

**Principal Consultant: Patrick Stileman** BSc(Hons), MICFor, Dip. Arb (RFS), M. Arbor. A

9 Chestnut Drive, Berkhamsted, Hertfordshire, HP4 2JL • Tel: 01442 866112 • Fax: 01442 879388  
Email: [patrick@treeconsulting.co.uk](mailto:patrick@treeconsulting.co.uk) • [www.treeconsulting.co.uk](http://www.treeconsulting.co.uk)

## TREE SURVEY REPORT

**In accordance with British Standard 5837 2012 ‘Trees in Relation to  
design, demolition and construction – Recommendations’**

### Site

Ramada Hatfield Hotel, St Albans Road, Hatfield, AL10 9RH

### Client

Fusion

### Prepared by

Patrick Stileman BSc(Hons), MICFor, Dip. Arb (RFS), M.Arbor.A

### Date

16<sup>th</sup> June 2014

### Project reference:

DS14011401

# 1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 I am Patrick Stileman, Director of Patrick Stileman Ltd. I am acting on instruction of the client Fusion. I have qualifications and experience in arboricultural consultancy and I have given details of this in Appendix 1.

## 1.2 Brief:

1.2.1 Patrick Stileman Ltd is instructed by the client to undertake a survey of trees which could potentially be affected by proposed development at the Ramada Hatfield Hotel, St Albans Road, Hatfield, AL10 9RH in accordance with British Standard 5837:2012 '*Trees in relation to design, demolition and construction – Recommendations*' (hereafter referred to as BS5837). We are to survey all trees with stem diameters in excess of 75 mm at a height of 1.5 metres, including those off site which could pose a potential constraint to development.

1.2.2 Based on the data collected in the tree survey, we are to show constraints to development posed by trees at a preliminary level by means of a Tree Constraints Plan.

1.2.3 The purpose of the information provided at this stage is to give advice on the principal tree constraints in relation to development in order to assist the design process towards the preparation of an arboriculturally defensible scheme.

## 1.3 Caveats:

1.3.1 I surveyed trees at a preliminary level only. The survey must not be substituted for a tree risk assessment report. Detailed inspection including decay mapping, aerial inspections, root or soil analysis etc. was not undertaken. In cases where I consider that further investigation is required I note this in the preliminary management recommendations column of the tree survey data.

1.3.2 The trees were viewed from public vantage points and within the site boundaries only. I had no access to third-party property.

1.3.3 This Tree Survey Report comprises Stage 1 of a five stage arboricultural process relating to planning. Stage 2 is the arboricultural input required during layout design taking account of arboricultural features and constraints; Stage 3 is the preparation of supporting documentation (Arboricultural Implication Assessment) when the layout is to our satisfaction; Stage 4 is the preparation of an Arboricultural Method Statement specifying how trees will be physically protected during the development process; and Stage 5 is the implementation, supervision and on-going monitoring of the works during development.

1.4 **Survey date:** Trees were surveyed by me, Patrick Stileman, on 13<sup>th</sup> June 2014.

## **2 TREE SURVEY**

2.1 **Tree identification:** Individual trees have been allocated a number and groups of trees have been allocated a number prefixed by the letter G. Their locations are shown on the Tree Survey Plan drawing no: DS14011401.01A and data pertaining to each tree or group of trees is included in the Tree Survey Data on Pages 8-13 of this report.

2.2 **Tree data:** In carrying out the survey I assessed the following for each tree and group of trees:

- Dimensions (height, crown spread, stem diameter, and height of crown base).
- Root protection area, based on stem diameter (See 4.6).
- Life stage and physiological condition.
- Structural defects of significance, and general condition. Assessment of the value that the tree provides from a wider landscaping perspective.
- An assessment of the likely remaining useful contribution in years.

Based on the above information, I have allocated a category (A, B, C, U) indicating the quality and value for each tree or tree group (in accordance with BS5837), to be taken into account when planning any future development.

## **3 STATUTORY PROTECTION**

3.1 I have been informed by my client that trees at this site are not protected by a tree preservation order (TPO) and that the site is not within a conservation area which confers provisional protection on all trees (bar exemptions) with stem diameters greater than 75mm at 1.5 metres above ground. At this stage I have not been instructed to confirm the legal status of trees with the Local Planning Authority.

