110 ST JOHNS ROAD BUXTON SK17 6UT

Report Prepared by

A L Smith M Arb CEnv MICFor F Arbor A Chartered Arboriculturist

Page 1/18

Report on trees at 110 St Johns Road, Buxton, SK17 6UT For Bennet Property Ltd Tree Health Consulting Ltd Ref: THC/2016/12/17 AS 17th December 2016

Summary

The purpose of this report is to provide an arboricultural assessment of the trees within and adjacent to the access drive and rear garden area of 110 St Johns Road, Buxton, SK17 6UT The assessment is based on BS5837-2012 Trees in Relation to Demolition, Design and Construction-Recommendations and the report will provide information on the trees and supply a Tree Constraints Plan to guide the design process. The report concludes that a suitable design for redeveloping the site has been achieved with the retention of the better-quality trees on site.

Page 2/18

Table of Contents

1.	INTRODUCTION	4
2.	SITE VISIT AND OBSERVATIONS	4
3.	APPRAISAL	5
4.	CONCLUSIONS	6
5.	RECOMMENDATIONS	7
Арр	pendix 1 Qualifications	8
Арр	pendix 2 Tree Schedule and Data	9
Арр	pendix 3 Works Required and Tree Protection Distances	10
Exp	planatory Notes	12
Fig	pendix 4 Plans 1 Tree Constraints Plan*	14
Fig	2 Arboricultural Impact Assessment Plan	15
LIN	IITING CONDITIONS/DISCLAIMERS	16

Page 3/18

1. INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 **Brief** I am instructed by Mr M Bennet of Bennet Property Ltd to survey the trees within and adjacent to 110 St Johns Road, Buxton, SK17 6UT to provide an arboricultural report to meet the requirements of BS5837-2012 Trees in Relation to Demolition, Design and Construction (2012)
- 1.2 **Qualifications and experience:** I have based this report on my site observations and the provided information, and I have come to conclusions in the light of my experience. I have experience and qualifications in arboriculture, and include a summary in Appendix 1.
- 1.3 **Documents and information provided:** I have been supplied the following information by Mr Bennet.
 - Topographical survey of the site
- 1.4 **Relevant background information:** The site is not within a Conservation Area and there are no Tree Preservation Orders on the site. However some of the neighbouring trees are protected.
- 1.5 **Scope of this report:** This report is only concerned with surveying the trees on the site and adjacent areas to BS5837. It includes a preliminary assessment based on the site visit and the documents provided, listed in 1.3 above.

2. SITE VISIT AND OBSERVATIONS

2.1 **Site visit:** I carried out an accompanied site visit on the 12th December 2016. All my observations were from ground level without detailed investigations and I estimated all dimensions unless otherwise indicated. I did not have access to trees outside the boundaries and have confined observations of them to what was visible from inside the site. The weather at the time of inspection was dry with reasonable visibility.

Page 4/18

- 2.2 **Brief site description:** The site is the rear garden area of 110 St Johns Road which is accessed by a driveway leading downhill to the garden. The boundaries of the site are with other residential properties containing several trees. The garden area is reasonably level and not considered exposed.
- 2.3 **Identification and location of the trees:** I have illustrated the approximate locations of the significant trees and groups on the sketch plan included as Figure 1 at Appendix 4 to this report. This plan is for illustrative purposes only and it should not be used for directly scaling measurements. All the relevant information on the trees is contained within this report and the provided documents.
- 2.4 **Collection of basic data:** I inspected each tree and have indicated the numbering on the site plan extract enclosed as Figure 1 in Appendix 4. For each tree, I collected information on species, height, diameter, maturity and potential for contribution to amenity in a development context. I have recorded this information in the tree schedule included as Appendix 2. I stress that my inspection was of a preliminary nature and did not involve any climbing or detailed investigation beyond what was visible from accessible points at ground level.

