



Arboricultural Report and Tree Survey

**Trees at Proposed Site at
Belgard Gardens
Tallaght
Dublin 24**

December 2018

The Tree File Ltd

**Consulting Arborists
Brookfield House
Carysfort Avenue
Blackrock
Co Dublin
01-2833500**

Contents

<u>Page</u>	<u>Subject</u>
1	Arboricultural Summary Arboricultural Implications Tree Protection
2	Tree Population Review Tree Management
4	Introduction Report Brief
5	Appendix 1 - The Survey Nature of Survey and Report Drawing Reference Site Description
6	Survey Data Collection and Methodology
7	Survey Key and Explanations
8	Tree Protection and Management within Scope
9	Table 1 - Tree Survey Table

Report Summary, Findings and Recommendations

This report was commissioned by Atlas GP Ltd

The survey has been prepared by-
Andy Worsnop Tech Arbor A, NCH Arb (PTI LANTRA)

The Tree File Ltd

Brookfield House
Carysfort Avenue
Blackrock
Co Dublin

Report Summary

Though the current industrial context is complimented by tree planting, the nature and extent of the proposed development is considered such as to provide no realistic scope to retain that tree population.

For this reason, a design decision was made not to retain any trees within the walled/railed development area, in favour of a broader landscape replacement plan, that could by design, address and avoid context and sustainability issues as may arise if remnant of the previous landscape were retained.

This decision was bolstered by the fact that a proportion of trees that were wholly unsuitable for retention and that overall, a majority, in line with prior site development history, were relatively young and of limited size. Accordingly, and notwithstanding a developing cumulative effect, it was felt that current small statures lent itself to better facilitating landscape replacement, by the installation of new stock.

The tree survey describes several trees that adjoin but are located outside the site that will, with very few exceptions, remain unaffected by the proposed works. Nonetheless all site vegetation including trees, arising from within the wall/railing defined site area will be removed in favour of replacement by a new landscape scheme.

Arboricultural Implications

The proposed development of the site not only consumes space in respect of new buildings but requires substantial modification of remaining ground space and particularly, the modification of existing ground levels.

Such practices are notably injurious to tree health and do not allow for sustainable tree retention.

Additionally, the context of the site will change greatly in comparison to its current industrial usage. Accordingly, many of the trees through a species and potential for growth but also through location will no longer suit the proposed new context and thus would be unsuitable for retention.

The above factors were appreciated at an early stage of the development design. Additionally, it was equally appreciated that with very few exceptions, the trees within the site area were relatively young and small, thus providing the potential for landscape redevelopment and replacement, in some cases with similar stock but in all cases, within a relatively short period of time.

For this reason, a design rationale has been adopted whereby all site vegetation within the existing walled/railed site area, will be removed in favour of replacement, selecting new species from a pallet compatible with the proposed development context and at locations that will allow for sustainable retention.

Tree Protection

As the overall intent of site development will be to retain no trees, then typical tree protection measures, such as those defined by “BS5837:2012, Trees in Relation to Design, Demolition and Construction – Recommendations”, do not necessarily apply to this site

Nonetheless, it is appreciated that, prior to works completion, tree installation will comprise a notable element of the proposed landscaping works. It is however envisaged that such works will only commence at a point in time when much of the material construction works will have been completed and a stable, long-term ground infrastructure will have been created to accept the new plantings. Accordingly, tree protection is of minimal value or importance, considering the proposed development procedure.

Site Tree Review

The vegetation associated with this site is of two distinct types, naturally arising and deliberately planted.

To the north-west and south-west of the site the apparently unused areas of the site and that previously used as a halting site supports extensive but typically young regeneration and thicket growth. None of this material exhibits any evidence to suggest deliberate planting, either by way of location or species type. Though young and healthy, much of this material will be regarded as of minimal value regarding retention within the scope of the development and as such has not been afforded any degree of importance.

The main portion of the site currently occupied by commercial buildings and vehicular access supports highly artificial but nonetheless typically young tree population. Much of this material has been installed deliberately for screening purposes and is positioned adjoining site boundaries or for ornamentation being located within green beds within the broader site layout. A few concerns arose regarding the survey findings, firstly regarding species use and secondly in respect of location and context.

Attention is drawn to species such as Eucalyptus (Tree Line 1) and Leyland Cypress (Group 35) as these species are regarded as fast-growing, potentially large and ill-suited for commercial planting. Eucalyptus can exceed 30 m in height and Leyland Cypress is commonly cited regarding management issues and indeed is mentioned specifically within the UK based “High Hedges” legislation.

Elsewhere on the site several contextual issues arise for example those trees directly adjoining the southern and eastern boundaries. Whilst these trees are extensively young and healthy and thus offer substantial sustainability, their location, arising from limited and typically narrow grass border is and being located close to existing kerb edges of boundary walls raises concern regarding future growth potential and the likelihood of mechanical disturbance. In respect of this, attention will be drawn to table “A1” of BS 5837:2012 in respect of the proximity of trees when planted close to likely laden structures.

This factor occurs on a repeated basis across the site where existing ground space is limited by its prior commercial use and necessary infrastructure. For this reason and carrying forward to any potential development plan then, the ability to convert the existing landscape without disturbing trees or, to retain such structures with the inherent risk of disturbance raises issues of sustainability over time.

Attention should also be drawn to the diversity of tree health and quality. Those located adjoining the southern and eastern boundaries were found to be an exceptionally good health, commensurate with their age however, equally young trees located centrally and to the west of the commercial site tended to be of substantially poorer quality.

In conclusion, we find ourselves dealing with a predominantly healthy and currently high-quality tree population whose longevity and sustainability is somewhat undermined in respect of the constraints afforded by the context within which it exists at present. Accordingly, and regarding any possible conversion or disturbance of the existing landscape, some concern arises regarding true sustainability beyond the existing context.

In appreciation of these facts it should also be considered that though developing rapidly, most trees on the site are still relatively young and of limited stature. Having said this, those adjoining the boundary already afford a notable degree of visual impact to the public realm however, this impact has not attained a size where it would be considered irreplaceable or impossible to replicate within a relatively short space of time using new nursery stock, should the need arise.

Management Recommendations

Whilst management recommendations have been put forward within the context of the survey table. Such recommendations are based on the current site scenario and pay no respect to any possible site developments or the effects that these may have on the trees. Accordingly, and because all trees within the walled/railed site area are

currently intended for removal, then such recommendations are considered irrelevant.

If for whatever reason, any of the described trees are retained, it is advised that all trees be reviewed on regular basis and after any actions that may affect the trees, be those site development works, or tree management works that involve tree removal or pruning.

This survey has been undertaken at the instruction of: -

Atlas GP Ltd
8-10 Hanover Street East,
Dublin 2

Report Brief

In accordance with the request for information, the intention of the tree survey is to register, describe and evaluate the trees regarding their current health status and current condition within their current context. The survey is based upon and has been compiled considering the recommendations of BS5837: 2012 Trees in Relation to Design, Demolition and Construction – Recommendations.

Report Context

In line with the recommendations of “BS5837: 2012 Trees in Relation to Design, Demolition and Construction – Recommendations”, this assessment has been advised by the results and findings of a tree survey, the findings of which are included as “Appendix 1” to this report. This report comprises a simple qualitative tree survey and a summary report describing the material of Arboricultural interest upon and adjoining the site in question.

This information has been provided without any specific review of development works. This information does not include a full “Arboricultural Implication Assessment” and it does not provide an “Arboricultural Method Statement” or “Tree Protection Plan”. It does however provide much of the basic information that would assist in the compilation of such documentation, should it be requested in the future and with the provision of suitable information regarding the nature and extent of any proposed development works.

This tree report should be read in conjunction with the combined tree constraints and basic impacts plan drawing “D1-Belgard Gardens-TCP-10-18”. This drawing provides a graphic representation of the tree survey depicting the constraints of those trees potentially affected by work as well as categorisation their condition and potential value. Accordingly, and in line with BS5837:2012 Trees in Relation to Design, Demolition and Construction – Recommendations, this documentation does provide an invaluable “design tool” in respect of the quantification of sustainable trees within any proposed development.

