

# Arboricultural Condition Report - TPO 2016/05 Moss Side Lane

Prepared by: Nick Harrison, Arboricultural Consultant

Checked by: Richard Bassindale, Senior Landscape Architect

Approved by: Andy Wakefield, Principal Arboricultural Consultant

Rev No	Comments	Checked by	Approved by	Date
0	Draft	Richard Bassindale	Andy Wakefield	21/10/16

2 City Walk, Leeds, LS11 9AR, United Kingdom  
Telephone: 0113 391 6800 Website: <http://www.aecom.com>

Job No: 60493277

Reference: Arboricultural Report

Date Created: 18/10/2016

## Copyright

© This Report is the copyright of AECOM Infrastructure & Environment UK Limited. Any unauthorised reproduction or usage by any person other than the addressee is strictly prohibited.

# Table of Contents

<b>1.</b>	<b>Introduction .....</b>	<b>1</b>
1.2	Methodology.....	1
<b>2.</b>	<b>The Legal Framework Relating to Trees .....</b>	<b>4</b>
2.1	The Risks from Trees.....	4
2.2	Legal Obligations of the Tree Owner/Manager.....	4
2.3	Best Practice in Tree Risk Management .....	5
2.4	Re-inspection frequency.....	5
<b>3.</b>	<b>Field Observations.....</b>	<b>21</b>
3.1	The Site:.....	21
3.2	The Trees:.....	21
<b>6.</b>	<b>Conclusion .....</b>	<b>21</b>
<b>7.</b>	<b>Photographs.....</b>	<b>21</b>
	<b>Appendix A Tree Survey Schedule .....</b>	<b>21</b>
	<b>Appendix B Tree Survey Plans .....</b>	<b>22</b>

# 1. Introduction

- 1.1.1 AECOM has been commissioned to carry out a tree condition survey in relation to the trees covered by Fylde Council Tree Preservation Order (TPO) 2016.05 Moss Side Lane, Wrea Green, Fylde.
- 1.1.2 The scope of work includes a tree survey to assess current condition and to highlight any potential hazards. The line of trees which have been assessed all have a stem diameter over 150mm at 1.5m and are located on Moss Side Lane.
- 1.1.3 The survey and the accompanying notes provide guidance as to the nature and condition of the existing tree stock in the survey area.

## 1.2 Methodology

- 1.2.1 The tree survey has been based on, and trees plotted with the aid of topographical map PMS1217-01, see Appendix A.
- 1.2.2 The fieldwork was undertaken on the 18<sup>th</sup> of October 2016 and included all accessible significant trees as indicated on the topographical map and referenced in the council's TPO. Total access was not possible for T9 given its location amongst dense undergrowth on a steep bank adjacent to the highway (Moss Side Lane).
- 1.2.3 During the survey estimated dimensional data and observational information has been collected. The fieldwork informing this report has comprised a preliminary, non-intrusive, Visual Tree Assessment (VTA) undertaken from ground level with the specific intention of highlighting any potential arboricultural hazards. Where further inspection is deemed appropriate to ascertain the condition of the tree or other arboreal features, this has been identified within the preliminary management recommendations in the tree schedule.
- 1.2.4 A tree survey schedule is included in section 5 of this report and this corresponds with the Tree Survey Plan which shows the position of trees and a corresponding number which can be cross referenced to the schedule. This drawing is included as Appendix A.
- 1.2.5 Tree works have been assigned a priority in the schedule according to the following methodology which has been colour coded for clarity.

Urgent works	<b>ASAP</b>
High priority work	<b>within 3 months</b>
Low priority work	<b>within 12 months</b>
Very Low priority works/	<b>Proactive management</b>

## 2. The Legal Framework Relating to Trees

### 2.1 The Risks from Trees.

- 2.1.1 Trees pose a very low risk to people and property. Approximately 6 people a year are killed in tree related incidents. In relation to the number of trees within falling distance of people or property this equates to a very low likelihood of harm occurring. The Health and Safety Executive (HSE) states that such a level of risk is broadly acceptable i.e. 1:10,000,000 risk of death. To put this low risk in context, there is a 1:16,000 risk of death associated with driving. Despite this low risk, the law requires that the risks from trees are managed in a reasonably practicable manner.

