Private client

Tree quality survey for Athlone House, Hampstead Lane, London N6

June 2016

Catherine Bickmore Associates Ltd
ENVIRONMENTAL CONSULTANCY

LF 3.09, Lafone House,
11 - 13 Leathermarket Street,
London, SE1 3HN

Tel: 020 7357 6700
E-mail: info@bickmoreassociates.co.uk
Website: www.bickmoreassociates.co.uk

CONTENTS

Drawing
725/04 Athlone House: tree quality plan

725/05: Athlone House: preliminary tree protection plan

SUMMARY

A tree quality survey was undertaken of trees within in the vicinity of Athlone House, Hampstead Heath, a property contained within Highgate Conservation Area. The survey was undertaken to accompany the planning application for the restoration and extension of the buildings and followed recommendations provided in BS 5837:2012. It was undertaken in April 2016, updating previous surveys.

Of note were three mature oaks, and a yew tree on the eastern side of the property. Some of the mature trees were in sub optimal condition and remedial tree surgery work is required together with further investigation of cavities. Trees around the Cottage and Gatehouse were mostly self set.

A preliminary tree protection plan with recommendations has been prepared to cover the proposed works for Athlone House and adjacent buildings. Within the root protection areas of retained trees no dig construction methods would be undertaken to reduce the effects of excavation including for hard surfaces for the drive. Mostly trees scheduled for removal were in poor condition and /or of a small size of relatively little significance.

Accompanying the planning application landscape proposals for grounds include for planting additional trees.

1 INTRODUCTION

Introduction

1.1 A tree quality survey was undertaken in April 2016 in the vicinity of Athlone House to inform decisions on tree retention and protection measures relating to proposals for the restoration and extension works within the immediate vicinity of Athlone House. The site is located in Highgate Conservation Area. The survey was undertaken to accompany the planning application.

Outline

1.2 Section 2 outlines the survey method, with the survey findings and general recommendations presented in section 3. Section 4 provides a summary of general recommendations for tree protection and works with conclusions presented as the final section 5. Illustrations of the trees are included on the photosheet. Appendix I is a schedule of the tree survey.

2 METHOD

Survey

2.1 The tree quality survey was undertaken from ground level with a visual inspection of trees from all sides where accessible. A pro forma (Appendix I) were completed recording measurements of the physical characteristics, and assessing tree quality and condition following recommendations in BS5837: 2012. This information enabled an assessment of the tree retention category as set out in Table 1 of BS 5837:2012. Sub categories (1,2,3) relate to arboricultural and landscape qualities and cultural values, however the retention value for each sub category has equal weighting. The values inevitably include an element of subjectivity.

2.2 To calculate the root protection area the girths were measured using either a girth tape or a calliper and in accordance with the procedures set out in the BS 5873:2012. The survey used the topographical survey for measurements relating to tree location, height and average spread. It is likely that there are minor differences to these original measurements. Where trees have not been included in the topographical survey approximate location was estimated by eye.

Assessment

2.3 An assessment was made of the implications to the trees of the likely temporary and permanent construction works relating to the restoration and extension of Athlone House and associated buildings with recommendations for tree protection measures forming part of the preliminary tree protection plan.

2.4 The survey area is contained within the Highgate Conservation Area which means that trees with a trunk diameter of 75mm or greater at a height of 1.5m are protected and require consent to undertake any works not approved by planning consent.

Constraints

2.5 The survey was undertaken from ground level on 26 April 2016, a fine dry sunny day. Survey work was subject to seasonal and access conditions reflecting the conditions on site at the time of the survey.

3 ANALYSIS

Overview

3.1 A total of 43 no. trees were included in the survey. Drawing 725/04 shows their arboricultural retention quality and the calculated root protection area. The trees are described in groups with recommendations as to protection measures (Drawing 725/05).

3.2 Five trees have been graded a moderate quality category (B) on account of arboricultural or landscape qualities, with an estimated remaining life of at least 20 years.

Trees along eastern boundary

Oak (nos.905/906/912)

3.3 Oak trees are one of the characteristic species of the Hampstead Heath. Three mature oaks were located in the north eastern part of the site in the vicinity of the entrance off Hampstead Lane.

