ADRIAN HOPE
TREE SERVICES

ARBORICULTURAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT

Revision C

Ref: 11918c

REGARDING PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT WITHIN THE CURTILAGE OF BROCKINGTON, HAFOD ROAD, HEREFORD HR1 1SH

Prepared on behalf of:

IE Developments Limited

Prepared by:

David Gardner BSc.(Hons), NDArb

CONTENTS

1 Summary

The purpose of this report is to provide a preliminary consideration of the arboricultural implications created by the proposed development. In accordance with BS5837:2012 "Trees in relation to design, demolition and construction – Recommendations", trees standing both within the curtilage of the site and off-site trees within 12x their stem diameter of the site have been assessed in accordance with the requirements of BS5837:2012.

In this instance, it is proposed to construct 4 detached dwellings and one apartment building within the curtilage of Brockington, Hafod Road, Hereford HR1 1SH. The arboricultural implications of the proposal are as follows:

1 Implications on Construction Methods
The encroachment by Plot 2 into the Root Protection Area (RPA) of T39 will require the use of specialist construction methods, either manual excavation of the limits of the encroachment in conjunction with pre-emptive root pruning or the use of low-invasive foundations such as a pile and raft design. The proposed new parking spaces within the RPA of T52 and T72 will require no-dig construction methodologies utilising a porous finished surface. The removal of the existing hard surfacing from within the RPA of T48, G6, T86 and G9 will need to be carried out in a controlled manner.

2 Implications for Retained Trees
Some minor crown raising works to T52 may be required to permit the passage of construction traffic.

3 Landscape Implications
It is necessary to fell 18 trees and 3 small groups of trees in total, of which 5 are unsuitable for retention regardless of development with the remainder being of low quality with the exception of 1 moderate quality specimen. A substantial and detailed planting scheme is proposed, both to complement the new facilities, and also to mitigate for the tree loss. The scheme has been designed with the retention of the high and moderate quality trees in mind, particularly T75, at the request of the tree and planning officers.

4 Post Development Implications
The design of the development, together with the orientation of the site is such that matters involving retained trees (e.g. privacy, screening, direct damage, future pressure for removal) are not considered to be significant issues.

Given the above, there are no overt or overwhelming arboricultural constraints that can be reasonably cited to preclude the proposed construction. The proposed design has taken into consideration the constraints of the existing trees and has sought to integrate them as an integral feature of the site.

Impact	Trees Affected	Proposed Mitigation
Trees felled	T37, 38, 40, 43-47, 49, 73, 74, 78-81, T84, T85, T86, G6, G8 & G9	New plantings
Removal of structures / hard surfaces within RPA	T48 & T52	Controlled removal of hard surfacing
Building within RPA	T39	Low-invasive foundations / manual excavation
Hard surfaces within RPA	T52, T72 T82	No-dig construction Manual excavation

Table 1: Summary of potential impacts

Revisions to this document:

- Expansion of Section 3.4 following comments from tree officer

2 Introduction

2.1 Terms of Reference

2.1.1 I have been instructed by IE Developments Ltd with regard to a planning application to be made in respect of the erection of 4 detached dwellings and an apartment building within the curtilage of Brockington, Hafod Road, Hereford HR1 1SH to report on the following in full accordance with British Standard 5837:2012 Trees in Relation to Design, Demolition and Construction: Recommendations. To that end, my instructions are to:

i) Carry out site visit inspecting all trees likely to be affected by the proposed development

ii) Produce an Arboricultural Impact Assessment and associated Arboricultural Implications Assessment Plan

2.1.2 I have been provided with and relied upon the following information in the production of this document:

- Existing Site Plan: XRF_TOPO_SURVEY
- Proposals Plan: P0528-DR-5-001 (F) Masterplan

2.1.3 In the absence of a full topographical survey, tree positions may be approximate only.

2.1.4 It is important to note that this report only considers the arboricultural implications arising from the proposed development on the part of the site owned by IE Developments Ltd.

2.2 Scope of Survey

2.2.1 As Adrian Hope Tree Service's arboricultural consultant I visited the site on 14th March 2016 recording relevant qualitative data in order to assess the condition of the trees present and any constraints they may pose to development in accordance with BS5837: 2012.

