



BUCKLAND TREE CARE LTD

Poole Hill, Poole, Nantwich, Cheshire, CW5 6AH.

Telephone: 01270 611 626

Mobile: 07812 16 11 73

Email: info@tree-care.org.uk

Web: www.tree-care.org.uk

Company Registration No 4748241

**ARBORICULTURAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT (PHASE I)
At**

PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT AT RUABON ROAD

**SURVEY CARRIED OUT BY D. HINDE CERT ARBOR. & C. HOCKNELL
AMENDMENT TWO**

**ISSUE 2:
17 FEBRUARY 2010**

Director: Miss C Hocknell

Associate: Mr. K Thelwell Tec Cert Arbor A, RFS Cert Arb.

CONTENTS PAGE

1.0 Instruction	3
1.1 Arboricultural Impact Assessment (Phase 1)	3
2.0 Terms of Reference	3
2.1 Arboricultural Impact Assessment in Context	3
2.2 Phase 1	3
2.3 Phase 2	3
2.4 Phase 3	3
2.5 Documents Received	4
2.6 Trees & Building Subsidence/Heave Issues	4
2.7 Tree Safety Matters	4
2.8 Caveats	4
3.0 Introduction	5
3.1 The Assessment Methodology	5
3.2 Arboricultural Impact Assessment (AIA 1)	5
3.3 Site Visit Details.....	5
4.0 Construction Exclusion Zones (CEZ'S)	5
4.1 General	5
4.2 CEZ 1: Root Protection Area (RPA)	6
4.3 CEZ 2: Tree Crown Protection Zone	7
4.4 CEZ 3: Tree Dominance Zone	7
4.5 CEZ 4: New Planting Zone	7
4.6 Notes on the Tree Constraints Plan (TCP)	8
5.0 Statutory Controls	8
5.1 Statutory Tree Protection	8
5.2 Tree Work Consent	8
5.3 Wildlife Legislation	8
6.0 Wildlife Habitats	8
7.0 Tree Works - Best Practice	9
8.0 Wildlife Considerations	9
8.1 Roosting Bats	9
9.0 Conclusions	9
9.1 Amenity/Separation Distance	10
10.0 Literature Cited	11
11.0 Amendments.....	11
APPENDICES	
1. TREE SURVEY SCHEDULES	
2. TABLE 1 - TREE QUALITY ASSESSMENT	

1.0 INSTRUCTIONS

1.1 ARBORICULTURAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT (PHASE 1) - Ruabon Road Proposed Development

Buckland Tree Care Ltd is instructed by Mr W. Johnson of DSJ Architectural Consultants to survey all trees, either as individuals or in small groups, identifying species, physiological condition and structural morphology, tree dimensions, preliminary management recommendations, estimated remaining contribution (years) and British Standard 5837; 2005 *Trees in Relation to Construction - Recommendations* 'Tree Quality Assessment - Retention Categories' (Table 1).

Identify all trees.

Prepare a tree schedule.

Prepare a Tree Constraints Plan (TCP); identify Root Protection Areas (RPA) for those trees worthy of retention.

Prepare a Phase 1 Arboricultural Impact Assessment report on the above matters to inform the design of the planning layout.

2.0 TERMS OF REFERENCE

2.1 PHASE 1, 2 & 3: ARBORICULTURAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT IN CONTEXT

2.2 Phase 1. The initial stage for trees within the development process is a survey of those trees that should be retained and those that may/should be removed. Retention trees are allocated Root Protection Areas (RPA's) that are then detailed on a preliminary Tree Constraints Plan (TCP). The RPAs provide for sufficient rooting volume to ensure that trees are successfully retained during and after the completed development. The TCP represents Phase 1 of an Arboricultural Impact Assessment (AIA1). It indicates a notional development footprint for any given site but moreover, it **may affect the value of land** earmarked for development. The AIA1 is **only** a baseline survey. It is not intended to represent, in isolation, the supporting information for a Planning application to obtain full and detailed planning permission.

2.3 Phase 2. The next stage is for 'site layout master planners' to factor the tree constraints into draft layout proposals. This draft is then referred to the Arboriculturist for further impact assessment, to arrive at a 'best fit' scheme, which achieves site viability whilst allowing for the retention of appropriate trees. This layout review represents Phase 2 of an AIA2. Once it has been agreed, the Arboriculturist can then prepare a supporting report to accompany the planning application. This report should demonstrate that the trees have been properly considered such that the site layout is defensible in arboricultural terms, both at the application stage and also, if necessary, at Appeal. The AIA2 also involves the Arboriculturist working as part of the development team to secure discharge of tree related Planning Service planning conditions, including any relating to levels, services and drainage, as well as protective fencing.