## 4 TREE CONSTRAINTS PLAN

- 4.1 Based on the information obtained by the tree survey I have prepared a tree constraints plan (TCP), drawing no: DS14011401.02A dated 16<sup>th</sup> June 2014.
- 4.2 On the TCP, I have used different colours indicating tree crowns to distinguish between trees which should be removed for reasons of sound arboricultural management (red); trees which could defensibly be removed in order to facilitate development (blue); and trees with a higher retention priority which should, initially, be considered for retention (green). The TCP has been prepared as a working drawing and the suggested tree retention / removal balance is not definitive.
- 4.3 Category C trees are classified as trees of low quality; they should not impose significant constraints to design layout, and if necessary can defensibly be shown for removal in order to facilitate good design. If Category C trees can be satisfactorily retained within the proposed layout then consideration should be given for this.
- 4.4 Category B trees are classified as trees of moderate quality, which covers a large range. It is likely that most Category B trees are ones which should be retained and regarded as a constraint to development. Some Category B trees, particularly smaller individuals, are of insufficient value to impose significant design constraints and removal of such trees can sometimes be justified in order to promote good design (usually on the basis that mitigation is provided elsewhere on the site in the form of high quality new planting).
- 4.5 Category A trees are classified as trees of high quality and there should be a general presumption for retention of these trees.
- 4.6 The TCP shows the position of the Root Protection Area (RPA) for trees with a higher retention priority as broken pink lines, and for trees with a lower retention priority as broken pale brown lines. BS5837 (Section 3.7) defines the RPA as a '*layout design tool indicating the minimum area around a tree deemed to contain sufficient roots and rooting volume to maintain the tree's viability, and where the protection of the roots and soil structure is treated as a priority*'. In other words, the RPA represents the **minimum** area around each tree in which the ground should remain largely undisturbed. The RPA is an area based on a circle with a radial distance of 12x the stem diameter at 1.5 metres in the case of single-stemmed trees, or 12x the combined stem diameter (calculated in accordance with a formula set out in BS5837) for trees with more than one stem. In situations where the site conditions clearly prevent consistent rooting around the tree (for example the presence of roads or buildings within the notional RPA circle) I

modify the shape of the RPA to take this into account. At Ramada Hatfield Hotel I have not considered it necessary to adjust the RPA of any tree and these are all indicated as circles.

4.7 At the design stage (Stage 2 – see Section 1.3.3), detailed advice should be given by the arboriculturalist, specifically in relation to the above ground constraints, namely:

1. Future growth predictions for the key retention trees where this is likely to be significantly different to their existing dimensions.
2. The effects of dominance and shading posed by trees in a) their current context, and b) taking account their future likely growth.

This level of detailed advice is beyond the scope of this report which is preliminary in nature.

## **5 SOIL**

5.1 I am not aware if a detailed soil analysis has been undertaken at this site. I did not take soil samples while on site however I have looked at the British Geological Survey plan to establish the likely nature of the soil present. This indicates that the bedrock geology comprises the Lewes Nodular Chalk Formation with superficial deposits above comprising the Kesgrave Catchment Subgroup of sand and gravel.

5.2 The soils associated with the geology described above are likely to be neutral to alkaline loams with good drainage.

5.3 There may be local anomalies not shown in the British Geological Survey maps and a more detailed site specific soil assessment should be undertaken if required.

## **6 KEY TO TREE SURVEY DATA**

6.1 **Tree / Group reference:** Tree numbers as shown on the Tree Survey Plan. Where trees form a coherent group, they have been assessed as a group, and are shown in the survey and on the plan prefixed with the letter G.

- 6.2 **Species:** These are listed in the schedule by their common name. The botanical names of the principal species present are as follows:

Aspen: *Populus tremula*  
Black Italian poplar: *Populus x canadensis* 'Serotina'  
Ash: *Fraxinus excelsior*  
Sycamore: *Acer pseudoplatanus*  
White poplar: *Populus alba*  
Lombardy poplar: *Populus nigra* 'Italica'  
Weeping willow: *Salix x sepulcralis* 'Chrysocoma'  
Cherry: *Prunus avium*  
Box elder: *Acer negundo*  
Hawthorn: *Crataegus monogyna*  
Downy birch: *Betula pubescens*  
Hazel: *Corylus avellana*  
Myrobalan plum: *Prunus cerasifera*  
Holly: *Ilex aquifolium*  
Norway maple: *Acer platanoides*  
Goat willow: *Salix caprea*  
Elder: *Sambucus nigra*  
Privet: *Ligustrum vulgare*  
Laurel: *Prunus laurocerasus*  
Lawson cypress: *Chamaecyparis lawsoniana*  
Leyland cypress: *x Cupressocyparis leylandii*  
Hornbeam: *Carpinus betulus*

- 6.3 **Ht. (m):** The height of the tree is measured or estimated to the nearest metre.