### 2.2 Legal Obligations of the Tree Owner/Manager

- 2.2.1 The key statutory legislation (laws created by an Act of Parliament) relating to a duty of care for tree owners or those responsible for them is the Occupiers Liability Acts 1957 and 1984, the Health and Safety at Work Act 1974 and the Highways Act 1980.
- 2.2.2 **The Occupiers Liability Act 1957** confers a duty on an occupier to take reasonable care to ensure that visitors to the property are safe from harm. In 1984 the scope of the act was extended to include uninvited visitors including trespassers. This duty to the uninvited is limited to those dangers which the occupier is aware of, those dangers that the uninvited are likely to be foreseeably exposed to (i.e. they will be in the area near hazardous trees) and those dangers which the occupier could be reasonably expected to take steps to protect visitors (invited or otherwise) from. The 1957 Act also indicates in section 2(3) (a) that occupiers need to be prepared for the fact that children may not be as risk aware or as careful as adults and finally it includes a consideration of the nature and circumstances of the occupier(s) and the reasonableness of any steps to help prevent injury. Prosecutions under this act are generally restricted to civil law cases and fall under the tort of negligence.
- 2.2.3 **The Health and Safety at Work Act 1974** places a duty of care on employers to those who are not employees. Employers (when conducting their business) must ensure as far as reasonably practicable that persons not in their employment are not exposed to risks to their health and safety. This legislation is typically used in criminal law cases and Birmingham City Council was successfully prosecuted under this act by the Health and Safety Executive (HSE) following a tree failure which killed three people in 1999.
- 2.2.4 **The Highways Act 1980** places a statutory obligation on tree owners to prevent trees from causing an obstruction to roads and footpaths.
- 2.2.5 **The Countryside and Rights of Way (CROW) Act 2000** indicates that those who utilise their right of public access (under the Act) are not deemed to be 'visitors', and therefore their protection comes under the 1984 amendment of the Occupiers Liability Act, however, conversely Section 1 (b) of the Act states that there is no duty owed associated with risks from natural features (which includes trees). The Act also infers that the right of access shouldn't place an unreasonable burden on the occupier and also identifies that maintaining the character of the countryside is important. In practice this could be interpreted to mean that potentially hazardous trees can be retained as valuable habitat or natural features (i.e. veteran trees). This also suggests that any control measures to mitigate the risk from trees is commensurate with the resources available to the owner (i.e. not an 'unreasonable burden').
- 2.2.6 **The Compensation Act 2006** has relevance to tree risk management in that indicates that risk abatement measures shouldn't lead to the stopping or infringement of a desirable activity taking place. This reinforces the idea that control measures shouldn't be unnecessarily restrictive, and that some exposure to risk is acceptable, particularly when there are associated benefits.

## 2.3 Best Practice in Tree Risk Management

- 2.3.1 **The National Tree Safety Group (NTSG)** published Common Sense Risk Management of Trees in 2011 and this is generally viewed as the baseline for tree risk management. This document attempts to address the disproportionate response to the very low risk of harm from falling trees. It interprets statute and common law and gives examples of the minimum level of risk management that is expected from those responsible for trees in a range of situations. The guidance suggests that those carrying out tree inspections do not need to be arboriculturists, but that most hazardous trees are obviously hazardous and that experts do not need to be involved until obvious hazards have been identified or tree defects which require expert opinion are discovered.
- 2.3.2 The guidance sets out that sites should be zoned according to the likely risk associated with the trees present based on the level or frequency of land use and the size and nature of the trees present. Significant trees in high and moderate use areas are likely to require a formal proactive inspection regime. Where tree ownership is by a large organization with significant resources tree assessment is expected to be undertaken by inspectors with a good working knowledge of trees with reference to more qualified persons where issues beyond their experience are encountered (qualified to a minimum of a recognized NQF level 3 arboricultural qualification or equivalent). Tree risk management can also be supported by the informal assessment of trees on site by staff and maintenance teams as they go about their day to day activities.
- 2.3.3 Records must be maintained for all formal tree inspections, assessments and tree works carried out to assist in demonstrating a reasonable approach to tree risk management and the tree owners/managers duty of care has been carried out.

