Landmark Trees

ARBORICULTURAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT REPORT:

Flat 1, 89 Priory Rd

West Hampstead

NW6 3NL

REPORT PREPARED FOR:

PML Architecture

86-90 Paul Street

London

C2A 4NE

REPORT PREPARED BY

Adam Hollis

MSc ARB MICFor FArbor A MRICS C Env

Ref: PML/89PRR/AIA/01

Date: 29th May 2015

Appendices

Caveats

This report is primarily an arboricultural report. Whilst comments relating to matters involving built structures or soil data may appear, any opinion thus expressed should be viewed as qualified, and confirmation from an appropriately qualified professional sought. Such points are usually clearly identified within the body of the report. It is not a full safety survey or subsidence risk assessment survey. These services can be provided but a further fee would be payable. Where matters of tree condition with a safety implication are noted during a survey they will of course appear in the report.

A tree survey is generally considered invalid in planning terms after 2 years, but changes in tree condition may occur at any time, particularly after acute (e.g. storm events) or prolonged (e.g. drought) environmental stresses or injuries (e.g. root severance). Routine surveys at different times of the year and within two - three years of each other (subject to the incidence of the above stresses) are recommended for the health and safety management of trees remote from highways or busy access routes. Annual surveys are recommended for the latter.

Tree works recommendations are found in the Appendices to this report. It is assumed, unless otherwise stated ("ASAP" or "Option to") that all husbandry recommendations will be carried out within 6 months of the report's first issue. Clearly, works required to facilitate development will not be required if the application is shelved or refused. However, necessary husbandry work should not be shelved with the application and should be brought to the attention of the person responsible, by the applicant, if different. Under the Occupiers Liability Act of 1957, the owner (or his agent) of a tree is charged with the due care of protecting persons and property from foreseeable damage and injury.' He is responsible for damage and/or nuisance arising from all parts of the tree, including roots and branches, regardless of the property on which they occur. He also has a duty under The Health and Safety at Work Act 1974 to provide a safe place of work, during construction. Tree works should only be carried out with local authority consent, where applicable.

Inherent in a tree survey is assessment of the risk associated with trees close to people and their property. Most human activities involve a degree of risk, such risks being commonly accepted if the associated benefits are perceived to be commensurate.

Risks associated with trees tend to increase with the age of the trees concerned, but so do many of the benefits. It will be appreciated, and deemed to be accepted by the client, that the formulation of recommendations for all management of trees will be guided by the cost-benefit analysis (in terms of amenity), of tree work that would remove all risk of tree related damage.

Prior to the commencement of any tree works, an ecological assessment of specific trees may be required to ascertain whether protected species (e.g. bats, badgers and invertebrates etc.) may be affected.

Tree Constraints & Protection Overview

Client:	pmlarchitecture	Case Ref:	PML/89PRR/AIA/01
Local Authority:	LB Camden	Date:	29/05/15
Site Address: Flat 1, 89 Priory Rd, West Hampstead, NW6 3NL			
Proposal: Rear extension to include a ground floor and Mezzanine floor			

Report Checklist	Y/N		Y/N
Arboricultural constraints on site	Y	Trees removal proposed	Y
Tree Survey	Y	Topographical Survey	N
BS5837 Report	Y	Conservation Area	Y
Tree Preservation Orders	N/k		
Tree Protection Plan:	N/a	(Include in future method statement)	
Tree Constraints Plan:	Y		
Arboricultural Impact Assessment:	Y		

Site Layout					
Site Visit	Y	Date: 20/05/15		Access Full/Partial/None	F
Trees on Site			Y	Off-site Trees	Y
Trees affected by development			N	O/s trees affected by development	N
Tree replacement proposed:			N/a	On or off-site trees indirectly affected by development	N

Trees with the potential to be affected
Removal of the cabbage 'tree' T1 (member of grass family, not a tree) required. Category U willow tree - proposed construction of new terrace within 1m of stem, but tree is not a material constraint on development as it is subject to an irremediable disease, honey fungus.

Comments
Recommended works to fell T2 due to irremediable disease of its root system, regardless of development, but also pertinent to maintaining a safe work site.

