**TREE WORK ASSESSMENT**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **DATE INSPECTED:** | 21/04/2023 |
| **TPO:** | N/A |
|  |  |
| **CONSERVATION AREA:** | Chatburn |
| **APPLICATION NO:** | 3/2023/0422 |
| **SPECIES:** | Sycamore  |
| **BS5837 CAT:** |  U | **ASSESSOR:** | A Shutt |
|  |  |  |
|  |  | **SIGNATURE:** | LH |
|  |  |  |  |
| **VISUAL TREE ASSESSMENT / COMMENTS**Tree is of amenity value and is important within the village treescape. Landowner instructed a qualified Arboricultural Consultant to assess the conditions of the trees and produce a report, which was submitted with a Treework Application 3/2023/0217.T194 was highlighted for further survey due to the plethora of defects and high target areas. The Landowners consultant carried out a Resistograph test on the stem, the results can be seen in the submitted report, which shows there is a insufficient structural wood to minimise the probability of failure of the tree caused primarily to *Ganoderma applanatum*Tree works form part of sound health and safety management of urban trees and will minimise risk of failure on high target areas, primarily Crow Trees Brow and garden and buildings.T1 (T194) |
|  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **RELATED ISSUES:** | **YES** | **NO** |  | **YES** | **NO** |
| Planning Application  |  | 🗵 | Highway issue |  | 🗵 |
| Statutory Undertaker |  | 🗵 | Damage to property (proven) |  | 🗵 |
| Health & safety issues | ☑ |  | Nuisance |  | 🗵 |
| Other (describe)\* |  | 🗵 |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
| **AMENITY EVALUATION:**  | **YES** | **NO** |  |  |
| Carried out | **☑** |  |  |  |
| Necessary  |  |  **🗵** |  |  |
|  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Application works appropriate?** | **YES ☑**  |
| **Why?**  Tree works form part of sound health and safety management of urban trees and works will minimise risk of failure on high target area Crow Trees Brow.T194 Sycamore could almost be classed as a veteran due to size and features, the landowner followed the advice of the consultant and carried out further surveys to ascertain whether the tree could be retained. Unfortunately, the defects have eroded the trees structural wood and risk of failure on to high target areas is unacceptable.Retention as a 7m habitat pole would be advantageous for bio diversity and habitat and replacement planting will be advised due to the amenity loss but neither can be conditioned. A protected species note will also be advised.   |
| **Alternative works more appropriate?**  | **NO 🗵** |
| **Describe Alternative Works:**  |