2.2.2 The survey of the trees, soils and any other factor is of a preliminary nature. The trees were surveyed on the basis of the Visual Tree Assessment (VTA) method as developed by Mattheck and Breloer (1994). The trees were surveyed from ground level only with no climbing inspections undertaken. It is not always possible to access every tree and as such some measurements may have to be estimated. Where this has been necessary, it will be highlighted in Appendix 1. No samples have been removed from the site for analysis. The survey does not cover the arrangements that may be required in connection with the laying or removal of underground services.

2.2.3 An intrinsic part of tree inspection in relation to development is the assessment of risk associated with trees in close proximity to persons and property. Most human activities involve a degree of risk with such risks being commonly accepted, if the associated benefits are perceived to be commensurate. In general, risks relating to trees tend to increase with the age of the trees concerned, as do the benefits. It will be deemed to be accepted by the client that the formulation of the recommendations for all the management of the trees will be guided by the cost-benefit analysis (in terms of amenity), of the tree work that would remove all the risk of tree related damage.

2.2.4 Trees are living organisms whose health and condition can change rapidly; the health, condition and safety of trees should be checked on a regular basis, preferably at least once a year. The conclusions and recommendations in this report are only valid for a period of one year. The period of validity may be reduced in the case of a change of conditions to or in proximity to the tree.

2.3 The Site

Photograph 1: Application site within curtilage of Brockington, Hafod Road, Hereford HR1 1SH

2.3.1 The site comprises former offices of Hereford Council and contains an extensive amount of car parking and hardstanding as well as large expanses of lawn planted with specimen trees. The application site is generally level although the wider site does slope gently to the north-west.

2.3.2 It is important to note that the site has been split into 2 parcels, one owned by IE Developments and the other by a third party. This report is wholly concerned with the parcel of land owned by IE Developments.

2.4 Subject Trees

2.4.1 A total of 30 individual trees and 3 groups of trees were surveyed, of which 1 is of high quality (A category), 5 are of moderate quality (B category), 21 are of low quality (C category) and 6 are of poor quality / unsuitable for retention (U category).

2.4.2 The species present consist of red oak, Scots pine, purple plum, common ash, Japanese maple, box elder, hawthorn, magnolia, copper beech, Norway maple, Douglas fir, silver birch, Deodar cedar, western red cedar, Holm oak, whitebeam, Leyland cypress and pear.

2.5 Statutory Tree Protection

2.5.1 Hereford Council's online Administrative Map indicates the presence of a group Tree Preservation Order covering a number of trees on the site and that the site lies within the Hafod Road Conservation Area. This means that should any tree with a stem diameter exceeding 75mm 1.5m above ground level be damaged or destroyed by any omission or action not pursuant to the exercising of any full planning permission that may be granted, then the developer and or contractor may be liable to a potentially unlimited fine.

3 Arboricultural Implications Assessment

3.1 Effects of Development on the Amenity Value of Trees On or Near the Site

3.1.1 It is proposed to remove a number of trees to facilitate the development, all of these trees are of poor or low quality with the exception of one moderate quality tree and thus their removal will not be of significant impact to the amenity provided by the site, nor will it affect the character of the conservation area.

3.1.2 The effect of the proposed replanting scheme on the amenity the site provides in future must also be considered. The proposed scheme offers the opportunity to secure the planting of good quality stock of species agreed with the local planning authority, thereby helping to secure long term tree cover on the site.

3.2 Above and Below Ground Constraints

3.2.1 The constraints trees can pose to development can be broadly grouped as being above or below ground. Above ground constraints primarily consist of the current and ultimate height and spread of the trees with species characteristics such as susceptibility to honeydew drip, branch drop *etcetera* also forming a consideration.

3.2.2 Below ground constraints comprise the Root Protection Area (RPA) around each retained tree. Paragraph 4.6.2 of BS5837: 2012 states that this is calculated as an area equivalent to a circle with a radius 12 times the stem diameter. It must be remembered that the circular RPA put forward in the British Standard is a notional representation of the minimum area to be protected rather than an accurate representation of where the roots are likely to be found.

3.2.3 Paragraph 4.6.2 of the British Standard states that where pre-existing site conditions or other factors indicate that rooting is likely to have occurred asymmetrically, a polygon of equivalent area shall be produced that reflects a soundly based arboricultural assessment of the likely root distribution.

3.2.4 Whilst the Standard comments that the default position should be that structures are located outside the RPAs of trees to be retained, it also recognises (paragraph 5.3.1) that technical solutions such as low-invasive foundations are available that enable construction to occur within RPAs without damage to trees.