Recommendations		
1	Proposal will mean the loss of important trees (TPO/CA)	N
2	Proposal has sufficient amelioration for tree loss	Y
3	Proposals provide adequate tree protection measures	Y
4	Proposal will mean retained trees are too close to buildings	N
5	Specialist demolition / construction techniques required	N
6	The Proposal will result in significant root damage to retained trees	N
7	Further investigation of tree condition recommended	N

RPA= Root Protection Area
TPP= Tree Protection Plan
AMS= Arboricultural Method Statement
AIA = Arboricultural Implication Assessment
BS5837: 2012 'Trees in relation to design, demolition and construction – Recommendations'

1. SUMMARY

1.1 This report comprises an arboricultural impact assessment of the proposals for Flat 1, 89 Priory Rd, West Hampstead, NW6 3NL, reviewing any conflicts between the proposals and material tree constraints identified in our survey.

1.2 There is one weeping willow tree (T2) surveyed on or around the site that could potentially be affected by development proposals in this area, but which is rated a category U / Poor Quality tree. Such trees are not regarded as material constraints on development and are discounted from the planning process. Their status as such is denoted by (among other things) the presence of (i) *a serious, irremediable, structural defect, such that their early loss is expected due to collapse;* (ii) *pathogens of significance to the health and/or safety of other trees nearby* (BS5837 : Table 1 Cascade chart for tree quality assessment). In this instance, the advanced colonisation of the tree's root collar by honey fungus (*Armillaria sp.*) from the north to east, with concomitant cambial dieback and decay, including a modest cavity to the north, satisfies both of the above criteria. The tree also has a pronounced lean to the East, over the communal gardens, and we recommend the tree be felled as soon as is reasonably possible (subject to relevant consents).

1.3 A horse chestnut, plum and false cypress growing well beyond the willow were not surveyed, because their RPA will not overlap the application site; tree protection measures will ensure that the contractor will not be able to access the communal gardens. There is one further member of the grass family, a inappropriately named cabbage tree (T1), which is growing within close proximity to the existing elevations, and requires removal.

1.4 The proposals comprise a ground floor extension, which will be excavated to around 1m below the existing garden level to allow a mezzanine first floor level to be provided. The terrace is to be excavated to the same level within 1 meter of the stem of the category U willow tree, which will require felling beforehand. These works should not be undertaken prior to the felling of the tree.

1.5 Thus, tree removal is required on site, ahead of proposed works, but there are no arboricultural impacts *per se*. The only constraint trees are well removed from the proposals within the communal gardens, which will be closed to contractors (by a tree protection barrier, shown in Appendix 6). The site has potential for development without impacting at all on the viable tree population or local landscape. With suitable replacement planting and protection measures, the scheme is recommended to planning.

* British Standards Institute: Trees in relation to design, demolition and construction BS 5837: 2012 HMSO, London

2. INTRODUCTION

2.1 Terms of Reference

2.1.1 LANDMARK TREES were asked by pmlarchitecture to provide a survey and an arboricultural impact assessment of proposals for the site: Flat 1, 89 Priory Rd, West Hampstead, NW6 3NL. The report is to accompany a planning application.

2.1.2 The proposals are for a ground floor extension with a mezzanine first floor, in addition to a new terrace garden area. This report will assess the impact on the trees and their constraints, identified in our survey. Although the proposals were known at the time of the survey, Landmark Trees endeavour to survey each site blind, working from a topographical survey, wherever possible, with the constraints plan informing their evolution.

2.1.3 I am a Registered Consultant and Fellow of the Arboricultural Association and a Chartered Forester, with a Masters Degree in Arboriculture and 25 years' experience of the landscape industry - including the Forestry Commission and Agricultural Development and Advisory Service. I am a UK Registered Expert Witness, trained in single and joint expert witness duties. I am also Chairman of the UK & I Regional Plant Appraisal Committee, inaugurated to promote international standards of valuation in arboriculture.

2.2 Drawings Supplied

2.2.1 The drawings supplied by the client and relied upon by Landmark Trees in the formulation of our survey plans are:

Existing site survey: PRI – P102*

Proposals: PRI – P103 to P108

*In the absence of a full topographical survey, tree positions may be approximate only.