Report Limitations

This report is based on the Arborists interpretation of information provided to his prior to report compilation and gained from the site during the undertaking of the site review. The site review data is subject to the limitation as set out under “Inspection and Evaluation Limitations and Disclaimers” in “Appendix 1” to this report. The findings and recommendations made within this report are based upon the knowledge and expertise of the inspecting Arborist.

Appendix 1 – Tree Survey

Nature of Survey

This survey has been based upon many of the criteria put forward in BS 5837: 2012 – Trees in Relation to Design, Demolition and Construction – Recommendations.

The data collected has been represented in table form as “Table 1” within “Appendix 1” to this report. This appendix includes a Survey Methodology, Survey Key, Survey Abbreviations, Condition Category Definitions and a brief resume of the typical application of Tree Protection measures as defined within the above standard and as relates to the “RPA” zones defined both within the survey table and on the “TCP” drawing.

The survey relates to the site and the conditions thereon at the time of the survey. It is likely that changes in site usage, development or other environmental changes will require an amendment of recommendations and in some instances, may require the re-classification of a tree’s suitability for retention.

Drawing References

The survey should be read in conjunction with drawing “D1-Belgard Gardens-TCP-10-18” regarding the representation of tree positions, crown forms, “RPA” extents and colour reference to category systems. Where tree positions were not indicated on the supplied drawing, their positions may have been given “sketched” locations within “D1-Belgard Gardens-TCP-10-18”. It is advised that any such trees are accurately located by professional means so that the constraints such trees have upon the site can be accurately gauged.

Each tree is represented by a coloured circle, scaled to represent the north, east, south and west crown radii as denoted in the survey table. Each tree (categories A-green, B-blue and C-grey only) have been apportioned a “Root Protection Area” (RPA) denoted as a dashed orange circle. This circle represents the minimum area requiring protection from the effects of development activity. It should, for the purposes of design, be considered, as approximating the position of the tree protection fencing that must be erected prior to the commencement of any site works, thus excluding all site activities other than those dealt with by way of the “Arboricultural Implication Assessment” and “Arboricultural Method Statement”

Survey Intent and Context

Intention of this document is to highlight the extent and nature of material of Arboricultural interest on the site in question.

Site Description

The site is of irregular shape, comprising several existing industrial units, apparently unused and open space as well as an area previously used as a halting site to the west.

The entire site has been converted/disturbed in recent history, including the open space to the north-west and south-west though this area is now subject to natural regeneration and regrowth.

The entire central and eastern site remains dominated by existing building and access infrastructure and thus is broadly artificial in nature.

The site appears to be broadly level and except for one specific area to the south-east, exhibited no signs of drainage issue. The one boggy area to the south east was particularly localised and as such appears most likely to be attributable to failed underground pipes.

The vegetation this report describes tends to be limited to margins and strips associated with the prior commercial usage and particularly to the edges of access roads.

Survey Data Collection and Methodology

The Survey

The primary survey was carried out in August of 2017 and updated in September 2018. This survey is not an Implication Assessment though but provided some of the basic information regarding its compilation. The survey has been undertaken under the recommendations of BS 5837: 2012. This survey includes only tree of a stem diameter exceeding 150mm at approximately 1.50 metres from ground level. The survey relates to current site conditions, setting and context.

Identification

Each of the trees described within the text has been affixed with a consecutively numbered, alloy disk that relates directly to the survey text, positioned at approximately 1.50m from ground level.

Measurements

Measurements are metric and defined in metres and millimetres. All trees referred to in the survey text have been measured to provide information regarding canopy height and canopy spread (north, east, south and west radii), level of canopy base and stem diameter at 1.50 meters from ground level. The dimensions provided are intended to provide a reasonable representation of a trees size and form. Whilst efforts are made to maintain accuracy, visual obstruction, especially regarding trees in groups, requires that some tree dimensions are estimated only.

Inspection and Evaluation Limitations and Disclaimers

The information set out in this report relates to the review of a tree population on the site in question. As such, the information provided is based on a general review of trees and does not constitute a detailed review of any one of the individual specimens. Such an evaluation (tree report) would require the gathering of substantially more information than that dealt with in this survey.

The survey is not a safety assessment and the parameters reviewed within this survey context would be substantially deficient in extent to provide for a reliable safety assessment. The survey is intended to provide a general and qualitative review to assist in gauging the suitability of an individual tree for retention within a development context. All trees are subject to impromptu failure and damage and the assessment of risk as may be presented by a tree requires the review of numerous factors more than those noted herein and as such, remains outside the scope of this document and any attempt to use the information herein for such proposes will render the information invalid.

A competent and experienced Arborist has completed all inspection and tree assessment. The inspection involves visual assessment only, which has been carried out from ground level. No below ground, internal, invasive or aerial (climbing) inspection has been carried out.

Trees are living organisms whose health, condition and safety can change rapidly. It is recommended that all trees should be re-evaluated regarding their condition on an annual basis or after substantial trauma such a storm event, other damage or injury. It is advised that the results and recommendations of this survey will require review and reassessment after one year from the date of execution. This survey does not constitute a review of tree or site safety. Attempts to use the contents herein for such purposes will render the contents invalid.

Throughout the undertaking of the survey, several factors acted against the inspectors, contriving to reduce the accuracy of the survey.

Seasonality

The survey was commenced during the late-summer period. Some of the signs, typically symptomatic of ill-health or defect within a tree, may not have been available to view at the time of the survey or may have been obscured by seasonality related factors. Some of the fruiting bodies of various fungi, parasitic upon or causing decay or disease in trees, may have been out of season and unavailable to view. This survey can only comment upon symptoms of ill-health or defects visible at the time of the inspection.

Survey Key

Species	Refers to the specific tree species
Age	Referred to in generalized categories including: -
Y - Young.....	A young and typically small tree specimen.
S/M - Semi-Mature.....	A young tree, having attained dimensions that allow it to be regarded independently of its neighbours but typically, would be less than 50% of its ultimate size.
E/M - Early-Mature.....	A specimen, typically 50% - 100% of ultimate dimensions but with substantial capacity for mass and dimensional increase remaining.
M - Mature.....	A specimen of dimensions typical of a full-grown specimen of its species. Future growth would tend to be extremely slow with little if any dimensional increase.
O/M - Over-Mature.....	An old specimen of a species having already attained or exceeded its naturally expected longevity.
V - Veteran.....	An extremely old, veteran specimen of a species, usually of low vigour and typically subject to rapid decline and deterioration or of very limited future longevity.
Tree Dimensions	All dimensions are in meters. See notes regarding limitation of accuracy.
Ht	Tree Height
C-Ht	Lowest canopy height
FSB	Level of First Significant Branch
Sp: R	Tree Canopy Spread measured by radii at north, east, south and west
Dia	Stem diameter at approx. 1.50m from ground level.
RPA	Root Protection Area, as a radius measured from the tree's stem centre.
Con	Physical Condition
G Good.....	A specimen of generally good form and health
G/F Good/Fair.....	
F Fair.....	A specimen with defects or ill health that can be either rectified or managed typically allowing for retention
F/P Fair/Poor.....	
P Poor.....	A specimen whom through defect, disease attack or reduced vigour has a limited longevity or may be un-safe
D Dead.....	A dead tree
Structural Condition	Information on structural form, defects, damage, injury or disease supported by the tree
PMR – Preliminary Management Recommendations	Recommendation for Arboricultural actions or works considered necessary at the time of the inspection and relating to the existing site context and tree condition. Note is also made of works considered as urgent.
Retention Period	
S – Short.....	Typically 0 -10 years
M – Medium.....	Typically 10 -20 years
L – Long.....	Typically 20 – 40 years
L+.....	Typically in excess of 40 years
Category System	The Category System is intended to quantify a tree regarding its Arboricultural value as well as a combination of its structural and physical health. Note should be made of the fact that tree categorization relates to the current site and tree locations therein. As site changes occur, it may become necessary to re-evaluate trees regarding their relationship to new features.
Category U.....	Typically relates to trees that are dead, dying or dangerous. Such trees may present a threat of suffer from a defect or disease that is considered irremediable.
Category A.....	A typically a superior quality specimen, which is considered to make a substantial Arboricultural contribution
Category B.....	Typically including trees regarded as being of moderate quality
Category C.....	Typically including generally poor-quality trees that may be of only limited value. The above categories (A, B and C) will be further subdivided regarding the nature of their values or qualities. A tree may be awarded one or more value categories as below, but such attributes do not infer any additional value and it may be possible for a tree may qualify for one or more of the categories as below.
Sub-Category 1.....	Values such as species interest, species context, landscape design or prominent aspect.
Sub-Category 2.....	Mainly cumulative landscape values such as woods, groups, avenues, lines.
Sub-Category 3.....	Mainly cultural values such as conservation, commemorative or historical links.