3.2.5 The quality of the tree in question will also have a bearing on the significance of the constraint it poses. Ordinarily, only moderate quality (category B) and above trees will pose a constraint to development although the removal of significant numbers of low quality (category C) trees may pose a constraint in certain circumstances.

3.2.6 In this instance, the primary arboricultural constraints to development of the site arise from the moderate and high quality trees present, specifically their Root Protection Areas although the crown of T52 has the potential to pose some minor constraints. It should be noted that these high and moderate quality trees are predominantly distributed around the outer part of the site and thus the constraints they pose are likely to be limited in practice.

3.2.7 The principal impact of the proposals is the removal of T37, 38, 40, 43-47, 49, 73, 74, 78-81, T84, T85, T86, G6, G8 and G9. Of these, 5 are U category (unsuitable for retention regardless of development) and thus they do not, strictly speaking, form a material consideration in the planning process. The remaining trees are all C category (low quality) with the exception of the category B T85. The loss of these trees is considered to be of low impact, subject to the proposed replanting scheme, given the number of trees within the application site. It should be noted that a number of the low quality trees as well as the moderate quality T85 have somewhat limited remaining useful life expectancies and thus their removal is of lesser impact than if they were able to make a contribution over a longer period of time.

3.2.8 Whilst it is clear that a number of trees are to be removed, the proposals offer the opportunity to secure a significant planting scheme for the site, providing the opportunity to replace a number of specimens whose removal is necessary regardless of development as well as a number of trees who have a limited remaining life expectancy.

3.2.9 Further implications of the scheme comprise the encroachment of the Root Protection Area (RPA) of T39 by the likely footprint of Plot 2. This encroachment is approximately 18.9sqm or 4.7% of the total RPA and thus is assessed as being insignificant to the future health and growth of the tree subject to the proposed mitigation of manual excavation with pre-emptive root pruning under arboricultural supervision or the use of low-invasive foundations such as pile and raft.

3.2.10 The location of the proposed new parking spaces within the RPA of T52 and T72 necessitates the use of a no-dig construction methodology using a cellular confinement system to avoid potentially significant damage to the root systems of both trees. The parking spaces shall be finished with a porous surface to further minimise any potential impact. The difference in levels such a system entails should be taken into account during the design stage.

3.2.11 There is a very minor encroachment of the RPA of T82 by the proposed new internal roadway. Mitigation of manual excavation under arboricultural supervision in conjunction with pre-emptive root pruning is proposed to reduce the potential very low impacts of this.

3.2.12 The removal and replacement of the existing hardstanding within the RPA of T52 will need to be carried out in a controlled manner, retaining the existing sub-base to prevent disturbance to the root system of the tree. It should be noted that the provision of a porous finished surface will mean that this will be of betterment to the tree.

3.2.13 Similarly, the removal of the existing hardstandings from within the RPA of T48 will be of betterment to the tree provided it is undertaken in a controlled manner.

3.3 Infrastructure Requirements

3.3.1 The installation of services within the rooting zones of trees can have a large detrimental impact on the long-term survival of retained trees leading to their unnecessary loss or root failure in high winds. No services are to be installed within any retained tree's RPA.

3.3.2 Undisclosed siting of above ground services, CCTV cameras, electrical sub-stations, refuse stores, lighting and other infrastructure requirements can lead to unnecessary pruning of tree crowns or root loss during or post development.

3.4 Proximity of Structures to Trees

3.4.1 The juxtaposition of the proposed units retained trees means shading will not be a significant issue to the although some minor organic deposition may occur. I would comment that this can be easily managed by minor crown reductions that are highly unlikely to become onerous over time.

3.4.2 There may be some need to maintain clearance between the crown of T75 and the apartment building but this will not be an onerous task, the slow rate of growth of Holm oak will ensure that this will not be necessary for a number of years.

3.4.3 It is recognised that Herefordshire Council are very keen to retain and maximise the amenity that T75 provides, as indeed is IE Developments. The Council has raised concerns that the proximity of Plot 4 and the block of flats to the tree will lead to post-development pressure to prune or remove the tree.

3.4.4 The concerns regarding the proximity to Plot 4 are perhaps easier to allay, the part of that structure closest to the tree is the garage and thus a combination of minor crown raising and reduction in the long term, will provide an acceptable and sustainable level of clearance to the building whilst having a negligible impact on the amenity of the tree.

