Tree Survey

in Relation to Retrospective Planning Application
for Formation of Outbuilding to Serve Holiday Let at

Thorneyholme Hall, Dunsop Bridge, Lancashire, BB7 3BB

Prepared by:

Bowland
Tree Consultancy Ltd

April 2021

CONTENTS

Contact Details

Bowland Tree Consultancy Ltd
Unit 2
First Floor
11 Cannon Street
Preston
Lancashire
PR1 3NR

T: 01772 437150
E: info@bowlandtreeconsultancy.co.uk

CONTROL SHEET

Project No.:	BTC2209
Site:	Thorneyholme Hall, Dunsop Bridge, Lancashire, BB7 3BB
Agent for Client:	PWA Planning
Council:	Ribble Valley Borough Council
Survey Date:	3 November 2016 (reviewed 17 April 2021)
Surveyed by:	Jennie Keighley MSc MArborA
Reviewed by:	Phill Harris MSc BSc(Hons) HND MArborA CEnv MICFor
Prepared by:	Jennie Keighley & Phill Harris
Checked by:	Joseph Lambert BSc(Hons) FdSc MArborA
Date of Issue:	4 May 2021
Version No:	1

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.

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.

Statutory Tree Protection: It is the client's responsibility to check for the presence of any statutory tree protection measures, such as the site's location within a Conservation Area and/or the presence of any Tree Preservation Orders, directly with the applicable Council's planning department prior to scheduling or carrying out any tree works. In turn, it is also the client's responsibility to check for the need for a felling licence with the Forestry Commission prior to scheduling or carrying out any tree works. Bowland Tree Consultancy Ltd cannot be held responsible for any decisions made by the client to prune or remove trees where any such statutory protection exists.

TREE SURVEY SCHEDULE		Surveyor:	Jennie Keighley MSc MArborA	Page: 1 of 2
Site:	Thorneyholme Hall, Dunsop Bridge, Lancashire, BB7 3BB	Survey Date:	3 November 2016	
Agent for Client:	PWA Planning	Job Ref:	BTC1208	

No.	Species	Height	Stem Diam.	Branch Spread		Branch & Canopy Clearances	Life Stage	PC	General Observations and Comments	Management Recommendations	ERC	Cat. Grade	RPA (m²)	RPA Radius (m)
T1	Wellingtonia	30	1580	N E S W	8 8 6 6	14-W 10	M	G	▪ Bifurcates into two codominant leaders at a height of 4m. ▪ Crown slightly biased north and east. ▪ Strip of slight black bark staining with sappy exudate on western side from base to a height of 2.5m. ▪ Tree retained in context of development under consideration. ▪ Understood, from information provided by agent, that tree was protected in accordance with Arboricultural Method Statement (AMS) relating to previous planning application, and that the additional decking to its perimeter was constructed on existing ground levels without any associated ground excavation works.	▪	10+	A1/3	707	15
T2	Holly	11	1x420 1x280 1x260 (ms)	N E S W	5 5 3 3	1.5-S 2	PM	P	▪ Tree removed in accordance with previous planning approval.	▪	<10	U	146	6.81
T3	Wellingtonia	27	1090	N E S W	4.5 4.5 5 4.5	12-NW 8	M	G	▪ No visible defects. ▪ Tree retained in context of development under consideration.	▪ .	40+	A1	537	13.08
T4	Beech	18	680	N E S W	12 9 7 10	3-W 3	M	G	▪ Flared buttress root to west. ▪ Four primary leaders from a height of approximately 3m. ▪ Crown suppressed south due to presence of neighbouring tree. ▪ Tree retained in context of development under consideration.	▪ .	40+	A1/2	209	8.16
T5	Sycamore	20	740	N E S W	7 3 3 7	4-SE 5	M	M	▪ Tree understood to have been removed in accordance with previous planning approval.	▪	<10	U	248	8.88
T6	Scots Pine	25	390	N E S W	3 4 1 2	19-N 19	M	M	▪ Tree understood to have been removed in accordance with previous planning approval.	▪	<10	U	69	4.68

Headings and Abbreviations:

