

320160838P

Tree Constraints Appraisal

in Relation to Proposed Residential Redevelopment at



**Cibola, Pendleton, Clitheroe,
Lancashire, BB7 1PT**

Prepared by:

Bowland 
Tree Consultancy Ltd

September 2016

TREE CONSTRAINTS APPRAISAL CIBOLA, PENDLETON

CONTENTS

1. TREE SURVEY SCHEDULE & BS5837:2012 TABLE 1
2. TREE CONSTRAINTS PLAN

Contact Details

Bowland Tree Consultancy Ltd
7 Lakeland Close
Billington
Lancashire
BB7 9LN

T: 01254 825098
E: info@bowlandtreeconsultancy.co.uk

Client: Mr T Hutchison

Job Ref-	BTC1186
----------	---------

Job Ref-	BTC1186
----------	---------

Headings and Abbreviations

where areas are located 01-810, or are inaccessible for any other reason, and accurate measurements or other information cannot be taken then the information provided is estimated and is duly marked with a "W" symbol

Where trees are located off-site, or are inaccessible for any other reason, and accurate measurements or other information cannot be taken then the information provided is estimated and is duly suffixed with a "W" symbol

TREE SURVEY SCHEDULE FOR ARBORICULTURAL CONSTRAINTS APPRAISAL

Site: Cibola, Pendleton, Clitheroe, Lancashire, BB7 1PT

Client: Mr T Hutchison

Surveyor: Jennie Keighley MSc TechBIOA

Survey Date: 14 September 2016

Job Ref: BTC1186

Page: 2 of 3

No.	Species	Height	Stem Diam.	Branch Spread	Branch & Canopy Clearances	Life Stage	PC	General Observations and Comments	Management Recommendations	ERC	Cdt Grade	RPA (m ²)	RPA Radius (m)
T7	Sycamore	7.5	210	N 2 E 2 S 3 W 2.5	2-W 2.5	Y	G	- Growing on opposite side of brook. - Bifurcates at a height of 1.75m. - Crown biased south-west due to large neighbouring Ash tree.		40+	C1	20	2.52
G1	2no. Pissards Plum, 1no. Beech	≤ 7	≤ 280	N ≤ 3 E ≤ 5 S ≤ 5 W ≤ 3	0.5 ≥ 1	Y-M	M-G	- Moderately spaced group in front garden of property. - Leaf abscission has occurred early in central Plum in comparison to neighbouring Plum, with majority of crown defoliated and neighbour's still almost full. - Beech has crown heavily biased south and slight stem lean south.		10+	C1	≤ 35	≤ 3.36
G2	3no. Apple	≤ 6.5	≤ 1x180 2x160 (ms)	N ≤ 2.5 E ≤ 3 S ≤ 3.5 W ≤ 3.5	1.5-N ≥ 1	SM-M	M-G	- Widely spaced group in front garden of property. - All have slight stem leans south and crowns biased south, away from large Ash trees to north.		10+	C1	≤ 38	≤ 3.47
G3	2no. Common Ash	≤ 15	≤ 480#	N ≤ 6 E ≤ 6 S ≤ 5 W ≤ 6	8-E ≥ 3	EM	P	- Widely spaced pair growing in hedge H1 and therefore unable to inspect bases. - Western tree in an advanced stage of decline, has only one leader remaining and has evidently lost other leaders and numerous primary branches in the past, and has heavy ivy to lower crown. - Eastern tree in a moderate stage of decline, bifurcates at a height of 5m, where a third leader has been lost in the past, has a moderate stem lean north, towards road, widespread deadwood to a maximum diameter of 150mm, and a noticeably thinning crown. - Eastern tree also has a defective union with swelling at a height of 10m with 250mm diameter secondary live branch likely to fall over road. - Short projected life expectancies due to terminal state of decline.	- Options: 1. Carry out risk assessment and remedial tree works in order to retain trees in the short-term; or 2. Remove due to short projected life expectancies.	<10	U	≤ 104	≤ 5.76
G4	3no. Common Ash	≤ 18	≤ 480	N ≤ 6 E ≤ 6 S ≤ 6 W ≤ 6	5-N ≥ 1.5	EM	M	- Located on neighbouring land and therefore not inspected in detail. - Growing in neighbouring churchyard, either very close to or in contact with stone boundary wall. - Central tree severely displacing boundary wall, which now bows heavily into site.		20+	B2	≤ 104	≤ 5.76
G5	1no. Common Ash, 1no. Weeping Ash	≤ 18	≤ 450#	N ≤ 7 E ≤ 5 S ≤ 7 W ≤ 6	6-S ≥ 2	EM	P	- Growing on opposite side of brook. - Common Ash is located on neighbour's side of fence. - Weeping Ash has severe stem curvature west from a height of 1.5m to a height of 3m and has several tear-out wounds mid-crown where branches up to 200mm diameter have been lost. - Both trees have small leaves, slight to moderate thinning of crowns, and occasional deadwood to a maximum diameter of 100mm.		10+	C1	≤ 92	≤ 5.4

