

Appendix no. 1

Site visit report relating to new Tree Preservation Order no. 472 (2010)

Contact: Maxine Knagg
Telephone: 01524 582384
FAX: 01524 582323
Email: mknagg@lancaster.gov.uk
Website: www.lancaster.gov.uk
Our Ref: TPO/470/010
Your Ref:

Regeneration & Policy Service
Development Management

PO Box 4
Town Hall
LANCASTER
LA1 1QR

DX63531 Lancaster

Date: 27th May 2010

Re: New Tree Preservation Order TPO no.472 (2010) – Land adjacent to Escow Beck, off Low Road, Halton

1.0 Introduction

- 1.1 Site: The trees in question are established on land immediately adjacent to Escow Beck.
- 1.2 Scope and limitation of this report: This is an arboriculture report restricted to the trees subject to the proposed new Tree Preservation Order. The information provided within this report has been gathered by means of a preliminary visual tree assessment restricted to ground level observations and inspection at the time of the site visit. An objective appraisal of the amenity value of the trees in question has also been undertaken using a Tree Evaluation Method for Preservation Orders (TEMPO). It should be noted that trees are dynamic, living organisms subject to changes in weather, climate, pest and disease, development activities and site conditions.

2.0 Site Visit

- 2.1 Date: Undertaken 26th May 2010.
- 2.2 Brief site description: There was no direct access to the private property. There was evidence of the recent removal of a single, mature oak tree that had been established immediately adjacent to the beck. The reason for removal was unknown.
- 2.3 The trees in question are clearly visible from two public highways and are all important components of the local landscape making an important contribution to the character of the area and are also an important wildlife resource.

3.0 Identification and condition of the trees

- 3.1 The trees are mature and include 2x oak, and 4 x hawthorn. All of the trees in question are established within a private property immediately adjacent to Escow Beck. They are situated several hundred meters from the River Lune which is an important biological site.
- 3.2 For the purpose of this report and the proposed new tree preservation order the trees in question have been identified and referenced as **T1-T2; & G1**.
- 3.3 **T1 & T2** are oak; **G1** is a group comprised of 4x hawthorn.
- 3.4 Generally, the trees appear to be healthy and vigorous; leaf size, shape, colour and distribution are all within normal parameters for the species. There is some deadwood within the canopy of the oak trees (T1 & T2) and a number of small cavities which represent important wildlife resources and potential habitat for protected species including bats and nesting birds.

4.0 Tree Preservation Order

- 4.1 The amenity value of the trees has been assessed using an objective and systematic approach; the Tree Evaluation Method for Tree Preservation Orders (TEMPO system) has been used. A score of 14 was accumulated, supporting the use of a Tree Preservation Order.
- 4.2 Lancaster City Council considers it expedient in the interests of amenity to make provision for the preservation of **T1-T2 & G1** – under sections 198 (201) and 203 of the Town & Country Planning Act 1990. Lancaster City Council cite the following reasons:
- make an important contribution to the character and amenity value of wider local area
 - provide greening, screening, and shelter within the site
 - clearly visible from a number of public vantage points and highways
 - important wildlife resource

5.0 Recommendation

- 5.1 Serve a Tree Preservation Order no.472 (2010) under sections 198 (201) and 203 of the Town & Country Planning Act 1990.

**Maxine Knagg BSc (Hons) Arboriculture
Tree Protection Officer
Planning Services
Lancaster City Council**

TREE EVALUATION METHOD FOR PRESERVATION ORDERS (TEMPO):

SURVEY DATA SHEET & DECISION GUIDE

Date: 27/5/10 Surveyor: MH

Tree details
 TPO Ref: 472(2010) Tree/Group No: Species: oak x 2
 Owner (if known): unknown name. T1+T2; Hawthorn x 4
 Location: low Rd., Halton, G1

Part 1: Amenity assessment

a) Condition & suitability for TPO:

Refer to Guidance Note for definitions

- 5) Good Highly suitable
- ③) Fair Suitable
- 1) Poor Unlikely to be suitable
- 0) Unsafe Unsuitable
- 0) Dead Unsuitable

Score & Notes ③
 No direct access to trees.

b) Remaining longevity (in years) & suitability for TPO:

Refer to 'Species Guide' section in Guidance Note

- 5) 100+ Highly suitable
- ④) 40-100 Very suitable
- 2) 20-40 Suitable
- 1) 10-20 Just suitable
- 0) <10 Unsuitable

Score & Notes ④
 Data have significantly > potential remaining longevity

c) Relative public visibility & suitability for TPO:

Consider realistic potential for future visibility with changed land use; refer to Guidance Note

- 5) Very large trees, or large trees that are prominent landscape features Highly suitable
- ④) Large trees, or medium trees clearly visible to the public Suitable
- 3) Medium trees, or larger trees with limited view only Just suitable
- 2) Small trees, or larger trees visible only with difficulty Unlikely to be suitable
- 1) Young, v. small, or trees not visible to the public, regardless of size Probably unsuitable

Score & Notes
 ④ clearly seen
 2x public highway
 + heritage part.

d) Other factors

Trees must have accrued 7 or more points (with no zero score) to qualify

- 5) Principal components of arboricultural features, or veteran trees
- 4) Members of groups of trees important for their cohesion
- 3) Trees with identifiable historic, commemorative or habitat importance
- 2) Trees of particularly good form, especially if rare or unusual
- ①) Trees with none of the above additional redeeming features

Score & Notes ①

Part 2: Expediency assessment

Trees must have accrued 9 or more points to qualify; refer to Guidance Note

- 5) Known threat to tree
- 3) Foreseeable threat to tree
- ②) Perceived threat to tree
- 1) Precautionary only
- 0) Tree known to be an actionable nuisance

Score & Notes ②
 1x oak recently felled - reason unknown at present => preservation

Part 3: Decision guide

- Any 0 Do not apply TPO
- 1-6 TPO indefensible
- 7-10 Does not merit TPO
- ①1-14 TPO defensible
- 15+ Definitely merits TPO

Add Scores for Total:
 14

Decision:
 Some TPO.