<u>Trees and Construction</u> BS5837 Tree Survey Assessment

Site:	The Graftonbury Garden Hotel, Grafton, Herefordshire, HR2 8BN
Ref:	14553/A1
Client:	Procuro Planning Services Ltd

NKM ASSOCIATES

Arboricultural Consultant	Arboricultural Consultant
(Author):	(Checked by):
Tony Banner TechCert (ArborA), TechArborA	Andrew Turnbull FDSc MArborA

- February 2015 -

Procuro Planning Services Ltd | **CLIENT** The Graftonbury Garden Hotel, Grafton | **SITE** 14553/A1 | **REF** 06/02/2015 | **DATE**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Title	Page
1	Introduction	3
2	Site & Application Information	4
3	Findings & Recommendations	5 - 8

Appendices

Caveat	Ι
Terms and Definitions	II
Tree data table & Tree Constraints Plan	III

Revision	Description	Date
/	/	/

Procuro Planning Services Ltd | **CLIENT** The Graftonbury Garden Hotel, Grafton | **SITE** 14553/A1 | **REF** 06/02/2015 | **DATE**

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 **Instruction:** This advice has been prepared for Procuro Planning Services ltd (hereafter; client) and is in respect of the tree related considerations at the The Graftonbury Garden Hotel, Grafton, Herefordshire, HR2 8BN (hereafter; site).

As the proposal relates to development works at site, the advice herein is produced in accordance with the British Standard 5837 : 2012 '*Trees in Relation to Design, Demolition and Construction - Recommendations*' (hereafter; BS5837).

- 1.2 **BS5837:** The scope of BS5837 is to provide guidance on how trees and other vegetation can be integrated into construction and development design schemes. The overall aim is to ensure the protection of amenity by trees which are appropriate for retention.
- 1.3 **Scope of this advice:** This advice has been produced in accordance with BS5837 and is intended to demonstrate the site's realistic arboricultural constraints and assist with the design process. The objective is to systematically assess and provide suitable recommendations regarding the proposal's potential impact on trees and vice versa.
- 1.4 Following instruction the consultant surveyed the site on the 30th January 2015 where a site walkover and BS5837 tree survey were carried out; all trees on site and around the application boundary were surveyed from ground level and plotted as either an individual or a tree group.
- 1.5 This advice is subject to caveat at Appendix I, outlines relevant terms and definitions at Appendix II and constitutes the findings of the preliminary site assessment and associated arboricultural recommendations.
- 1.6 The survey data and site observations use the supplied topographical survey to illustrate the surveyed trees in plan format as a 'Tree Constraints Plan' (hereafter; TCP); the TCP and the tree survey data table are at Appendix III.

2. SITE INFORMATION & TREE ASSESSMENT

- 2.1 The site currently comprises the Graftonbury Garden Hotel with associated access, parking and gardens. Vehicular/pedestrian access is directly off Grafton Lane in the north of site.
- 2.2 **Proposal:** No detailed scheme has been provided at this stage for comment, however, it is understood that the site is being considered for residential development. As such, the considerations herein surround the principal of development in respect of trees and tree retention / protection recommendations.
- 2.3 The site requires consideration from an arboricultural perspective due to the presence of trees on and around the site; these trees are deemed to be within impacting distance of the existing property and potential construction area.
- 2.4 <u>The trees</u> -
- 2.4.1 The tree survey and assessment resulted in the BS5837 quality/retention categories of 'A high', 'B moderate' and 'C low' being attributed to trees/tree groups as well as those categorised as 'U' for those dead, dying or dangerous trees needing to be removed.
- 2.4.2 The gardens at site are well landscaped with a number of large mature specimens contributing to the collective, most notably the high quality 'A' category trees. Thereafter, mostly moderate quality growth makes the planting at site.
- 2.4.3 There are identified defects to the surveyed trees, this has resulted in the recommendation for tree removal, i.e. the category 'U' trees. Thereafter, general site inspections and tree works will be required for H&S tree risk management, namely for those trees around the boundaries, or in closer proximity to the developed areas.