TREE SURVEY SCHEDULE FOR ARBORICULTURAL CONSTRAINTS APPRAISAL

Site: Cibola, Pendleton, Clitheroe, Lancashire, BB7 1PT

Client: Mr T Hutchison

Surveyor: Jennie Keighley MSc TechnicianA

Survey Date: 14 September 2016

Job Ref: BTC1186

Page: 3 of 3

No	Species	Height	Stem Diam.	Branch Spread	Branch & Canopy Clearance	Life Stage	PC	General Observations and Comments	Management Recommendations	ERC	Cat. Grade	RPA (m²)	RPA Radius (m)
G6	Cypress, Rhododendron, Maple	≤ 9	≤ 250	N ≤ 3 E ≤ 3 S ≤ 3 W ≤ 3	0 ≥ 0	Y-SM	G	■ Very closely spaced garden shrub bed comprising various large shrubs and small trees.	■	10+	C1	≤ 28	≤ 3
H1	Holly, Hawthorn	≤ 2	≤ 75#	≤ 1.5 Wide	N/A ≥ 0	Y	G	■ Managed boundary hedge to front of property.	■	10+	C2	N/A	≤ 0.9
H2	Leyland Cypress	≤ 2	≤ 100#	≤ 1 Wide	N/A ≥ 0.25	Y	G	■ Managed, fragmented boundary hedge to rear of property.	■	10+	C2	N/A	≤ 1.2

BS5837:2012 Table 1 – Cascade Chart for Tree Quality Assessment

Category and definition	Criteria (including subcategories where appropriate)	Identification on plan
Trees unsuitable for retention (see Note)		
Category U Those in such a condition that they cannot realistically be retained as living trees in the context of the current land use for longer than 10 years	- Trees that have a serious, irremediable, structural defect, such that their early loss is expected due to collapse, including those that will become unviable after removal of other category U trees (e.g. where, for whatever reason, the loss of companion shelter cannot be mitigated by pruning) - Trees that are dead or are showing signs of significant, immediate, and irreversible overall decline - Trees infected with pathogens of significance to the health and/or safety of other trees nearby, or very low quality trees suppressing adjacent trees of better quality <i>Note: Category U trees can have existing or potential conservation value which it might be desirable to preserve; see BS5837:2012 paragraph 4.5.7.</i>	Red
	1. Mainly arboricultural qualities 2. Mainly landscape qualities 3. Mainly cultural values, including conservation	
Trees to be considered for retention		
Category A Trees of high quality with an estimated remaining life expectancy of at least 40 years	Trees that are particularly good examples of their species, especially if rare or unusual; or those that are essential components of groups or formal or semi-formal arboricultural features (e.g. the dominant and/or principal trees within an avenue)	Trees, groups or woodlands of particular visual importance as arboricultural and/or landscape features
Category B Those of moderate quality and value: those in such a condition as to make a significant contribution. A minimum of 20 years is suggested.	Trees that might be included in the high category, but are downgraded because of impaired condition. Examples include the presence of remediable defects including unsympathetic past management and minor storm damage	Trees with clearly identifiable conservation or other cultural benefits
Category C Those trees of low quality and value: currently in adequate condition to remain until new planting could be established - a minimum of 10 years is suggested - or young trees with a stem diameter below 150 mm	Trees not qualifying in higher categories	Trees with very limited conservation or other cultural benefits
	<i>Note -- Whilst C category trees will usually not be retained where they would impose a significant constraint on development, young trees with a stem diameter of less than 150mm should be considered for relocation</i>	Grey