Tree Protection and Management within the Scope of a Development

The design and management recommendations as set out in BS5837: 2012 are considered “best practice” regarding the selection, retention, protection and management of tree within the scope of a new development.

The development of a Tree Constraints Plan (TCP) provides a design tool regarding tree retention. Such a plan combines the topographical land survey drawing with additional information as provided by the tree survey. The aspects of the tree’s existence recorded on the “TCP” are, firstly, the tree canopies, represented in accordance with the four cardinal compass point radii (Sp: R in survey Table 1). Secondly, each tree’s Root Protection Area (RPA) is represented in accordance with paragraphs 4.6.1, 4.6.2 and 4.6.3 of BS5837: 2012.

The “Tree Constraints Plan” (TCP) depicts the extent and location of constraints, placed upon the site by the trees. The “TCP” drawing represents both the true canopy form (north, east, south and west radii) and the “RPA” as defined above. These constraints must be considered regarding the design and layout of a proposed development.

Tree Protection

All protection, whether vertical or horizontal, must conform or equate to the recommendations of Section 9, BS5837: 2012, must be fit for purpose and commensurate with the nature of development and the expected day-to-day activities of the site works.

Appendix 1 – Tree Data Table

No.	Species	Age	Con	Ht.	CH	N	E	S	W	Stm	Dia.	RPA	Structural Condition	PMR	Yrs	Cat
1	Eucalyptus (<i>Eucalyptus variety</i>)	S/M	F/P	12.00-15.00	1.00-2.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	1	344	4.13	A close knit (often less than 1 m apart) alignment of eucalyptus located arising from a narrow soil verge between the kerb edge to car parking and an existing block-built boundary wall. The scenario from within which the trees arise is highly restrictive and raises concern regarding natural root development. Proximity to existing structures will result in damage. Specimens are yet small with immense potential for size increase over time. Alignment is of dubious sustainability or suitability for retention within a developed context.	Consider early removal.	N/A	U
2	Turkish Hazel (<i>Corylus colurna</i>)	E/M	F	6.00	0.50	3.50	3.50	4.00	3.50	1	261	3.13	Young and still vigorous, part of a broader planted group.		L	B2
3	Turkish Hazel (<i>Corylus colurna</i>)	S/M	F	5.00	0.50	2.00	2.50	2.50	2.50	1	229	2.75	Suppressed as result of position within broader planted group. Is maintaining good vigour and vitality.		L	B2
4	Olearia (<i>Olearia paniculata</i>)	E/M	F	5.00	1.00	2.00	3.50	3.00	3.50	1	271	3.25	Suppressed and slightly distorted but maintaining good vigour and vitality.		L	B2
5	Olearia (<i>Olearia paniculata</i>)	E/M	F	5.00	1.00	2.00	3.50	3.00	3.00	1	302	3.63	Suppressed and slightly distorted but maintaining reasonable vigour and vitality.		M	C2

No.	Species	Age	Con	Ht.	CH	N	E	S	W	Stm	Dia.	RPA	Structural Condition	PMR	Yrs	Cat
6	Turkish Hazel (<i>Corylus colurna</i>)	E/M	G/F	6.00	0.50	3.00	3.00	3.00	4.00	1	344	4.13	Badly suppressed but maintaining reasonable vigour and vitality.		L	B2
7	Silver Birch (<i>Betula pendula</i>)	E/M	G/F	7.00	2.00	2.50	2.50	3.00	2.50	1	216	2.60	Young and still vigorous.		L	B2
8	Whitebeam (<i>Sorbus aria</i>)	S/M	F	5.00	1.25	2.00	2.00	2.50	2.50	1	191	2.29	Young and vigorous.		L	B2
9	Silver Birch (<i>Betula pendula</i>)	E/M	G/F	6.50	1.00	2.00	2.50	1.50	2.50	1	201	2.41	Young and vigorous.		L	B2
TL10	Tree Line 10 Ornamental Cherry (<i>Prunus variety</i>) Hoheria (<i>Hoheria Sp.</i>) Silver Birch (<i>Betula pendula</i>) Norway Maple (<i>Acer platanoides</i>) Cherry Laurel (<i>Prunus laurocerasus</i>) Rowan (<i>Sorbus aucuparia</i>) Goat Willow (<i>Salix caprea</i>) Elder (<i>Sambucus nigra</i>)	E/M	F	3.00-7.50	0.00	Contiguous				11	159	1.91	A continuous and contiguous alignment of trees arising from a narrow and raised bed, constrained by a block-built boundary wall to the west and by a retaining wall to the east. Whilst most of the plants encountered would attain limited stature is at maturity, some trees including Birch, Rowan and cherry will attain sizes enough to outgrow the existing scenario and all result in damage to the adjoining structures. Accordingly, the alignment of trees is considered unsustainable beyond the short-term.	Review in respect retention context but consider early removal and replacement if required.	S	C2

No.	Species	Age	Con	Ht.	CH	N	E	S	W	Stm	Dia.	RPA	Structural Condition	PMR	Yrs	Cat
11	Sycamore (<i>Acer pseudoplatanus</i>)	M	F	13.00	0.00	5.50	6.00	6.00	6.00	1	548	6.57	A broad and spreading specimen whom through low-level sucker growth has developed an extended canopy at ground level. General vigour and vitality appears good though tree arises from notably disturbed ground. Tree asserts substantial potential for size increase over time.		L	B2
12	Turkish Hazel (<i>Corylus colurna</i>)	E/M	F	6.00	0.50	2.50	2.50	1.50	2.50	1	175	2.10	Young and vigorous.		L	B2
13	Lime (<i>Tilia europea</i>)	S/M	F	5.50	0.50	1.50	2.50	1.00	1.50	1	159	1.91	Slightly suppressed but maintaining good vigour and vitality.		L	B2
14	Turkish Hazel (<i>Corylus colurna</i>)	S/M	F	5.50	1.00	1.00	2.50	1.00	1.50	1	153	1.83	Suppressed but maintaining good vigour.		L	B2
15	Lime (<i>Tilia europea</i>)	S/M	G/F	6.50	1.50	2.00	3.50	3.00	3.00	1	229	2.75	Young and vigorous. Asserts immense potential for size increase over time.		L	B2
16	Turkish Hazel (<i>Corylus colurna</i>) Cordyline (<i>Cordyline australis</i>)	S/M	F	5.50	1.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	1	159	1.91	A close-knit alignment of young trees whose canopies of coalesced to create an almost hedge like scenario.	Review regarding retention context.	M	C2
17	Lime (<i>Tilia europea</i>) Turkish Hazel (<i>Corylus colurna</i>)	S/M	G/F	5.50	1.50	3.50	3.00	2.50	2.50	1	197	2.37	Suppressed but maintaining reasonable vigour and vitality. Asserts immense potential for continued size increase over time.		L	B2
18	Turkish Hazel (<i>Corylus colurna</i>)	S/M	F	5.00	1.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	1.00	1	143	1.72	Badly suppressed but maintaining good vigour.		L	B2