3. APPRAISAL

- 3.1 **Relevant references:** The tree protection distances used in Appendix 3 are based upon the recommendations in BS5837 Trees in Relation to Demolition, Design and Construction (2012)
- 3.2 Within the site no tree has been graded higher than a C under the BS5837 classification scheme. B category trees are located outside of the site boundaries.
- 3.3 On the eastern side of the drive is a linear feature of trees which appear to be in the neighbouring property. A Birch T2 overhangs the drive significantly leaning to the west. The tree offers little visual amenity as the neighbouring trees are large and the visual impact of the Birch is minimal.

Page 5/18

- 3.4 The remaining trees in this feature offer good visual amenity and a natural screen between the proposal area and the existing property. There are several branches that I have identified for removal to give clearance to the proposal site. None of these proposed works will affect the overall amenity of the trees in this area.
- 3.5 A small Beech T9 has been recommended for removal because of its poor potential and past pruning works have left an ill-defined form of limited visual amenity.
- 3.6 On the rear boundary of the property is an Ash T13 which is growing in an unsustainable location near to the fence. Removal and replacement of this tree now will prevent issue arising from its proximity to the neighbouring property to the north. To the west of this is a neighbouring Sycamore which offers good visual amenity and screening.
- 3.7 **The Proposal:** It is proposed to construct a single dwelling in the rear garden area. The Arboricultural Impact Assessment plan at Appendix 4 to this report indicates that the proposal is located outside of the Root Protection Areas of all the retained trees on site. The access drive is existing and no tree has been recommended for removal based on development needs.

4. CONCLUSIONS

- 4.1 Based on the above information and discussions, I summarise my conclusions as follows: -
 - No tree needs to be removed based purely on development requirements. Tree removals have been recommended based on arboricultural needs alone.
 - Retained trees to the northwest of the proposal can be protected by a linear fence separating the development from the trees retained therein.

Page 6/18

5. RECOMMENDATIONS

- 5.1 **Present requirements:** Works identified to the trees are made on arboricultural grounds alone and do not consider development requirements.
- 5.2 **Tree Protection Zones:** These are an indication of the trees soil volume requirements to both survive and prosper after a potential development of the site.
- 5.3 **Implementation of works:** All tree works should be carried out to BS 3998 *Recommendations for Tree Work* as modified by more recent research. It is advisable to select a contractor from the local authority list and preferably one approved by the Arboricultural Association. Their Register of Contractors is available free from The Malthouse, Stroud Green, Standish, Stonehouse, Gloucestershire GL10 3DL website www.trees.org.uk/contractors.htm.
- 5.4 **Statutory wildlife obligations:** The Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 as amended by the Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000 provides statutory protection to birds, bats and other species that inhabit trees. All tree work operations are covered by these provisions and advice from an ecologist must be obtained before undertaking any works that might constitute an offence.

A L Smith M Arb CEnv MICFor F Arbor A

Chartered Arboriculturist

Page 7/18

Appendix 1 Qualifications

Qualifications and experience of Andrew L Smith

1. Qualifications:

Certificate in Arboriculture Royal Forestry Society 1986 Technicians Certificate Arboricultural Association 1988 Master of Arboriculture Royal Forestry Society 1989 Advanced Diploma in Arboriculture and Community Forestry 2001 Cardiff University Accredited Expert Witness 2006 Licensed Practitioner of Quantified Tree Risk Assessment 2006 Professional Tree Inspection, Arboricultural Association / Lantra 2007

2. Professional Body memberships

Fellow of the Arboricultural Association Chartered Forester, Institute of Chartered Foresters Chartered Environmentalist, Society of the Environment Professional Member of the International Society of Arboriculture

- 3. **Practical experience:** I have been involved in arboriculture for 40 years and have experience of private and local authority work practices.
- 4. Continuing Professional Development: This is collated and monitored by the professional associations to which I belong and reaches and agreed amount hours per year.