3.4 Oak 905 and 906 were located either side of the entrance, off Hampstead Lane. However, previous poor maintenance and possibly their location close to previous buildings/hard standing (associated with the former Hospital use) may have affected their condition. Both these oaks were severely lopped over 10 years ago resulting in a poor form, in particular oak 906 with regrowth now forming a pollard (photo P2).

3.5 Oak 905 is located to the immediate south side of the Gatehouse with a foot path to its north and hard standing to its south. The oak included decay in the lower trunk recorded as part of an investigation in 2004. Die back (photo P1) that was recorded in the crown in 2007 still persisted in 2012 and 2016. A comparison of photographs from that time also showed a thinner canopy cover in this part of the tree suggesting on going decline in vigour.

3.6 The tree leans to the west (photo P1 & P7). Previous recommendations to reduce sail area of the tree through reducing its height by not less than 30 per cent to a minimum of 4.5m have not been undertaken. This tree continues to provide a significant risk to the adjacent Gatehouse building, and the entrance drive to Athlone House. The tree was classed as grade B quality on account of its current condition and life expectancy of over 20 years assuming recommended tree works were undertaken.

3.7 Prior to the start of works tree protection barriers should be erected to delineate the root protection area outside existing hard standing. The position of the fencing would need to be adjusted to accommodate the works to the Gatehouse and wall, with the reduced secondary protected area to remain in place for the duration of the construction works for Athlone House. Sections of the tree barrier could be incorporated as a part of the fencing to define the construction area for the contractors Drawing 725/05).The barriers would need to be removed to enable the landscape works to be undertaken.

3.8 The landscape proposals (Drawing no .9135/01) show the hard standing area to the immediate south side of the tree would be removed to provide medium to high shrub planting, planting of birch and magnolia trees and amenity grass. Hard standing for the two drives would be required on the western and southern sides of the root protection area. The proposed euro bin store on the eastern side of the tree would require the demolition and erection of a short section of wall together with a small area of hard standing also within the root protection area.

3.9 The removal/breakup of the hard standing and wall should be undertaken following a method statement and under the supervision of an arboriculturalist. The construction of the drives and euro bin surface within the root protection area should apply a no dig method. Note: this would result in a slight increase in levels to be accommodated in the detailed design of the drives.

3.10 The tree would benefit from the removal of hard standing and associated kerbs to the immediate south and west in the area where new shrub planting and lawn are proposed. The three proposed trees within the tree canopy and root protection area should positioned as far as possible to avoid future conflict with the canopy and severance of the tree roots. Also,

under the canopy care would be required to select shrubs of a lower height to avoid future conflict, with any new trees located outside the root protection area. The preparation of the ground for planting within the root protection area should be undertaken by hand so as not to sever main roots over 25mm in diameter and subject to a method statement.

3.11 Oak 906 is located along the eastern boundary of Athlone House, and to the south side of a wall constructed by the entrance gate as part of the subdivision of Athlone House from Caenwood Court. Previously there was hard standing along the southern side of the oak with a building to the north. Now there is a hedge and raised planting bed together with hard standing on the east side, with grass and shrubs on the south western and northern sides. A group of birch have been planted to the north side of the entrance wall on the edge of the canopy.

3.12 The dense canopy of the tree provided some containment of views of the north western part of Caenwood Court and Athlone House (photo P5). The regrowth from previous lopping appeared vigorous however there were significant cavities and decay in both the upper trunk and close to ground level with at least part of the trunk hollow (photo P3). The condition of the tree needs to be monitored annually on account of the internal decay. Re pollarding is recommended on account of likely weak union of branch regrowth. In the absence of re pollarding the continued re growth could result in future structural instability and failure close to vulnerable locations of the entrances of Caenwood Court and Athlone House. This tree merited a category B retention classification mainly for landscape qualities.