- 6.4 **Crown spread – NSWE:** Radial crown spread measured or estimated, rounded up to the nearest metre, for north, south, west and east.

- 6.5 **Crown base:** The height above ground level and orientation of the lowest permanent crown base (excluding basal, and small epicormic growth).

- 6.6 **Stem count:** For trees recorded as individuals, the number of stems recorded for the purpose of RPA calculation (where stem numbers exceed 5 an average diameter is assessed).

- 6.7 **Stem dia:** In the first column the stem diameter is recorded for trees with a single stem, or the first measured stem where there are fewer than five, or the average stem diameter for trees with more than 5 stems. The diameter of individual stems for trees with up to five stems is recorded in columns 2-5. Measurements are shown in mm, rounded to the nearest 10. In some situations it is not possible to measure the diameter of stems, and for these estimates are made. When stem diameters have been estimated they are written in *italics*. Measurements are taken in accordance with BS5837 Annex C. For tree groups, stem measurements are recorded for the largest tree in the group.
- 6.8 **RPA Rad:** This shows the radius of the notional RPA circle in metres to be centered on the tree, based on the calculation made using the stem diameter.
- 6.9 **RPA Area:** This shows the calculated RPA in m<sup>2</sup> for each tree (as individuals or within groups). If the notional RPA circle is adjusted (see 4.6) the area must be maintained. The RPA area is capped at 707 m<sup>2</sup>, equivalent to a circle with a radius of 15m.
- 6.10 **Life Stage:** An assessment of the tree's stage of life, where: Y = young, SM = semi-mature, EM = early-mature, M = mature, and OM = over-mature.
- 6.11 **Phys. Condition:** The physiological condition of the tree, reflecting the condition of the vascular system as indicated by leaf and shoot vitality. The physiological condition is not a comment on the tree's structural condition. The physiological condition codes used are G = good; F = fair; P = poor; D = dead.
- 6.12 **Condition and observations:** Description of general tree condition, including structural integrity, the presence of hazards, pests and diseases which may affect the tree's retention span.
- 6.13 **Preliminary management recommendations:** Work required to trees for reasons of sound arboricultural management only, **not for development facilitation**. This is not to be taken as a list of tree work required prior to development activity, but provides management recommendations for trees in their current context. This may include the further investigation of suspected defects. Where trees are located in neighbouring property, this is usually not applicable.
- 6.14 **Ret span:** Estimated remaining likely retention span based on species, condition & context. The following longevity bands are used: <10; 10-20; 20-40; >40. The retention span assessment is based on trees in their current context.

6.15 **Category:** BS5837:2012 Category where:

6.15.1 **U = Trees unsuitable for retention.** Trees in such a condition that they cannot realistically be retained as living trees in the context of the current land use for longer than 10 years. These trees are shown on the tree plans with dark red centres.

6.15.2 **A = Trees of high quality.** Trees of high quality with an estimated remaining life expectancy of at least 40 years. These trees are shown on the tree plans with green centres.

6.15.3 **B = Trees of moderate quality.** Trees of moderate quality with an estimated remaining life expectancy of at least 20 years. These trees are shown on the tree plans with blue centres.

6.15.4 **C = Trees of low quality.** Trees of low quality with an estimated remaining life expectancy of at least 10 years, or young trees with a stem diameter below 150mm. These trees are shown on the tree plans with grey centres.

6.15.5 Trees of notable quality are graded as Category A or Category B. These trees are divided further into sub-categories. Sub-category 1 is allocated where it has been assessed that the tree has mainly arboricultural qualities. Sub-category 2 is allocated where it is assessed that the tree has mainly landscape qualities. Sub-category 3 is allocated where it is assessed that the tree has mainly cultural qualities, including conservation.