No.	Species	Age	Con	Ht.	CH	N	E	S	W	Stm	Dia.	RPA	Structural Condition	PMR	Yrs	Cat
TL19	Tree Line 19 Silver Birch (<i>Betula pendula</i>) Corkscrew Willow (<i>Salix matsudana</i>) Cordyline (<i>Cordyline australis</i>)	E/M	F	6.50-10.00	1.00-1.50	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	1	271	3.25	A close-knit alignment of trees whose coalesced canopies create a singular almost hedge like structure. Whilst most of Birch remain in good condition, the smaller number of corkscrew willow exhibit evidence of decline, dieback and mechanical failure that illustrates minimal sustainability. The birches raise concern in respect of the limited border from which they arise their proximity to hard surfaces and kerbs that may be subject to damage and distortion in respect of ongoing growth.	Remove willows. Review Birch with regarding to retention context.	L	B2
20	Ornamental Cherry (<i>Prunus variety</i>)	E/M	P	4.50	1.25	2.00	4.00	3.50	2.00	1	229	2.75	In an advanced state of decline with minimal viable canopy remaining.	Remove.	N/A	U
21	Ornamental Cherry (<i>Prunus variety</i>)	E/M	P	4.50	1.00	3.00	2.50	2.00	1.50	1	197	2.37	In a state of decline and deterioration that undermine sustainability.	Remove.	N/A	U
22	Ornamental Cherry (<i>Prunus variety</i>)	E/M	F/P	4.50	1.50	3.00	4.00	2.50	2.00	1	207	2.48	Higher crown is subject to decline and deterioration. Is unsuitable for retention.	Remove.	N/A	U
23	Lime (<i>Tilia europea</i>)	S/M	G/F	4.50	0.00	2.50	2.50	2.50	2.50	1	156	1.87	Young and vigorous with immense potential for continued growth over time.		L	B2
24	Lime (<i>Tilia europea</i>)	S/M	G	5.00	0.50	2.50	2.50	2.50	2.50	1	175	2.10	Young and vigorous with immense potential for continued growth over time.		L	B2
25	Lime (<i>Tilia europea</i>)	S/M	G/F	4.00	1.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	1	127	1.53	Young and vigorous with immense potential for continued growth over time.		L	B2

No.	Species	Age	Con	Ht.	CH	N	E	S	W	Stm	Dia.	RPA	Structural Condition	PMR	Yrs	Cat
26	Lime (<i>Tilia europea</i>)	S/M	G/F	5.00	0.50	2.50	2.50	2.50	2.50	1	172	2.06	Young and vigorous with immense potential for continued growth over time.		L	B2
27	Lime (<i>Tilia europea</i>)	S/M	G/F	5.00	0.50	2.50	2.50	2.50	2.50	1	175	2.10	Young and vigorous with immense potential for continued growth over time.		L	B2
28	Lime (<i>Tilia europea</i>)	S/M	G/F	5.50	1.50	3.50	4.00	3.00	3.00	1	207	2.48	Young and vigorous with immense potential for continued growth over time.		L	B2
29	Lime (<i>Tilia europea</i>)	S/M	G	5.50	0.50	3.50	3.50	3.50	3.50	1	229	2.75	Young and vigorous with immense potential for continued growth over time.		L	B2
30	Lime (<i>Tilia europea</i>)	S	F	4.00	1.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	1	156	1.87	Young and vigorous with immense potential for continued growth over time.		L	B2
31	Lime (<i>Tilia europea</i>)	S	G	5.50	0.50	3.50	3.50	3.50	3.50	1	223	2.67	Young and vigorous with immense potential for continued growth over time.		L	B2
32	Lime (<i>Tilia europea</i>)	S/M	G/F	5.00	1.50	2.50	2.50	2.50	2.50	1	159	1.91	Young and vigorous with immense potential for continued growth over time.		L	B2
33	Lime (<i>Tilia europea</i>)	S/M	G/F	5.00	1.50	2.50	2.50	2.50	2.50	1	172	2.06	Young and vigorous with immense potential for continued growth over time.		L	B2
34	Lime (<i>Tilia europea</i>)	S/M	G/F	5.00	1.50	2.50	2.50	2.50	2.50	1	169	2.02	Young and vigorous with immense potential for continued growth over time.		L	B2

No.	Species	Age	Con	Ht.	CH	N	E	S	W	Stm	Dia.	RPA	Structural Condition	PMR	Yrs	Cat
35	Leyland Cypress Group (<i>Cupressocyparis leylandii</i>)	E/M	F	13.00	0.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	1	350	4.20	A close-knit group of 5 individual stems of proximity to one another create a singular crown form. These trees arise from a sloping ground space between 2 disparate site areas. Growth potential over time is immense raising concern, widely understood issues relating to this species. Leyland cypress cannot readily be regarded as suitable for retention within the developed context.	Consider early removal.	N/A	U
36	Crack Willow (<i>Salix fragilis</i>)	S/M	F	8.00	0.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	1	302	3.63	A close-knit and shrubby group of plants that remain vigorous notwithstanding possible signs of anthracnose attack. Considered to be of dubious sustainability considering growth potential and development of invasive root.	Consider early removal.	N/A	U
37	Lime (<i>Tilia europea</i>)	S/M	F	5.50	2.00	2.50	2.50	2.50	2.50	1	175	2.10	Young and vigorous though heavily suppressed at lower levels by competitive shrubbery.	Review regarding retention context.	M	C2
38	Lime (<i>Tilia europea</i>)	S/M	G/F	5.00	1.75	2.50	2.50	2.50	2.50	1	175	2.10	Young and vigorous with immense potential continued growth over time.		L	B2
39	Lime (<i>Tilia europea</i>)	S/M	G/F	5.00	1.75	2.50	2.50	2.50	2.50	1	175	2.10	Young and vigorous with immense potential continued growth over time.		M	C2

No.	Species	Age	Con	Ht.	CH	N	E	S	W	Stm	Dia.	RPA	Structural Condition	PMR	Yrs	Cat
H1	Hedge 1 Pyracantha	S/M	G/F	3.00-3.50	0.00	Spread 2.00m				1	0.35		An unmanaged hedge line associated with substantially asymmetric ground levels and a retaining wall feature. The potential to retain this tree will be solely dependent upon the retention of its associated and existing ground features.	111	1.34	C2
40	Lime (<i>Tilia europea</i>)	E/M	F	9.00	1.25	4.50	4.50	4.50	4.50	1	366	4.39	Young and vigorous with immense potential for continued growth over time.		L	A2
41	Lime (<i>Tilia europea</i>)	S/M	G/F	8.00	1.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	1	229	2.75	Young and vigorous with immense potential for continued growth over time.		L	A2
42	Lime (<i>Tilia europea</i>)	S/M	G/F	8.00	1.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	1	223	2.67	Young and vigorous with immense potential for continued growth over time.		L	A2
43	Lime (<i>Tilia europea</i>)	S/M	G/F	8.00	1.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	1	229	2.75	Young and vigorous with immense potential for continued growth over time.		L	A2
44	Lime (<i>Tilia europea</i>)	E/M	G/F	8.50	1.75	3.50	3.50	3.50	3.50	1	248	2.98	Young and vigorous with immense potential for continued growth over time.		L	A2
45	Lime (<i>Tilia europea</i>)	E/M	G/F	6.50	1.75	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	1	239	2.86	Young and vigorous with immense potential for continued growth over time.		L	A2
46	Lime (<i>Tilia europea</i>)	E/M	F	7.50	1.50	3.50	3.50	3.50	3.50	1	302	3.63	Young and vigorous but located in extreme proximity to wall with stem within 150 mm of same. Is of dubious sustainability.		M	C2
47	Lime (<i>Tilia europea</i>)	E/M	G	6.00	1.50	3.50	3.50	3.50	3.50	1	248	2.98	Young and vigorous with immense potential for continued growth over time.		L	A2