3.13 Oak 912 on the eastern boundary with Caenwood Court retained a reasonable form although the crown was slightly unbalanced (photo P4 & 5). At c18m height it was significant in certain restricted views in the immediate vicinity along Hampstead Lane and between Athlone House and the north western side of Caenwood Court. A road was previously located along the western side of the trunk and has since been grassed over and a line of laurel bushes established within the canopy spread. Some hard standing also remained within the vicinity. There were areas of hard standing on its western side.

3.14 Minor die back on the eastern side of the crown was been removed recently on account the potential risk to occupants of Caenwood Court, however minor die back in the upper crown has developed since. Wet brown slime mould was previously recorded in a cavity at the base of the trunk with a further cavity recorded at a higher level. The recommendations of 2004 survey to lighten the three main branches by about 2m and to re balance the crown have still to be implemented. Regular inspection of the tree should be undertaken on account of its proximity including overhang to the central drive way of Caenwood Court. The tree provides a significant landscape feature between the two properties with a Category B retention classification.

3.15 Prior to the start of works tree protection barriers tree protection barriers should be erected along side the root protection area of oak trees 906 and 912 (Drawing 725/05). This should remain in place for the duration of the construction works for Athlone House and could be incorporated as a part of the fencing to define the construction area available for the contractors.

3.16 Landscape proposals around the two oak trees include areas of grass to the west side, medium to tall shrubs to the east, and lines of holm oak to the north and south. Under the canopy care would be required to select shrubs of a lower height to avoid future conflict. As far as possible trees planted should be outside the root protection area of the oaks to reduce future potential suppression and some adjustment to present proposed positions would be beneficial. Areas of remaining hard standing within the root protection area should be broken up/removed following a method statement so as to not damage underlying roots. Outside the hardstanding areas, the preparation of the ground for the landscape works should be undertaken by hand so as not to result in severance of larger roots over 25mm in diameter.

3.17 Subject to the removal of the existing hard standing the proposals would be an improvement with the replacement of existing hard standing by a grass surface providing an opportunity for feeding and greater infiltration.

Yew (955)

3.18 Yew 955 was a mature tree located on slightly sloping ground with a reasonable form and condition (photo P6). It is classed as category B retention quality. Yew 955 was previously adjacent to the southern side of the single storey accommodation block extension to Athlone House and had the majority of the lower branches removed exposing the lower trunk. These branches have re-grown to provide an indented lower canopy to the ground unsynchronised with the main canopy. Removal of the lower canopy back to expose the main trunk is recommended and included as part of the landscape proposals. The north eastern part of the root protection area has been affected by changes in ground levels as a result of landscape works within Caenwood Court.

3.19 A driveway is proposed to the west side of the tree beyond the root protection area. The adjacent landscape proposals include tree planting and tall to medium high shrubs mostly boarder line to the root protection area with grassland within the root protection area.

3.20 Prior to the start of works tree protection barriers (Drawing 725/05) should be erected to incorporate the root protection area, and areas for planting to the north and south. Preparation of the ground for tree and shrub planting and areas of grassland within the root protection area should be undertaken by hand so as not to result in severance of larger roots. As far as possible the planting should avoid areas with a high density of roots.

Flowering cherry (956)

3.21 This mature cherry was located in open grass to the south of the yew. It was showing significant signs of decline including extensive die back in the crown (photo P11) and should be removed Category U class. This tree would be replaced by new tree planting including two Catalpa bignoides 'Aurea' and yew hedging as part of the landscape proposals. On its eastern side such planting of trees and shrubs would enable the establishment and long term development of trees along the eastern garden boundary.

Leyland cypress (1-9)

3.22 A row of nine semi mature Leyland cypress were planted sometime in 2009 along the boundary with Caenwood Court to provide immediate screening (photo P 9). Most retained the tree planting guys, but establishment has been slow. In 2016 the tree canopies were beginning to join suggesting that they were becoming more established. Their slow rate of establishment may be attributed to localized the poor ground conditions including the possible remains of a foundation slab (pers. com). The landscape proposals include for the replacement of the cypress with holm oak and pine planted as semi mature nursery stock (Dwing 9135/01). The alleviation of compacted ground and removal/breaking- up of any remaining underlying hard standing is recommended to improve growing conditions for the proposed planting along this section of the boundary.

