



Technical Arboriculture

Arboricultural statement/
Justification of tree works

Our Ref: TPO/5aMill/001

Site address 5a Mill Lane
Langstone
Hampshire

9th February 2015



Licensed User



Tree Preservation
Order
ConsultingArboristSociety.com



Tree preservation order application

One no. Walnut (T1 on supplied plan – Fell and replace with semi mature walnut.

Location – 5a Mill Lane, Langstone, Hampshire

Application submitted via planning portal.

Site/Location plan provided shows location of trees.

I have been instructed by the applicant to visit land at the above address and assess a single mature walnut.

I attended the site of the tree on the morning of 28th January 2015 and undertook an assessment of the tree using visual tree assessment techniques.

In making my assessment, I have evaluated the target beneath the tree and consider the risk of harm from any defects noted. These factors, and others (as may be relevant) detailed in the bullet points under clients brief below, inform my recommendations.

Technical Arboriculture Limited
10 Albany Court | Bishops Waltham | Hampshire SO32 1AZ
01489 896655 | info@techarb.co.uk
Registered in England and Wales No: 6018958
VAT Registration No: 936 3872 90

**Technical
Arboriculture**
www.techarb.co.uk





Clients Brief

I have been instructed to conduct a survey of 1 no. mature walnut tree at the location stated (refer to location plan) and to recommend remedial work(s) as may be required.

In light of any recommendations I have been asked to submit supporting evidence to accompany a tree preservation order (TPO) application, based upon findings (as appropriate) as follows;

- a tree survey, including basic data and a condition assessment;
- an appraisal of key 'targets' beneath the trees (**target evaluation**);
- identification of significant biological and structural defects (**hazard evaluation**);
- an appraisal of the level of risk (**risk assessment**);
- recommendations for any appropriate **remedial or preventative action**.
- a **priority** timescale for remedial work;
- a timescale for further **review** of the tree(s) and/or updated report.

Survey methodology and limitations

A tree survey was conducted on 28th January 2015. At the time of the survey the weather was dry with clear visibility.

All trees within the scope of survey were subject to a visual survey, carried out on foot (where safe and reasonable unhindered access was possible), using non-invasive survey techniques.



Prior to commencement of the survey an appraisal of key 'targets' was undertaken and significant target and/or target zones noted.

Trees have been assessed in a stepwise manner working through the following areas of the tree – root zone; buttress; stem; crown.

The stepwise approach, identification of significant defects, hazard evaluation, risk assessment and any recommendations for remedial work, priority and follow up accord with current industry best practice (as updated) and are based upon the surveyor's qualifications and experience including the LANTRA Professional Tree Inspection certificate (full list of qualifications and experience available on request).

Observations were made from ground level and relate to arboricultural aspects only. No inspection has been made of the soil structure. No account has been taken of the effects of the tree(s) or their removal directly or indirectly on any building(s) or structure(s) relating to the possibility of subsidence or heave

This assessment is based on the condition of the tree at the time of inspection. Trees are dynamic and their condition changes throughout their lives. Regular inspections of the tree(s) should be undertaken to monitor their health and determine appropriate management. The level of detail with which the tree was assessed has been guided, where appropriate, by the target appraisal.

The survey and report does not account for unusual weather conditions, changes in land use, soil level or structure, demolition, development or any other changes in surrounding that may affect changes in the tree(s) health unless specifically requested and noted in the scope of the report.



Our initial survey does not employ invasive techniques such as drilling or any form of excavation or sampling. If such further investigations were deemed necessary, specific techniques and/or approaches will have been discussed and agreed with the client together with a cost estimate, reasons for further investigation and a cost benefit appraisal. Following our survey, arrangements will have been made for these investigations to be made at a later date with additional fees levied as required. Results will have been supplied as a separate addendum to this report.

Where safe and reasonable access to the tree, or parts thereof, was prevented due to vegetation, obstructions, ivy or other reasons, this has been stated with recommendation for removal of obstruction and full survey recommended at the earliest convenient time.

Tree survey data

Measurements are in metre (m) and millimetres (mm).

T1

Species	Walnut
Height	10m
Diameter	690mm
Note – above measured at 1 metre above ground level (AGL); tree becomes tri-stemmed above 1.5 metres (AGL) with northerly stem 430mm, central stem 570mm and southerly stem 350mm.	
Life Stage	Mature
Crown spread	6m North; 7m East; 8 South; 6m West
Number of stems	single main stem to 1m then tri stem above
Vitality	low
Physiological condition	fair
Structural condition	fair/poor



Assessment

Location

The tree is located in the north east corner of the parking area within an ornamental, walled, circular 'planter'. The tree lies adjacent to the eastern boundary of the applicant's land.

Root zone

Entirety of root zone, with exception of an area to the east which is public footpath, is occupied by built form including the garage, dwelling and gravel surfaced access and parking area.

A circular brick retaining wall, approximately 1m high, sits at a radius of approximately 1.5m from the tree. The area contained by the wall has been infilled with soil and gravel providing a localised ground level change around the base of the tree to the height of the wall.

To North:

Brick retaining wall (approximately 2m); garage (approx. 3m).

To East:

Boundary fence and cypress boundary vegetation (approx. 3m); former railway line with central public footpath beyond.

To South:

Gravel surfaced parking area.

To West:

Gravel surfaced parking area and access; dwelling.



Notwithstanding restricted views of the base of the tree, I observed no visible signs of ground heave, soil cracking or otherwise to indicate movement within the soil.