3.4.5 The proximity of the apartment block to the tree is closer than that of the Plot 4 house. Nonetheless a resolution remains feasible. It is proposed that T75 is managed using broadly similar methods as described above, a combination of crown raising and reduction to maintain the current clearance. We accept that this is essentially proposing a regime of cyclical pruning but this is preferable to its removal.

3.4.6 There will of course be some loss of amenity than if the tree were left to grow unfettered but this is of course how many trees in urban areas are retained and managed. In any case, this loss in amenity will not be significant, it is not proposed to pollard the tree repeatedly, and will be most felt by the occupants of the apartments. Whilst the tree is visible from Hafod Road, this is only through the 'window' of the site entrance and the view from there of the pruned part of the tree will be largely obscured by the frontage of the apartment building itself.

3.4.7 Holm Oak is a species that is slow-growing and more than capable of tolerating the impacts of cyclical pruning with no ill-effect and therefore I would consider this approach to be sustainable. It is also the intension to install a vertical root barrier just outside the existing RPA to ensure any future root growth does not damage adjacent building foundations. This in itself, coupled with a management regime helps to ensure that the tree can remain long term with no reason for removal.

3.5 Mitigating Tree Loss / New Plantings

3.5.1 An extensive and well-considered replanting scheme is proposed whereby 14 replacement 14-16cm girth nursery grown native ornamental specimens will be planted to replace those lost to facilitate the development.

4 Conclusions

4.1 The potential impacts of development are all low in terms of both quality of trees removed and level of encroachment into retained trees RPAs.

4.2 The affected trees are generally tolerant of root disturbance / crown reduction and as such capable of sustaining these low impacts with significant effect on long-term health and growth.

4.3 The trees that are recommended for removal are of negligible individual or collective significance and as such, their loss will not affect the wider area.

4.4 Therefore, the site has the potential to be developed in line with the proposals with no significant impact to the retained trees or the wider area.

Appendix 1 – Schedule of Tree Condition and Retention Category

REF	SPECIES	HT (M)	STEM DIA. (MM)	BRANCH SPREAD (M)				HEIGHT & DIRECTION OF FIRST BRANCH (M)	LIFE STAGE (YOUNG/ EARLY MATURE/ MATURE/ OVER MATURE)	GENERAL OBSERVATIONS	PRELIMINARY RECOMMENDATIONS	ESTIMATED REMAINING CONTRIBUTION (<10/10+/20+/ 40+)	CATEGORY (A/B/C + 1/2/3)
				N	E	S	W						
T33	Quercus rubra	20	1114	4	8	11	11	2.5 S	M	Limited amount of decay at base on NW side. Sufficient sound material at present	Monitor extent of decay	40+	B2
T35	Pinus sylvestris	12	500	2	3	3	2	3.0 E	M	Slight lean towards boundary due to suppression by T36	None	40+	C1
T36	Quercus rubra	8	254	3	3	3	4	2.5 NW	EM	Suppressed by larger T38 adjacent.	None	40+	C1
T37	Prunus cerasifera	6	445	5	2	4	6	1.6 W	M/OM	Suppressed by T38. Numerous broken limbs at base.	Consider removal	10+	C1
T38	Quercus rubra	18	879	10	8	4	9	2.5 N	M	Numerous Ganoderma brackets at base and buttress development indicative of extensive basal decay.	Fell	<10	U
T39	Fraxinus excelsior	18	939	5	7	6	10	5.0 S	M	Large branch has been removed to S. Suppressed by T38 to north.	None	40+	B2
T40	Pinus sylvestris	12	776	2	4	0	0	5.0 N	M	Trunk covered by ivy. Heavy lean SE, risk of failure onto adjoining property	Fell	20+	C1
T43	Acer palmatum	4	150	2	0	0	4	1 W	OM	Leaning extensively to one side.	Fell	<10	U
T44	Acer negundo	6	MS 318, 382	4	3	4	4	1.6 all round	M	Split in main stem arising from union of secondary limbs. Extensive decay in upper stems	Fell	<10	U