Group 902-904

3.23 To the south west of the existing entrance, group no 902-904 comprised two semi mature birch and a Swedish whitebeam (photo P7) in an area of open grass adjacent to hard standing. The whitebeam no 904, in particular had developed into a reasonable tree although still relatively small in height it formed a local feature by the entrance and was allocated a category B retention class. It would be affected by the realignment of the drives and therefore would be removed.

3.24 Of the silver birch, no. 902 had died and should be removed at any rate. No. 903 was allocated a category C retention class-it included a minor cavity with decay and was of no particular merit and would be removed as part of the proposals.

3.25 The landscape proposals include an avenue of liquid amber trees planted as semi mature nursery stock along the drive and would replace Group 902-904 (drawing 9135/01 and 725/05). Removal of hard standing and ground compaction would be required to aid the long term establishment of the new planting.

Trees to the south/west side of Athlone House (nos 958, 957, 64-65)

3.26 Two trees of no special merit were located to the south side of the house. At the southern end of the terrace by the corner of Athlone House no. 958 was a multi stemmed moribund hawthorn (photo P9). The majority of the trunk was dead with parts split off although the western part of the canopy was regenerating. It was allocated a U category as unsuitable for retention and would be removed as part of plans for the restoration of Athlone House including the extension of the terrace.

3.27 Tree no.957, a semi mature purple leaved birch (photo P10), was located in the lawn on the south side of Athlone House. It was a straggly specimen with a poor growth rate and was allocated a Category C retention class, of no particular merit to the immediate or wider landscape. Although it would be possible to retain, it is included for removal within the landscape proposals.

3.28 Two young self set ash (no 64-65) had established along the terrace on the western side of the house. No 64 was multi-stemmed growing out of the wall and was classed as U category unsuitable, with no. 65 growing out of a mound, and of limited merit. Both would be removed as part of the terracing and banking works.

Trees along the edge of the northern boundary including by the gatehouse, cottage and the eastern edge of the woodland (nos. 12-21, 22- 23, 66-71, 959, 965)

3.29 Nos. 22 and 23, an ash and a birch, were located along the northern boundary wall as semi mature self-set volunteers. The ash was growing out of the wall. Both had significant growth of ivy on the lower trunks and slight lean, with no.23 being suppressed. Neither of the trees were of any merit and allocated a Category C retention class and would be replaced by medium to tall shrub planting as part of the landscape proposals.

3.30 Trees nos 11 cedar, 959 cherry, and 965 false acacia, were located on the eastern edge of the woodland to the north west side of the main building. Cedar no 11 was the tallest tree on the eastern edge of the wooded area (photo 14), however significant branch drop in 2011 has resulted in a lopsided crown and impaired condition. It has been allocated a Category C retention class.

3.31 A leaning cherry no 959 on a banked area had a low fork at 1.5 m and leaned. Growth was suffering from being suppressed by neighbouring trees, in addition to heavy ivy cover. There was die back in the crown. It had a relatively low life expectancy and was of little merit, allocated a category U unsuitable class. On account of its woodland location it should be removed to provide more space for adjacent trees.

3.32 The adjacent false acacia no 965 (photo P15) at some 12m in height at the eastern edge of the wooded area was growing on a bank from the edge of a wall. It had a slight lean, with a significant ivy cover (which should be removed from the trunk on account of the weight). It was allocated a Category C retention class. It would benefit from the removal of the adjacent cherry no 959 which could be undertaken as part of the conservation management plan for the grounds. The acacia would be retained as part of the development proposals.

3.33 Prior to the start of the works, and on account of the proximity to the north east corner of the wooded area to the north western part of the works including the steps and bank extension, a protective barrier is recommended (Drawing 725/05). The fencing should extend to incorporate the majority of the root protection area of the cedar no 965. The barrier would also restrict access by construction personnel to the wider area of the grounds. The barrier may restrict the extent of the working area for the construction of the terrace. Much would depend on the extent of the earthworks and the detailed design.