## 2.4 Re-inspection frequency

- 2.4.1 The Wrea Green Site includes the moderately busy B5259 public highway (Moss Side Lane) and a footpath running along the northern side of the carriageway. Private residences are located to the north of the B5259 directly opposite and within falling distance of these trees.
- 2.4.2 The B5259 is a main arterial route into the western side of Wrea Green village. It is recommended that a condition survey for these trees should be carried out every 1-2 years given their current condition and location.

### 3. Field Observations

#### 3.1 The Site:

- 3.1.1 This linear group of trees are located to the western fringes of Wrea Green, to their north is the B5259 and private residences with agricultural fields to the south and east and an area of open farmland is located to the west.
- 3.1.2 The trees are located within a narrow band of verge between the southern edge of the highway and the arable farmland (see photograph 1). There is evidence that ploughing takes place within a close proximity to the base of these trees (less than 1 m). A telephone pole is also situated between T5 and T6 close to the highway.

#### 3.2 The Trees:

- 3.2.1 The group subject to the TPO includes nine trees, six sycamore (*Acer pseudoplatanus*), two beech (*Fagus sylvatica*) and one ash (*Fraxinus excelsior*), all within the age range of between semi-mature to mature. These trees form a boundary feature between the arable farmland to the south and the highway to the north. It is considered, that a large percentage of the notional Root Protection Area (RPA – an area defined by the British Standard BS5837:2012 Trees in relation to design demolition and construction – Recommendations as of particular importance to tree health and stability) to the south will have been impacted by ploughing within the agricultural field, and the compacted ground (beneath the highway) to the north. It is expected that the rooting zones of these trees is, therefore, restricted.
- 3.2.2 **T1** – A semi-mature sycamore (*A. pseudoplatanus*) in good to fair condition. The canopy is weighted predominantly to the east due to neighbouring tree to the west. The tree has suffered damage on its lower southern canopy, presumably due to farm machinery working the agricultural field. A wire fence is located adjacent to the southern side of the main stem and has resulted in the tree growing around and encapsulating the wire over time (see photo 3). Moderate deadwood was visible within the canopy, and tar spot (*Rhytisma acerinum*) is evident throughout the canopy. Although this is not generally viewed as being detrimental to the health of the tree it can be considered to have an effect on the amenity value of the tree.
- 3.2.3 This tree is considered to have a limited rooting environment due to its location on a narrow roadside verge to the north and an arable field to the south. Structural integrity of this tree will need to be monitored given that the ploughing of the adjacent field to the south currently runs approximately 0.6 m from the base of the tree which is likely to severely impact integral anchor roots. Long term retention is considered unlikely given the above comments.
- 3.2.4 If a TPO were to be confirmed for this group, it is assumed that the ploughing will need to consider the RPAs of these trees thus requiring an adjustment to the current plough line. This has been classified as a 'C' category tree based on its low landscape quality.
- 3.2.5 **T2** – A semi to early mature sycamore (*A. pseudoplatanus*) in fair to poor condition. The canopy of this tree has grown as part of a collective with the rest of this group. Die back in the crown was evident along with moderate deadwood, this is currently a hazard to the highway directly below the crown. Small and chlorotic leaves were noted in sections of the canopy; this is often a symptom that the tree's physiological system is suffering stress. This tree also has tar spot (*R. acerinum*) and a limited rooting environment. Long term retention is questionable given the apparent poor health and location of the tree. This has been classified as a 'C' category tree based on its low landscape quality.
- 3.2.6 **T3** – A semi-mature sycamore (*A. pseudoplatanus*) in good to fair condition. The canopy of this tree has grown as part of a collective with the rest of this grouping. Moderate deadwood was noted along with broken branches on the southern lower canopy. The tree has a sparse crown with small leaves, minor die-back, and areas of dead bark and delamination at the base of the tree (see photo 5) indicate an impaired physiological system. Tar spot (*R. acerinum*) was also evident throughout the canopy. Long term retention is questionable given the apparent poor health of the tree. This has been classified as a 'C' category tree based on its low landscape quality.