Procuro Planning Services Ltd | **CLIENT** The Graftonbury Garden Hotel, Grafton | **SITE** 14553/A1 | **REF** 06/02/2015 | **DATE**

3. FINDINGS & RECOMMENDATIONS

- 3.1 The following information, as with the prior contents of this report, should be read with the appended tree data table and tree constraints plan (14553/TCP/01).
- 3.2 <u>General Considerations for Tree Retention / Removal</u>
- 3.2.1 Based on the boundary line location/neighbour's site location of T9 and T22, their retention and protection is to be assumed as part of the scheme.
- 3.2.2 Due to the poor condition and defects noted to the trees categorised as 'U', and in the context of a residential development with regular future site use, it is recommended that T12, T13 and T23 be removed.
- 3.2.3 Based on the prominence and lack of significant defects of the high quality 'A' category trees (T5, T8, T14 and T20), these trees are to be retained, protected and be clear of the proposal.
- 3.2.4 The 'B' category trees (T1, T2, T7, T10, T11, T15, T17 T19, T21, T22, T27, T28, G1 and G2), provide a moderate quality contribution to the amenity of site. For the most part, said trees are situated towards the boundaries. Hence, said trees should be retained and protected by avoidance in the design and layout of a scheme.
- 3.2.5 The low quality 'C' category trees (T3, T4, T6, T16, T24 T26, T29, T30, G3 and G4), are noted as such due to either their small scale, poor form and/or defects. As such, said trees should not significantly guide nor constrain a scheme. However, for those which contribute to the screen/sheltering of site, most notable along the south boundary, their retention should be an aim of a scheme to maintain the screen. Thereafter, new tree planting will be required in acknowledgement for the removal of low/poor quality trees or suitable justification with mitigation planting to replicate and enhance amenity.
- 3.2.6 The proportionate removal of the above trees or vegetation would not negatively impact on amenity and are required for health and safety management of the tree stock.
- 3.3 <u>Tree Protection</u>
- 3.3.1 The design and layout of the site is to incorporate the essential components of retained trees (crown and rooting area) and provide a suitable level of clearance to allow for their long term safe retention, i.e. RPA protection and crown clearance as well as for any new tree(s) being planted.

3.3.2 Depending on the level of tree retention/removal, the protection methods for the retained trees is likely to vary. However, it is likely that a combination of construction restrictions be used with protective barrier fencing (to protect RPAs).

The process of site operations will be an important aspect to confirm by way of a construction layout plan, i.e. showing storage areas, parking, delivery area, access routes etc., all outside of RPAs or with a provision for ground protection. As a basis for tree protection the following points will need to be considered:

- Removal of all agreed trees and any agreed pruning works prior to works commencing by a suitably qualified arboricultural contractor;
- Induction of construction personnel regarding the exclusion of works (including access and storage) from the retained trees' RPAs;
- Secure temporary barrier fencing around the site to exclude the retained tree's crowns and RPAs from the working site;
- The storage of materials clear of all retained trees and conditions to ensure no contamination/run-off into soils in proximity to trees or on higher ground;
- For the removal of existing structures and/or hard surfaces from RPAs the works to be undertaken separate to construction, manually and sensitively.

3.4 <u>General Overview</u>

3.4.1 The considerations for trees which are to be retained as part of the proposal need to be addressed in order to ensure their protection. This is to account for the potential impact on retained trees and their growing environment from the proposed development and vice versa (these follow).

Tree Works

Any trees which are to be removed should be well indicated to ensure that the retained trees are suitably protected. Hence, all trees which are to be removed are to be marked by a suitably qualified person [spraying the stems with a cross] prior to tree works.