3.34 Trees (nos. 12-21 and 66-71), within the immediate vicinity of the Gatehouse and Cottage were mostly semi mature and self-set and growing amongst scrub (photos P12 & 13). The majority were ash with others including birch, rhus, sycamore and bay. Many were growing in unsuitable locations from the base of walls and garden fences and therefore should be removed regardless of any proposed works. Landscape proposals include a new entrance with associated planting of medium to high shrubs and multi-stemmed snowy mespil trees.

4 GENERAL RECOMMENDATIONS FOR TREE PROTECTION AND WORKS

4.1 The recommendations presented in this report form a preliminary tree protection plan with further information to be incorporated once details of the design and construction works are available. The plan should be supported by an arboricultural method statement produced prior to the start of works on site and subject to a planning condition.

4.2 Tree protection should be in accordance with BS 5837:2012. This provides guidance as to the minimum distances of protective barriers and the type of fencing (figure 2): weld mesh panels fixed onto a scaffold framework with all-weather exclusion notice. Drawing 725/05 is superimposed onto the development proposals (as shown on the landscape plan). It shows the theoretical tree root retention area based on the BS calculation of 12 times the dbh at 1.5m (or otherwise for several stems as per BS 5837: 2012) and the protective barrier fencing which has accommodated hard surfaces. Tree protection also would be required for the false acacia no. 965 to the north west of the main building. No protection would be required for trees on the southern side of Athlone House as none of these would be retained.

4.3 As part of the contract documents it is recommended that a tree protection plan (Drawing 725/05) should locate the positions of the protective barrier fencing. Fencing should be erected prior to the commencement of the start of works. The fenced off area should only be entered for essential works.

4.4 In most instances retained trees would be located away from areas likely to be affected by the construction works (Drawing 725/05). In vulnerable locations the extent of the root damage can be minimised by supervision of the excavations by an arboriculturalist including the excavation of the roadways. Kerbs may need to bridge over roots to reduce the need for severance.

4.5 No details of service trenches are available. Service trenches should be located away from the canopy spread of the trees but where this is not possible should follow the trenchless solutions as included in BS5837:2012.

4.6 No storage of materials should take place under the canopy spread of retained trees.

4.7 Surface water drainage from the driveway should be directed towards any adjacent trees. The proposed ground source heat pump has been located to avoid the root protection areas.

4.8 Some tree works are recommended but these would only be undertaken following approval of the arboricultural officer responsible for the Highgate Conservation Area. All pruning should take branches back to a branching point and be in accordance with recommendations given in BS 3998:2010 tree work-recommendations and be undertaken by a specialist arboriculture contractor.

4.9 Planting of trees and shrubs is proposed along the eastern and northern boundaries of the property over land that has been mostly compacted by previous buildings, and construction activities (Drawing 725/05). To aid successful establishment remediation measures would be necessary to reduce compaction.

4.10 The initial maintenance of new planting is of importance, particularly in the first five years of establishment. This would be addressed in the landscape management plan. The plan would address on-going monitoring of the condition of mature retained trees including on account of health and safety.

5 CONCLUSION

5.1 The restoration and extension of Athlone House and associated buildings would retain most of the significant trees within the vicinity of the House.

5.2 Subject to more details contained in a tree protection plan/arboricultural method statement submitted prior to the start of the works, the retained trees would be protected and the application of no dig construction methods applied.

5.3 A limited number of small sized, low value trees are recommended for removal and would be replaced with other trees elsewhere as part of the landscape proposals submitted with the application (Drawing 9135/01).

P1: Oak no. 905 with lost leader, die back in the crown and slight lean

P2: Oak no. 906 with former lopping, pollarded branches with a relatively vigorous re-growth, and internal cavities.

P3: Oak no. 906 with cavity at base of trunk

P4: Oak 912 by eastern boundary

P5: Dense low canopy of oak no. 905 next to taller oak no. 912 showing slight lopsided crown

P6: Yew no. 955 with epicormic re growth on the lower trunk creating a lower canopy,

P7: Swedish whitebeam no. 904 near the entrance between birch no. 901-902 and oak no. 905, also showing existing hard standing

P8: Row of nine Leyland cypress along eastern boundary planted as a temporary screen

P9: Moribund hawthorn no. 958 with much dead wood on south western corner of the terrace of Athlone House

P10: Purple leaved birch no. 957 to the south of Athlone House

P 11: Cherry no. 956 near eastern boundary with sparse canopy

P12: Ash no. 21 ingrowing into garden fence near cottage

P13: Ash no. 17 growing from base of a drain.