Page 8/18

Tree No	Species	Crown Spread as radii from Trunk (m)			Height (M)	Age	Stem diameter (mm)	Lowest Structural branch	Life Estimate	Condition	
1	Sycamore	2	8	3	6	22	М	650	4	30	F
2	Birch	1	6	0	5	19	М	550	4	20	F
3	Lime	0	5	2	6	21	М	650	4	30	F
4	Beech	1	1	1	1	5	EM	150	1	20	F
5	Beech	2	2	6	6	22	М	550	4	30	F
6	Hawthorn	0	5	2	5	14	М	320	5	20	F
7	Sorbus	2	2	2	2	16	М	350	5	10	F/P
8	Lime	4	6	6	7	24	М	800	2	30	F
9	Beech	5	1	4	5	22	М	500	1	30	F
10	Beech	2	2	2	2	6	М	300	2	20	F
11	Cypress	1	1	1	1	5	М	100	0	20	F
12	Apple	4	4	5	1	5	М	250	1	20	F
13	Ash	4	5	6	1	15	М	350	2	20	F
14	Sycamore	7	6	7	2	18	М	550	4	20	F
G1	Cypress	2	2	2	2	6	М	200	0	20	F
G2	Cypress	2	2	2	2	8	М	150	1	20	F
G3	Cypress	2	2	2	2	6	М	190	0	20	F

Appendix 2 Tree Schedule and Data

Page 9/18

Appendix 3 Works Required and Tree Protection Distances

Tree No	Species	Remarks	BS 5837 Class	Arboricultural Works Required	TPZ (m²)	Radius of TPZ (m)
1	Sycamore	Stem leaning to south, ivy on stem and lower crown, obstructing lamp	B2	Sever ivy on stem, crown lift to clear light	191	7.8
2	Birch	Stem leaning to west, in neighbouring property, overhanging site by 7m, ivy on stem and lower crown	C2	Fell	137	6.6
3	Lime	Ivy on stem and lower crown, stem leaning to west	B2	Sever ivy on stem	191	7.8
4	Beech	Suppressed by neighbouring tree	C2	No tree works required	10	1.8
5	Beech	Reasonable form, in neighbouring property, overhanging site by 4m	B2	No tree works required	137	6.6
6	Hawthorn	Stem leaning to west, edge of drive, unsustainable location	U	Fell	46	3.8
7	Sorbus	In neighbouring property, covered in ivy	U	Fell	55	4.2
8	Lime	In neighbouring property, overhanging site by 4m, low fork at 1m	B2	Crown lift to 4m on drive side only	290	9.6
9	Beech	In neighbouring property, overhanging site by 1m, crown biased to north	B2	No tree works required	113	6.0
10	Beech	Poorly pollarded tree on raised bed	C1	Fell	41	3.6
11	Cypress	Two stems from ground level	C2	No tree works required	5	1.2
12	Apple	Crown biased to east, stem leaning to east	C2	Formative prune to restore balance	28	3.0
13	Ash	On rear boundary, crown biased to east, unsustainable location	C2	Fell	55	4.2
14	Sycamore	In neighbouring property, overhanging site by 2m	B2	No tree works required	137	6.6
G1	Cypress	On raised area above drive	C2	No tree works required	18	2.4

Page 10/18

			BS 5837	Arboricultural Works	TPZ	Radius
Tree No	Species	Remarks	Class	Required	(m²)	of TPZ (m)
	Cypress	Linear feature along boundary	C1	Reduce to 4m in height		
G2	Cypiess		GT	and maintain	10	1.8
G3	Cypress	Group of 3 trees minor screen value	C2	No tree works required	16	2.3