2.4 Phase 3. All the effort put into the pre-application phases (1-2) to protect retention trees is likely to fail without effective site supervision. The AIA3 covers the **on-site project implementation**, including arranging (Planning Service) approved tree removal/ pruning, overseeing the installation of tree protection fencing, ground protection and any special engineering works through to periodic reporting on the retention of protection measures. Many if not all of the latter are usually specified as Planning Service planning conditions that need to be formally discharged. Phases 1-3 are in accordance with BS 5837; 2005 *'Trees in Relation to Construction - Recommendations'* British Standards Institute, London.

2.5 DOCUMENTS RECEIVED

Topographical Land Survey Drawing (Paper copy)

2.6 TREES & BUILDING SUBSIDENCE/HEAVE ISSUES

Assessing the potential influence of trees upon load-bearing soils beneath existing and proposed structures, resulting from water abstraction by trees on shrinkable soils, was not included in the contract brief and is not, therefore, considered in any detail in this report. Buckland Tree Care Ltd cannot be held responsible for damage arising from soil shrinkage or heave issues related to the retention or removal of trees on site.

2.7 TREE SAFETY MATTERS

The tree survey is carried out in sufficient detail to gather data for and inform the current project. The appraisal of the mechanical integrity of trees on the site is of a preliminary nature and sufficient only to inform the current project. The assessment of trees is carried out from ground level as is appropriate for this type of survey and without invasive investigation. The disclosure of hidden defects cannot therefore be expected. Whilst the survey is not specifically commissioned to report on matters of tree safety, we report obvious visual defects that are significant in relation to the existing and proposed land use. We do not carry out detailed safety inspections unless specifically instructed in writing to do so and have not carried out such inspections of trees on the proposal site.

2.8 CAVEATS

The author does not have formal qualifications in the areas of structural engineering or the law. Making comment on such matters from an arboricultural perspective is both within the normal scope of the instructions and also the range of the author's experience. Notwithstanding this, specialist professional advice should be sought to clarify/confirm any observations on engineering or legal matters that this report may contain.

3.0 INTRODUCTION

3.1 THE ASSESSMENT METHODOLOGY

The BS 5837: 2005 provides 'guidance on the principles to be applied to achieve a satisfactory juxtaposition of trees in relation to fixed structures'. The Standard recommends that trees within categories A-C (where A is the highest quality) are a material consideration in the development process. Such trees may then become a constraint for a planning proposal. Category R trees are those that will not be expected to exist for long enough to justify their consideration in the planning process. Tree categories are used with the number 1, 2, or 3 to signify whether the category was made based on arboricultural, landscape or cultural/conservation values respectively. The tree categories are shown on plan by colour coding. Category A: green. Category B: blue. Category C: grey. Category R: dark red.

Generally Category C trees would not be expected to be retained if they are a significant constraint on a development as stated in Table 1 of the BS: 5837: 2005 (pg. 6). Reasonably young trees below 150mm stem diameter would normally be given a C Category (if they satisfy the quality criteria), but as they are small they could be replaced/transplanted. As such they should not be regarded as a significant constraint on a development.

Data collected during the survey are set out in the tabulated Tree Survey Schedules at Appendix 1 to this report. The vast majority of trees have been surveyed as individuals. Groups of trees have been prefixed 'G'.

3.2 ARBORICULTURAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT (AIA 1)

We have been provided with a paper topographical land survey drawing without tree stem positions plotted and a paper proposed development drawing. For the purpose of the report, it has been assumed that details on the drawings are accurate.

As part of this AIA 1, we have considered the following BS 5837: 2005 recommendations:

1. Tree Categories (Quality Assessment)
2. Crown Spread measured to the four cardinal compass points for single specimens only
3. Root Protection Areas (RPA)
4. Tree Constraints

3.3 SITE VISIT

The site survey was carried out in July 2010 by Daniel Hinde (Cert Arbor) and an additional site visit carried out in February 2011 by Charlotte Hocknell of Buckland Tree Care Ltd. The site adjacent to Ruabon Road and Afon Terrace consists of an open area of scrub land surrounded by trees with some ground movement works having taken place previously. Access is possible alongside Ruabon road and also along the track down the side of Afon Terrace. At the time of survey there were no buildings onsite or evidence of building work taking place. The site is bordered by garages and houses of Afon terrace to the north, the tree lined Ruabon Road to the east, a wooded area to the south and a gulley/stream and trees to the west.