P14: Cedar no. 11 on northern eastern edge of woodland belt showing lopsided canopy on account of previous branch drop.

P15: False acacia and cherry nos. 959/965 along northern boundary bank with dense ivy cover

APPENDIX I: TREE SURVEY SCHEDULE

TREE RETENTION CATEGORY SUMMARY (BS 5837:2012) ♦

LIFE EXPECTANCY		AGE CLASS ■	
A	<10 years	A	Young
B	10+ years	B	Semi-mature
C	20+ years	C	Early mature
D	40+years	D	Mature
		E	Over mature

◙ Category	♦ Criteria (1 = Arboricultural, 2 = landscape, 3 = cultural)
A High quality	Rare/unusual/essential components; screening/softening effect; conservation/cultural value
B Moderate quality	Impaired condition; form distinct landscape features; conservation/cultural benefits
C Low quality	No added landscape value; low screening benefit; limited conservation/cultural benefits
U Unsuitable	Irremediable structural defect/dead/impacts other trees/unviable when U trees removed

Ref.	Species	Size								Indications of Physiological/Structural Condition (S = significant, M=minor)																Prelim recom.				Notes	
		Diameter (cm) (of each stem at 1.5m)	Height (m) from topo survey	Crown clearance Height (m)	Height/directn 1st sig branch	Spread (m) (N)	Spread (m) (S)	Spread (m) (E)	Spread (m) (W)	Dead	Root damage	Suckers	Attachments, ivy etc.	Bark damage	Cavities	Splits	Fungi/canker/decay	Disease/infestation	Lost leader	Stubs	Dead wood	Pollard	Weak forks	Suppressed	Leaning	Age class ■	Tree life expectancy (yrs) ◙	Retention category ♦	Retention criteria ♦	Fell	Remove dangerous branch	Prune	Further investigation	TPO/Conservation Area	
901	birch	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	X																			U					stump
902	birch	19	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	X																			U	X				
903	birch	25		0	3.5 N	2	1	1	2						M		M									C	A	C						Minor cavity with rot
904	Swedish whitebeam	22, 23, 23, 30		1.5	1.5 S	2	3	2	2.5																	D	C	B						Soil over root plate
905	oak	104		2	2.5 S	5	4	4	5				IM		X		D		X	X	M				M	D	C	B	2/3			X	X		Soil over root plate, die back in crown, broken off main branch at height, cavities associated with branch loss, unbalanced crown, tree work to reduce sail
906	oak	108		3.5	3 S	5	5	5	5					X	S		D		X	X		X				D	C	B	2/3			X			Cavities at base & height from branch loss/lopping, hollow. Re-pollard
912	oak	104		3	4 W	4	5	4	4						X						M					D	C	B	2/3						Cavities 2 on w side at height on main branch & trunk
1	Leyland cypress	21		0	-	1	1	1	1																	B	B	C							Guyed
2	Leyland cypress	19		0	-	1	1	1	1																M	B	B	C							Guyed

Tree quality survey date: 26/04/16 Name of Surveyor: CB/MM

Job. Ref.: 725 Athlone House

LIFE EXPECTANCY

A	<10 years
B	10+ years
C	20+ years
D	40+years

AGE CLASS ■

A	Young
B	Semi-mature
C	Early mature
D	Mature
E	Over mature

TREE RETENTION CATEGORY SUMMARY (BS 5837:2012) ♦

◙ Category	♦ Criteria (1 = Arboricultural, 2 = landscape, 3 = cultural)
A High quality	Rare/unusual/essential components; screening/softening effect; conservation/cultural value
B Moderate quality	Impaired condition; form distinct landscape features; conservation/cultural benefits
C Low quality	No added landscape value; low screening benefit; limited conservation/cultural benefits
U Unsuitable	Irremediable structural defect/dead/impacts other trees/unviable when U trees removed