No.	Species	Age	Con	Ht.	CH	N	E	S	W	Stm	Dia.	RPA	Structural Condition	PMR	Yrs	Cat
48	Lime (<i>Tilia europea</i>)	E/M	G	7.00	1.75	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	1	280	3.36	Young and vigorous with immense potential for continued growth over time.		L	A2
49	Lime (<i>Tilia europea</i>)	E/M	G	8.00	1.75	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	1	309	3.71	Young and vigorous with immense potential for continued growth over time.		L	A2
50	Lime (<i>Tilia europea</i>)	E/M	F	7.50	1.50	4.00	4.50	4.00	3.00	1	312	3.74	Young and still vigorous though supports notable imbalance to east.		L	B2
51	Lime (<i>Tilia europea</i>)	E/M	F	7.00	1.25	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	1	251	3.02	Young and vigorous with immense potential for continued growth over time.		L	A2
52	Lime (<i>Tilia europea</i>)	E/M	G	6.50	1.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	1	245	2.94	Young and vigorous with immense potential for continued growth over time.		L	A2
53	Lime (<i>Tilia europea</i>)	E/M	G/F	6.00	1.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	1	236	2.83	Young and vigorous with immense potential for continued growth over time.		L	B2
54	Lime (<i>Tilia europea</i>)	E/M	G	5.50	1.25	4.50	4.50	4.50	4.50	1	312	3.74	Broad and spreading specimen. Young and vigorous with immense potential for continued growth over time.		L	B2
55	Lime (<i>Tilia europea</i>)	S/M	F	4.00	1.25	3.00	2.00	1.00	1.50	1	146	1.76	Relatively small recently installed specimen with pronounced imbalance to North.	Review regarding retention context and or suitability for retention/removal/replacement.	M	C2
56	Lime (<i>Tilia europea</i>)	E/M	G	8.00	1.00	5.50	4.00	3.50	4.00	1	328	3.93	Young and vigorous with immense potential for continued growth over time.		L	A2
57	Lime (<i>Tilia europea</i>)	E/M	G	7.50	1.50	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	1	322	3.86	Young and vigorous with immense potential for continued growth over time.		L	A2
58	Lime (<i>Tilia europea</i>)	E/M	G/F	8.00	1.25	6.00	5.00	4.50	5.00	1	357	4.28	Young and vigorous with immense potential for continued growth over time.		L	A2

No.	Species	Age	Con	Ht.	CH	N	E	S	W	Stm	Dia.	RPA	Structural Condition	PMR	Yrs	Cat
59	Lime (<i>Tilia europea</i>)	S/M	F	5.00	1.50	3.50	3.50	3.50	3.50	1	207	2.48	Young and vigorous with immense potential for continued growth over time.		L	B2
60	Lime (<i>Tilia europea</i>)	E/M	G	1.00	1.00	6.50	5.50	5.50	5.50	1	484	5.81	Young and vigorous with immense potential for continued growth over time.		L	A2
61	Ornamental Cherry (<i>Prunus variety</i>)	M	F	9.00	0.00	7.00	5.00	4.50	5.00	1	366	4.39	Of reduced vigour with limited foliage retention suggesting likely pathogen attack.	Review regularly.	S	C2
62	Ornamental Apple variety (<i>Malus Sp.</i>)	E/M	F	5.00	1.00	3.50	3.00	3.00	2.50	1	185	2.22	Young and relatively vigorous though supporting some twiggy deadwood.	Review regularly.	L	B2
63	Ornamental Apple variety (<i>Malus Sp.</i>)	E/M	F	4.50	1.00	2.50	1.50	1.50	3.00	1	153	1.83	Distorted as result of suppression but maintaining reasonable vigour.		M	C2
64	Blue Atlas Cedar (<i>Cedrus atlantica</i>)	E/M	G/F	11.00	0.50	5.50	5.50	5.50	5.50	1	159	1.91	Young and vigorous with immense potential for ongoing growth and size increase over time. Consideration should be given to ultimate size and brittle nature.		L	B2
65	Swedish Whitebeam (<i>Sorbus intermedia</i>)	M	G/F	9.00	2.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	1	471	5.65	Supports dense crown but is of good vigour.		L	B2
66	Lawson Cypress (<i>Chamaecyparis lawsoniana</i>)	E/M	F	5.50	0.00	2.50	2.50	2.50	2.50	1	207	2.48	Young and vigorous but coalescing with near neighbour.		M	C2
67	Lawson Cypress (<i>Chamaecyparis lawsoniana</i>)	E/M	F	5.50	0.00	2.50	2.50	2.50	2.50	1	207	2.48	Young and vigorous but coalescing with near neighbour.		M	C2

No.	Species	Age	Con	Ht.	CH	N	E	S	W	Stm	Dia.	RPA	Structural Condition	PMR	Yrs	Cat
68	Sycamore (<i>Acer pseudoplatanus</i>)	E/M	F	10.00	1.00	5.50	5.00	5.00	5.50	1	430	5.16	Distorted a multi-stemmed from 1.50 m suggesting early life trauma. Vigour and vitality is good with immense potential for continued growth.	Review regarding retention context.	M	C2
69	Purple Leaved Sycamore (<i>Acer pseudoplatanus purpureum</i>)	E/M	G/F	6.50	2.00	4.50	4.50	4.00	4.00	1	357	4.28	Young and vigorous with substantial potential to can for continued growth over time.		L	B2
70	Sycamore (<i>Acer pseudoplatanus</i>)	E/M	G	9.00	2.00	4.50	4.50	4.00	4.00	1	366	4.39	Young and vigorous with substantial potential to can for continued growth over time.		L	A2
71	Purple Leaved Sycamore (<i>Acer pseudoplatanus purpureum</i>)	E/M	G	6.50	2.00	4.50	4.50	5.00	5.00	1	312	3.74	Young and vigorous. Proximity to kerb raises concerns regarding sustainability.		L	B2
72	Sycamore (<i>Acer pseudoplatanus</i>)	E/M	G	6.50	2.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	1	302	3.63	Young and vigorous. Proximity to kerb raises concerns regarding sustainability.		L	B2
73	Norway Maple (<i>Acer platanoides</i>)	S/M	P	4.50	0.00	3.00	2.50	2.00	2.00	1	159	1.91	Suppressed distorted and in decline. Is ill suited to retention.	Remove.	N/A	U
74	Variegated Sycamore (<i>Acer pseudoplatanus</i>)	E/M	G	8.00	2.00	5.00	4.50	4.00	4.00	1	306	3.67	Young and vigorous with substantial potential for continued growth. Proximity to kerb raises concern regarding sustainability.		L	B2
75	Ornamental Apple variety (<i>Malus Sp.</i>)	E/M	G	6.50	2.00	4.50	5.00	5.00	5.00	1	299	3.59	Young and vigorous with substantial potential for continued growth. Proximity to kerb raises concern regarding sustainability.		L	B2

No.	Species	Age	Con	Ht.	CH	N	E	S	W	Stm	Dia.	RPA	Structural Condition	PMR	Yrs	Cat
76	Sycamore (<i>Acer pseudoplatanus</i>)	E/M	G	5.00	2.00	4.50	4.50	4.50	4.50	1	267	3.21	Young and vigorous with substantial potential for continued growth. Proximity to kerb raises concern regarding sustainability.		L	A2
77	Norway Maple (<i>Acer platanoides</i> <i>Crimson King</i>)	E/M	G	9.00	2.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	1	312	3.74	Young and vigorous with substantial potential for continued growth. Proximity to kerb raises concern regarding sustainability.		L	A2
78	Ornamental Apple variety (<i>Malus Sp.</i>)	E/M	G	7.50	2.00	5.00	4.50	5.00	5.00	1	299	3.59	Young and vigorous with substantial potential for continued growth. Proximity to kerb raises concern regarding sustainability.		L	B2
79	Sycamore (<i>Acer pseudoplatanus</i>)	E/M	G/F	6.50	2.25	3.50	3.00	3.50	4.50	1	264	3.17	Slightly distorted as result of proximity to larger growing specimens.	Review regularly.	L	B2
80	Sycamore (<i>Acer pseudoplatanus</i>)	E/M	G	8.50	2.00	5.50	5.50	4.50	6.00	1	334	4.01	Large and dominating specimen supporting developing Ivy cover. Proximity to kerb raises concern regarding sustainability.		L	A2
81	Sycamore (<i>Acer pseudoplatanus</i>)	E/M	G	6.00	2.00	4.00	4.00	4.50	4.50	1	283	3.40	Young and vigorous with substantial potential for continued growth. Proximity to kerb raises concern regarding sustainability.		L	A2
82	Sycamore (<i>Acer pseudoplatanus</i>)	E/M	F	8.50	2.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	1	369	4.43	Young and vigorous with immense potential for continued growth over time. Proximity to kerb raises concern regarding sustainability.		L	A2