No. Allocated sequential reference number - Tree ('T'), Group ('G'), Woodland ('W') or Hedge ('H') reference number - refer to plan and to numbered tags where applicable
Species: Common name
Height: In metres, to nearest half metre – where possible approximately 80% are measured using an electronic clinometer and the remainder estimated against the measured trees. In the case of Groups and Woodlands the measurement listed is that of the highest tree
Stem Diam.: Stem diameter in millimetres, to nearest 10mm - measured and calculated as per Annex C of BS5837:2012. MS = multi-stemmed, TS = twin-stemmed
Branch Spread: Crown radius measured (or estimated where considered appropriate) from the four cardinal points (north, east, south and west) to give an accurate visual representation of the crown
Branch & Canopy Clearances: Existing height above ground level, in metres, of first significant branch and direction of growth (e.g. 2.5-N) and of canopy at lowest point – to inform on crown to height ratio, potential for shading, etc.
Life Stage: Estimated age class - Y = young, SM = semi-mature, EM = early-mature, M = mature, PM = post-mature
PC: Physiological Condition - a measure of the tree'(s)' overall vitality, i.e. D = Dead, MD = Moribund, P = Poor, M = Moderate, G = Good
General Observations and Comments: Comments relating to the tree'(s)' overall condition and any other pertinent factors including structural defects, current and potential direct structural damage, physiological decline, poor form, etc.
Management Recommendations: Either Preliminary or In Consideration of the Proposal - In the case of Arboricultural Constraints Surveys the recommended management works only take exiting site and tree circumstances and conditions into account and not approved developments. Arboricultural Impact Assessment and Method Statement related Surveys take the approved development into consideration with recommendations made accordingly. More than one option may be given if considered appropriate
ERC: Estimated Remaining Contribution - in years as per BS5837:2012 (i.e. <10, 10+, 20+, 40+)
Cat. Grade: Category Grading - tree retention value listed as U, A, B or C - in accordance with BS5837:2012 Table 1
RPA m²: Root Protection Area in m² - calculated area around the tree that must be appropriately protected throughout the development process in order avoid root damage
RPA Radius (m): Root Protection Area Radius - in metres measured from the centre of the stem to the line of tree protection
 # (Estimated Dimensions): 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 "#" symbol

Bowland Tree Consultancy Ltd

TREE SURVEY SCHEDULE		Surveyor:	Jennie Keighley MSc MArborA	Page: 2 of 2
Site:	Thorneyholme Hall, Dunsop Bridge, Lancashire, BB7 3BB	Survey Date:	3 November 2016	
Agent for Client:	PWA Planning	Job Ref:	BTC1208	

No.	Species	Height	Stem Diam.	Branch Spread		Branch & Canopy Clearances	Life Stage	PC	General Observations and Comments	Management Recommendations	ERC	Cat. Grade	RPA (m^2)	RPA Radius (m)
G1	2no. Weeping Ash	≤ 16	≤ 560	N E S W	≤ 4 ≤ 2.5 ≤ 5 ≤ 5	6-S ≥ 0	M	P	▪ Group retained in context of development under consideration. ▪ Easternmost tree: ▪ 300mm diameter primary branch has failed in past, leaving 1m+ long tear out wound at a height of around 5m. ▪ Large swelling on east side of stem at a height of 3m around a fully occluded pruning wound. ▪ Sounding with a nylon hammer indicates some moderate decay within area of swelling. ▪ Light epicormic growth arising from swelling wound. ▪ Crown belongs to only one remaining primary branch. ▪ Westernmost tree: ▪ Larger primary branch lost at a height of 6m with a tear out wound. ▪ Smaller primary branch removed at a height of 4m. ▪ Remaining crown purely composed of epicormic growth emerging from wounds.	▪	<10	U	≤ 142	≤ 6.72
G2	7no. Yew, 2no. Holly	≤ 16	≤ 470	N E S W	≤ 5 ≤ 5 ≤ 5 ≤ 5	4-N ≥ 0	EM-M	M-G	▪ Closely to widely spaced group. ▪ Most twin-stemmed from base. ▪ Several trees have had leaders and branches removed in the past. ▪ Largest Yew has slight stem lean west.	▪	20+	B2	≤ 100	≤ 5.64
G3	approx. 15no. Western Red Cedar, Leyland Cypress, Yew, Ornamental Cypress, Holly	≤ 16	≤ 1x430 1x330 (ts)	N E S W	≤ 4 ≤ 4 ≤ 5 ≤ 4	1-S ≥ 1	EM	D-G	▪ Closely to loosely spaced group. ▪ One Western Red Cedar has had a rope tied around its stem at a height of approximately 4m to 5m, which is now fully embedded within the stem, and the tree has died as a result.	▪	20+	B2	≤ 133	≤ 6.5
G4	2no. Beech, 2no. Corsican Pine, 1no. Sycamore, 1no. Oak	≤ 27	≤ 800	N E S W	≤ 7 ≤ 7 ≤ 9 ≤ 11	5-E ≥ 3	M	M	▪ Closely spaced group. ▪ Crowns suppressed east. ▪ 11kv uninsulated electrical cables pass within 2m of crown of Beech to south of group.	▪	20+	B2	≤ 290	≤ 9.6
G5	6no. Apple	≤ 4	≤ 75	N E S W	≤ 1 ≤ 1 ≤ 1 ≤ 1	0.5-E ≥ 1	Y	M	▪ Closely spaced group of planted as a double row.	▪	10+	C2	≤ 3	≤ 0.9
G6	3no. Common Yew, 1no. Scots Pine	≤ 13	≤ 7x365 (ms)#	N E S W	≤ 9 ≤ 6 ≤ 9 ≤ 7	1-N ≥ 2	M	G	▪ Closely spaced linear group. ▪ All have multiple primary leaders from a height of 1m to 2m.	▪	40+	A2	≤ 422	≤ 11.59