2.3 Scope of Survey

2.3.1 As Landmark Trees' (LT) arboricultural consultant, I surveyed the trees on site on 22nd May 2015, recording relevant qualitative data in order to assess both their suitability for retention and their constraints upon the site, in accordance with British Standard 5837:2012 Trees in relation to design, demolition and construction – Recommendations [BS5837:2012].

2.3.2 Our survey of the trees, the soils and any other factors, is of a preliminary nature. The trees were SURVEYED on the basis of the Visual Tree Assessment method expounded by Mattheck and Breloer (The Body Language of Trees, DoE booklet Research for Amenity Trees No. 4, 1994). LT have not taken any samples for analysis and the trees were not climbed, but inspected from ground level.

2.3.3 A tree survey is generally considered invalid in planning terms after 2 years, but changes in tree condition may occur at any time, particularly after acute (e.g. storm events) or prolonged (e.g. drought) environmental stresses or injuries (e.g. root severance). Routine surveys at different times of the year and within two - three years of each other (subject to the incidence of the above stresses) are recommended for the health and safety management of trees remote from highways or busy access routes. Annual surveys are recommended for the latter.

2.3.4 The survey does not cover the arrangements that may be required in connection with the laying or removal of underground services.

2.4 Survey Data & Report Layout

2.4.1 Detailed records of individual trees are given in the survey schedule in Appendix 1 to this report.

2.4.2 A site plan identifying the surveyed trees, based on the client's drawings / topographical survey is provided in Appendix 5.

2.4.3 This plan also serves as the Tree Constraints Plan with the theoretical Recommended Protection Areas (RPA's), tree canopies and shade constraints, (from BS5837: 2012) overlain onto it. These constraints are then overlain in turn onto the client's proposals to create an Arboricultural Impact Assessment Plan in Appendix 6. General observations and discussion follow, below.

3.0 OBSERVATIONS

3.1 Site Description

Photograph 1: Flat 1, 89 Priory Rd, West Hampstead, NW6 3NL

3.1.1	The site is an existing detached residential property that is divided into flats. The ground floor flat (Flat 1) includes a rear private garden, with additional communal garden space.
3.1.2	The site is relatively level.
3.1.3	In terms of the British Geological Survey, the site overlies the London Clay Formation (see indicated location on Fig.1 plan extract below). The associated soils are generally, highly shrinkable clay; e.g. slowly permeable seasonally waterlogged fine loam over clay. Such highly plastic soils are prone to movement: subsidence and heave. The actual distribution of the soil series are not as clearly defined on the ground as on plan and there may be anomalies in the actual composition of clay, silt and sand content.
3.1.4	Clay soils are prone to compaction during development with damage to soil structure potentially having a serious impact on tree health. The design of foundations near problematic tree species will also need to take into consideration subsidence risk. Further advice from the relevant experts on the specific soil properties can be sought as necessary.



Figure 1: Extract from the BGS Geology of Britain Viewer

3.2 Subject Trees

3.2.1	There is one early mature category U willow tree T2 surveyed. A further grass known as a cabbage tree is also within the proposed development area. A horse chestnut, plum and false cypress beyond the willow that also lie within the communal garden were not surveyed, because their RPAs will not overlap the application site.
3.2.2	The weeping willow tree (T2) surveyed is rated a category U / Poor Quality tree on account of the presence of (i) *a serious, irremediable, structural defect, such that their early loss is expected due to collapse;* (ii) *pathogens of significance to the health and/or safety of other trees nearby* (BS5837: Table 1 Cascade chart for tree quality assessment). In this instance, the advanced colonisation of the tree's root collar by honey fungus (*Armillaria sp.*) from the north to east, with concomitant cambial dieback and decay, including a modest cavity to the north, satisfies both of the above criteria. The tree also has a pronounced lean to the East, over the communal gardens, and we recommend the tree be felled as soon as is reasonably possible (subject to relevant consents).

3.2.4	Full details of the surveyed trees can be found in Appendix 1 of this report.

Photographs 2: Category U willow

Photograph 3: Category U willow in winter illustrating poor form

3.3 Planning Status

3.3.1	We are not aware of the existence of any Tree Preservation Orders, but understand the site stands within South Hampstead Conservation Area, which will affect the subject trees: it is a criminal offence to prune, damage or fell such trees without permission from the local authority.