Page 11/18

Explanatory Notes

- **Measurements/estimates:** All dimensions are estimates unless otherwise indicated.
- **Species:** The species identification is based on visual observations and the common English name of what the tree appeared to be is listed first. In some instances, it may be difficult to quickly and accurately identify a particular tree without further detailed investigations. Where there is some doubt of the precise species of tree, it is indicate it with a '?' after the name in order to avoid delay in the production of the report. The species listed for groups and hedges represent the <u>main</u> component and there may be other minor species not listed.
- **Mathematical abbreviations:** > = Greater than; < = Less than
- Height: Height is estimate height to the nearest metre.
- **Spread:** The maximum crown spread is visually estimated to the nearest metre from the centre of the trunk to the tips of the live lateral branches.
- **Diameter:** These figures relate to 1.5m above ground level and are recorded in millimetres. If appropriate, diameter is measured with a diameter tape. 'M' indicates trees or shrubs with multiple stems.
- Estimated Age: Age is <u>estimated</u> from visual indicators and it should only be taken as a <u>provisional guide</u>. Age estimates often need to be modified based on further information such as historical records or local knowledge. Y= < 20Yrs, SM = Half the expected mature age, EM = Two Thirds the expected mature age, M = Mature age, OM = Over mature going into senescence, V = Veteran
- **Distance to Structures:** This is estimated to the nearest metre and intended it as an indication rather than a precise measurement.
- **BS 5837** Trees in Relation to Construction- Recommendations 2005 lists 4 categories that trees should be placed into to aid in the Design, Planning and Implementation of Construction works near trees, these categories are as follows
- Category U Trees (less than 10 Years)
- Those trees that are 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
- Category A Trees (More than 40 Years) Those of such high quality and value, that they are able to make a substantial contribution to the finished development.
- Category B Trees (minimum of 20 years) Those of moderate quality and value and that are able to make a significant contribution to the finished development.
- Category C Trees (Minimum of 10 years) Those of low quality and value and can remain until new planting can be established or young trees below 150mm diameter.
- Categories A B and C have 3 sub categories to cover either Arboricultural (1) Landscape
 (2) or Conservation (3) values

Page 12/18

- **Condition** P = Poor F = Fair G = Good
- Tree Protection Zone (TPZ) M² The area needed surrounding a tree that contains sufficient rooting volume to ensure its survival.
- Radius of Tree Protection Zone (M) Suggested minimum radius of a circular enclosure that ensures the tree has sufficient rooting volume left undisturbed.
- Works Required
- Formative prune generally entails cleaning through the canopy to remove dead, dying, crossing and rubbing branches. It also includes the removal of epicormic and basal growth, the removal of any unbalanced or misshapen limbs, this will leave the tree in a safe attractive and desirable form
- Crown lift to a specified height is when lower branches are removed to allow either highway access or pedestrian access. This work is specified where the author has felt that damage may occur to the tree if lower branches are left as they are.
- Remove ivy instructions mean that at least 300mm should be removed from the base of any ivy growing into a trees canopy; the ivy should be allowed to dieback and then be removed from the tree.
- Monitor refers to an annual check on the condition of a fork that may be prone to movement within it.

Page 13/18

Appendix 4 Plans



Fig 1 Tree Constraints Plan*

Page 14/18



Fig 2 Arboricultural Impact Assessment Plan

*Electronic copies available in pdf or dwg format

Page 15/18

LIMITING CONDITIONS/DISCLAIMERS

Unless stated otherwise

1. The Service

1.1 Tree Health Consulting Ltd agrees to supply arboricultural consulting services of a preliminary nature or a more thorough service as advised or as commissioned.

2. <u>Fees</u>

2.1 The client(s) will settle the agreed fee in full, within 14 days of receiving the invoice. Reports will remain the property of Tree Health Consulting Ltd until full payment has been received. No liability is accepted for the contents of a report that is not paid in full. Any queries should be notified to Tree Health Consulting Ltd within 7 days of the invoice date.

2.2 If the client(s) fails to pay within the time specified in 2.1 then Tree Health Consulting Ltd shall charge the client(s) interest on the outstanding fee, both before and after any judgment, at the rate of 4% above the Midland Bank base rate, until payment is made in full (A part of a month being treated as a full month for the purposes of calculating interest).

2.3 In the event that it is necessary to recover any outstanding fees from the client(s), the client(s) will fully reimburse any costs and expenses incurred during the recovery period, including court costs. Tree Health Consulting Ltd reserves the right to make a charge for every letter sent and telephone/fax call made, in connection with the recovery.