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 *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.*			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	Trees, groups or woodlands of significant conservation, historical, commemorative or other value (e.g. veteran trees or wood-pasture)	Green
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 present in numbers, usually as groups or woodlands, so they form distinct landscape features which attract a higher collective rating than they might as individuals. But which are not, individually, essential components of formal or semi-formal arboricultural features. For example, trees of moderate quality within an avenue that includes better, A category specimens. Or trees which are internal to the site, therefore individually having little visual impact on the wider locality	Trees with clearly identifiable conservation or other cultural benefits	Blue
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 present in groups or woodlands, but without this conferring on them significantly greater landscape value, and/or trees offering low or only temporary screening benefit	Trees with very limited conservation or other cultural benefits	Grey
	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			

Important: The original version of this plan was produced in colour, which is essential to the plan's interpretation and usability. As such, a monochrome copy should not be relied upon

KEY

T = Individual Tree
G = Group of Trees

Please refer to associated Tree Survey Schedule for specific details in respect of items below:

Tree Categorisations:

Those to be Considered for Retention:

Category 'A' Tree/Group
Those of a High Quality with an Estimated Remaining Life Expectancy of at Least 40 Years

Category 'B' Tree/Group
Those of a Moderate Quality with an Estimated Remaining Life Expectancy of at Least 20 Years

Category 'C' Tree/Group
Those of Low Quality with an Estimated Remaining Life Expectancy of at Least 10 Years, or Young Trees

Those Considered Unsuitable for Retention:

Category 'U' Tree/Group
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

Note: Trees with their identification numbers labelled in grey are recommended for removal in the context of the development

Root Protection Areas (RPAs):

RPAs
Area(s) of Ground Around Trees that Should be Protected Throughout Development Works with Protective Fencing to form a Construction Exclusion Zone - see appended Temporary Protective Fencing Specification

Project:
THORNEYHOLME HALL
DUNSOP BRIDGE
LANCASHIRE
BB7 3BB

Agent for Client:
PWA PLANNING

Title:
TREE CONSTRAINTS PLAN
in Relation to Retrospective Planning Application for Formation of Outbuilding to Serve Holiday Let

Scale:	1:500@A3
Survey Date:	April 2017
Drawn by:	JK & PH
Checked by:	JL

Bowland Tree Consultancy Ltd
e: info@bowlandtreeconsultancy.co.uk
t: 01772 437150

Ref: BTC220-TCP Rev:

LEGEND

Ansell Lighting
● Taurus LED
Bollard

Thorneyholme Hall - Proposed Site Layout

Rev F:	Site Layout updated	23-03-21
Rev E:	Proposed bollard positions indicated	17-08-20
Rev D:	Site Layout updated	14-03-19
Rev C:	Site Layout updated	13-02-19
Rev B:	Accommodation notation altered	19-05-17
Rev A:	Parking indicated	02-05-17

Project
Proposed Development at
Thorneyholme Hall, Dunsop Bridge

PWL
ARCHITECTURE

Title
Proposed Site Layout

31 Chapel Brow Leyland Preston PR25 3NH
Tel 01772 467404 E Mail: info@pwlarchitecture.com

Scale	Date
1:200@A1	March 2017
Drawn	Drwg No
PL	1178-PL-22F