No.	Species	Age	Con	Ht.	CH	N	E	S	W	Stm	Dia.	RPA	Structural Condition	PMR	Yrs	Cat
83	Purple Leaved Sycamore (<i>Acer pseudoplatanus purpureum</i>)	S/M	P	5.00	2.00	2.50	3.00	3.00	3.00	1	197	2.37	In a state of decline with active folia loss. Ill-suited to retention.	Remove.	N/A	U
84	Sycamore (<i>Acer pseudoplatanus</i>)	E/M	G	9.00	2.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	1	334	4.01	Young and vigorous with immense potential for continued growth over time. Proximity to kerb raises concern regarding sustainability.		L	A2
85	Norway Maple (<i>Acer platanoides</i>)	E/M	G	9.00	1.50	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	1	309	3.71	Young and vigorous with immense potential for continued growth over time. Proximity to kerb raises concern regarding sustainability.		L	A2
86	Norway Maple (<i>Acer platanoides</i>)	E/M	F/P	8.50	1.75	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	1	306	3.67	crown vigour is variable with evidence of deadwood and dieback throughout crown possibly indicative of pathogen attack and limited sustainability.	Review annually regarding ongoing suitability for retention.	M	C2
87	Sycamore (<i>Acer pseudoplatanus</i>)	E/M	G/F	7.50	2.00	4.50	4.50	4.50	4.50	1	315	3.78	Young and vigorous with immense potential for continued growth over time. Proximity to kerb raises concern regarding sustainability.		M	C2
88	Sycamore (<i>Acer pseudoplatanus</i>)	E/M	G/F	6.00	2.00	4.50	4.50	5.00	5.00	1	299	3.59	of variable crown vigour though with no direct dieback	review regularly.	L	B2
89	Purple Leaved Sycamore (<i>Acer pseudoplatanus purpureum</i>)	E/M	G	6.00	2.00	4.50	4.00	4.00	4.50	1	280	3.36	Young and vigorous with immense potential for continued growth over time. Proximity to kerb raises concern regarding sustainability.		L	A2

No.	Species	Age	Con	Ht.	CH	N	E	S	W	Stm	Dia.	RPA	Structural Condition	PMR	Yrs	Cat
90	Variegated Sycamore (<i>Acer pseudoplatanus</i>)	E/M	G/F	6.50	1.75	4.00	3.50	4.00	4.00	1	248	2.98	Of variable vigour.	Review regularly.	L	B2
91	Sycamore (<i>Acer pseudoplatanus</i>)	E/M	F/P	5.50	1.50	4.00	3.50	4.50	4.50	1	290	3.48	Of variable crown vigour with Twiggy dieback in evidence about middle crown.	Review regularly.	L	B2
92	Sycamore (<i>Acer pseudoplatanus</i>)	E/M	G/F	7.00	1.25	4.00	4.50	3.50	3.00	1	267	3.21	Slightly unbalanced and of variable vigour.	Review regularly.	L	B2
93	Swedish Whitebeam (<i>Sorbus intermedia</i>)	E/M	F	4.50	2.00	2.00	1.50	2.00	2.50	1	191	2.29	Slightly unbalanced to east.		L	B2
94	Swedish Whitebeam (<i>Sorbus intermedia</i>)	E/M	G/F	5.00	2.00	2.50	3.00	2.50	2.00	1	280	3.36	Supports minor imbalance to east.		L	B2
95	Swedish Whitebeam (<i>Sorbus intermedia</i>)	E/M	F	4.50	2.00	2.00	2.50	2.00	1.50	1	229	2.75	Supports minor imbalance to east.		L	B2
96	Swedish Whitebeam (<i>Sorbus intermedia</i>)	E/M	G/F	5.00	2.00	2.00	2.50	2.00	2.00	1	251	3.02	Is maintaining reasonable vigour and vitality.		L	B2
97	Rowan (<i>Sorbus aucuparia</i>)	S/M	F/P	3.50	0.00	1.50	1.50	1.50	1.50	1	175	2.10	eastern side of crown is subject to necrosis and dieback.		S	C2
98	Rowan (<i>Sorbus aucuparia</i>)	S/M	P	3.00	1.75	1.50	1.50	2.00	1.00	1	83	0.99	In state of ongoing decline with minimal viable crown remaining.	Remove.	N/A	U
99	Rowan (<i>Sorbus aucuparia</i>)	S/M	P	3.00	1.75	0.00	1.50	2.00	1.50	1	89	1.07	In state of ongoing decline with minimal viable crown remaining.	Remove.	N/A	U
100	Hornbeam (<i>Carpinus betulus</i>)	E/M	G	9.00	2.00	4.00	4.00	3.00	4.00	1	315	3.78	Young and vigorous with substantial potential for continued growth over time.	Review regularly.	L	A2

No.	Species	Age	Con	Ht.	CH	N	E	S	W	Stm	Dia.	RPA	Structural Condition	PMR	Yrs	Cat
101	Hornbeam (<i>Carpinus betulus</i>)	E/M	G	9.00	2.00	3.00	4.00	4.00	3.00	1	322	3.86	Young and vigorous with substantial potential for continued growth over time.	Review regularly.	L	A2
102	Rowan (<i>Sorbus aucuparia</i>)	E/M	F/P	3.00	1.75	0.00	1.50	2.50	2.00	1	89	1.07	Heavily distorted and of reduced vigour. Is of dubious retention merit.		S	C2
103	Rowan (<i>Sorbus aucuparia</i>)	S/M	P	3.00	2.00	1.50	1.00	1.50	2.00	1	89	1.07	In a state of ongoing decline in deterioration.	Remove.	N/A	U
104	Rowan (<i>Sorbus aucuparia</i>)	S/M	P	3.00	0.00	1.00	1.00	1.50	1.50	1	111	1.34	In an advanced state of decline and deterioration.	Remove.	N/A	U
105	Ornamental Cherry (<i>Prunus variety</i>)	E/M	F	5.00	2.00	4.00	3.50	4.00	4.00	1	274	3.29	Of fair but variable crown vigour.	Review regularly.	L	B2
106	Golden Ash (<i>Fraxinus excelsior</i> "Jaspidea")	/M	F	5.50	2.00	2.50	3.00	3.00	2.00	1	191	2.29	Of variable crown vigour with substantial twiggy deadwood throughout crown.	Review regularly.	L	B2
107	Purple Leaved Sycamore (<i>Acer pseudoplatanus purpureum</i>)	/M	F	5.00	1.75	2.00	2.50	2.50	1.00	1	143	1.72	Slightly one-sided but maintaining reasonable vigour and vitality.		L	B2
108	Norway Maple (<i>Acer platanoides</i>)	/M	F	4.50	1.50	2.50	2.00	1.00	2.00	1	95	1.15	Appears be maintaining reasonable vigour and vitality though exposed position has resulted in minor crown imbalance.		L	B2
109	Lime (<i>Tilia europea</i>)	S/M	G	4.50	0.00	2.50	2.50	2.50	2.50	1	175	2.10	Young and vigorous.		L	B2
110	Lime (<i>Tilia europea</i>)	S/M	G	4.50	0.00	2.50	2.50	2.50	2.50	1	172	2.06	Young and vigorous.		L	B2

