condition of a tree have not been undertaken. Further investigations of this type can be made and have been recommended where it has been considered necessary, within the report although these investigations are beyond the scope of this report.

2.13 Evaluation of the trees condition given within this assessment applies to the date of survey and cannot be assumed to remain unchanged. It may be necessary to review these within 12 months, in accordance with sound arboricultural practice.

2.14 The individual positions of trees and groups of trees recorded in the Arboricultural Data Tables have been shown on the Tree Constraints Plan, in Appendix 2.0. The positions of trees are based on a topographical / land survey supplied by the development and client in dwg. format for the purpose of plotting the trees.

2.15 The Root Protection Areas (RPA) to be required by the individual and groups of trees are indicated by the Tree Constraints element of the above plans. The Root Protection Areas are formulated as described below.

2.16 Below ground constraints to future development is represented by the area surrounding the tree that contains sufficient rooting volume to ensure survival of the tree, which need protecting in order for the tree to be incorporated into any future scheme, without

adverse harm to the tree or structural integrity of buildings. This is referred to as the RPA and is shown as a circle of a given radius.

2.17 The circle may be modified in shape to maintain a similar total area depending on the presence of surrounding obstacles. Where groups of trees have been assessed, the RPA has been shown based on the maximum sized tree in any one group and so would automatically exceed the RPA's required for many of the individual specimens within the group. A RPA is equivalent to a circle with a radius 12x the stem diameter for single stem trees and 10x the basal diameter for trees with more than one stem arising less than 1.5 meters above ground level. The RPA for the trees in the Arboricultural Data Tables are shown on the Tree Constraints Plan in Appendix 2.0.

2.18 A summary table of all the trees included in the Arboricultural Data Tables, detailing further information on each tree and group of trees is shown in Appendix 1.0.

2.19 The survey was undertaken in July during fine weather conditions, with deciduous trees in full leaf.

3.0 RESULTS OF SURVEY

SITE DESCRIPTION

3.1 The assessment site covers an area of approximately 0.403 hectares (ha) and is centred on National Grid Reference TQ282843, OS Co-ordinates 528297, 184302.

3.2 The site is split in two with the Crogsland Road site on the western side of Crogsland Road and the Belmont Street site on the eastern side. The majority of the Crogsland Road site is a derelict land currently being used as a car park. Dense buddleia runs along the western border with some more scattered patches at the northern end. The southern part of this section of the site is occupied by a small block of woodland. The Belmont Street site is dominated by the existing Charlie Ratchford Resource Centre, a single-storey flat roofed building. Areas to the north and south of the building comprise predominately short amenity grassland with some scattered trees. A small area of ornamental planting is located in the southeast corner.

3.3 The site is set in an urban environment with residential housing extending to the north, east and west. Commercial buildings associated with Chalk Farm Road sit to the south with the railway line beyond. Haverstock School directly borders the Crogsland Road site to the west. Green space in the in the vicinity of the site is predominately restricted to soft landscaping and private gardens associated with the residential housing. In the wider area there are more significant expanse of green space such as Primrose Hill 650m to the southwest and Regents Park 840m to the south. The Regents Canal runs 480m to the southeast.

3.4 To highlight any Tree Preservation Orders (TPO), a request was made to the Local Authority (ref: 9539194); 'The Charlie Ratchford Resource Centre and surrounding properties are not in a conservation area. None of the trees are covered by TPOs.'

THE PROPOSALS

3.5 The proposals for the Crogsland Road site involve the construction of a 6-storey Extra Care/Community Facility on the currently vacant plot. The Community Resource Facility will sit on the ground floor with approximately 38 Extra Care units provided on up to 5 floors above. Proposals for the Belmont Street site, which currently comprises the existing Charlie Ratchford Resource Centre, are not clear at this stage but it is intended to provide residential development for private sale in the order of 60 – 70 units.

3.6 Potential tree conflict exists with the northern edge of the woodland block and this will need clarification.

3.7 A ground floor landscape plan (AA4796_1012) shows a line of street trees planted in alignment with T18 Magnolia, which is shown as retained to feature as an established tree along Crogsland Road.

