



Mr and Mrs Bowden

**52 Maplewell Road, Woodhouse Eaves**

**Tree Condition Report –**

**Dragon's Claw Willow Tree Situated within Front Garden**

February 2019

**FPCR Environment and Design Ltd**

Registered Office: Lockington Hall, Lockington, Derby DE74 2RH

Company No. 07128076. [T] 01509 672772 [F] 01509 674565 [E] [mail@fpcr.co.uk](mailto:mail@fpcr.co.uk) [W] [www.fpcr.co.uk](http://www.fpcr.co.uk)

This report is the property of FPCR Environment and Design Ltd and is issued on the condition it is not reproduced, retained or disclosed to any unauthorised person, either wholly or in part without the written consent of FPCR Environment and Design Ltd. Ordnance Survey material is used with permission of The Controller of HMSO, Crown copyright 100018896.

Rev	Issue Status	Prepared / Date	Approved/Date
-	Final	EC / 01.02.19	CTT / 01.02.19

**CONTENTS**

1.0 INTRODUCTION..... 2

2.0 RESULTS ..... 3

3.0 CONCLUSION ..... 4

**APPENDICES**

Appendix A: Copy of TEMPO Assessment

## 1.0 INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 This report has been prepared by FPCR Environment and Design Limited on behalf of Mr and Mrs Bowden to present the findings of an assessment of the condition of a Dragons Claw Willow *Salix matsudana Tortuosa* situated within the front garden of 52 Maplewell Road, Woodhouse Eaves
- 1.2 Edward Cole, Senior Arboricultural Consultant at FPCR, was appointed by Mr and Mrs Bowden to undertake an arboricultural condition inspection of the tree in question on the morning of Thursday 31<sup>st</sup> January 2019.
- 1.3 Weather conditions were dry, sunny and clear, providing good visibility. The tree was freely accessible, situated within the front garden of the property, and it was possible to examine around the base of the tree.

### Background History

- 1.4 The Dragons Claw Willow is within the front garden of 52 Maplewell Road, Woodhouse Eaves a single residential dwelling within the Woodhouse Eaves Conservation Area. A planning application for an extension to the dwelling was approved in December 2017 by Charnwood Borough Council (App No: P/18/0548/2)
- 1.5 The approved planning permission demonstrated that the tree in question shall be retained within a formal, hard-landscaped front garden area separated from the driveway by a retaining wall similar to that which currently exists. The homeowners have since submitted an amendment to the planning application and the approved scheme stating their intent to remove this tree.
- 1.6 As the site is within a Conservation Area, the homeowners sent a notification of intent to fell the tree to the Local Planning Authority (LPA), Charnwood Borough Council, on 26<sup>th</sup> September 2018. The acting LPA subsequently placed statutory protection on the tree, in the form of a Tree Preservation Order (TPO Ref: 52 Maplewell Road, Woodhouse Eaves 2018), on 7<sup>th</sup> December 2018.
- 1.7 The homeowners objected to the formal notice of this TPO on 3<sup>rd</sup> January 2019 and this objection is due to be considered by the Council's Appeals and Review Committee on 18<sup>th</sup> February 2019.

### Assessment

- 1.8 The assessment has been carried out at the request of property owners Mr and Mrs Bowden following their objection to the TPO. This report provides an assessment of the tree condition, taking into account site observations, and assesses the suitability of the TPO via the methodology of a Tree Evaluation Method For Preservation Orders (TEMPO) assessment.

### Limitations

- 1.9 Evaluation of tree condition given within this assessment applies to the date of survey and cannot be assumed to remain unchanged. It may be necessary to review these within 12 months, in accordance with sound arboricultural practice. The inspection was performed from ground level only and did not involve the use of any decay detection equipment.