No.	Species	Age	Con	Ht.	CH	N	E	S	W	Stm	Dia.	RPA	Structural Condition	PMR	Yrs	Cat
111	Norway Maple (<i>Acer platanoides</i>)	S/M	F/P	5.00	1.75	2.00	1.50	2.00	2.00	1	111	1.34	Appears to be affected by wind scorch with poor canopy retention.	Review regularly.	M	C2
112	Norway Maple (<i>Acer platanoides</i>)	S/M	F	5.50	2.25	1.50	2.50	1.50	1.00	1	175	2.10	Subject to wind scorch and development of deadwood about higher crown.	Review regularly.	M	C2
113	Norway Maple (<i>Acer platanoides</i>)	E/M	F	5.00	1.50	2.50	2.50	2.50	2.50	1	197	2.37	Young and apparently vigorous.		L	B2
114	Norway Maple (<i>Acer platanoides</i>)	E/M	F	5.50	1.50	2.50	2.50	2.50	2.50	1	191	2.29	Young and apparently vigorous.		L	B2
115	Norway Maple (<i>Acer platanoides</i>)	S/M	F/P	5.00	2.00	2.50	2.50	1.50	1.00	1	124	1.49	Notably one-sided and unbalanced to east.	Consider replacement.	N/A	U
116	Norway Maple (<i>Acer platanoides</i>)	S/M	P	3.50	0.50	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1	64	0.76	Entire higher crown is dead.	Remove.	N/A	U
117	Norway Maple (<i>Acer platanoides</i>)	S/M	F	5.50	2.00	2.50	2.50	1.50	1.50	1	175	2.10	Reasonable vigour and vitality and of drawn-up form.	Review regarding retention context.	M	B2
118	Norway Maple (<i>Acer platanoides</i>)	S/M	P	4.00	2.00	1.50	1.50	1.50	1.50	1	143	1.72	In a state of decline with much of outer crown periphery already dead.	Remove and replace.	N/A	U
119	Norway Maple (<i>Acer platanoides</i>)	S/M	F	5.00	1.50	2.50	3.00	3.50	3.00	2	207	2.48	Young and vigorous but compromised by compression fork at 0.50 m.	Review regularly.	S	C2
120	Lime (<i>Tilia europea</i>)	S/M	G	6.00	0.00	4.50	4.50	4.50	4.50	1	226	2.71	Young and particularly vigorous with vibrant sucker development surrounding base.	Review regarding retention context.	L	B2

No.	Species	Age	Con	Ht.	CH	N	E	S	W	Stm	Dia.	RPA	Structural Condition	PMR	Yrs	Cat
TL121	Leyland Cypress Line (<i>Cupressocyparis leylandii</i>)	M	F	14.00	0.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	1	446	5.35	A close-knit and Crescent like alignment of trees apparently planted to surround and underground feature. Trees remain vigorous with substantial growth potential though concerns arise in respect of widely appreciated management issues. Trees cannot be regarded as suitable for retention within developed context.		S	C2
122	Lime (<i>Tilia europea</i>)	S/M	F	4.50	0.00	2.00	2.50	2.50	1.50	1	143	1.72	Heavily suppressed as result of position beneath canopy of adjoining cypresses. Is of dubious sustainability.		S	C2
123	Norway Maple (<i>Acer platanoides</i>)	S/M	P	5.00	0.00	4.50	4.50	4.50	4.50	1	280	3.36	Of reduced vigour and vitality with central stem already dead. Proximity to underground structures and raised ground levels raise concern regarding sustainability.	Remove.	N/A	U
124	Norway Maple (<i>Acer platanoides</i>)	E/M	F	6.50	2.00	2.00	4.00	3.50	2.00	1	236	2.83	Distorted as result proximity to near neighbours. Proximity to underground structures and raised ground levels raise concern regarding sustainability.	Review regularly.	M	C2
125	Norway Maple (<i>Acer platanoides</i>)	E/M	F	7.00	2.00	2.50	4.00	2.00	2.00	1	223	2.67	Distorted as result proximity to near neighbours. Proximity to underground structures and raised ground levels raise concern regarding sustainability.		M	C2
126	Norway Maple (<i>Acer platanoides</i>)	E/M	F	8.00	1.50	4.00	4.50	3.50	1.50	1	261	3.13	Distorted as result proximity to near neighbours. Proximity to underground structures and raised ground levels raise concern regarding sustainability.		M	C2

No.	Species	Age	Con	Ht.	CH	N	E	S	W	Stm	Dia.	RPA	Structural Condition	PMR	Yrs	Cat
127	Norway Maple (<i>Acer platanoides</i>)	E/M	P	8.00	1.00	4.00	4.00	2.00	0.00	1	271	3.25	Position beneath canopy of adjoining cypresses and is wholly unbalanced. Is unsuitable for retention.	Remove.	N/A	U
128	Sycamore (<i>Acer pseudoplatanus</i>)	S	F	4.50	0.00	1.50	1.50	1.50	1.50	1	64	0.76	Naturally arising from position close to palisade rails. Is of dubious retention merit.		S	C2
129	Sycamore (<i>Acer pseudoplatanus</i>)	S	F	4.50	0.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	1	64	0.76	Naturally arising from position close to palisade rails. Is of dubious retention merit.		S	C2
130	Rowan (<i>Sorbus aucuparia</i>)	S/M	F	4.50	1.50	1.50	1.50	1.50	1.50	1	143	1.72	Of reduced vigour particularly on eastern side of crown.	Review regularly.	M	C2
131	Turkish Hazel (<i>Corylus colurna</i>)	E/M	F	5.50	0.00	4.00	3.50	4.00	4.50	1	229	2.75	Large dominating specimen for area.		L	B2
132	Rowan Group (<i>Sorbus aucuparia</i>)	S/M	F/P	4.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1	80	0.95	Suppressed and of reduced vigour.		S	C2
132	Norway Maple (<i>Acer platanoides</i>)	S/M	F	4.50	1.25	3.00	2.50	2.50	3.00	1	172	2.06	Arises from constrained environment but is maintaining reasonable vigour and vitality.		L	B2
134	Norway Maple (<i>Acer platanoides</i>)	S/M	F	4.50	1.25	2.50	2.50	1.50	2.00	1	166	1.99	Arises from constrained environment but is maintaining reasonable vigour and vitality.		L	B2
135	Rowan (<i>Sorbus aucuparia</i>)	S/M	F	4.00	1.50	1.50	1.50	0.75	1.50	1	121	1.45	Slightly suppressed and distorted but maintaining reasonable vigour and vitality.		L	B2
136	Rowan (<i>Sorbus aucuparia</i>)	S/M	P	4.00	1.25	2.00	2.50	2.00	2.00	1	143	1.72	In an advanced state of decline.	Remove.	N/A	U
137	Rowan (<i>Sorbus aucuparia</i>)	S/M	P	4.00	1.25	2.00	1.50	1.00	1.50	1	143	1.72	In an advanced state of decline.	Remove.	N/A	U

No.	Species	Age	Con	Ht.	CH	N	E	S	W	Stm	Dia.	RPA	Structural Condition	PMR	Yrs	Cat
138	Rowan (<i>Sorbus aucuparia</i>)	S/M	P	4.00	1.25	3.00	1.50	1.00	2.50	1	143	1.72	In advanced state of decline and unbalanced to east.	Remove.	N/A	U
139	Rowan (<i>Sorbus aucuparia</i>)	S/M	P	4.00	1.50	2.50	2.00	1.50	1.00	1	153	1.83	In an advanced state of decline.	Remove.	N/A	U
140	Rowan (<i>Sorbus aucuparia</i>)	S/M	P	4.00	1.00	3.00	1.00	0.00	1.00	1	143	1.72	In an advanced state of decline and unbalanced to east.	Remove.	N/A	U
141	Rowan (<i>Sorbus aucuparia</i>)	S/M	F	4.50	1.25	3.50	2.50	1.50	1.00	1	185	2.22	Unbalanced to south-east but maintaining reasonable vigour and vitality.		L	B2
142	Rowan (<i>Sorbus aucuparia</i>)	S/M	F/P	3.50	1.50	2.00	2.00	1.50	1.50	1	159	1.91	In a state of decline ill-suited to retention.	Remove.	N/A	U
143	Lime (<i>Tilia europea</i>)	E/M	G/F	7.50	2.50	3.50	3.50	3.00	2.00	1	207	2.48	Young and vigorous arising from roadside verge. Supports minor imbalance to east. Is affected by compression fork at 2.50 m.		L	B2
144	Lime (<i>Tilia europea</i>)	E/M	F	6.00	2.25	3.50	3.00	3.00	1.50	1	216	2.60	Affected by mower damage near ground level with substantial bark wound. Tree supports minor imbalance to east.	Review regularly.	L	B2
145	Lime (<i>Tilia europea</i>)Lime (<i>Tilia europea</i>)	S/M	F	5.50	2.50	2.50	2.50	1.50	2.00	1	175	2.10	Young and still vigorous with immense potential for continued growth over time.		L	B2
146	Lime (<i>Tilia europea</i>)	E/M	F	6.00	2.25	4.00	2.50	2.50	2.50	1	185	2.22	Principal stem supports notable imbalance to north-west and has sustained major wounding between 1.00 and 2.00 m. Remains vigorous, but sustainability is impaired.	Review regularly.	M	C2