3.8 No plans have been made available to us for the site of the Charlie Ratchford Resource Centre.

4.0 THE TREES

4.1 The vacant section of the Crogsland Road site is predominantly populated buy self-set buddleia regeneration that is damaging the fabric of the site and requires eradication.

4.2 Only two mature trees exist on this plot; a mature magnolia and an early mature lime tree. These trees are adjacent to the site entrance on Crogsland Road and have noteworthy landscape value. When the magnolia is in flower it will be a prominent feature within its locality.

4.3 To the south of Crogsland Road site contains the majority if the tree population, which comprises of early mature to semi mature silver birch and alder. This area has potential for informal recreation within the school and offers useful screening and amenity interest to Crogsland Road. Trees within this block have been graded predominantly 'B' for their landscape and amenity value.

4.4 The Belmont Street site contains a number of mature trees located on the southern and eastern boundaries of the plot. T20 is a mature ash tree that has structural weakness and has been poorly reduced. Given its location it has been downgraded to 'U' and should be removed inline with BS 3998: 2010 best practice.

4.5 T21 is a mature sycamore, appearing stressed and is in decline. It is located within a close mown grass matric and has decay and a cavity at the base of the stem on the southern aspect. This decay appears to be K.Deusta and the tree should be felled for safety as the roots are likely to have suffered damage. The value of the tree would not warrant further expense of management or investigation of the percentage of decay using a device such as a PICUS.

4.6 The remainder of the tree cover is located on the eastern aspect of the site with a mixture of soft and hard landscaping within the rooting areas. Full details of these trees are located within the data tables. Some of these trees will form a constraint.

5.0 RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1 As stated, individual recommendations for the trees, groups and hedges are noted in the arboricultural data tables, this information provides the necessary evidence for submission with a planning application.

5.2 The London Borough of Camden have a policy whereby the loss of any trees is generally resisted with a trend towards retention back up by appropriate protection. The more prominent the tree the greater the likelihood it should be protected and retained.

5.3 Potential conflict exists between the design and T13 - T17, although T14 and T17 are classified as C1 and could be removed if required. An Arboricultural Method Statement will be prepared to ensure any retained trees are effectively protected during the redevelopment of the site and to support their future health and conservation.

5.4 The woodland block encompassing trees T1 - T17 should be considered a stand-alone block. Potential conflict exists between the design and T17 and T16, although T17 has been classified as C1 and could be removed if required.

5.5 The woodland block as a whole would benefit from thinning to best stems. A management plan has been commissioned for these trees and will be provided.

5.6 No plans have been provided for the existing Belmont Street site. Any proposals for this site should avoid conflict with the tree population on the eastern boundary. T20 and T21 should not be considered as constraints.

5.7 T20 and T21 should be felled for safety reasons; T21 as soon as practicable.

6.0 CONCLUSIONS

6.1 The majority of the tree population is of good quality, exhibiting both pleasing form and good structure. The higher quality trees should be considered a constraint and retained and protected. It is unlikely, given Local Authority policy that any of the street trees or woodland group would be approved for removal without proper mitigation.

6.2 Scope exists for further tree planting on Crogsland Road, particularly to the north where there is no tree cover currently. This should be planned into any proposals as mitigation for the potential loss of T13-T17.

6.3 To summarize, the plans as provided to us show a potential conflict between T13-17 and T18. This should be fully explored by overlapping the proposals with our tree data. All other trees on site (with the exception of those highlighted for removal on safety grounds) should be retained and protected.

LIMITATIONS

6.4 Greengage LLP has prepared this Report for the sole use of the above named Client/Agent in accordance with our terms of business, under which our services were performed. No other warranty, expressed or implied, is made as to the professional advice included in this Report or any other services provided by us.

6.5 This Report may not be relied upon by any other party without the prior and express written agreement of Greengage LLP. The assessments made assume that the sites and facilities will continue to be used for their current purpose without significant change. The conclusions and recommendations contained in this Report are based upon information provided by others and upon the assumption that all relevant information has been provided by those parties from whom it has been requested. Greengage LLP has not independently verified information obtained from third parties.

6.6 This Report is the copyright of Greengage LLP. Any unauthorised reproduction or usage by any person other than the addressee is strictly prohibited.

6.7 Trees were inspected from ground level only; trees were not climbed or inspected below ground. Inaccessible trees will have best estimates made about location, physical dimensions and characteristics.