REF	SPECIES	HT (M)	STEM DIA. (MM)	BRANCH SPREAD (M)				HEIGHT & DIRECTION OF FIRST BRANCH (M)	LIFE STAGE (YOUNG/ EARLY MATURE/ MATURE/ OVER MATURE)	GENERAL OBSERVATIONS	PRELIMINARY RECOMMENDATIONS	ESTIMATED REMAINING CONTRIBUTION (<10/10+/20+/ 40+)	CATEGORY (A/B/C + 1/2/3)
				N	E	S	W						
T45	Cretagus sp	4	382	2	7	5	3	1.2 fork	M/OM	Tree suppressed by adjacent brick outbuildings. Old wounds are evident and the tree has lost bark.	Fell	<10	U
T46	Magnolia acuminata	5	400	0	4	5	3	1.2 S	OM	Sparse crown	None	10+	C1
T47	Fagus sylvatica 'Purpurea'	10	828	7	7	7	7	2.5 N	M	Significant decay at graft point around majority of stem. Exudations from numerous points of graft point.	Fell	<10	U
T48	Acer platanoides	9	318	5	4	5	4	1.9 NW	EM	Suppressed by G6 and T49	None	40+	C1
T49	Pseudotsuga menziesii	10	382	3	2	3	3	1 NW	M	Suppressed by T48.	Consider removal and replacement with Cedrus to complement T52	40+	C1
T50	Crataegus sp	6	MS	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.2 fork	M	Extensive dieback in crown	Fell	<10	U
T51	Betula pendula	8	191	3	2	2	2	2.5 W	EM	Forms screening to edge of the car park exit adjacent Hafod Road	None	20+	C2
T52	Cedrus deodora	14	764	4	6	7	4	1.8 N	M	Some branches to north have been removed. Prominent specimen on edge of car park, visible from Hafod Road	None	40+	A2

REF	SPECIES	HT (M)	STEM DIA. (MM)	BRANCH SPREAD (M)				HEIGHT & DIRECTION OF FIRST BRANCH (M)	LIFE STAGE (YOUNG/ EARLY MATURE/ MATURE/ OVER MATURE)	GENERAL OBSERVATIONS	PRELIMINARY RECOMMENDATIONS	ESTIMATED REMAINING CONTRIBUTION (<10/10+/20+/ 40+)	CATEGORY (A/B/C + 1/2/3)
				N	E	S	W						
T53	Acer pseudo-platanus	9	318	3	4	4	4	1.5 N	EM	Forms small cluster of more recent planting with T54, T55 and T56	None	40+	C2
T54	Acer pseudo-platanus	9	222	3	3	3	3	1.6 N	EM	Forms small cluster of more recent planting with T53, T55 and T56	None	40+	C2
T56	Betula pendula	6	175	2	2	2	2	1.5 N	Y	Slightly contorted form to tree	None	20+	C2
T57	Crataegus sp	7	286	2.5	3	3	2.5	1.0 fork	M	Minor specimen adjacent to hedgeline	None	40+	C2
T71	Larix kaempferi	11	350	3	3	3	3	2.0 all round	EM	Forms coniferous pair with T72	None	20+	B2
T72	Calocedus decurrens	10	541	2	2	2	2	1.2 N	EM	As T71	None	20+	B2
T73	Robinia pseudo-acacia	10	423	3	3	3	4	2.0 S	OM	Minor deadwood present throughout crown	None	20+	C1
T74	Robinia pseudo-acacia	10	382	2.5	2.5	4	2.5	4.0 S	OM	Minor deadwood present throughout crown	None	20+	C1
T75	Quercus Ilex	8	477	4	4	4	4	1.3 E	M	Nice specimen tree at edge of H8 with low hanging crown	None	20+	B2

REF	SPECIES	HT (M)	STEM DIA. (MM)	BRANCH SPREAD (M)				HEIGHT & DIRECTION OF FIRST BRANCH (M)	LIFE STAGE (YOUNG/ EARLY MATURE/ MATURE/ OVER MATURE)	GENERAL OBSERVATIONS	PRELIMINARY RECOMMENDATIONS	ESTIMATED REMAINING CONTRIBUTION (<10/10+/20+/ 40+)	CATEGORY (A/B/C + 1/2/3)
				N	E	S	W						
T76	Betula pendula	10	254	3	3	2	2	2.2 N	EM	Leaning to east	None	40+	C2
T77	Betula jacquemontii	9	191	3	3	3	3	2.0 N	EM	Recently planted specimen	None	40+	C2
T78	Prunus sp.	8	286	4	4	3	4	2.0 all round	M	A memorial plaque on a stone at the base of the tree reads, "*Sue Haslam, 1957-1998, Love, Warmth and Happiness Remembered*"	None	20+	C2
T79	Thuja plicata	10	320, 320	4	4	4	5	0 all round	EM	Weak union at base	Consider removal	20+	C2
T80	Sorbus aria	8	254	4	3	3	4	0.5 W	M	Suppressed by T81 & T82	None	20+	C2
T81	Betula pendula	5	207	0	4	4	2	3.0 S	EM	Suppressed by T82 & T83	None	10+	C2
T82	Acer platanoides	12	423	6	2	6	6	1.5 N	M	Suppressed by T83	None	40+	C2
T83	Acer platanoides	10	350	5	6	4	2	2.5 S	M	Low quality specimen	None	40+	C2
T84	Cupressus x leylandii	18	600	4	4	4	4	0.5 all round	M	Outgrown specimen growing in inappropriate location on boundary with residential properties to the immediate south of the site.	Fell	20 – 40	C2