Tree Crowns

Consideration is required for both existing and newly planted trees whereby the proposed construction should take account of trees reaching their full growth potential. It is always prudent to provide adequate clearance from a tree's current crown for future growth, i.e. to allow a tree adequate space to reach maturity without conflicts with new structures.

Root Protection Areas (RPA)

As a minimum it would be suitable to consider the outer extents of retained trees' RPAs as construction exclusion zones and be protected.

Procuro Planning Services Ltd | **CLIENT** The Graftonbury Garden Hotel, Grafton | **SITE** 14553/A1 | **REF** 06/02/2015 | **DATE**

As above, it is *sometimes* possible to undertake construction activities within the rooting areas of retained trees which requires greater attention to tree protection, foundation designs, phasing of works etc. If it is proposed to undertake works within these areas, more specific advice should be sought from a qualified arboriculturalist with a view to assessing the feasibility of said proposal and forming a suitable method statement.

Demolition/Excavation Works

Any removal of existing built structures (including stairways, small outbuildings, retaining walls etc.) or hard surfacing will need to be undertaken with great care where this occurs within or near to the anticipated rooting areas of retained trees.

Said works should adhere to the RPA restrictions, be undertaken manually with hand held non mechanical tools and ensure that existing ground levels are retained.

Hard Landscape Works

Conversion of soft surfaced areas within RPAs to hard surfaced walkways, parking areas etc., will need to utilise a no-dig product to ensure no negative impact on the tree roots and/or growing conditions.

3.4.2 For any proportion of tree removal, new tree planting is to be integrated into a landscape scheme. The new trees should be of a suitable volume, species, scale, in suitably prepared planting locations with adequate space for future growth and development and enhance the site's long term amenity contribution.

3.5 Additional Details

3.5.1 The surveyed trees have been subject to a detailed inspection and the arboricultural considerations detailed within this advice. The advice herein is intended to guide a suitable design in consideration for the site's valuable amenity assets.

Where retained trees are avoided and removed trees are mitigated, typically, the considerations herein can form part of tree related planning conditions. These are then detailed within a method statement based on the approved scheme; proposed construction near trees may require detailed method statements to support the planning application and should be requested where present within the design.

- 3.5.2 Where the aspect of tree removal is supported by the council, the removals mentioned herein will leave arboricultural constraints which can be managed effectively, i.e. by the use of the barrier fencing etc. The use of planning conditions for detailed protection methods and new tree planting proposals are therefore considered suitable.
- 3.5.3 The finer details of the tree planting proposals are to be illustrated on a tree planting landscape plan. This is to include the exact proposals for hard and soft landscaping



Procuro Planning Services Ltd | **CLIENT** The Graftonbury Garden Hotel, Grafton | **SITE** 14553/A1 | **REF** 06/02/2015 | **DATE**

together with the details for tree planting locations, species and stock selection, installation and maintenance; this is to be undertaken by the appointed landscape architect who will have the full support of the arboricultural consultant where required.

This concludes our advice.

Procuro Planning Services Ltd | **CLIENT** The Graftonbury Garden Hotel, Grafton | **SITE** 14553/A1 | **REF** 06/02/2015 | **DATE**

Caveat

Any and all information supplied to NKM Associates by/on behalf of the client is assumed to be accurate unless otherwise informed. | This advice is limited to the observations made on the date of inspection as detailed herein and any deletion, editing or alteration will result in the advice being null and void in its entirety. | This advice in its entirety may be deemed null and void if remedial works are undertaken on any area of the site, on or after the date of the survey. | No liability is assumed by the author or by NKM Associates for any misuse, misinterpretation or misrepresentation of this advice. | This advice is not valid in adverse or unpredictable weather conditions or for any failure due to 'force majeure' or unpredictable events. | No responsibility is assumed either by the author of this advice or by NKM Associates for any legal matters that may arise as a consequence. | Neither the author nor NKM Associates will be required to attend court or give testimony as part of this agreement. | The responsibility for any works undertaken on the basis of the recommendations of this advice does not form part of this agreement.