6.15.6 Trees may be allocated more than one sub-category. All sub-categories carry equal weight, with for example an A3 tree being of the same importance and priority as an A1 tree.

6.15.7 I do not allocate sub-categories to Category C trees.

*Patrick Stileman*

**PATRICK STILEMAN** BSc(Hons), MICFor, Dip.Arb(RFS), M.Arbor.A  
**Chartered Arboriculturist. Arboricultural Association Registered Consultant**

Director Patrick Stileman Ltd



RAMADA HATFIELD : TREE SURVEY DATA

Tree / Group reference	Species	Ht. (m)	Crown Spread (m)				Crown base (m)	Stem Count	Stem Dia. (mm)					RPA Rad. (m)	RPA Area (m2)	Life Stage Y-SM-EM-M-OM	Phys. Condition G-F-P-D	Condition and observations	Preliminary management recommendations	Ret. Span <10, 10+ 20+, >40	Grade U-A-B-C
			N	S	W	E			1 / mean	2	3	4	5								
1	Aspen	11	5	5	4	4	0m E	4	350	300	250	100		6.41	129	EM	F	Off-site tree in verge adjacent to road. Multi-stemmed from 1 metre. Slight lean towards road. Limited retention span.	No action required at time of survey	10+	C
2	Black Italian poplar	22	6	6	6	5	8m N	2	500	550				8.92	250	EM	F	Twin-stemmed from ground level. Tight union between members likely to limit retention span.	No action required at time of survey	10+	C
3	Ash	17	6	7	6	4	6m W	1	500					6.00	113	EM	F	Open, spreading crown. 2.5 metres length longitudinal stem wound on north-east side caused by old fire damage limits long-term retention span.	No action required at time of survey	20+	B1
4	Sycamore	20	4	7	6	6	3m W	1	750					9.00	254	EM	P	Twin-stemmed from 2.5 metres. Highly included bark with open crack developing from union to 1 metre above ground. High hazard of stem failure.	Remove within 3 months	<10	U
5	White poplar	19	11	1	3	2	7m N	1	650					7.80	191	OM	P	Multiple splits and cavities in crown. Large fractured hanging limb. High hazard of further crown collapse. Bat roost potential.	Remove crown to retain as 14 metre height stem, retained for ecological value	20+ with management	B3
6	Ash	12	0	10	3	3	2m S	2	350	150				4.57	66	EM	P	Poor form with pronounced crown asymmetry south over garden. Low future potential.	No action required at time of survey	20+	C
7	Ash	19	4	4	5	3	7m S	1	570					6.84	147	EM	G	Dominant tree in group with no defects seen of apparent structural significance. Crown asymmetry from competition.	No action required at time of survey	>40	B1
8	Sycamore	10	0	9	2	3	4m S	1	350					4.20	55	EM	P	Poor form with pronounced crown asymmetry south over garden. Low future potential.	No action required at time of survey	20+	C
9	Sycamore	14	7	4	6	2	3m N	1	550					6.60	137	EM	G	Twin-stemmed from 2 metres. Slight crown asymmetry from competition. Tree of moderate overall quality and value.	No action required at time of survey	20+	B1

Tree / Group reference	Species	Ht. (m)	Crown Spread (m)				Crown base (m)	Stem Count	Stem Dia. (mm)					RPA Rad. (m)	RPA Area (m2)	Life Stage Y-SM-EM-M-OM	Phys. Condition G-F-P-D	Condition and observations	Preliminary management recommendations	Ret. Span <10, 10+20+, >40	Grade U-A-B-C
			N	S	W	E			1 / mean	2	3	4	5								
10	Sycamore	15	1	6	5	3	3m S	1	400					4.80	72	EM	F	Located off-site in adjacent property. Crown asymmetry from competition. No defects seen of apparent structural significance.	No action required at time of survey	>40	B1
11	Lombardy poplar	23	2	2	1	2	4m S	1	620					7.44	174	M	F	Slightly low vitality with small dead wood throughout. Stem appears sound.	No action required at time of survey	20+	B1
12	Sycamore	14	5	6	6	3	3m S	1	370					4.44	62	SM	G	Slight crown asymmetry. Tree of moderate overall quality and value	No action required at time of survey	20+	B1
13	Sycamore	15	8	3	5	1	5m W	1	470					5.64	100	EM	F	Pronounced crown asymmetry from competition with G6. Tree of moderate overall quality and value.	No action required at time of survey	20+	B1
14	Sycamore	14	3	5	3	3	4m S	1	400					4.80	72	EM	F	Crown asymmetry developing from competition. Tree of moderate overall quality and value.	No action required at time of survey	>40	B1
15	Sycamore	14	4	4	1	5	4m E	1	380					4.56	65	EM	F	Crown asymmetry developing from competition. Tree of moderate overall quality and value.	No action required at time of survey	>40	B1
16	Sycamore	13	5	4	3	4	2m N	1	320					3.84	46	SM	F	Twin-stemmed from 2 metres. Tree of moderate overall quality and value.	No action required at time of survey	>40	B1
17	Weeping willow	13	6	7	8	2	2m N	1	770					9.24	268	M	F	Re-grown vigorously from heavy past crown reduction. Pronounced crown asymmetry to north-west. Prominent tree - companion with Tree 18 forming significant arboricultural feature but will require future management if retained.	No action required at time of survey	20+	B2

