Appendix no. 1

Site visit report relating to new Tree Preservation Order no. 470 (2010)

Date

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

> Regeneration & Policy Development Management Team

PO Box 4 Town Hall LANCASTER LA1 1QR

DX63531 Lancaster

Date: 9th April 2010

Re: New Tree Preservation Order TPO no.470 (2010) – Land to the rear of Moreton Green, no.1 Highdale and no.18 Hurstleigh Drive, Mossgate Park, Heysham

1.0 Introduction

- 1.1 Site: The trees in question are established on land between private residential properties within the Heysham Mossgate housing area.
- 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 7th April 2010.
- 2.2 Brief site description: The land lies between Moreton Green, Highdale and Hurstleigh Drive. There is a narrow public footpath that begins at Highdale and proceeds behind housing on Moreton Green, finally leading out onto Hurstleigh Drive.
- 2.3 The surrounding housing development was constructed and completed within the last 8-10-years. As part of the development trees were planted on the land in question.

2.4 The trees provide valuable greening and screening between properties, creating a pleasant walk through a heavily urbanised locality. They are also an important wildlife resource

3.0 Identification and condition of the trees

- 3.1 The trees are predominantly semi-mature and early-mature. Species include lime, silver birch, ash, rowan, cherry, hawthorn and sycamore. For the purpose of this report and the proposed new tree preservation order the trees in question have been identified and referenced as **G1**.
- 3.2 Generally, the trees are healthy and vigorous. However, a number of trees have recently been removed and heavily pruned to a poor standard. They remain under threat from unauthorised future works.

4.0 Tree Preservation Order

- 4.1 The amenity value of trees within **G1** have been assessed using an objective and systematic approach; the Tree Evaluation Method for Tree Preservation Orders (TEMPO system) has been used. A score of 15+ 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 **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 greening, screening and amenity value of the surrounding area
- clearly visible from the public footpath, and limited view from the public highway which will increase as trees grow and mature
- important wildlife resource

5.0 Recommendation

5.1 Serve a Tree Preservation Order no.470 (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

SURVET DATA SHEET & DECISION GUIDE					
Date: 7/2	10 Surveyor: Ht				
Owner (if kn	own): interact	Tree/Group No: Species: Lune, Speciere, birch, Gi derg, rown. retor Green, Hursleyd Driet Hyddde, Mossgate Pott, Heyslon			
a) Condition 8	ty assessment z suitability for TPO: nee Note for definitions	Mossgrite Potr, Heyshon			
Good 3) Fair 1) Poor 1) Unsafe 1) Dead	Highly suitable Suitable Unlikely to be suitable Unsuitable Unsuitable	Score & Notes (S) Remaining brees, health + ugarous/ good Form.			
	longevity (in years) & suitabili es Guide' section in Guidance N				
5) 100+ 40-100 2) 20-40 1) 10-20 1) <10	Híghly suitable Very suitable Suitable Just suitable Unsuitable	Score & Notes @ Semme tore - early motore tores			
· •	blic visibility & suitability for T ic potential for future visibility	TPO: with changed land use; refer to Guidance Note			
	ees, or large trees that are promin or medium trees clearly visible to	inent landscape features Highly suitable to the public Suitable Score & Notes (3)			

(3)Medium trees, or larger trees with limited view only

2) Small trees, or larger trees visible only with difficulty

1) Young, v. small, or trees not visible to the public, regardless of size Probably unsuitable

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	<u> </u>		
4) Members of groups of trees important for their cohesion	Score & Notes	\bigcirc	
3) Trees with identifiable historic, commemorative or habitat importance			
2) Trees of particularly good form, especially if rare or unusual			
1) Frees with none of the above additional redeeming features			

Just suitable

Unlikely to be suitable

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 (3) Number tees Felled + heavily pured

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:	Decision:
(8	Selve TPO

USBLE PUBLIC F

vereasing with

+ maksi