The trees included in this report lie around the perimeter of the site. There are few trees within the site that are of high value. The majority of the trees have been surveyed individually; only the woodland area to the south has been surveyed as a group.

4.0 CONSTRUCTION EXCLUSION ZONES (CEZ's)

4.1 GENERAL

The three phases of an AIA were outlined in Section 1. In addition, during the development process for retention trees, there may be three and even four constraints to consider: Construction Exclusion Zone (CEZs):

- . CEZ 1: Root Protection Area (see 4.2)
- . CEZ 2: Tree Crown Protection (see 4.3)
- . CEZ 3: Tree Dominance (see 4.4)
- . CEZ 4: New Tree Planting Zone (see 4.5)

CEZ's are explained further below.

4.2 CEZ 1: ROOT PROTECTION AREA (RPA)

The RPA, calculated in m², should be protected before and during any demolition/construction works. This ensures the effective retention of trees by safeguarding a reliable quantum of functioning tree roots. The RPA is based on a radial measure from the centre of the tree stem, which is calculated by multiplying the stem diameter by a factor of twelve (or by a factor of ten when measuring basal diameter immediately above the root flare for multi-stemmed trees). With the AIA 1, the RPA is only shown indicatively on the preliminary TCP, as its shape may be subject to amendment as the design progresses.

During the AIA 2, the derived radial measure is converted by the Arboriculturist into the actual area to be protected, having due regard to prevailing site conditions and how these may have affected the tree(s), particularly in relation to factors affecting their likely rooting disposition.

The means of protecting the RPA will include the installation of tree protective fencing prior to the start of any demolition or construction work on site. The prohibition of various activities within the RPA must be adhered to (e.g. mechanical excavation, soil stripping, fire lighting, material storage, lowering levels and creating excessive sealed surfacing) and may include the use of temporary ground protection

and/or special engineering solutions where construction is proposed near to retention trees or within the RPA.

4.3 CEZ 2: TREE CROWN PROTECTION ZONE

This is the area above ground occupied by the crown (branches) of the tree, along with allowances for working space (safe working area) and if appropriate, for future growth. The extent of CEZ 2 is determined by considering the existing and future crown spread of the tree(s), bearing in mind the possibility of this being modified by an acceptable quantum of pruning.

Arising from the above, the means of protecting CEZ 2 is likely to include providing an adequate separation distance between retention trees and new buildings.

4.4 CEZ 3: TREE DOMINANCE ZONE

This is the area above ground dominated by the tree in relation to issues of shading, seasonal debris and safety apprehension. This area is calculated by considering the height and spread of the tree relative to the proposed buildings, cross-referenced with intended end-use. As such, what is assessed is the likely psychological effect of the tree on the end-user.

The purpose of identifying CEZ 3 is to protect trees from post-development pressure (resentment) by the site's end-users, who may, if resentful of the trees, seek to procure excessive pruning treatments or even to have them removed. This is a common Planning Service concern, which has led on many occasions both to refusals of consent and to dismissed Appeals against those refusals.

The means of protecting CEZ 3 is likely to include optimising the site layout and room type (especially in relation to new residential dwellings), such that any adverse psychological impacts of the trees are reduced to an acceptable minimum. Key principles include ensuring adequate separation distances between trees and new buildings, in the context of the buildings' end-use relative to the location of the tree(s) and avoiding excessive obstruction by trees of critical solar access.

4.5 CEZ 4: NEW PLANTING ZONE

In some cases, it may be appropriate to identify and protect areas intended for new landscape planting, which can fail to establish if the soil has been heavily compacted or contaminated during the demolition/construction process. The means of protecting CEZ 4 will either be by fencing it off prior to the start of works on site, or by soil remediation once construction has finished (and prior to the start of planting). Topsoil protection in areas destined for new planting is frequently an economy measure, saving on plant replacement and soil structure remediation.