Tree / Group reference	Species	Ht. (m)	Crown Spread (m)				Crown base (m)	Stem Count	Stem Dia. (mm)					RPA Rad. (m)	RPA Area (m2)	Life Stage Y-SM-EM-M-OM	Phys. Condition G-F-P-D	Condition and observations	Preliminary management recommendations	Ret. Span <10, 10+20+, >40	Grade U-A-B-C
			N	S	W	E			1 / mean	2	3	4	5								
18	Weeping willow	15	9	5	8	4	2m N	1	830					9.96	311	M	F	Re-grown vigorously from heavy past crown reduction. Crown asymmetry to north-west. Prominent tree - companion with Tree 17 forming significant arboricultural feature, but will require future management if retained.	No action required at time of survey	20+	B2
19	Sycamore	13	4	4	4	4	6m W	1	490					5.88	109	EM	F	Relatively compact crown. Large low wounds from past limb removal. Tree of moderate overall quality and value.	No action required at time of survey	20+	B1
20	Cherry	10	6	4	4	3	2m N	1	560					6.72	142	OM	P	Slightly low vitality. Heavy past crown reduction. Tree of relatively low overall quality and value	No action required at time of survey	10+	C
21	Weeping willow	7	4	4	5	3	2m W	1	570					6.84	147	EM	F	Re-grown from pollarding at 3 metres where a large wound from past stem failure if likely to develop decay with time. Position next to street light not ideal.	No action required at time of survey	20+	C
22	Box elder	14	4	7	7	5	2m S	1	520					6.24	122	M	F	Past storm damage and significant stem decay at 3 metres on west side which limits retention span.	No action required at time of survey	10+	C
23	Hawthorn	10	3	3	2	2	2m E	1	310					3.72	43	EM	F	Upright growth habit. No defects seen of apparent structural significance. Relatively low significance, but just crosses B grade threshold.	No action required at time of survey	20+	B1
24	Downy birch	15	5	6	3	3	2m S	1	350					4.20	55	M	P	Moderate crown asymmetry to south over neighbouring property. Large stem cavity at 6 metres. Crown failure foreseeable.	Remove for reasons of sound arboricultural management	<10	U
25	Hazel	5	5	3	1	5	1m E	10	40					1.52	7	EM	F	Small tree of relatively low significance.	No action required at time of survey	>40	C
26	Sycamore	19	7	7	7	7	4m E	3	500	500	300			9.22	267	M	F	Located off-site in adjacent property. 3 stems from 1 metre. Crown overhanging site.	No action required at time of survey	20+	B1

