

### Marcus Foster Arboricultural Design & Consultancy BA (Hons) | NDArb | TechCert (ArborA) | EGS.Dip

### Arboricultural Survey <u>& Report</u>

#### Site details:

Junior School Branch University College School Holly Bush Vale London NW3 6QN

#### **Client details:**

University College School Frognal London NW3 6XH

#### Date of Report:

#### 9th January 2018

#### **Report Prepared by:**

Marcus Foster BA (Hons) NDArb. Tech Cert (Arbor.A) EGS.Dip (Dist.)

Marcus Foster Arboricultural Design & Consultancy Contact: +44(0)7812 024070 Email: marcus@mfdesignconsultancy.com

# **Contents**

- 1. Introduction
- 2. Survey Methodology
- 3. Limitations
- 4. Findings
- 5. Tree Work Specifications
- 6. Appendices
  - A: Tree Survey B: Site Plan
- 7. References

#### 1. Introduction

1.1 This report has been commissioned to survey, assess and provide recommendations for all trees within the Junior Branch, University College School, Holly Bush Vale, London, NW3 6QN.

1.2 A site visit was made on Monday 18th December 2017 to survey and assess the trees. The weather at the time of inspection was cloudy and overcast, but dry.

1.3 The survey was carried out further to the instruction of Afshan Sohali, on behalf of University College School and a report and maintenance recommendations have been compiled for the trees, which have been surveyed.

1.4 The report takes into account the condition of 4 trees (T1 - T4). Notes have also been made to newly planted trees on the eastern boundary within *Section 4*.

1.5 The details of the subject trees are set out in the tree survey table in *Appendix A*. The trees were surveyed on the date and time shown above and the tree survey assessment information for the trees describing size, condition and surroundings is found in this appendix.

1.6 The trees surveyed are shown in a site plan, *Appendix B*, and this corresponds to the tree survey results table, *Appendix A*.

1.7 This report and the opinions within it have been produced without prejudice by Marcus Foster. A qualified arboriculturist, Marcus Foster holds the National Diploma in Arboriculture, the Arboricultural Association's Technicians Certificate in addition to a BA (Hons) in History. Work experience within the industry includes work as an arboricultural contractor, contracts manager for an Arboricultural Association Approved company and a Local Authority Tree Preservation Officer.

1.8 No documentation has been supplied relating to the trees for the compilation of this report.

#### 2. Survey Methodology

2.1 The site survey included 4 trees (T1 - T4) within the site as shown in the survey, *Appendix A*, and also highlighted on the site plan, *Appendix B*.

2.2 All trees were surveyed from ground level. The heights of the trees were generally estimated, as it was not generally possible due to access and difficult site topography to use a clinometer. The diameters of the trunks were measured using a diameter tape.

2.3 The following information was recorded for each tree and is shown in the Tree Schedule included in *Appendix A*:

- Number: an identity number which cross references locations shown on the plan in Appendix A with the schedule in Appendix B.
- Species: listed by common names
- Tree Height: approximate height in metres
- Tree Spread: approximate height in metres
- Stem diameter: measured in millimetres (mm) and taken at 1.5m above ground level
- Age Class: Y (young); EM (early-mature); M (mature); OM (over-mature)
- Visual condition: G (good); F (fair); P (poor)
- Vigour: G (good); F (fair); P (poor); D (dead)
- Structural conditions: Specific comments relating to each tree
- Management recommendations
- Priority Rating (time management proposal)

2.4 The information contained within the report reflects the condition of the specimens examined at the time of the inspection. As the inspection was only visual no guarantee can be given concerning the condition of the wood at present in any of the trees inspected and furthermore that no future problems or deficiencies may arise.

2.5 Information recorded in the tree survey is expanded in the report findings and a maintenance programme specified in the recommended schedule of works has been included.

#### 3. Limitations

- 3.1 No soil excavation or root inspection was carried out.
- 3.2 This report only considers conditions at the time of inspection.
- 3.3 No internal decay devices/ invasive tools were used during this site survey.
- 3.4 Soil conditions have not been investigated.

#### <u>4. Findings</u>

4.1 The survey included all trees as specified within the site survey plan and survey findings, located within boundary of the site and neighbouring where relevant. A works specification has been included within the 'Recommendations' section of the Tree Survey: *Appendix A*, also specified within *Section 5* below. This highlights all works, recommended to be carried out as:

#### • High Priority Works (H)

• These works are recommended to be carried out within the next 3 months from *March 2018* onwards.

or

- Medium Priority Works (M)
  - These works are recommended to be carried out within 1 year of the survey having been carried out.

or

- Low Priority Works (L)
  - These works are recommended to be carried out within the next 3 years. Obviously within the next 2-3 years it is probable that additional works will be required within this schedule.

4.2 Tree Survey Summary: Tree works are recommended on the timescales as highlighted below:

#### High Priority Works

T3 & T4

#### • Medium Priority Works

T1 & T2

#### Low Priority Works

No works currently recommended

4.3 Remedial works have been recommended in *Section 5* below, with priority ratings specified for each tree / area within the site.