4.6 NOTES ON THE TREE CONSTRAINTS PLAN (TCP)

As already described, we have identified our opinion as to the preliminary arboricultural constraints on the site that should be respected if an arboriculturally defensible layout is to be configured. These constraints are shown on the preliminary TCP, which will be sent as an electronic CAD or PDF document.

5.0 STATUTORY CONTROLS

5.1 STATUTORY TREE PROTECTION

The site may be located within a Conservation Area or be subject to a Tree Preservation Order, and as such trees may be protected. If this is the case it will be necessary to consult the council before any tree works other than certain exemptions can be carried out. Any works specified in Appendix 1 are necessary for reasonable management and should be acceptable to the council. However, tree owners should appreciate that they may take an alternative point of view and have the option to refuse consent.

5.2 TREE WORK CONSENT

No tree pruning or felling works should commence on site until necessary written permissions/consents have been obtained from Planning Service in respect of Tree Preservation Orders (TPO's) or Conservation Area Orders. However, if trees are found to be dead, dying or dangerous, the trees will be exempt from the Order; however, notification to Planning Service within 5 days of intent to carry out tree works should be made.

5.4 WILDLIFE LEGISLATION

The Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 as amended by the Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000 provide statutory protection to birds, bats and other species that inhabit trees. All tree work operations are covered by these provisions and advice from an ecologist must be obtained before undertaking any works that might constitute an offence.

It is an offence to:

- . Intentionally kill, injure or take a bat
- . Sell, hire, barter or exchange a bat, dead or alive
- . Be in possession or control of a bat or anything derived from them
- . Disturb a nesting bird

6.0 WILDLIFE HABITATS

A cursory assessment of wildlife habitat values of trees and hedgerows on the site was carried out during the survey. No protected or exceptional habitats were identified and details were not recorded. Trees and hedgerows of most species provide valuable nesting sites for a wide range of birds and it is likely that nesting birds will be present on the site during the period March to September. We have not been made aware of the presence of roosting bats and have not identified any obvious signs of roost sites; however, this does not mean that roost sites are absent.

7.0 TREE WORKS - BEST PRACTICE

All tree works must conform rigorously to BS 3998 (1989) *'Recommendations for Tree Work'* and as modified by research more recent.

All trees to be retained should be further inspected annually by an Arboriculturist in order to assess the significance of any future physiological, morphological or environmental changes.

8.0 WILDLIFE CONSIDERATIONS

Trees and hedgerows should be carefully inspected for birds' nests prior to tree pruning or removal and any work likely to destroy or disturb active nests should be avoided until the young birds have fledged, unless however, the trees pose an immediate danger (advice should be sought from the relevant wildlife authorities).

All personnel working with or in trees should be vigilant and mindful of the possible presence of roosting bats. A competent ecologist should investigate any indication that trees on the site are used as bat roosts.

9.0 CONCLUSIONS

Tree Survey Schedules:

The tree survey schedules are the basis for our consideration of the preliminary TCP, incorporating the RPA's in relation to trees and groups of trees.

Woodland (TP37) – This area needs cleaning through, removing fallen and unsafe specimens including Ash, Elm, and Sycamore etc. The edge of the woodland adjoining the development site is now a windblown frontline, meaning the trees along this boundary may have become unsafe due to the falling of windblown trees onto them. It is recommended that these trees be removed. The woodland is partly in a conservation area, but with the tree officer's consent it is recommended that the area be renovated. The damaged/windblown trees are to be removed and replanting with indigenous species take place. The replanting needs to be well designed, in that smaller mature height specimens be planted on the development side boundary of the woodland, such as shrubs or Hazels, Rowans, Hawthorns etc, grading in height through medium mature height trees such as Downy Birch to larger mature height trees such as Pendunculate Oak. There are Leyland Cypress at the development boundary of the woodland that need removing.

We recommend that the stumps from felled trees should not be removed with the woodland area and that timber and chippings be left safely within this area, to encourage wildlife population.

Currently, the woodland area shades the rear and side elevations of proposed 'No1' dwelling (as shown on the TCP and other supplied plans). However, the replanting suggestions made above and the removal of the 'windblown frontline' trees will change this CEZ line. It is also notable that the kitchen is sited at the rear of this property, and the lounge to the front.

Roadside Trees - Along the Ruabon Road side of the site the Beech could be retained and re-hedged where ever possible along with the Hawthorn, along with new plantings to encourage a thicker hedge of more benefit to smaller birds and wildlife, as well as screening/privacy from the road for the dwellings.