Tree / Group reference	Species	Ht. (m)	Crown Spread (m)				Crown base (m)	Stem Count	Stem Dia. (mm)					RPA Rad. (m)	RPA Area (m2)	Life Stage Y-SM-EM-M-OM	Phys. Condition G-F-P-D	Condition and observations	Preliminary management recommendations	Ret. Span <10, 10+20+, >40	Grade U-A-B-C
			N	S	W	E			1 / mean	2	3	4	5								
27	Sycamore	18	7	7	7	7	4m E	2	700	700				11.88	443	EM	F	Located off-site in adjacent property. 2 stems from 1 metre. Crown overhanging site.	No action required at time of survey	20+	B1
28	Sycamore	14	6	4	5	5	3m S	1	430					5.16	84	SM	F	Staining and bark loss at base on northern side. Slightly low crown vitality.	No action required at time of survey	20+	C
29	Myrobalan Plum	13	2	5	5	5	4m E	2	420	280				6.06	115	M	F	Twin-stemmed from ground level with large wound on northern stem from past pruning. Mature tree with relatively short likely retention span.	No action required at time of survey	10+	C
30	Cherry	4	3	2	2	1	2m E	1	130					1.56	8	SM	P	Small tree with poor form. Stunted growth and basal decay developing.	No action required at time of survey	10+	C
31	Cherry	7	1	4	3	1	2m E	1	200					2.40	18	SM	P	Small, slender tree with pronounced lean. Relatively low significance.	No action required at time of survey	10+	C
32	Sycamore	13	5	6	5	6	2m S	5	230	260	220	240	200	6.20	121	EM	F	Multi-stemmed form. Tree of moderate overall quality and value.	No action required at time of survey	20+	B1
33	Sycamore	12	4	2	4	5	3m E	1	290					3.48	38	EM	G	Slight crown asymmetry from competition with Tree 32, likely to become more pronounced with time. No defects seen of apparent structural significance.	No action required at time of survey	>40	B1
34	Holly	6	2	2	2	2	0m E	1	120					1.44	7	Y	G	Small tree of relatively low significance.	No action required at time of survey	>40	C
35	Hawthorn	7	3	3	3	3	2m E	1	270					3.24	33	EM	F	Small tree of relatively low significance.	No action required at time of survey	20+	C

Tree / Group reference	Species	Ht. (m)	Crown Spread (m)				Crown base (m)	Stem Count	Stem Dia. (mm)					RPA Rad. (m)	RPA Area (m2)	Life Stage Y-SM-EM-M-OM	Phys. Condition G-F-P-D	Condition and observations	Preliminary management recommendations	Ret. Span <10, 10+ 20+, >40	Grade U-A-B-C
			N	S	W	E			1 / mean	2	3	4	5								
36	Hawthorn	6	2	2	2	2	2m E	1	250					3.00	28	EM	F	Small tree of relatively low significance.	No action required at time of survey	20+	C
37	Hawthorn	7	0	2	3	3	3m S	5	130	130	130	130	130	3.49	38	EM	F	Small tree of relatively low significance.	No action required at time of survey	20+	C
38	Norway maple	13	5	6	4	6	3m S	4	180	200	250	230		5.21	85	SM	F	Multi-stemmed from ground level with tight unions developing, likely to limit retention span.	No action required at time of survey	10+	C
39	Goat willow	6	4	0	4	5	3m N	1	350					4.20	55	SM	P	Located off-site in highway verge. Highly distorted shape. Poor quality tree.	No action required at time of survey	10+	C
40	Norway maple	5	3	3	3	3	1m N	1	150					1.80	10	Y	G	Located off-site in verge. Small tree of relatively low significance.	No action required at time of survey	>40	C
G1	Sycamore, hawthorn, elder, hazel, ash, black italian poplar	7 to 15	4	4	4	4	0m N	1	350					4.20	55	SM-EM	F	Numerous closely spaced trees in linear group on embankment. Useful screening function with road. Dense ivy on some trees.	Sever ivy stems on trees where ivy dominates crown	>40	B2
G2	Ash, hawthorn	8 to 10	3	3	3	3	2m N	1	300					3.60	41	Y-SM	F	Scrubby group comprising spindly trees of relatively low significance.	No action required at time of survey	>40	C
G3	Elder, holly, sycamore, ash	6 to 8	2	2	2	2	1m N	1	150					1.80	10	Y-EM	F	Scrubby group comprising numerous stems. Relatively low significance.	No action required at time of survey	>40	C
G4	Privet	5	2	2	2	2	0m W	6	30					0.89	2	SM	F	Short linear group partially managed as a hedge. Relatively low significance.	No action required at time of survey	20+	C
G5	Laurel, hazel, myrobalan plum, elder	9	3	3	3	3	0m N	1	200					2.40	18	EM	F	Scrubby group comprising predominantly laurel with other scattered, poor quality woody vegetation throughout.	No action required at time of survey	20+	C