Ref.	Species	Size								Indications of Physiological/Structural Condition (S = significant, M=minor)																Prelim recom.				Notes	
		Diameter (cm) (of each stem at 1.5m)	Height (m) from topo survey	Crown clearance Height (m)	Height/directn 1st sig branch	Spread (m) (N)	Spread (m) (S)	Spread (m) (E)	Spread (m) (W)	Dead	Root damage	Suckers	Attachments, ivy etc.	Bark damage	Cavities	Splits	Fungi/canker/decay	Disease/infestation	Lost leader	Stubs	Dead wood	Pollard	Weak forks	Suppressed	Leaning	Age class ■	Tree life expectancy (yrs) ◙	Retention category ♦	Retention criteria ♦	Fell	Remove dangerous branch	Prune	Further investigation	TPO/Conservation Area	
3	Leyland cypress	20		0	-	1	1	1	1																	B	B	C						Guyed
4	Leyland cypress	18		0	-	1	1	1	1																	B	B	C						Slack guy, gap to 5
5	Leyland cypress	17		0	-	1	1	1	1																	B	B	C						Slack guy, narrow canopy
6	Leyland cypress	17		0	-	1	1	1	1																	B	B	C						Guyed. narrow canopy
7	Leyland cypress	14		0	-	1	1	1	1																	B	B	C						Slack guy, narrow canopy, few lower branches
8	Leyland cypress	17		0	-	1	1	1	1																	B	B	C						Slack guy
9	Leyland cypress	19		0	-	1	1	1	1																	B	B	C						Guy, thicker canopy than adjacent trees
955	yew	44, 45		0	0.5 W	5	5	4.5	5																	D	C	B						Lower canopy over-shaded by main canopy, Soil over root plate
956	flowering cherry	46		0.5	1.5 NE	4	2.5	4	4			M		M							X					E	B	U						Sparse canopy with die back
957	purple leaved birch	23		1	2 N	2	2	2	1																M	C	C	C						Straggly
958	hawthorn	3, 3, 4		0	0.5 N	2	5	1	1.5												S					E	B	U	3?	?					Moribund, collapsed with regrowth
959	cherry	38		2	3 S		5	3					IS												S	D	A	U		?					On mound, mostly ivy

Tree quality survey date: 26/04/16 Name of Surveyor: CB/MM
Job. Ref.: 725 Athlone House

TREE RETENTION CATEGORY SUMMARY (BS 5837:2012) ♦

LIFE EXPECTANCY		AGE CLASS ■	
A	<10 years	A	Young
B	10+ years	B	Semi-mature
C	20+ years	C	Early mature
D	40+years	D	Mature
		E	Over mature

◙ Category	♦ Criteria (1 = Arboricultural, 2 = landscape, 3 = cultural)
A High quality	Rare/unusual/essential components; screening/softening effect; conservation/cultural value
B Moderate quality	Impaired condition; form distinct landscape features; conservation/cultural benefits
C Low quality	No added landscape value; low screening benefit; limited conservation/cultural benefits
U Unsuitable	Irremediable structural defect/dead/impacts other trees/unviable when U trees removed