4.0 DEVELOPMENT CONSTRAINTS

4.1 Primary Constraints

4.1.1 BS5837: 2012 gives Recommended Protection Areas (RPA's) for any given tree size. The individual RPA's are calculated in the Tree Schedule in Appendix 1 to this report, or rather the notional radius of that RPA, based on a circular protection zone. The prescribed radius is 12-x stem diameter at 1.5m above ground level, except where composite formulae are used in the case of multi-stemmed trees.

4.1.2 Circular RPA's are appropriate for individual specimen trees grown freely, but where there is ground disturbance, the morphology of the RPA can be modified to an alternative polygon, as shown in the diagram below (Figure 2). Alternatively, one need principally remember that RPA's are area-based and not linear – notional rather than fixed entities. No modifications have been made in this instance (please see overleaf).



Figure 2 – Generic BS 5837 RPA Adjustments

4.1.3 In BS5837, paragraph 4.6.2 states that RPA's should reflect the morphology and disposition of the roots; where pre-existing site conditions or other factors indicate that rooting has occurred asymmetrically, a polygon of equivalent area should be produced. Modifications to the shape of the RPA should reflect a soundly based arboricultural assessment of likely root distribution. Not infrequently, LT are requested by LPA Tree Officers to modify the RPA's to reflect their assumptions that e.g. a road will have drastically limited root growth.

4.1.4 Such assumptions cannot be proved without prior site investigations / trial pits. Where it is not always possible to conduct site investigations (e.g. below busy roads), we can always look to the published science. There seems little support for the popular myth that roads and services will curb root growth: research for the International Society of Arboriculture by Kopinga J (ISA 1994), found that "a constant high moisture content of the soil directly underneath the pavement surface can be considered as a major soil factor in attracting the trees' roots to develop there." By contrast, grass in lawns may actively antagonise tree roots with natural pathogens. Similarly, Professor F Miller (ISA 1994) found that service trenches at > 3m distances from trees had minimal impact on growth or crown shape.

4.1.5 A key misunderstanding, even among professionals, is that we conflate the RPA with the actual root system: RPA's are *prima facie* a notion / convention / treaty and almost entirely theoretical, but readily calculable. Conversely roots are a "known unknown," spatial entity that we predict at our folly. Yet, many are quick to do so.

4.1.6 LT favour the neutrality of a circular RPA, because in a difference of opinion, the tree officer will always have the prerogative to dictate the final modification of shape. With the best will in the world, the free allowance of modifications will tend to lead to inequitable outcomes, prejudicing the applicant and the practice is in our view, best avoided. The neutral circle dispenses with this inequity.

4.1.7 Ultimately, the point of the circular RPA is to illustrate areas of concern. The purpose of this report is to consider areas of concern (not to modify them to suit our argument or findings). Therefore, no modifications are made here to the RPA's, regardless of roads etc.

4.1.8 The quality of trees will also be a consideration: U Category trees are discounted from the planning process in view of their limited service life. Again, Category-C trees would not normally constrain development individually, unless they provide some external screening function.

4.1.9 At paragraph 5.1.1. BS5837: 2012 notes that "Care should be exercised over misplaced tree preservation; attempts to retain too many or unsuitable trees on a site are liable to result in excessive pressure on the trees during demolition or construction work, or post-completion demands on their removal."

4.1.10 In theory, only moderate quality trees and above are significant material constraints on development. However, the low quality trees would comprise a constraint in aggregate, in terms of any collective loss / removal, where replacement planting would be appropriate.

4.1.11 In this instance, there are no significant primary constraints upon development: category U / Poor Quality trees are not regarded as material constraints on development and are discounted from the planning process.

4.2 Secondary Constraints

4.2.1 The second type of constraint produced by trees that are to be retained is that the proximity of the proposed development to the trees should not threaten their future with ever increasing demands for tree surgery or felling to remove nuisance shading (Figure 3), honeydew deposition or perceived risk of harm.

Figure 3 –
Generic Shading Constraints

4.2.2 The shading constraints are crudely determined from BS5837 by drawing an arc from northwest to east of the stem base at a distance equal to the height of the tree, as shown in the diagram opposite. Shade is less of a constraint on non-residential developments, particularly where rooms are only ever temporarily occupied.