No.	Species	Age	Con	Ht.	CH	N	E	S	W	Stm	Dia.	RPA	Structural Condition	PMR	Yrs	Cat
147	Lime (<i>Tilia europea</i>)	E/M	F	6.00	2.25	4.00	4.00	3.00	3.00	1	220	2.64	Slightly unbalanced to north-east but maintaining good vigour and vitality. Compression fork development is notable at circa 2.75 m.	Review regularly.	L	B2
148	Lime (<i>Tilia europea</i>)	E/M	F	6.50	2.50	3.50	3.50	2.50	2.50	1	220	2.64	Supports minor imbalance to north-east. Has developed compression fork at 3.00 m stop review regularly.		L	B2
149	Purple Leaved Sycamore (<i>Acer pseudoplatanus purpureum</i>)	S/M	G/F	5.50	2.25	3.00	3.00	2.50	2.00	1	207	2.48	Young and vigorous but supports minor bark wounding from lower damage near ground level.		L	B2
150	Purple Leaved Sycamore (<i>Acer pseudoplatanus purpureum</i>)	S/M	F	5.00	2.25	3.00	3.00	2.50	1.50	1	172	2.06	Supports minor imbalance to east but is otherwise of good vigour.		L	B2
151	Purple Leaved Sycamore (<i>Acer pseudoplatanus purpureum</i>)	S/M	G	7.00	2.00	3.50	3.00	3.00	2.50	1	204	2.44	Is of good vigour and vitality.		L	B2
152	Sycamore (<i>Acer pseudoplatanus</i>)	S/M	G/F	6.50	2.00	3.50	3.50	3.50	3.00	1	210	2.52	Young and vigorous with immense potential for continued growth over time.		L	B2
153	Sycamore (<i>Acer pseudoplatanus</i>)	S/M	G/F	6.50	2.00	4.00	3.50	3.50	3.50	1	210	2.52	Young and vigorous with immense potential for continued growth over time.		L	B2
154	Purple Leaved Sycamore (<i>Acer pseudoplatanus purpureum</i>)	S/M	G/F	7.50	2.00	4.00	3.50	3.00	3.50	1	204	2.44	Young and vigorous with immense potential for continued growth over time.		L	B2

No.	Species	Age	Con	Ht.	CH	N	E	S	W	Stm	Dia.	RPA	Structural Condition	PMR	Yrs	Cat
155	Purple Leaved Sycamore (<i>Acer pseudoplatanus purpureum</i>)	S/M	G/F	7.00	2.25	4.50	4.00	4.00	3.50	1	229	2.75	Young and vigorous with immense potential for continued growth over time.		L	B2
156	Purple Leaved Sycamore (<i>Acer pseudoplatanus purpureum</i>)	S/M	G/F	6.00	2.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	1	194	2.33	Young and vigorous with immense potential for continued growth over time.		L	B2
157	Purple Leaved Sycamore (<i>Acer pseudoplatanus purpureum</i>)	S/M	G/F	6.00	2.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	1	191	2.29	Young and vigorous with immense potential for continued growth over time.		L	B2
158	Purple Leaved Sycamore (<i>Acer pseudoplatanus purpureum</i>)	S/M	G/F	6.00	2.00	3.50	3.50	3.50	03.50	1	197	2.37	Young and vigorous with immense potential for continued growth over time.		L	B2
159	Purple Leaved Sycamore (<i>Acer pseudoplatanus purpureum</i>)	S/M	G/F	6.00	2.00	2.50	2.50	2.00	2.00	1	185	2.22	Young and vigorous with immense potential for continued growth over time.		L	B2
160	Purple Leaved Sycamore (<i>Acer pseudoplatanus purpureum</i>)	S/M	G/F	6.00	2.00	3.00	2.50	2.50	2.50	1	185	2.22	Young and vigorous with immense potential for continued growth over time.		L	B2
161	Purple Leaved Sycamore (<i>Acer pseudoplatanus purpureum</i>)	S/M	P	5.50	2.25	3.50	2.50	2.00	2.50	1	191	2.29	Unbalanced to east and heavily affected by massive bark wound to western lower stem. Is unsustainable beyond short-term.	Review regularly.	S	C2

No.	Species	Age	Con	Ht.	CH	N	E	S	W	Stm	Dia.	RPA	Structural Condition	PMR	Yrs	Cat
162	Maidenhair Tree (<i>Ginkgo biloba</i>)	S/M	G	4.50	2.00	1.00	1.00	0.75	0.50	1	134	1.60	Young and vigorous part of the landscape planting.		L	B2
163	Maidenhair Tree (<i>Ginkgo biloba</i>)	S/M	G	5.00	2.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1	159	1.91	Young and vigorous part of the landscape planting.		L	B2
164	Maidenhair Tree (<i>Ginkgo biloba</i>)	S/M	G	4.50	2.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.75	1	153	1.83	Young and vigorous part of the landscape planting. Part of landscape planting.		L	B2
165	Purple Leaf Sycamore (<i>Acer pseudoplatanus Purpurea</i>)	S/M	G	6.50	2.50	3.00	3.00	2.50	3.00	1	226	2.71	Young and vigorous part of the landscape planting.		L	B2
166	Purple Leaf Sycamore (<i>Acer pseudoplatanus Purpurea</i>)	S/M	G	6.50	2.50	2.50	2.50	2.50	2.50	1	223	2.67	Young and vigorous part of the landscape planting.		L	B2
167	Purple Leaf Sycamore (<i>Acer pseudoplatanus Purpurea</i>)	S/M	G	6.00	2.00	3.50	3.00	2.50	2.50	1	204	2.44	Young and vigorous part of the landscape planting.		L	B2
168	Purple Leaf Sycamore (<i>Acer pseudoplatanus Purpurea</i>)	S/M	F	5.50	2.25	2.50	2.00	2.00	1.50	1	216	2.60	Young and vigorous but has sustained lower stem bark damage.		M	C2
169	Turkish Hazel (<i>Corylus colurna</i>)	S/M	G	7.00	2.00	2.00	2.50	2.50	2.00	1	207	2.48	Young and vigorous.		L	B2
170	Turkish Hazel (<i>Corylus colurna</i>)	S/M	G	7.00	2.25	2.50	2.50	2.50	2.50	1	229	2.75	Young and vigorous.		L	B2

No.	Species	Age	Con	Ht.	CH	N	E	S	W	Stm	Dia.	RPA	Structural Condition	PMR	Yrs	Cat
171	Turkish Hazel (<i>Corylus colurna</i>)	S/M	G	7.00	2.25	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	1	216	2.60	Young and vigorous.		L	B2
172	Ash (<i>Fraxinus excelsior</i>)	S/M	G	5.00	2.00	1.50	1.50	1.50	1.50	1	143	1.72	Young and vigorous.		L	B2
173	Ash (<i>Fraxinus excelsior</i>)	S/M	F	5.00	2.25	1.50	2.00	1.50	1.00	1	131	1.57	Young and vigorous but has suffered notable lower stem damage.		M	C2
174	Ash (<i>Fraxinus excelsior</i>)	S/M	G	5.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	1	162	1.95	Young and vigorous.		L	B2
BH1	Boundary Hedge 1 Beech (<i>Fagus sylvatica</i>)	S/M	G/F	3.00	0.00	Spread 1.25m				m/s	100	1.20	Appears to be managed on regular basis and, dependent upon retention context would offer some degree of sustainability.	Review regarding retention context.	M	B2