The larger Sycamore trees need crown raising, dead wooding and having any crossing or damaged branches removed, with regard to safety on the roadside and pathways. This will also improve light to the front of the proposed dwellings. Some crown thinning of the Sycamores may be considered.

An entranceway can be achieved between TP11 and TP17 Sycamores, great care will to be taken not overlap the RPA's with the roadway (detail of tree protection guidance is shown on the TCP). To allow this entrance way TP's 12, 13 and 14 must be removed, these are category C3 trees. TP14 is an Elm, but has a leggy stem and will struggle to become a valuable tree under the large Sycamores. Where the proposed turning areas and pedestrian pathways are to be located an amount of TP17, 11, 8 & 5 RPA's (adjusted taking into account the impenetrable roadside surface) will be affected. It is recommended

that a three dimensional cellular confinement system be used as an integral component of the sub-base to the surfacing, to act as a load suspension layer within these RPA overlaps.

TP 11 is the most heavily affected by the proposed vehicle access layout, with approximately 23% of the RPA being load bearing surfacing. However, the area to be surfaced is at the furthest point of the RPA from the tree stem, and it worth bearing in mind the bus stop is being moved and some of the current surfacing will be returned to a permeable organic surface next to the tree base. Therefore, on consideration it is defensible from an arboricultural prospective to implement the proposed entranceway, pathways, parking and turning areas.

NB: The upmost care will be taken in the removal of the current surfacing within the RPA's during the replacing of the current bus stop. Where the current tarmac surfacing is in place within the RPA's, though a no dig approach should be taken so as not to damage the existing roots beneath, the surface layer can be prepared and a new surface layer placed on top. The **levels** within the RPA's will not be lowered; any area within the RPA's will only be raised to accommodate a no dig surfacing approach such as 'Cell-Web'.

TP35 &36 -Two trees to the west of the property require complete removal; previous ground movement works have compromised the root plates of both TP35 – Ash and TP36 – Sycamore. Both trees are showing signs of stress (sparse and small leaf growth, etc) Changes in the ground level and compaction damage root plates and bases of trees encouraging rot and disease, if allowed to continue both these trees root plates will become unable to support the upwards growth, causing them to become dangerous. If retained these trees present not only a danger but also light issues. With their removal, evening light available to the rear of the proposed properties will be greatly increased. To a degree, coppicing these specimens maybe a possibility but only as a part of a continuing tree management plan for the site as these specimens will grow to similar heights again with even more unstable bases should the coppicing program not be continued season after season. Often on developments such continued management plans are difficult to uphold, so it is recommended these trees be removed.

Any development is likely to increase stress on trees within a site. However, considering the current health, structure and value of the trees within this site it is our opinion that the development outlined in the plans we received from Mr. W Johnson will instigate works to improve these specimens, increasing their longevity. Arboricultural works such as pruning and hedging need to take place on this site in addition to the removal of trees, and the replanting of some areas with carefully selected specimens.

Arboricultural Method Statement (AMS) & Tree Protection Plan (TPP) – It is recommended that, post layout proposal finalisation, both an AMS and TPP be prepared and agreed with the Local Authority Representative and that all works are overseen by an arboriculturalist. As the site develops it is essential to consider the CEZ's and work the site around them and the physical barriers protecting them.

9.1 AMENITY/SEPARATION DISTANCE

In relation to trees subject to a Tree Preservation Order, there is a Planning Commission ruling that requires a 6 metre amenity/separation distance from the edge of the crown (drip-line) to the front and rear elevations of a proposed development and 3 metres to the side elevation. This appears to be a precautionary measure in relation to post-development pressure.

10.0 LITERATURE CITED

1. British Standards Institute (1989) *BS 3998: 1989 Recommendations for Tree Work*. HMSO, London
2. British Standards Institute (2005) *BS 5837: 2005 Trees in Relation to Construction - Recommendations*. HMSO, London
3. Department for Communities and Local Government (2006) *Tree Roots In the Built Environment*. HMSO, London
4. Helliwell, D.R. (2007) *Visual Amenity Valuation of Trees & Woodlands. The Helliwell System*. 4th Edition, Guidance Note No. 4, 2008 reprint, Arboricultural Association, Cheltenham, Gloucestershire, UK
5. Mattheck, C. and Breloer H. (1994) *The Body Language of Trees*. HMSO, London
6. Mitchell, A. (1974) *A Field Guide to the Trees of Britain and Northern Europe*. Collins, London

11.0 Amendments

One – Draft to BS5837:2005

Two – As per Tree Officer Requests

Removal from plans of all surveyed specimens under 75mm stem diameter to allow clearer assessment of more significant trees.