Figure 4 – Shading Arc

4.2.3 This arc (see Figure 4) represents the effects that a tree will have on layout through shade, based on shadow patterns of 1x tree height for a period May to Sept inclusive 10.00-18.00 hrs daily.

4.2.4 Assuming that the remaining trees within the communal garden will be retained, the orientation of the site will ensure that shading constraints are minimal, with leaf deposition and honey-dew likely to be as it is today. The significance of these constraints will vary depending on the location and proximity to the proposed re-development.

Note: Sections 5 & 6 will now assess the impacts upon constraints identified in Section 4. Table 1 in Section 5 presents the impacts in tabular form (drawing upon survey data presented in Appendices 1 & 2). Impacts are presented in terms of whole tree removal and the effect on the landscape or partial encroachment (% of RPA) and its effect on individual tree health. Section 6 discusses the table data, elaborating upon the impacts' significance and mitigation.

5.0

Table 1: Arboricultural Impact Assessment

(Impacts assessed prior to mitigation and rated with reference to Matheny & Clark (1998))

Hide irrelevant | Show All Trees

Ref: PML_89PRR_AIA

B.S. Cat.	Tree No.	Species	Impact	Tree / RPA Affected	Age	Growth Vitality	Species Tolerance	Impact on Tree Rating	Impact on Site Rating	Mitigation
N/a	1	Cabbage Tree	To be felled - grass not tree	m^2 N/A %	Semi-mature	Normal	N/A	N/A	N/A	Not required
U	2	Willow, Weeping	Excavations within RPA New terrace and steps within 1 meter of stem	6 m^2 5.76 %	Early Mature	Moderate	N/A	N/A	N/A	Category U tree which requires felling on the grounds of sound husbandry - replacement planting

6.0 DISCUSSION

6.1 Rating of Primary Impacts

6.1.1	The proposals comprise a ground floor extension, which will be excavated to around 1m below the existing garden level to allow a mezzanine first floor level to be provided. The terrace is to be excavated to the same level within 1 meter of the stem of the category U willow tree, which will require felling. However, this tree should be removed on the grounds of sound husbandry therefore is a non-constraint and is not rated as an impact due to the proposals.
6.1.2	The cabbage tree will have to be removed, although this is not an arboricultural impact as this plant is a member of the grass family and not a tree.
6.1.3	The loss of T1 & 2 is thus, not rated as an arboricultural impact in planning terms.

Photograph 4: Existing Terrace



Extract from Plan PRI-P107

6.2 Rating of Secondary Impacts

6.2.1	The secondary impacts will remain as today, with some minor organic deposition from the retained trees within the communal gardens.

6.3 Mitigation of Impacts

6.3.1	Any perceived landscape impact of tree losses could be offset with minor landscape proposals, ideally involving new planting of ornamental varieties of native species, and where appropriate with columnar or compact form. A selection of columnar tree species cultivars for constricted sites is provided in Appendix 4.

7.0 CONCLUSION

7.1 Tree removal is required on site, ahead of proposed works, but there are no arboricultural impacts *per se*. The only constraint trees are well removed from the proposals within the communal gardens, which will be closed to contractors (by a tree protection barrier, shown in Appendix 6.

7.2 The site has potential for development without impacting at all on the viable tree population or local landscape. With suitable replacement planting and protection measures, the scheme is recommended to planning.

8.0 RECOMMENDATIONS

8.1 Specific Recommendations

8.1.1 Current tree works recommendations are found in Appendix 2 to this report, with works to facilitate development in Appendix 3 and a selection of columnar tree species cultivars for constricted sites provided in Appendix 4. Any tree removals recommended within this report should only be carried out with local authority consent.

8.1.2 Excavation and construction impacts within the RPA's of trees identified in Table 1 above, will need to be controlled by method statements specifying mitigation methods suggested in para 6.3 above and by consultant supervision as necessary. These method statements can be provided as part of the discharge of conditions.