- 3.2.7 **T4** - A semi-mature sycamore (*A. pseudoplatanus*) in good to fair condition. The canopy of this tree has grown as part of a collective with the rest of this grouping. The canopy includes minor deadwood, some of which is located over the adjacent highway and broken branches within the lower section of the southern canopy. This tree is considered to have a limited rooting environment for the same reasons outlined for T1 and T2. Small leaves and tar spot (*R. acerinum*) were also noted within the canopy. Long term retention is questionable given the current condition and location of the tree. This has been classified as a 'C' category tree based on its low landscape quality.
- 3.2.8 **T5** – A semi to early mature sycamore (*A. pseudoplatanus*) in good to fair condition. Ivy (*Hedera* sp.) is growing at the base of the tree preventing a full survey. The tree has co-dominant stems at 9m above ground level with old stubs on both; this can potentially lead to decay /structural weakness and it is recommended that these are inspected at closer range (following removal of ivy). The southern side of the lower canopy (over the agricultural land) includes broken branches. The tree is adjacent to a telephone pole and wires and it was noted that the branches to the north-west were currently in contact with the wires. A slightly over-extended scaffold limb is orientated to the north at approximately 10 m above the highway; this has been identified as a potential hazard that will require regular monitoring. This has been classified as a 'C' category tree based on its low landscape quality.
- 3.2.9 **T6** – A semi-mature sycamore (*A. pseudoplatanus*) in poor condition and is in a state of severe decline. The tree has delaminating bark on the main stem with excessive die-back, early defoliation and moderate deadwood. It is assumed that this tree has not been included in the group TPO given its current condition. Removal within 6 months has been recommended. This has been classified as a 'U' category tree.
- 3.2.10 **T7** – A semi to early mature beech (*F. sylvatica*) in good to fair condition with a slight lean to the north and moderate to major deadwood within the crown, including some located over the highway. Minor die-back in the canopy was also evident.
- 3.2.11 A bulge on the eastern section of the main stem was identified (see photo 10). This is feature is often associated with internal decay and represents the tree reacting with increased growth around an area potentially weakened by fungal infection (white rot). **Given the close proximity of the tree to the highway and private residences, a more detailed inspection of this area of the main stem is recommended.** A slight lean towards these targets also highlights the need for a more thorough inspection.
- 3.2.12 Areas of exudation and secretions of white waxy substance (see photos 8 and 10) were also found around the base of the tree. These symptoms indicate the presence of beech bark disease. This is not considered a significant hazard although it can lead to further colonization by airborne pathogens into the exposed sapwood. This tree has been classified as a 'C' category tree based on its low landscape quality.
- 3.2.13 **T8** – A semi to early mature beech (*F. sylvatica*) in fair to poor condition. This is a single stem tree with moderate deadwood and minor die-back and a potential cavity on the on the west side of the main stem at approximately 6.5m above ground level. An aerial inspection would be required to fully assess the structural integrity around this area. A slight bulging was noted at approximately 0.5m on the main stem. Features suggesting a graft line were identified in the same area (see photos 13 to 15). This is considered a structural weak point and should be monitored for signs of potential failure. This tree has been classified as a 'C' category tree based on its low landscape quality.
- 3.2.14 **T9** – An early-mature to mature ash (*F. excelsior*) tree in fair condition. There is dense ivy (*Hedera* sp.) extending from the base into the canopy; a full survey has therefore not been carried out. Co-dominant stems occur at 1m above ground level, with the union obscured by ivy (see photo 16 – feature B). There is also epicormic growth throughout the canopy, along with minor die-back. A secondary limb extending south has failed in the past. The remaining limb is approximately 5m in length and is now dying back (see photo 16 – feature A). *Daldinea concentrica* fungal fruiting bodies were present on this limb indicating areas of deadwood. The tree has limited rooting environment to the northern side due to its position directly adjacent to the highway (see photo 17). This tree will require the removal of ivy before a more thorough survey can be carried to fully assess its condition. This tree has been classified as a 'C' category tree based on its low landscape quality.