REF	SPECIES	HT (M)	STEM DIA. (MM)	BRANCH SPREAD (M)				HEIGHT & DIRECTION OF FIRST BRANCH (M)	LIFE STAGE (YOUNG/ EARLY MATURE/ MATURE/ OVER MATURE)	GENERAL OBSERVATIONS	PRELIMINARY RECOMMENDATIONS	ESTIMATED REMAINING CONTRIBUTION (<10/10+/20+/ 40+)	CATEGORY (A/B/C + 1/2/3)
				N	E	S	W						
T85	Pyrus sp.	14	500	3	3	3	3	1.5	M	Mature pear standing adjacent to boundary	None	20 – 40	B1
T86	Acer platanoides	9	320	4	4	4	4	1.5	MA	No major physical defects	None	40+	C1
G6	Thuja plicata	Standing on corner on exit to Hafod Road. Good physiological condition but fair condition structurally due to numerous tight forks in Thuja. Forming useful screen but irredeemable structural defects, have limited remaining safe useful life.										20+	C2
G8	2 x Cupressus x leylandii & 1 x Thuja plicata	Outgrown specimens growing in inappropriate location on boundary with residential properties to the immediate south of the site.										20 – 40	C2
G9	Thuja plicata	Standing adjacent to beech T47. Numerous weak unions at base of stems.										20+	C2

Category and definition	Criteria (including subcategories where appropriate)			Identification on plan
Trees unsuitable for retention (see Note)				
Category U Those 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	• Trees that have a serious, irremediable, structural defect, such that their early loss is expected due to collapse, including those that will become unviable after removal of other category U trees (e.g. where, for whatever reason, the loss of companion shelter cannot be mitigated by pruning) • Trees that are dead or are showing signs of significant, immediate, and irreversible overall decline • Trees infected with pathogens of significance to the health and/or safety of other trees nearby, or very low quality trees suppressing adjacent trees of better quality *NOTE Category U trees can have existing or potential conservation value which it might be desirable to preserve; see **4.5.7**.*			See Table 2
	1 Mainly arboricultural qualities	**2 Mainly landscape qualities**	**3 Mainly cultural values, including conservation**	
Trees to be considered for retention				
Category A **Trees of high quality** with an estimated remaining life expectancy of at least 40 years	Trees that are particularly good examples of their species, especially if rare or unusual; or those that are essential components of groups or formal or semi-formal arboricultural features (e.g. the dominant and/or principal trees within an avenue)	Trees, groups or woodlands of particular visual importance as arboricultural and/or landscape features	Trees, groups or woodlands of significant conservation, historical, commemorative or other value (e.g. veteran trees or wood-pasture)	See Table 2
Category B **Trees of moderate quality** with an estimated remaining life expectancy of at least 20 years	Trees that might be included in category A, but are downgraded because of impaired condition (e.g. presence of significant though remediable defects, including unsympathetic past management and storm damage), such that they are unlikely to be suitable for retention for beyond 40 years; or trees lacking the special quality necessary to merit the category A designation	Trees present in numbers, usually growing as groups or woodlands, such that they attract a higher collective rating than they might as individuals; or trees occurring as collectives but situated so as to make little visual contribution to the wider locality	Trees with material conservation or other cultural value	See Table 2
Category C **Trees of low quality** with an estimated remaining life expectancy of at least 10 years, or young trees with a stem diameter below 150 mm	Unremarkable trees of very limited merit or such impaired condition that they do not qualify in higher categories	Trees present in groups or woodlands, but without this conferring on them significantly greater collective landscape value; and/or trees offering low or only temporary/transient landscape benefits	Trees with no material conservation or other cultural value	See Table 2