8.1.3 Any replacement trees should be native nursery stock planted under current best practice; i.e. conforming to and planted in accordance with the following:

- BS8545: 2014 Code of Practice for Trees from Nursery to Landscape
- BS 3936:1980 Nursery Stock;
- BS 4043:1966 Transplanting Semi-Mature Trees; and
- BS 5236:1975 Cultivation and Planting of Trees in the Advanced Nursery Stock Category.
- All replacement stock should be planted and maintained as detailed in BS 4428:1989 (Section 7): Recommendations for General Landscape Operations.

8.2 General Recommendations for Sites Being Developed with Trees

8.2.1 The trees within the communal garden should be protected with a Tree Protection Barrier (TPB). Protective barrier fencing should be installed immediately following the completion of the tree works, remaining in situ for the entire duration of the development unless otherwise agreed in writing by the council. It should be appropriate for the intensity and proximity of the development, usually comprising steel, mesh panels 2.4m in height ('Heras') and should be mounted on a scaffolding frame (shown in Fig 2 of BS5837:2012). The position of the TPB can be shown on plan as part of the discharge of conditions, once the lay out is agreed with the planning authority. The TPB should be erected prior to commencement of works, remain in its original form on-site for the duration of works and removed only upon full completion of works.

8.2.2	A TPB may no longer be required during soft landscaping work but a full arboricultural assessment must be performed prior to the undertaking of any excavations within the RPA of a tree. This will inform a decision about the requirement of protection measures. It is important that all TPBs have permanent, weatherproof notices denying access to the RPA.
8.2.3	Numerous site activities are potentially damaging to trees e.g. parking, material storage, the use of plant machinery and all other sources of soil compaction. In operating plant, particular care is required to ensure that the operational arcs of excavation and lifting machinery, including their loads, do not physically damage trees when in use.

9.0 REFERENCES

- Barlow JF & Harrison G. 1999. Shade By Trees, Arboricultural Practice Note 5, AAIS, Farnham, Surrey.
- British Standards Institute. 2012. Trees in Relation to Design, Demolition and Construction - Recommendations BS 5837: 2012 HMSO, London.
- Centre for Ecology & Hydrology. 2006. Tree Roots in the Built Environment, HMSO, London.
- Helliwell R (1980) Provision for New Trees; Landscape Design; July/August issue
- International Society of Arboriculture (ISA). 1994. The Landscape Below Ground. ISA, Champaign, Ilinois. USA.
- Lonsdale D 1999. Research for Amenity Trees No.7: Principles of Tree Hazard Assessment and Management, HMSO, London.
- Matheny, N; Clark, J. R.1998. Trees and Development: A Technical Guide to Preservation of Trees during Land Development. ISA, Champaign, Ilinois. USA.
- Mattheck C. & Breloer H. 1994. Research for Amenity Trees No.2: The Body Language of Trees, HMSO, London.
- Thomas P, 2000. Trees: Their Natural History, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Trowbridge J & Bassuk N (2004) Trees in the Urban Landscape: Site Assessment, Design, and Installation; J Wiley & Sons inc. NJ USA

APPENDIX 1

TREE SCHEDULE

Botanical Tree Names

Chestnut, Horse	: Aesculus hippocastanum
Cypress, False	: Chamaecyparis lawsoniana
Plum	: Prunus cerasifera
Willow, Weeping	: Salix × sepulcralis

Notes for Guidance:

1. Height describes the approximate height of the tree measured in metres from ground level.
2. The Crown Spread refers to the crown radius in meters from the stem centre and is expressed as an average of NSEW aspect if symmetrical.
3. Ground Clearance is the height in metres of crown clearance above adjacent ground level.
4. Stem Diameter (Dm) is the diameter of the stem measured in millimetres at 1.5m from ground level for single stemmed trees. BS 5837:2012 formula (Section 4.6) used to calculate diameter of multi-stemmed trees. Stem Diameter may be estimated where access is restricted and denoted by '#'.
5. Protection Multiplier is 12 and is the number used to calculate the tree's protection radius and area
6. Protection Radius is a radial distance measured from the trunk centre.
7. Growth Vitality - Normal growth, Moderate (below normal), Poor (sparse/weak), Dead (dead or dying tree).
8. Structural Condition - Good (no or only minor defects), Fair (remediable defects), Poor - Major defects present.
9. Landscape Contribution - High (prominent landscape feature), Medium (visible in landscape), Low (secluded/among other trees).
10. B.S. Cat refers to (British Standard 5837:2012 section 4.5) and refers to tree/group quality and value; 'A' – High, 'B' - Moderate, 'C' - Low, 'U' - Unsuitable for retention. The following colouring has been used on the site plans:
    - High Quality (A) (Green),
    - Moderate Quality (B) (Blue),
    - Low Quality (C) (Grey),
    - Unsuitable for Retention (U) (Red)
11. Sub Cat refers to the retention criteria values where 1 is Arboricultural, 2 is Landscape and 3 is Cultural including Conservational, Historic and Commemorative.
12. Useful Life is the tree's estimated remaining contribution in years.