## **6. Conclusion**

- 6.1.1 Trees must meet a set of prescribed criteria to qualify for protection by a TPO, this includes having amenity value and being suitable for long term retention. Given the findings of this report it is argued that the long term amenity and safe retention of these trees is questionable.
- 6.1.2 Trees T7 and T8 require further in depth investigation to assess their long term safe retention due to the features identified and the high target represented by the public highway (B5259) and private residential properties located to the north of the group.
- 6.1.3 It has not been possible to undertake a full inspection of T9 due to the dense ivy covering its stem; this will be required to confirm its potential long term viability. The tree is situated very close to the highway and could represent a significant hazard should any issues be identified.
- 6.1.4 Historical land use and topographical features also bring into question the longevity of these trees. The current land use suggests that the RPAs or rooting areas of all trees within this group have been and will be impacted by ploughing of the field to the south, and the physiological condition of the trees is considered fair to poor. These findings suggest potential root/soil issues that may be attributed to repeated root damage resulting from the ploughing of the neighbouring field. Structural integrity is also an issue given the limited rooting environment afforded by the adjacent highway which runs very close to the northern base of all trees.
- 6.1.5 In summary it is felt that the trees have a number of structural and physiological issues which we recommend are investigated further to fully assess their safe retention.

## 7. Photographs

Photo 1 – Looking south west along Moss Side Lane with T1 in the foreground.



Photo 2 – Looking north west from within agricultural field with T1 in the foreground.





Photo 3 – Looking north east from within agricultural field to the south of the trees.



Photo 4 – T1 growing around adjacent wire fence.





Photo 5 – dead bark at base of T3





Photo 6 – Dead bark and delamination at the base of T3.





Photo 7 – T6 in later stages of die-back and decline, rated 'U' category.



Photo 8 – T7 with areas of exudation and bulging at base of main stem.





Photo 9 – Close up of symptoms of beech bark disease on T7.



Photo 10 – Bulging at base of T7, looking south.





Photo 11 – Base of T7 on western side of main stem showing symptoms of beech bark disease.





Photo 12 – Area of potential decay on main stem of T7 requiring further inspection.



Photo 13 – Base of T8 with areas highlighting potential structural issue on eastern side of stem.





Photo 14 – Close up of northern section of stem, areas of potential structural weakness highlighted.



Photo 15 – Western side of T8 showing further potential structural weakness.





Photo 16 – T9 'A' is showing torn out limb extending south for approximately 5m, 'B' is showing ivy covered main union looking south from B5259.



Photo 17 – Base of T9 close to highway





Photo 18 – T9 looking east.