Procuro Planning Services Ltd | **CLIENT** The Graftonbury Garden Hotel, Grafton | **SITE** 14553/A1 | **REF** 06/02/2015 | **DATE**

Appendix II

Terms and Definitions

"Arboriculturist" - person who has, through relevant education, training and experience, gained expertise in the field of trees in relation to construction.

"Competent Person" - person who has training and experience relevant to the matter being addressed and an understanding of the requirements of the particular task being approached.

"Topographical survey" - an accurately measured land survey undertaken to show all relevant existing site features. *A method of carrying out topographical surveys is given in RICS specification* Surveys of land buildings and utility services at scales of 1:500 and larger.

"*BS5837 Tree survey*" - should be undertaken by an arboriculturist to record information about the trees on or adjacent to a site. The results of the tree survey, including material constraints arising from existing trees that merit retention, should be used (along with any other relevant baseline data) to inform feasibility studies and design options. For this reason, the tree survey should be completed and made available to designers prior to and/or independently of any specific proposals for development.

"Tree categorisation method" - trees should be categorised in accordance with the BS5837 cascade chart by an arboriculturist. This is to identify the quality and value (in a non-fiscal sense) of the existing tree stock, allowing informed decisions to be made concerning which trees should be removed or retained in the event of development occurring.

"Root protection area (RPA)" - 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, shown as an arboricultural constraint in m². The radius is calculated using the BS5837 calculation method. An arboriculturist may change the shape of an RPA but not reduce its area.

"*Arboricultural implications assessment*" - a study, undertaken by an arboriculturist, to identify, evaluate and possibly mitigate the extent of direct and indirect impacts on existing trees that may arise as a result of the implementation of any site layout proposal.

"*Arboricultural method statement*" - methodology for the implementation of any aspect of development that is within the root protection area, or has the potential to result in loss of or damage to a tree to be retained.

"Tree protection plan" - a scale drawing, informed by descriptive text where necessary, based upon the finalised proposals, showing trees for retention and illustrating the tree and landscape protection measures.

Procuro Planning Services Ltd | **CLIENT** The Graftonbury Garden Hotel, Grafton | **SITE** 14553/A1 | **REF** 06/02/2015 | **DATE**

Appendix III

Data Table:

As appended (BS5837 Tree Survey Key & Table)

Tree Constraints Plan:

As appended (14553/TCP/01)

TREE SURVEY 'KEY' - BRITISH S	TANDA	RD 5837:2012 'TREES IN RELATION TO DESIGN, DEMOLITION & CONSTRUCTION - RECOMMENDATIONS'
FIELD KEY:		
TPO/CA	-	On client request: presence of Tree Preservation Orders (TPO) / site location within a Conservation Area (CA) & date checked;
TREE REF. #	-	Tree reference number: tag or plan number (T - individual tree, G - group of trees/shrubs, H - hedge);
SPECIES	-	Genus, species and/or common name;
AGE	-	Age classification (NP - new planting, Y - young, SM - semi mature, M - mature, LM - late mature, OM - over mature);
HEIGHT (in m)	-	Approximate height of tree in metres;
CANOPY (in m) N - S - E - W	-	Approximate branch spread in metres of the four principal compass points;
STEM (in mm)	-	Stem diameter in millimetres: measured in accordance with s.4.6 of BS5837;
RPA (in m)	-	Circle radius of the Root Protection Area: calculated using the stem diameter (single/multiple stem variant, as outlined within BS5837);
CLEARANCE (in m)	-	Crown clearance in metres above the adjacent ground level;
IST BRANCH (in m)	-	Clearance in metres to first significant branch and direction of growth (where relevant);
VITALITY	-	Physiological condition typically gauged from canopy cover and annual extension growth (good, fair, poor, dead);
ESTIMATED REMAINING CONTRIBUTION	-	Approximate number of years the tree will continue to make a contribution without the need for oppressive arboricultural intervention, categorised in years as <10, 10-20, 20-40 and >40;
NOTES	-	Structural and physiological condition observations;
BS CAT.	- - - -	BS5837 tree quality assessment category: resulting from structural/physiological condition and remaining contribution (approximate Standard retention category U : in such a condition that any existing value would be lost within 10 years; Standard retention category A : high quality and value, in such a condition as to be able to make substantial contribution of 40+ years; Standard retention category B : moderate quality and value, in such a condition as to make a significant contribution of 20+ years; Standard retention category C : low quality and value, currently in adequate condition to remain until new planting could be established Standard retention sub-category, mainly due to: 1 - Arboricultural values, 2 - Landscape values, 3 - Cultural values, including conservation;
MANAGEMENT	-	Preliminary management recommendations (as appropriate);
• * •	-	Within the survey schedule denotes an estimate