I observed no signs of fungal fruit bodies within the root zone area.

Root buttress/stem base

The buttress and stem base are mostly obscured by the brick 'planter' and raised ground levels.

Notwithstanding restricted views of the base of the tree, I observed no signs of fungal fruit bodies associated with the species. I observed no decay or degradation of those areas visible.

Visible staining on the lower stem and visual evidence of previous weeping lesions.

I did not observe anything which would prompt me to probe, remove bark or prompt invasive investigation.

Sounding of the root buttress and stem base to 2 metres with a plastic mallet did not indicate any significant degradation of the wood in this region.

Stem

Previous pruning wounds, approximately 150 – 200mm diameter on east side at approx. 3m AGL resulting in approx. 1m long stub remaining.



At approx. 3m AGL on north side; approx. 200mm diameter branch removed showing partial callus.

Bark damage and peeling bark evident to north with exposed heartwood. Evidence of weeping lesions and exudate approximately 3m AGL, just above point of bifurcation of limb to north.

Northerly extending branch at 5m has failed approx. 2m from point of attachment to main stem. Evidence of decay at failure point. Evidence of previous weeping of exudate at point of failure.

Previous pruning wounds to east side at approx. 4m. Branch heading east towards public footpath shows major (>100mm diameter) dead wood with dieback.

Further major deadwood, weeping lesions and points of previous pruning and/or limb loss throughout branch framework.

Previous point of stem failure of central stem at approx. 8m showing signs of degradation.

Crown

Minor (25mm diameter) and moderate (25-100mm) deadwood throughout crown.

Sparse crown at various points due to loss of limb structure, dieback and previous competition from boundary vegetation.



Recommendations

I consider that intervention is required to reduce the risk presented by the tree i.e. future limb or main stem failure with resulting injury to property or persons.

Furthermore I consider the tree to be in decline and of such condition that its useful retention span is limited.

As a result of the above I do not consider remedial pruning to be a viable option.

I therefore recommend that the tree is felled and that a suitable replacement be planted in mitigation for the loss of the tree. I see no reason why another walnut could not be established within the garden area.

Carry out work within 3 months.

Justification for tree works

The work is justified on grounds of management of tree risk.

The tree has suffered the loss of a number of limbs, some to former unsympathetic pruning and some to mechanical failure.

The tree also shows signs of weeping from a number of lesions, dieback in the crown and a lessening of crown density as a result of these combined factors.



Impact on local visual amenity

Government guidance contained in Planning Practice Guidance (formerly *Tree Preservation Orders: a guide to the law and good practice* (now archived) states that:

"In considering an application, the local planning authority should assess the impact of the proposal on the amenity of the area and whether the proposal is justified, having regard to the reasons and additional information put forward in support of it".

Furthermore it states that;

"In general terms, it follows that the higher the amenity value of the tree or woodland and the greater any negative impact of proposed works on amenity, the stronger the reasons needed before consent is granted. However, if the amenity value is lower and the impact is likely to be negligible, it may be appropriate to grant consent even if the authority believes there is no particular arboricultural need for the work".

I include at table 1 (on next page), an assessment of the public visibility of the walnut from locations at the prime cardinal points of the compass (north; north-east; east; south-east; south; south-west; west and north-west). The positions of these various viewpoints are indicated on the supplied location plan.

The tree sits within a reasonably tree rich environment supported by under storey and lower vegetation. The loss of the tree will be mitigated, to a degree, by the surrounding vegetation and a replacement semi mature tree will provide a better quality replacement and provide for ongoing future amenity.



Table 1. Assessment of visibility of walnut T1 from public locations based on 8 cardinal points.

Cardinal point direction	Proportion of tree visible (1/3;2/3;3/3)	Comments
North	nil	View from public footpath (former Hayling Billy line) is obscured by vegetation. Long views are obscured further by vegetation.
North East	1/3	Tree is visible from footpath but obscured by vegetation such that an untrained eye would not necessarily pick out the tree from that surrounding vegetation. Longer views are from private gardens but also obscured.
East	3/3 nil	Full view from the footpath. View of tree is mostly of limbs containing dead wood. If the tree were to be pruned if dead wood then the prominence of the tree from this location would reduce. Longer views are from private gardens and obscured by vegetation on the eastern boundary of the footpath.
South East	3/3 nil	Full view from a short section of the footpath. Longer views are from private gardens and obscured by vegetation on the eastern boundary of the footpath.
South	nil	Private garden (applicant).
South west	nil	Private garden and obscured by boundary vegetation.
West	nil	Private garden and obscured by boundary vegetation.
North West	nil	Private garden and obscured by boundary vegetation.



The tree has a limited degree of public visibility, restricted to views from the public footpath when viewed from the north east, east and south east. All other locations yield no public view of the trees.

In light of this assessment, I consider the impact to amenity to be low.

Replacement tree(s)

The applicant is supportive of a condition for a semi mature replacement walnut, however the applicant is happy to be guided by the local planning authority if an alternate species is preferred.

Conclusion

The tree displays evidence of historic limb loss and a number of mechanical defects, weeping lesions and dieback which lead me to conclude that it would be better replaced and a suitable replacement established to maintain long term amenity.

I am of the opinion that the above information should allow you to make an informed decision regarding the tree, however if you feel that more information is required or wish to meet on site to discuss the matter further please do contact me.

Yours sincerely

Kevin Cloud BSc Hons, Tech Cert Arbor A, F Arbor A
Cardiff Law School certified Expert Witness
Director and Principal Arboricultural Consultant