APPENDIX 1: ARBORICULTURAL DATA TABLES

tree no	species	height	DBH (mm)	RPA (av. radius)	crown spread N-E-S-W	height to 1st signifi-cant branch	age class	condition	structural condition	preliminary management recommendations	estimated remaining years	Category grade
Individual Trees												
T1	Common Alder	14	300	41	3-4-4-3	1 S	EM	G	Part of linear group. Leaning South. Low branches over road/footpath. Low crown over street lamp. Ground level raised within RPA. Some minor deadwood pre-sent.	None required	20+	B1
T2	Magnolia	5	100	6	2-2-3-2	2 N	M	F	Poor previous pruning, con-strained by peers.	None required	10+	B1
T3	Silver Birch	12	220	22	2-3-3-2	2 S	EM	G	Located adjacent to fence, crown will obstruct security camera.	None required	20+	C1
T4	Common Alder	14	325	48	4-5-3-3	2 S	EM	G	Low limb over road and street lamp.	Crown lift to 3m over foot-path. Prune clear of road light.	20+	B1

tree no	species	height	DBH (mm)	RPA (av. radius)	crown spread N-E-S-W	height to 1st signifi-cant branch	age class	condition	structural condition	preliminary management recommendations	estimated remaining years	Category grade
T5	Common Alder	15	300	41	3-4-3-4	2 E	EM	G	Low crown over street lamp. Ground level raised within RPA.	Crown lift to 3m over foot-path. Prune clear of road light.	20+	B1
T6	Silver Birch	11	260	31	3-4-2-2	2 S	SM	F	Leaning East. Kink in stem at 2m, poor previous prun-ing. Asymmetric crown.	Crown lift to 3m over foot-path.	10+	C1
T7	Wild Cherry	11	325	66	4-3-5-5	2 N	M	F	Stem divides below 1.5m. Unbalanced crown shape. Crown distorted due to group pressure. Thin crown, low leaf density.	None required	<10	C1
T8	Silver Birch	8	150	10	2-2-3-2	2 S	Y	G	Crown distorted due to group pressure.	None required	20+	B1
T9	Silver Birch	12	280	35	1-2-2-3	2 E	EM	G	Crown distorted due to group pressure. Low branches over road/footpath.	Crown lift to 3m over foot-path.	20+	B1

tree no	species	height	DBH (mm)	RPA (av. radius)	crown spread N-E-S-W	height to 1st signifi-cant branch	age class	condition	structural condition	preliminary management recommendations	estimated remaining years	Category grade
T10	Silver Birch	11	260	31	3-3-2-3	2 N	EM	G	Crown distorted due to group pressure. Low branches over road/footpath.	Crown lift to 3m over foot-path.	20+	B1
T11	Silver Birch	13	250	28	2-3-3-2	1 S	EM	G	Crown distorted due to group pressure.	None required	20+	B1
T12	Silver Birch	8	180	15	2-3-2-2	2 E	SM	G	Leaning East. Unbalanced crown shape. Crown dis-torted due to group pres-sure. Low branches over road/footpath.	Crown lift to 3m over foot-path.	10+	C1
T13	Silver Birch	12	350	55	3-5-4-5	3 S	M	G	Largest stem of the birches.	None required	20+	B1
T14	Silver Birch	9	260	31	4-2-3-6	3 N	EM	F	Limited long-term prospects. Poor shape & form. Stunted habit. Leaning West.	None required	<10	C1
T15	Silver Birch	12	300	41	3-4-3-4	3 N	EM	G	Low branches over road/footpath.	Crown lift to 3m over foot-path.	20+	B1

tree no	species	height	DBH (mm)	RPA (av. radius)	crown spread N-E-S-W	height to 1st signifi-cant branch	age class	condition	structural condition	preliminary management recommendations	estimated remaining years	Category grade
T16	Silver Birch	12	300	41	3-4-3-4	3 N	EM	G	Low branches over road/footpath.	Crown lift to 3m over foot-path.	20+	B1
T17	Silver Birch	11	190	16	3-4-2-3	3 W	SM	P	Dieback in crown. Low bud/leaf density. Unbal-anced crown shape. In decline, limited long term prospects.	None required	<10	C1
T18	Magnolia	9	325	0	4-5-4-4	2 S	M	G	Tree located within hard surface area. Stem divides above 1.5m. Low branches over road/footpath. Branches restricting highway light. Prominent tree in the locality. Stem very close to palisade fence.	Crown lift to 3m over foot-path.	20+	B1