Landmark Trees

Site: 89 Priory Road

Date: 22/5/2015

Appendix 1

BS5837 Tree Constraints Survey Schedule

Landmark Trees Ltd

020 7851 4544

Surveyor(s): Adam Hollis

Ref: PML_89PRR_AIA

Tree No.	English Name	Height	Crown Spread	Ground Clearance	Stem Diamete	Age Class	Protection Radius	Growth Vitality	Structural Condition	B.S. Cat	Sub Cat	Useful Life	Comments
1	Cabbage Tree	7	0.5	6.0	0	Semi-mature	0.0	Normal	Good	N/a			Member of grass family, not a tree
2	Willow, Weeping	9	6447	1.5	480	Early Mature	5.8	Moderate	Fair	U		<10	Honey fungus at base Dead bark & cambium from N to E Small cavity (c. 100mm deep) to E Lopped & Topped

APPENDIX 2

RECOMMENDED TREE WORKS

Notes for Guidance:

Husbandry 1 - Urgent (ASAP), 2 - Standard (within 6 months), 3 - Non-urgent (2-3 years)

CB - Cut Back to boundary/clear from structure.
CL# - Crown Lift to given height in meters.
CT#% - Crown Thinning by identified %.
CCL - Crown Clean (remove deadwood/crossing and hazardous branches and stubs)*.
CR#% - Crown Reduce by given maximum % (of outermost branch & twig length)
DWD - Remove deadwood.
Fell - Fell to ground level.
FInv - Further Investigation (generally with decay detection equipment).
Pol - Pollard or re-pollard.
Mon - Check / monitor progress of defect(s) at next consultant inspection which should be <18 months in frequented areas and <3 years in areas of more occasional use. Where clients retain their own ground staff, we recommend an annual in- house inspection and where practical, in the aftermath of extreme weather events.
Svr Ivy / Clr Bs - Sever ivy / clear base and re-inspect base / stem for concealed defects.

*Not generally specified following BS3998:2010

Landmark Trees

Site: 89 Priory Road
Date: 22/5/2015

Surveyor(s): Adam Hollis
Ref: PML_89PRR_AIA

Appendix 2

Recommended Tree Works

Hide irrelevant
Show All Trees

Tree No.	English Name	B.S. Cat	Height	Ground Clearance	Crown Spread	Recommended Works	Comments/ Reasons
2	Willow, Weeping	U	9	1.5	6447	Fell	Honey fungus at base Dead bark & cambium from N to E Small cavity (c. 100mm deep) to E Lopped & Topped Recommended husbandry 2

APPENDIX 3

RECOMMENDED TREE WORKS TO FACILITATE DEVELOPMENT (See Table 1)

Notes for Guidance:

RP - Pre-emptive root pruning of foundation encroachments under arboricultural supervision.
CB - Cut Back to boundary/clear from structure.
CL# - Crown Lift to given height in meters.
CT#% - Crown Thinning by identified %.
CCL - Crown Clean (remove deadwood/crossing and hazardous branches and stubs)*.
CR#% - Crown Reduce by given maximum % (of outermost branch & twig length)
DWD - Remove deadwood.
Fell - Fell to ground level.
FInv - Further Investigation (generally with decay detection equipment).
Pol - Pollard or re-pollard.
Mon - Check / monitor progress of defect(s) at next consultant inspection which should be <18 months in frequented areas and <3 years in areas of more occasional use. Where clients retain their own ground staff, we recommend an annual in- house inspection and where practical, in the aftermath of extreme weather events.
Svr Ivy / Clr Bs - Sever ivy / clear base and re-inspect base / stem for concealed defects.