	TREE SURVEY IN ACCORDANCE WITH BRITISH STANDARD 5837:2012 'TREES IN RELATION TO DESIGN, DEMOLITION & CONSTRUCTION - RECOMMENDATIONS'															
	CLIENT:	Procuro Pla	anning Se	rvice	s Ltd		PRO	DJECT REF:	14533				SITE:	The Graftonbury Garden Hotel, Grafton, Herefor	dshire,	HR2 8BN
	CONTACT:	Neil Musgra	ave				SUF	RVEY DATE:	30th Ja	nuary 2015		ARB CON	SULTANT:	Tony Banner TechCert (ArborA), TechArborA &	Andy ⁻	Turnbull FDSc MArborA
TREE REF. #	SPECIES	AGE	HEIGHT (in m)	C/ N	ANOF - S	Υ(in - Ε -	m) W	STEM (in mm)	RPA (in m)	CLEARANCE (in m)	1st BRANCH (in m)	VITALITY	LIFE EXPEC.	NOTES	BS CAT.	MANAGEMENT
G1	Yew Group	SM / M	< 11	1	1	1	1	120 - 580	7.0	1	n/a	Normal	40 +	Growing along boundary with Grafton Lane, general good form, no significant defects.	В 3	
T1	Yew; Taxus, Taxodiaceae	SM / M	10	3.5	4	7	3	450	5.4	1	1	Normal	40 +	In G1, good form and future potential, no significant defects, low branching from stem (measured below).	В 2	
T2	Oak; Quercus, Fagaceae	SM / M	20	8	5	8	2.5	630	7.6	8	8	Normal	40 +	Planted adjacent to drive, stem lean east, minor deadwood.	В 2	
Т3	False Acacia; Robinia, Fabaceae	М	20	4.5	5.5	7	2.5	710	8.5	6.5	7	Fair	10 - 20	Planted adjacent to drive, stem lean east, deadwood, hazard beam crack on lateral.	C 3	Remove hazard beam cracked lateral.
T4	Oak; Quercus, Fagaceae	Y	5	1.5	2	2	2	110	1.3	1.5	1	Normal	40 +	Planted adjacent to drive, stem lean east, current small scale, multiple crown, poor form.	C 3	
T5	Oak; Quercus, Fagaceae	М	20	9	10	9	8.5	860	10.3	2	4	Normal	40 +	Planted adjacent to drive, stem lean east, close to gate, minor deadwood, dead lvy on stem.	A 2	Crown clean.
Т6	Cypress; Cupressus, Cupressaceae	SM / M	14	2.5	2.5	2.5	2.5	290	3.5	0	0	Normal	10 - 20	Growing close to boundary, fair/poor form, multiple stem at 1.5m - measured below.	C 3	
T7	Monterey Cypress; Cupressus, Cupressaceae	М	23	2.5	2.5	2.5	2.5	660	7.9	2	1	Normal	40 +	Large prominent tree, basal decay, pronounced root flare.	В 2	
Т8	Oak; Quercus, Fagaceae	М	22	10	12	9.5	11	1250	15.0	3	3	Normal	40 +	Large prominent tree, growing on boundary - no access to stem, multiple stem at 2.5m, active management evident.	A 2	