tree no	species	height	DBH (mm)	RPA (av. radius)	crown spread N-E-S-W	height to 1st signifi-cant branch	age class	condition	structural condition	preliminary management recommendations	estimated remaining years	Category grade
T19	Small-leaved Lime	12	300	41	5-4-4-4	2 S	EM	G	Stem divides above 1.5m. Low branches over road/footpath. Branches restricting highway light. Limited rooting area, located between tarmac and pavement adjacent to palisade fence.	Crown lift to 3m over foot-path.	20+	B1
Trees located on southern side of Crogsland Road												
T20	Ash	11	640	515	5-7-6-5	3 E	EM	P	Limited long-term prospects. Poor shape & form. Low vitality. Declining. Stunted habit. Stem divides at ground level. Included bark present in main fork. Die-back in crown. Low bud/leaf density. Unbalanced crown shape. Poor pruning, heavy compaction.	Remove tree inline with best arboricultural practice. Very weak forks.	<10	U

tree no	species	height	DBH (mm)	RPA (av. radius)	crown spread N-E-S-W	height to 1st signifi-cant branch	age class	condition	structural condition	preliminary management recommendations	estimated remaining years	Category grade
T21	Sycamore	12	510	118	10-6-5-9	4 E	M	P	In decline, small leaves for species. K. Deusta noted on south side of stem. Adap-tive growth.	Fell tree for safety inline with best arboricultural practice.	<10	U
T22	Wild Service Tree	6	80	3	1-1-1-1	1 S	Y	G	Good quality ornamental planting. Limited rooting area.	None required.	20+	B1
T23	Wild Cherry	10	330	49	5-4-3-6	3 W	M	G	Limited long term prospects due to location and con-strained roots. Roots lifting slabs.	None required.	20+	C1
T24	Norway Ma-ple	13	380	65	6-4-3-3	3 S	M	F	Low vitality. Declining. Tree located within hard surface area. Ivy on stem. Dieback in crown. Low bud/leaf den-sity. Stressed appearance,.	Remove ivy.	20+	C1

tree no	species	height	DBH (mm)	RPA (av. radius)	crown spread N-E-S-W	height to 1st signifi-cant branch	age class	condition	structural condition	preliminary management recommendations	estimated remaining years	Category grade
T25	Sycamore	13	510	163	6-7-6-8	3 W	M	F	Tree located within hard surface area. Stem divides below 1.5m. Included bark present in main fork. Low bud/leaf density.	Monitor.	20+	C1
Groups												
G1	Field Maple, Silver Birch, Box	7max	Various	To crown edges	As drawn	N/A	Y-EM	G	A linear feature of young trees adjacent to thee tennis court. 11 obvious stems with box and hazel under storey.	Thin to best stems.	20+	B2
G2	Hornbeam	7max	Various	To crown edges	As drawn	N/A	Y	G	4x identical specimen street trees in dedicated tree pits. Good structure form and vitality.	None required.	40+	B2
End of Records												

APPENDIX 2: TREE CONSTRAINTS PLAN

Topographical Legend

Abbreviations

Utilities Legend

Tree Constraints Plan showing existing layout against tree categories and root protection zones.

BS5837:2012 Tree Categories

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 remaining 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 150 mm

Category U
Trees in such a condition that they cannot realistically be retained as living trees in the context of the current land use for longer than 10 years

BS 5837:2012 Root Protection Area
Note: The RPA limits for some groups may be represented by a dashed category coloured line.

Tree
Showing Canopy extents, category colour, tag number (with category) and optional indication arrow showing bearing of first significant branch.

T35-B1

N

Tree numbering: Starts at 001 Ends at 025.
Tree Groups: G1-G2

Greengage LLP

Project
Crogsland Road, Camden, London.

Drawing Title
Tree Constraints Plan

Scale	Date	DB	CB
1:200@A1	July 14	CS	MH

Drawing Number	Rev
14_5837_07_01	2