*Not generally specified following BS3998:2010

Landmark Trees

Site: 89 Priory Road
Date: 22/5/2015

Surveyor(s): Adam Hollis
Ref: PML_89PRR_AIA

Appendix 3

Recommended Tree Works To Facilitate Development

Hide irrelevant
Show All Trees

Tree No.	English Name	B.S. Cat	Height	Ground Clearance	Crown Spread	Recommended Works	Comments/ Reasons
1	Cabbage Tree	N/a	7	6.0	0.5	Fell	Member of grass family, not a tree To facilitate development

APPENDIX 4: TREE SELECTION FOR CONSTRICTED LOCATIONS

Table A4.1: Rosaceous Tree Species for Constricted Planting Locations

Common Name	Species	Selected Form
Hawthorn	Crataegus monogyna	Stricta
Cockspur	Crataegus prunifolia	Splendens
Cherry	Prunus x hillieri	Spire
Bird cherry	Prunus padus	Albertii
Rowan / Mountain ash	Sorbus aucuparia	Cardinal Royal
Rowan / Mountain ash	Sorbus aucuparia	Rossica Major
Rowan / Mountain ash	Sorbus aucuparia	Sheerwater Seedling
Swedish whitebeam	Sorbus intermedia	Brouwers
B. whitebeam	Sorbus x thuringiaca	Fastigiata

Table A4.2: Specimen Tree Species for Constricted Planting Locations

Common Name	Species	Selected Form
Chinese red bark birch	Betula albosinensis	Fascination
Swedish birch	Betula pendula	Dalecarlica
Hornbeam	Carpinus betulus	Fastigiata Frans Fountaine
Turkish Hazel	Corylus colurna	
Maidenhair tree	Gingko biloba	
Pride of India	Koelreuteria paniculata	Fastigiata
European larch	Larix decidua	Sheerwater Seedling
Tulip tree	Liriodendron tulipfera	Fastigiata

APPENDIX 5

TREE CONSTRAINTS PLAN





NOTE:

This survey is of a preliminary nature. The trees were inspected from the ground only on the basis of the Visual Tree Assessment method. No samples were taken for analysis. No decay detection equipment was employed. The survey does not cover the arrangements that may be required in connection with the laying or removal of underground services.

Branch spread in metres is taken at the four cardinal points to derive an accurate representation of the crown.

Root Protection Areas (RPA) are derived from stem diameter measured at 1.5 m above adjacent ground level (taken on sloping ground on the upslope side of the tree base).

Landmark Trees

20 Broadwick Street, London, W1F 8HT
Tel: 0207 851 4544 Mobile: 07812 989928
e-mail: info@landmarktrees.co.uk Web: www.landmarktrees.co.uk

Site: 89 Priory Road	1:100@ A2
Drawing Title: Tree Constraints Plan	May 2015

Key:

- Category A High Quality
- Category B Moderate Quality
- Category C Low Quality
- Category U Trees Unsuitable for Retention



Tree Position Approximate (not shown on original survey)

APPENDIX 6

ARBORICULTURAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT PLAN





NOTE:

This survey is of a preliminary nature. The trees were inspected from the ground only on the basis of the Visual Tree Assessment method. No samples were taken for analysis. No decay detection equipment was employed. The survey does not cover the arrangements that may be required in connection with the laying or removal of underground services.

Branch spread in metres is taken at the four cardinal points to derive an accurate representation of the crown.

Root Protection Areas (RPA) are derived from stem diameter measured at 1.5 m above adjacent ground level (taken on sloping ground on the upslope side of the tree base).

Landmark Trees

Landmark Trees

20 Broadwick Street, London, W1F 8HT
Tel: 0207 851 4544 Mobile: 07812 989928
e-mail: info@landmarktrees.co.uk Web: www.landmarktrees.co.uk

Site: 89 Priory Road	1:100@ A2
Drawing Title: Arboricultural Impact Assessment Plan	May 2015

Key:

- Category A High Quality
- Category B Moderate Quality
- Category C Low Quality
- Category U Trees Unsuitable for Retention



Tree Position Approximate (not shown on original survey)

Tree Protection Fencing