#### 4.4 Newly Planted Trees

The strip of land on the eastern boundary includes approximately 10 x newly planted trees of a variety of species includeng:

Hornbeam (*Carpinus spp*) Cherry (*Prunus spp*) Mimosa (*Acacia spp*)

These trees should be watered on a regular basis for the initial 2 x growing seasons and continued to be mulched for a weed suppressant and moisture retentive base surrounding the trees

#### 5. Recommended Tree Works Specification

#### 5.1 HIGH PRIORITY Trees recommended for works to be carried out March 2018 onwards:

T3 Alder Fell to ground level and grind out stump Provide replacement planting

T4 Sycamore Fell to ground level and grind out stump Provide replacement planting

#### 5.2 MEDIUM PRIORITY Trees recommended for works to be carried out 2018:

T1 Lime Crown reduce height and spread 25% to previous reduction points (4m height and 3-4m spread) Crown thin 15 % Remove all epicormic growth to 5m

T2 Horse Chestnut Crown reduce to previous reduction points leaving some soft epicormic growth pruning of branch lengths of up to 4.5m Crown thin 10-15% Crown lift any remaining low growth to 4m

#### 5.3 LOW PRIORITY

No works are currently recommended as Low Priority Works.

# 6. Appendices

### Appendix A

**Tree Survey:** 

Junior Branch University College School Holly Bush Vale London NW3 6QN

Marcus Foster - Arboricultural Design & Consultancy - Tree Survey	teport Prepared by: Marcus Foster	Priority rating	Σ	Σ	Т	т
		Recommendations	Crown reduce height and spread 25% to previous reduction points (4m height and 3-4m spread) and crown thin 15 %. Remove all epicormic growth to 5m	Crown reduce to previous reduction points leaving some soft epicormic growth - pruning of branch lengths of up to 4.5m. Crown lift any remaining low growth to 4m	Fell to ground level and grind out stump	Fell to ground level and grind out stump
	Date: 18th December 2017 Survey & I	Comments	Tree growing from hard landscape directly adjacent Epicormic growth at base is regularly removed. Generally structurally sound, with good buttress roots despite limited root plate area adjacent to boundary wall. Main union at 4m height is sound; cavities on main stem well occluded. Originally pollarded at 8m - most previous crown reduction points at 10-12m. Tree was last crown reduced approx 3-4 years ago and has now a fully re-developed crown.	Tree is located very close to building but has a long standing relationship with proximity to building - no signs of hard landscape alterations surrounding the tree from visual inspection. The tree is generally structurally sound at the base with buttress roots - some exposed; increased compensatory growth over kerbstone to north. There is weeping from the main stem on north west side at 1.0m which is historic and also at 2.2m on south side of main stem. Main stem generally sound, large branches removed (low) but have generally cocluded. Tree crown reduced on a cyclical basis - last reduced approximately 3.4 years ago with good epicomic re-growth having developed since growth of 4.4.5m which now extends over building with encroaching growth.	Accentuated buttress roots at base. Decay evident on main stem to north and east at base extending to at least 2.5m height. Decay extends through main union to north Eastern stem. Some light occluding growth but insignificant in relation to extent of decay and high target location. Cavity also on west side at 1.5m height. Previously reduced specimen	Tree has good buttress roots at base. Excessive shedding of bark for species. Cavity at 1.6m height to south west, minimum 200mm depth and minimum 150mm width from direct probe; occluding growth fair but decay significant. Cavity also to south east where cavity is 120mm depth. Decline throughout crown particularly to east and in upper crown with deadwood throughout some major. Low vigour for species; high target area / busy localion
		Vigour	U	U	g	U
		Visual Condition	ш	щ	Ð	U
	Site: University College School - Junior School	Age Class	Σ	Σ	M	×
		Crown Spread (m)	თ	5	9	ω
		Stem Diameter (mm)	700	1110	350	510
		Height (m)	17	6	ø	5
		Species	Lime	Horse Chestnut	Alder	Sycamore
		Tree No.	11	12	Т3	74

# Appendix B

Site plan:

Junior Branch University College School Holly Bush Vale London NW3 6QN

UCS JUNIOR BRANCH TREE SURVEY SITE PLAN DECEMBER 2018



Map and canopies not to scale

#### <u>Appendix C: Photographs:</u> Junior Branch, University College School, Holly Bush Vale, London, NW3 6QN</u>

















### 7. References

- 1. *Principles of Tree Hazard Assessment and Management,* Lonsdale, D. (Department for Transport, Local Government and the Regions, 1999).
- 2. The Body Language of Trees, Mattheck, C. and Breloer, H. (HMSO, 1994).
- 3. Trees in Britain, Philips, R. (Pan Books, 1978).
- 4. Diagnosis of III Health in Trees, Strouts, R. and Winter, (TSO, 1994).

Report prepared by Marcus Foster: January 2018