Т9	Dawn Redwood; Metasequoia glyptostroboides	М	23	6.5	4	4.5	4.5	1270	15.0	10 +	4	Normal	40 +	Offsite in neighbours garden, good form and future potential, no access to stem.	A 2	
T10	Lime; Tilia, Tiliaceae	М	13	7	6.5	7	7	430	5.2	1	2	Normal	40 +	Planted along east boundary, multiple stem at 2m, fair form, contributes to screening/ sheltering of site.	В 3	
G2	Conifer Group	М	< 10	1	1	1	1	210 - 390	4.7	1.5	0	Normal	40 +	Planted along east boundary, fair form, contributes to screening/sheltering of site.	В 3	
T11	Lombardy Poplar; Populus, Salicaceae	М	21	2.5	2.5	2.5	2.5	650	7.8	10 +	4	Normal	20 - 40	Planted along east boundary, co-dominant stem at 4m, contributes to screening/sheltering of site.	в 3	
T12	Whitebeam; Sorbus, Rosaceae	М	10	3.5	3.5	3.5	3.5	380	n/a	3	1.5	Poor	< 10	Fire damage damage to north side, dieback and decline.	U	Fell tree.
T13	Norway Maple; Acer, Aceraceae	М	13	6.5	8	7	7	400	n/a	4	4	Poor	< 10	Fire damage, cankerous stem, fungus on stem and laterals.	U	Fell tree.
T14	Deodar Cedar; Cedrus, Pinaceae	М	25	12	8.5	9	9	1380	15.0	2	2	Normal	40 +	Large prominent tree, snap outs and large pruning wounds.	A 2	Monitor trees condition.
T15	Pine; Pinus, Pinaceae	М	15	3.5	5	4.5	4	580 lvy	7.0	3	5	Normal	40 +	Thick Ivy limits VTA, fair form.	B 3	Sever Ivy and reinspect.
T16	Irish Yew; Taxus, Taxodiaceae	М	6	1	1	1	1	300	3.6	0	0	Normal	40 +	Compact fastigiate form, no significant defects, hard standing up to base.	C 1	
G3	Mixed Boundary Line Group	SM - M	< 9	1	1	1	1	< 410	4.9	1	0	Normal	40 +	Contribute to screening/sheltering, scrubby form in parts, 1x failed Cypress stem.	C 3	Remove failed Cypress stem.
T17	Colorado Blue Spruce; Picea, Pinaceae	М	15	7	7	7	7	770	9.2	1	2.5	Normal	40 +	Planted close to G3, good form, small limb snap out.	В 2	
T18	Spruce; Picea, Pinaceae	М	26	4	5	6	6.5	1030	12.4	5	7	Normal	40 +	Large prominent tree, planted close to boundary, fair form.	В 2	
T19	Atlas Cedar; Cedrus, Pinaceae	М	15	5	8	7	7	990	11.9	1	3	Normal	40 +	Large prominent tree, planted close to boundary, fair form.	В 2	