**Appendix A Tree Survey Schedule**

5. TREE SURVEY SCHEDULE

Table 1. Tree Survey Schedule

Ref. No	Species		Est. Height (m)	Stem Diameter (mm)	Canopy Spread (m)				Canopy Clearance height (m)	Condition		First significant branch and direction		Life Stage	Observations	Recommendations	Estimated Remaining Contribution (years)	Category	Root Protection Area	
	Common name	Scientific name			N	E	S	W		Physiological	Structural								Radius (m)	m²
T1	Sycamore	<i>Acer pseudoplatanus</i>	16	510	5.0	5.0	5.0	1.0	1.0	G-F	G-F	2.0	N	Sm	Moderate deadwood with epicormics growth throughout. One sided canopy due to neighbouring tree. Broken branches on southern side of lower canopy. Wire fence in-grown into the main stem on south side. Situated on highway verge. RPA has been encroached via ploughing on the southern side. Limited rooting environment. Tar spot throughout canopy.	No action	40+	C2	6.1	118
T2	Sycamore	<i>Acer pseudoplatanus</i>	17	610	7.8	3.5	8.0	2.5	1.5	F-P	F-P	3.5	E	Sm-Em	Die-back in crown with moderate deadwood. Co-dominant stems at 3m. Tar spot throughout canopy. Secondary limb has fused with co-dominant stem at 4m. Some chlorotic and small leaves in canopy. Wire fence in-grown into base of tree. Limited rooting environment.	Remove deadwood over highway within 3 months	10+	C2	7.3	168
T3	Sycamore	<i>Acer pseudoplatanus</i>	16	545	6.0	2.0	4.5	6.0	2.0	F	G-F	2.5	S	Sm	Moderate deadwood in canopy. Dead bark at base of main stem with some delamination, external sapwood is dead, does not sound hollow. Minor die-back and broken branch at 4m on south side. Old stub with minor decay on southern side of main stem at 2m. Tar spot throughout, small leaves and a sparse crown.	No action	20+	C2	6.5	134
T4	Sycamore	<i>Acer pseudoplatanus</i>	15	455	5.5	2.0	5.0	4.0	2.0	F	G-F	2.5	S	Sm	Minor deadwood and broken branches. Small leaves and tar spot in some parts of the canopy. Limited rooting environment.	Remove deadwood over highway within 3 months	20+	C2	5.5	94
T5	Sycamore	<i>Acer pseudoplatanus</i>	17	620	7.0	4.0	2.5	2.5	1.0	G-F	G-F	2.5	S	Sm-Em	Ivy at base of tree therefore not fully surveyed. Moderate deadwood and broken branches. Co-dominant stems at 9m. Old stubs with potential decay extending into co-dominant stems. Slightly over extended scaffold limb at 10m extending to the north over the highway. Telephone pole located 1.5m to NW of main stem. Upper canopy making contact with telephone wires.	Aerial inspection to assess potential decay in co-dominant stems. Remove ivy. To be done within 6 months.	20+	C2	7.4	174
T6	Sycamore	<i>Acer pseudoplatanus</i>	15	450	2.0	2.5	7.0	4.0	3.0	P	P	2.5	S	Sm	Tree is in advanced stages of decline. Delaminating bark on main stem and excessive die-back and early defoliation. Moderate deadwood.	Fell within 6 months	<10	U	5.4	92
T7	Beech	<i>Fagus sylvatica</i>	17	710	5.0	3.0	4.5	3.0	0.0	G-F	G-F	5.0	E	Sm-Em	Bulge at base of main stem on east side with some exudation present both at the base of the tree and other secondary limbs. Possible symptoms of beech bark disease identified. Moderate to major deadwood in canopy over highway. Minor die-back in the canopy. Slight lean to the north towards the highway.	Remove deadwood over highway within 3 months.	40+	C2	8.5	228
T8	Beech	<i>Fagus sylvatica</i>	17	644	2.5	4.0	6.5	4.0	1.5	F	F-P	5.0	E	Sm-Em	Single stem tree with moderate deadwood and minor die-back. Slight bulge at base of tree. Signs of weak point/graft union at base of tree. Wire fence in-grown into main stem. Cavity on main stem at 6.5m on west side from historic failure. Branches on northern canopy making contact with adjacent phone lines.	Aerial inspection is required to assess wound at 6.5m for any decay issues. Graft union will require regular monitoring to assess for any structural issues. Both to be done within 12 months.	20+	C2	7.7	188

Ref. No	Species		Est. Height (m)	Stem Diameter (mm)	Canopy Spread (m)				Canopy Clearance height (m)	Condition		First significant branch and direction		Life Stage	Observations	Recommendations	Estimated Remaining Contribution (years)	Category	Root Protection Area	
	Common name	Scientific name			N	E	S	W		Physiological	Structural								Radius (m)	m²
T9	Ash	<i>Fraxinus excelsior</i>	19	1300#	8.0	3.0	8.0	8.0	1.0	F	F	4.0	S	Em-M	Dense ivy extending from base of tree into main canopy therefore not fully surveyed. Co-dominant stem at 1m, unable to assess union due to dense ivy. Secondary limb at 4m south side has had historic partial failure leaving a 5m long branch with die-back evident. Sparse upper canopy.	Remove ivy and inspect main union and base of tree within 6 months.	20+	C2	15.0	707