Ref.	Species	Size								Indications of Physiological/Structural Condition (S = significant, M=minor)																	Prelim recom.				Notes	
		Diameter (cm) (of each stem at 1.5m)	Height (m) from topo survey	Crown clearance Height (m)	Height/directn 1st sig branch	Spread (m) (N)	Spread (m) (S)	Spread (m) (E)	Spread (m) (W)	Dead	Root damage	Suckers	Attachments, ivy etc.	Bark damage	Cavities	Splits	Fungi/canker/decay	Disease/infestation	Lost leader	Stubs	Dead wood	Pollard	Weak forks	Suppressed	Leaning	Age class ■	Tree life expectancy (yrs) ◙	Retention category ♦	Retention criteria ♦	Fell	Remove dangerous branch	Prune	Further investigation	TPO/Conservation Area	
965	false acacia	65		2	2.5 SW		6.5	4					IS												X	D	B	C						Growing from wall, much ivy
11	cedar	91		2	6 S		7	9																		D	C	C						Lop sided canopy from fallen braches- callous regrowth beginning over cuts.
22	ash	9, 23		3	3S	c.1	3	2	3				IS								M				M	C	B	C						Ivy on lower trunk
23	birch	27		7	6S	2	3	2	3				IS											X	M	D	B	C						Ivy on lower trunk
64	ash	6, 9, 10		0.5	1 W	1.5	2	1	1.5																	A	B	U		X				Growing out from wall
65	ash	10		1.5	1.5 N	1.5	1	1	1			X													X	A	B	C		X				Volunteer on mound, exposed roots
12	birch	9, 9, 14		1	1.5 E		2																			A	C	C						On mound
13	birch	6, 11, 12		1.5	1.5 W		1.5																			A	C	C						On mound
71	sycamore	7		1.5	1.5 E	0.5	1	2	0.5										X		X					A	B	U		X				Growing from wall
70	rhus	8, 9		2	1.5 S		2																			A	B	C						
14	rhus	5, 6, 9, 9, 9		1.5	1.5 S		3						IM													B	B	C						
15	ash	11, 12		2.5	2.5 S		2																			A	B	U		X				Growing from wall

Tree quality survey date: 26/04/16 Name of Surveyor: CB/MM
Job. Ref.: 725 Athlone House

TREE RETENTION CATEGORY SUMMARY (BS 5837:2012) ♦

LIFE EXPECTANCY		AGE CLASS ■	
A	<10 years	A	Young
B	10+ years	B	Semi-mature
C	20+ years	C	Early mature
D	40+years	D	Mature
		E	Over mature

◙ Category	♦ Criteria (1 = Arboricultural, 2 = landscape, 3 = cultural)
A High quality	Rare/unusual/essential components; screening/softening effect; conservation/cultural value
B Moderate quality	Impaired condition; form distinct landscape features; conservation/cultural benefits
C Low quality	No added landscape value; low screening benefit; limited conservation/cultural benefits
U Unsuitable	Irremediable structural defect/dead/impacts other trees/unviable when U trees removed

Ref.	Species	Size								Indications of Physiological/Structural Condition (S = significant, M=minor)															Prelim recom.				Notes	
		Diameter (cm) (of each stem at 1.5m)	Height (m) from topo survey	Crown clearance Height (m)	Height/directn 1st sig branch	Spread (m) (N)	Spread (m) (S)	Spread (m) (E)	Spread (m) (W)	Dead	Root damage	Suckers	Attachments, ivy etc.	Bark damage	Cavities	Splits	Fungi/canker/decay	Disease/infestation	Lost leader	Stubs	Dead wood	Pollard	Weak forks	Suppressed	Leaning	Age class ■	Tree life expectancy (yrs) ◙	Retention category ♦	Retention criteria ♦	Fell	Remove dangerous branch	Prune	Further investigation	TPO/Conservation Area	
69	ash group	4, 6, 6, 8, 10		1.5	1.5 S		1																			A	C	C						
68	ash	4, 4, 7, 9, 12		1.5	2 S		2																			A	B	U		X				Growing from wall
21	ash	16		1.5	2 E			2																		B	B	U		X				In growing in fence
20	ash	16		3	2.5 E			2					IM								M			X		B	B	U		X				Die back in crown
16	ash	12		3	3 S			1					A													A	C	U		X				Clementis in canopy, too close to house, straggly
19	ash	15, 18, 23		1	2 E			4					IM													B	C	U		X				Too close to wall
18	ash	14, 18		2	1.5 W			2					IM													B	C	U		X				Too close to wall
17	ash	11, 14, 22		2	2.5 E	2	5	4	3												M					B	C	U		X				Too close to wall & building
66	bay	6, 7, 7, 8, 9, 9, 10		0	-	1	1																			B	C	C						
67	bay	7 x 5 stems		0	-	0.5	1																			B	C	C						

Tree quality survey date: 26/04/16 Name of Surveyor: CB/MM
Job. Ref.: 725 Athlone House

Catherine Bickmore Associates
ENVIRONMENTAL CONSULTANCY

20/06/16