2.4 Should the arboriculturist be unable to complete the site investigation as a result of conditions outlined in 3.5, then Tree Health Consulting Ltd will charge the client(s) the costs of travel and time spent.

3. Site Investigation

3.1 The scope of the site investigation is preliminary in nature, unless otherwise agreed with the client(s). Where a more detailed investigation is required, the client(s) will be advised accordingly.

3.2 No investigation will be made of any covered, inaccessible, or underground structures (unless specifically stated).

3.3 Investigation of Private Covenants is to be the responsibility of the client/landowner or agent.

3.4 Site investigations are undertaken by experienced and suitably qualified arboriculturists. Observations are taken from ground level only, within the curtilage of the site and public

Page 16/18

accessible areas, where this can be done safely and without undue difficulty. Binoculars are used where necessary. Tree heights, age range and future growth potential are approximate. Unless stated otherwise: 1) information contained within our reports covers only those trees that were examined and reflects the condition of those trees at the time of the inspection: and 2) the inspection is limited to visual examination of the subject trees from ground level only and without dissection, excavation, probing or coring. There is no warranty or guarantee, expressed or implied, that problems or deficiencies of the subject trees may not arise in the future.

3.5 During the site investigation if the arboriculturist considers their personal safety is at risk, or that they would breach the conditions of the Health and Safety at Work Act (1974), then they are entitled to abandon the investigation and advise the client(s) accordingly.

3.6 The inspection may require on-site soil profile analysis and excavation and we cannot be held responsible for damage to any underground services not made known to us by the client/landowner or agent.

3.7 Identification of fungi, insects, or tree disorders is based on field observations and does not include a laboratory analysis (unless specifically stated).

3.8 Soil profile samples are extracted using a hand auger. The identification of soil profile types and soil conditions is based on field observations. No samples are taken for laboratory analysis (unless specifically stated).

4. The Report

4.1 If any part of the report is lost, or altered without the written consent of Tree Health Consulting Ltd, then the entire report becomes invalid.

4.2 The general format of reports is a licensed/certified product and cannot be shown, copied or distributed to third parties without the permission of Tree Health Consulting Ltd. No liability is accepted for the contents of the report, other than to that of the client(s).

4.3 The report will purport not to express any opinion or comment as to the condition or structural integrity of any building and no reliance should be made on any such comments.

4.4 The report does not represent legal advice and no reliance should be placed on any such comments.

4.5 If tree/s are on neighbouring land, the tree owner is ultimately responsible and therefore we would advise that the neighbouring tree owner check with his/her insurance company in order to ascertain if adequate building insurance cover is available in the event of any claims arising from the action of the tree/s.

4.6. Trees are dynamic living organisms and constantly change; therefore, all trees to be retained on site should be further inspected every two years by a qualified Consulting Arboriculturist.

Page 17/18

4.7. Scale drawings, technical land surveys and accurate tree plotting data will be supplied if necessary and at extra cost. Non-scale sketch plan drawings may be included as part of the report.

5. Insurance Cover

5.1 All work carried out by Tree Health Consulting Ltd is covered by a £5,000,000 Third Party, Public Liability insurance and a £500,000 professional Indemnity insurance.

6. Quality of Craftsmanship

6.1 When appointing a Tree Contractor, please use only suitably qualified and experienced companies (The Local Authority Tree Officer may be able to provide a select list of such companies) and always check that they carry Public and Products Liability Insurance with a minimum of £2 million cover and the relevant Employers Liability Insurance. All tree works must conform rigorously to BS 3998 (1989) 'Recommendations for Tree Work' and as modified by research more recent. Any stump treatment (poisons) must be carried out by a licensed chemical operative.

6.2 Tree Health Consulting Ltd will not accept liability for any works undertaken by any other companies, or contractors.

7. <u>Statutory Provisions</u>

7.1 Before authorising these, or any other tree works, you should contact your Local Planning Authority to ascertain if the trees are the subjects of any Tree Preservation Order or if they are within a Conservation Area, as if either applies, statutory permission will be required before any works can take place

Page 18/18