Resurvey of stem diameters and replotting of tree positions to clarify possibility of entranceway.

Reassessment of grading of trees to BS5837:2005

Rename Hedge 29 to 29A on drawing.

Revisions to drawings to allow clearer depiction of tree positions, RPA's, CEZ's etc.

Re-evaluated conclusions.

APPENDIX 1
TREE SURVEY SCHEDULES

Tree schedule and explanatory notes – categorisation by British Standard for trees in relation to construction (BS 5837:2005)

The following pages show the results of the tree inspection. An (e) adjacent to a figure within the table indicates an estimated measurement.

KEY: Abbreviations and categories used in the survey are as follows:

Tree No	Corresponding number on plan
Species	Common name
Height	Estimated from ground level
Stem Diameter	Diameter measured in millimetres at 1.5m above ground level. Or if multistemmed then basal diameter above root flare
Branch spread	Measured on the four compass points
Height of crown clearance	The height to the lowest branch attachments
Age class	Young (Y) Middle aged (MA) Mature (M) Over Mature (OM) Veteran (V)
Physiological condition	Good Fair Poor Dead
Structural condition	Good Fair Poor
Preliminary management recommendations	Including further investigations of suspected defects that require more detailed assessment and potential for wildlife habitat
Estimated remaining contribution in years	Less than 10years 10-20 years 20 -40 years More than 40 years

APPENDIX 2
TABLE 1 - -TREE QUALITY ASSESSMENT

Category and definition	Criteria			Identification on plan
Trees for Removal				
<u>Category R</u> Those in such a condition that any existing value would be lost within 10 years and which should, in the current context be removed for reasons of sound Arboricultural management.	• 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 R category trees (i.e. 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 (e.g. Dutch elm disease), or very low quality trees suppressing adjacent trees of better quality NOTE Habitat reinstatement may be appropriate (e.g. R category tree used as a bat roost: installation of bat box in nearby tree).			DARK RED
TREES TO BE CONSIDERED FOR RETENTION				
Category and definition	Criteria – Subcategories			
	1 Mainly Arboricultural values	2 Mainly landscape values	3 Mainly cultural values, including conservation	Identification on plan
<u>Category A</u> Those of high quality and value: such a condition as to be able to make a substantial contribution (a minimum of 40 years is suggested)	Trees that are particularly good examples of their species, especially if rare or unusual, or essential components of groups, or of formal or semi-formal Arboricultural features (e.g. the dominant and/or principal trees within an avenue)	Trees, groups or woodlands which provide a definite screening or softening effect to the locality in relation to views into or out of the site, or those of particular visual importance (e.g. avenues or other Arboricultural features assessed as groups)	Trees, groups or woodlands of significant conservation, historical, commemorative or other value (e.g. veteran trees or wood-pasture)	LIGHT GREEN
<u>Category B</u> Those of moderate quality and value: those in such a condition as to make a significant contribution (a minimum of 20 years is suggested)	Trees that might be included in the high category, but are downgraded because of impaired condition (e.g. presence of remediable defects including unsympathetic past management and minor storm damage)	Trees present in numbers usually as groups or woodlands, such that they form distinct landscape features, thereby attracting a higher collective rating than they might as individuals but which are not, individually, essential components of formal or semi-formal Arboricultural features (e.g. trees of moderate quality within an avenue that includes better A category specimens), or trees situated mainly internally to the site, therefore individually having little visual impact on the wider locality	Trees with clearly identifiable conservation or other cultural benefits	MID BLUE
<u>Category C</u> Those of low quality and value: currently in adequate condition to remain until new planting could be established (a minimum of 10 years is suggested), or young trees with a stem diameter below 150mm	Trees not qualifying in higher categories	Trees present in groups or woodlands, but without this conferring on them significantly greater landscape value, and/or trees offering low or only temporary screening benefit	Trees with very limited conservation or other cultural benefits	GREY
	NOTE Whilst C category trees will usually not be retained where they would impose a significant constraint on development, young trees with a stem diameter of less than 150mm should be considered for relocation			

-----END-----