Key to Abbreviations Used in the Survey

Ref No	Specific identification number given to each tree or group. T=Tree/H=Hedge/G=Group.	
Species	Common name followed by botanical name shown in <i>italics</i> .	
Stem diameter	Diameter of main stem, measured in millimetres at 1.5 m above ground level. (MS = Multi-stem tree measured in accordance with BS5837 Annexe C).	Av / Average:  indicates an average representative measured dimension for the group or feature
#	Estimated dimensions.	
Life stage	<b>Young (Y):</b> Newly planted tree 0-10 years. <b>Semi-Mature (Sm):</b> Tree in the first third of its normal life expectancy for the species (significant potential for future growth in size). <b>Early Mature (Em):</b> Tree in the second third of its normal life expectancy for the species (some potential for future growth in size). <b>Mature (M):</b> Tree in the final third of its normal life expectancy for the species (having typically reached its approximate ultimate size). <b>Over Mature (Om):</b> Tree beyond the normal life expectancy for the species. <b>Veteran (V):</b> Tree which is of interest biologically, aesthetically or culturally because of its condition, size or age.	
Structural condition	<b>Good:</b> No significant structural defects. <b>Fair:</b> Structural defects which can be resolved via remedial works. <b>Poor:</b> Structural defects which cannot be resolved via remedial works. <b>Dead:</b> Dead.	
Physiological condition	<b>Good:</b> Normal vitality including leaf size, bud growth, density of crown and wound wood development. <b>Fair:</b> Lower than normal vitality, reduced bud development, reduced crown density, reduced response to wounds. <b>Poor:</b> Low vitality, low development and distribution of buds, discoloured leaves, low crown density, little extension growth for the species. <b>Dead:</b> Dead. <b>Fair/Good</b> = Indicates an intermediate condition. <b>Fair – Good</b> = Indicates a range of conditions (e.g. within a group).	
Preliminary management recommendations	Works identified during the tree survey as part of sound arboricultural management, based on the current context of the Site are shown in standard text.	

Category	<b>A</b> = High quality/value 40yrs+ <b>B</b> = Moderate quality/value 20yrs+ <b>C</b> = Low quality/value min 10yrs/stem diameter less than 150mm <b>U</b> = Unsuitable for retention
	<b>1</b> = Arboricultural quality/value <b>2</b> = Landscape quality/value <b>3</b> = Cultural quality/value (including conservation)

## Considerations:

- 1) Tree owners/managers have a legal duty to prevent foreseeable harm. It is generally accepted that this duty can be fulfilled by undertaking proactive inspections of significant trees to identify obvious defects and by taking appropriate remedial action or gaining further advice as appropriate. .
- 2) The trees considered within this report are covered by Fylde Council Tree Preservation Order (TPO) 2016.05. Prior to any tree works a Tree Works Application must be submitted to the Local Planning Authority (LPA). Trees which are dead or dangerous are exempt from the requirement for a tree works application but at least 5 day's notice must be given to the LPA of the intention to undertake the works along with supporting evidence where appropriate.
- 3) Where more than 5m<sup>3</sup> of timber is to be felled within a calendar quarter a felling licence may be required from the Forestry Commission unless an agreed exception applies including the management of dead or dangerous trees.
- 4) Full consideration must be given to the presence of species protected under the Wildlife and Countryside Act (1981 - as amended), the Countryside and Rights of Way Act (2000) and the Habitats Regulations (2010 – as amended); in particular, the presence of bats and nesting birds. It is recommended that wherever possible, significant tree / hedge works take place outside of the typical bird nesting season of March to September.
- 5) Any tree surgery recommendations contained within this report are to be undertaken in accordance with BS3998: 2010 Tree work – Recommendations (BS3998) by suitably qualified and insured contractors. Significant pruning works are best undertaken when trees are dormant or outside periods of high functional activity to reduce the overall impact on energy available to the tree for growth and processes. In general the optimum period for works is between November to February and July to August (subject to the presence of protected species) when the tree is less active and better placed to respond to wounding and a reduction in leaf area.
- 6) Fieldwork survey information is subject to seasonal/access constraints.



## **Appendix B: Tree Survey Plans**



## About AECOM

AECOM (NYSE: ACM) is a global provider of professional technical and management support services to a broad range of markets, including transportation, facilities, environmental, energy, water and government. With approximately 100,000 employees around the world, AECOM is a leader in all of the key markets that it serves. AECOM provides a blend of global reach, local knowledge, innovation, and collaborative technical excellence in delivering solutions that enhance and sustain the world's built, natural, and social environments. A Fortune 500 company, AECOM serves clients in more than 100 countries and has annual revenue in excess of \$6 billion.

More information on AECOM and its services can be found at [www.aecom.com](http://www.aecom.com).

Scott House  
Alençon Link  
Basingstoke  
Hants  
RG24 9HA  
United Kingdom

+44 (0) 1256 310 200