DISCLAIMER

Survey Limitations: Unless otherwise stated all trees are surveyed from ground level using non-invasive techniques. The disclosure of hidden crown and stem defects, in particular where they may be above a reachable height or where trees are ivy clad or in areas of ground vegetation, cannot therefore be expected. All obvious defects, however, are reported. Detailed tree safety appraisals are only carried out under specific written instructions. Comments upon evident tree safety relate to the condition of said tree at the time of the survey only.

Unless otherwise stated all trees should be re-inspected annually in order to appraise their on-going mechanical integrity and physiological condition. It should, however, be recognised that tree condition is subject to change, for example due to the effects of disease, decay, high winds, development works, etc. Changes in land use or site conditions (e.g. development that increases access frequency) and the occurrence of severe weather incidents are also significant considerations with regards tree structural integrity and trees should therefore be re-assessed in the context of such changes and/or incidents and inspected at intervals relative to identified and varying site conditions and associated risks.

Where trees are located wholly or partially on neighbouring private third-party land then said land is not accessed and our inspection is therefore restricted to what can reasonably be seen from within the site. Stem diameters of trees located on such land are estimated. Any subsequent comments and judgments made in respect of such trees are based on these restrictions and are our preliminary opinion only. Recommendations for works to neighbouring third-party trees are only made where a potentially unacceptable risk to persons and/or property has been identified during our survey. Where significant structural defects of third-party trees are identified and associated management works are considered essential to negate any risk of harm and/or damage then we will first attempt to inform the site occupier of the issues and, if not possible, then inform the relevant Council. Where a more detailed assessment is considered necessary then appropriate recommendations are set out in the Tree Survey Schedule.

Where tree stem locations are not included on the plan(s) provided then they are plotted at the time of the survey using, where appropriate and/or practicable, a combination of measurement triangulation and GPS co-ordination. Where this is not possible then locations are estimated. Restrictions in these respects are detailed in the report.

The tree survey and any report information provided is intended as a guide to identify key tree related constraints to site development only. As such, the potential influence of trees upon existing or proposed buildings or other structures resulting from the effects of their roots abstracting water from shrinkable load-bearing soils is not considered herein. The tree survey information in its current form should not therefore be considered sufficient to determine appropriate foundation depths for new buildings. Accordingly, an updated survey, with reference to the current NHBC Standards Chapter 4.2 - Building Near Trees, must therefore be prepared for the specific purpose of informing suitable foundation depths subsequent to planning approval being granted. The advice of a structural engineer must also be sought with regard to appropriate foundation depths for new buildings.

Copyright & Non-Disclosure Notice: The content and layout of this report are subject to copyright owned by Bowland Tree Consultancy Ltd, save to the extent that copyright has been legally assigned to us by another party or is used by Bowland Tree Consultancy Ltd under license. This report may not be copied or used without our prior written agreement for any purpose other than those indicated.

Third Parties: Any disclosure of this document to a third party is subject to this disclaimer. The report was prepared by Bowland Tree Consultancy Ltd at the instruction of and for use by our client, as named. This report does not in any way constitute advice to any third party who is able to access it by any means. Bowland Tree Consultancy Ltd excludes to the fullest extent lawfully permitted all liability whatsoever for any loss or damage arising from reliance on the contents of this report.