Tree / Group reference	Species	Ht. (m)	Crown Spread (m)				Crown base (m)	Stem Count	Stem Dia. (mm)					RPA Rad. (m)	RPA Area (m2)	Life Stage Y-SM-EM-M-OM	Phys. Condition G-F-P-D	Condition and observations	Preliminary management recommendations	Ret. Span <10, 10+ 20+, >40	Grade U-A-B-C
			N	S	W	E			1 / mean	2	3	4	5								
G6	Lawson cypress	10 to 15	2	2	2	2	2m W	1	600					7.20	163	M	F	Linear group comprising trees typically multi-stemmed from 2 metres with slender stems, some leaning. Relatively limited likely retention span.	No action required at time of survey	10+	C
G7	Ash, sycamore	6 to 15	3	3	2	4	2m E	1	250					3.00	28	Y-SM	F	Group comprising small saplings and 3 semi-mature trees. Slender stems. Tree group of relatively low significance.	No action required at time of survey	>40	C
G8	Leyland cypress	6	2	2	2	2	0m E	1	120					1.44	7	Y	F	Linear group providing useful screening function close to boundary.	No action required at time of survey	>40	B2
G9	Leyland cypress	15	4	4	4	4	3m E	1	300					3.60	41	SM	F	Located off-site in adjacent property. 3 relatively slender trees close to boundary.	No action required at time of survey	10+	C
G10	Leyland cypress	16	3	3	3	3	1m N	1	350					4.20	55	EM	P	Group surrounding sub-station. Trees have low vitality. At southern end trees typically lean east	No action required at time of survey	10+	C
G11	Hornbeam, hawthorn	8 to 14	4	4	2	8	2m E	3	500	250	250			7.35	170	M	F	Linear group close to boundary with useful screening function . Dense ivy throughout.	Sever ivy stems	20+	B2
G12	Myrobalan Plum	7	6	6	6	6	0m E	1	600					7.20	163	OM	P	Group in corner of site of poor quality with some stems collapsing.	No action required at time of survey	10+	C
G13	Privet	4	1	1	1	1	0m S	8	30					1.02	3	M	G	Clipped hedge with useful screening function.	No action required at time of survey	20+	B2
G14	Privet	4	1	1	1	1	0m S	8	30					1.02	3	M	G	Clipped hedge with useful screening function.	No action required at time of survey	20+	B2

## APPENDIX 1

### Qualifications and experience of Patrick Stileman BSc(Hons), MICFor, Dip.Arb(RFS), M.Arbor.A

I am Patrick Stileman, director of Patrick Stileman Ltd Arboricultural Consultancy.

My qualifications in arboriculture are as follows:

National Certificate in Arboriculture *Nch(arb)*

The Arboricultural Associations Technicians Certificate *Tech.Cert (Arbor.A)*

The Royal Forestry Society's Professional Diploma in Arboriculture *Dip.Arb(RFS)*

In addition to the qualifications listed above which are specific to the field of arboriculture, I also hold an honours degree in Environmental Science *BSc(Hons)*.

I hold chartered status, being a Chartered Arboriculturist and professional member of the Institute of Chartered Foresters *MICFor*.

I am a registered consultant with the Arboricultural Association.

I am a trained expert witness, and hold the Cardiff University Bond Solon Expert Witness Certificate.

I am a member of the Royal Forestry Society.

I have been working within the arboricultural industry since 1994 and have been working as a consultant since 2001. I am frequently instructed by professionals to provide advice and assistance relating to trees within the planning process; I have a wide client base in this field including developers, architects, planning consultants, and Local Planning Authorities. I am experienced with providing arboricultural input in planning appeals as written representation, informal hearing and public local inquiry.

I am regularly instructed to assist with tree risk assessments, and to provide guidance relating to tree safety. Past clients for this work include Local Authorities, schools, residents associations, large organisations including zoos and estates, and private individuals.

I provide advice in relation to alleged tree-related damage to buildings. Clients for this work are typically domestic homeowners, but have also included Hertfordshire County Council and Dacorum Borough Council. Other work that I undertake involves the provision of tree planting schemes; and advice relating to the general management of trees.

I have worked as an arboricultural expert witness for public and private sector clients.

Prior to running my current consulting practice, I was a partner in an arboricultural contracting business in which I was involved with the practical aspect of organising, and execution of contract tree work.