	TREE SURVEY IN ACCORDANCE WITH BRITISH STANDARD 5837:2012 'TREES IN RELATION TO DESIGN, DEMOLITION & CONSTRUCTION - RECOMMENDATIONS'															
	CLIENT:	s Ltd		PRC	JECT REF:	14533				SITE:	The Graftonbury Garden Hotel, Grafton, Herefordshire, HR2 8BN					
	CONTACT:		SUR	VEY DATE:	30th Ja	anuary 2015	ARB CONSULTANT: Tony Banner TechCert (ArborA), TechArborA & Andy Turnbull FDSc MArbo									
TREE REF. #	SPECIES	AGE	HEIGHT (in m)	C/ N	ANOP - S	Y (in - E -	m) W	STEM (in mm)	RPA (in m)	CLEARANCE (in m)	1st BRANCH (in m)	VITALITY	LIFE EXPEC.	NOTES	BS CAT.	MANAGEMENT
T20	Dawn Redwood; Metasequoia glyptostroboides	М	26	6	7	6	6	1500	15.0	1	2	Normal	40 +	Large prominent tree, planted close to boundary, fair form, Ivy.	A 1	Sever Ivy at base.
T21	Spruce; Picea, Pinaceae	М	25	11	10	9	9	900	10.8	1.5	3	Normal	40 +	Large prominent tree, planted close to boundary, fair form.	В 2	
G4	Mixed Boundary Group (Ash saplings, small scale Oak, Willow etc.)	Y - SM	2 - 8	1	1	1	1	< 280	3.4	1	0	Normal	20 - 40	Scrubby/leggy growth around south boundary, lvy covered and/or suppressed.	C 3	
T22	Spruce; Picea, Pinaceae	SM	11	4	4	4	4	260	3.1	1	1	Normal	40 +	Offsite in neighbours garden, good form and future potential.	В 3	
T23	Cypress; Cupressus, Cupressaceae	М	12	4	3	4	4	1090	n/a	8	7	Dead	< 10	Tree has had all foliage removed, no chance of recovery.	U	Fell tree.
T24	Cypress; Cupressus, Cupressaceae	SM	8	4	4	4	2	460	5.5	0	0	Normal	20 - 40	Compact crown, growing close proximity to boundary fence.	С 3	
T25	Holly; Ilex, Aquifoliaceae	Y	5	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	147	1.8	0	0	Normal	20 - 40	Small scale tree, multiple stem at base (measured as 80mm, 90mm and 85mm), fair form.	С 3	
T26	Willow; Salix, Salicaceae	SM	7	4	4	4	4	504	6.0	1	0	Normal	10 - 20	Multiple stem at base (measured as 260mm, 280mm, 310mm and 110mm), poor form, acute unions with included bark.	С 3	
T27	Holly Oak; Quercus, Fagaceae	Μ	16	7	5	8	8	1110	13.3	1.5	2	Normal	40 +	Large prominent tree growing close to boundary wall with approximately 7m overhang to Grafton Road with 2.5 - 3m clearance, telegraph wire through crown, previously removed stem that was displacing wall - decaying stump remains, cavity at base.	B 1	Maintain clearance to road.
T28	Holly Oak; Quercus, Fagaceae	М	15	8	3	7	7	780	9.4	3	2	Normal	40 +	Offsite in neighbours garden, no access to stem, approximately 6m from gate post to hotel entrance.	В 1	
T29	Golden Chain; Laburnum, Fabaceae	SM	7	3	4	3	3	130	1.6	2	2	Normal	10 - 20	Offsite, poor form, telegraph wire through crown.	С 3	
Т30	Cypress; Cupressus, Cupressaceae	SM / M	11	4	4	4	4	390	4.7	2	2	Normal	20 - 40	Offsite, planted close to boundary wall, stem deviation from base, fair form, telegraph wire through crown.	С 3	



REV.		DESCRIPTIC	N		DWN	CHK'D	DATE				
CLI Pr	ENT Focuro	Plar	nning	S	ervi	ces	Ltd				
PR	OJECT The (Grafto	Graftor n, Her	1453 Ibury G efordsh	3 ard ire,	en ⊦ HR2	lotel, 2 8BN	I				
TITLE Tree Constraints Plan											
DWN RC	DATE CK 2/2/2015	CHK'D TB	DATE 6/2/2015	APP'	D D	ATE	SCALE 1:500				
NKM Associates											
Dra	Drawing Number A2										
	14533/TCP/01										