## 2.0 RESULTS

### Tree Condition

- 2.1 The Dragon Claw Willow is situated on a raised area of ground in the front garden of 52 Maplewell Road, a property on the corner of Mill Road and Maplewell Road. The tree is an early mature specimen (circa. 20-30 years old) of 11m in height, with a stem diameter (measured at 1.5m) of 390mm and a uniformly balanced crown spread of 6m.
- 2.2 The tree has been previously pollarded, at approximately 6m, a management practice where the top and branches of the tree are cut off to encourage new growth at the top, with eight main pollarded knuckles forming on the principal branches.
- 2.3 As the tree is a pollard, in line with good arboricultural practice, this tree shall require re-pollarding every five-ten years to avoid significant defects developing. These include weakly attached stems and tight unions between new growth shoots both of which leave the tree susceptible to branch failure.
- 2.4 The tree currently displayed few notable defects with the exception of a small number of crossing and rubbing branches throughout the crown and tight unions starting to develop between shoots. This is typical for pollarded specimens when they are reaching the point where they need of re-pollarding.
- 2.5 It is advised that the tree is re-pollarded in the near future with the regrowth shoots being approximately 150mm in diameter.

### TEMPO Assessment

- 2.6 A copy of the TEMPO assessment record sheet has been included within this report as Appendix A. TEMPO evaluation is the approved methodology for determining the suitability of a TPO, having undergone scrutiny through numerous court cases.
- 2.7 Having conducted this assessment, as outlined below and within Appendix A, the resulting score (8 points) would conclude that the tree in question does not merit a TPO. The below paragraphs provide reasoning behind each of the scores given in each category.

### Amenity Assessment

- 2.8 **Fair/satisfactory (3)** - The tree is downgraded from good due to need for regular intervention and re-pollarding to allow the tree to be retained safely. Furthermore, the tree is unlikely to reach its full age or size potential due to the prior intervention of this pruning and its setting within a small residential garden within an area of relatively confining rooting soil volumes.

### Retention Span

- 2.9 **20-40 years Suitable (2)** – The Arboricultural Association (AA) guide to the life expectancy gives Willow trees a life expectancy of 50 – 70 years. The tree is circa. 20-30 years old and due to the past management, it is unlikely to be retainable beyond 40 years.

**Relative Public Visibility and Suitability for TPO**

- 2.10 **Large or Medium Tree Clearly Visible to the Public (4)** – The tree is visible for Maplewell Road, Mill Road and Victoria Road and is a medium sized tree.

**Other Factors**

- 2.11 **Tree of Poor Form or generally unsuitable for Their Location (-1)** – The tree has been considered as unsuitable for its location, evident by the need for regular intervention and re-pollarding to stop the tree from outgrowing its available space.

**Results**

- 2.12 The tree does not then qualify for the expediency assessment having accrued less than 10 points and scores a total of 8 points with the decision guide stating that the tree does not merit a TPO.

**3.0 CONCLUSION**

- 3.1 A TEMPO Evaluation is the approved methodology for determining the suitability of a TPO and the evaluation shows that the tree does not merit a TPO. Although publicly visibly, the tree has a relatively short retention span, judged on knowledge of its respective species, and is considered to be unsuitable for its location.
- 3.2 The tree will require regular pollarding every five-ten years to avoid it outgrowing its setting. Without this management the crown shall come into contact with the residential dwelling and overhang the driveway. This has the added concerns with willow trees being susceptible to shedding branches, even more so when pollarded, which are likely to damage guttering or vehicles parked beneath them.
- 3.3 Through confirming of this TPO, the homeowners will need to apply to the council each time they need to re-pollard the tree. This would be considered onerous given that the work shall need to be carried out regularly. Further to this, any application for consent to carry out these works could not reasonably be refused by the LPA, as without this management the tree would present a risk to people and property.
- 3.4 The need for continuous future management, the relatively short retention span due to the species and the setting within a small residential garden, and subsequent low TEMPO score would bring into question the suitability of the Tree Preservation Order and based on this assessment the tree does not merit a TPO.

Signed:



**Edward Cole** ND Arb, TechArborA

Senior Arboricultural Consultant

### **Author Information**

- 3.5 Edward Cole: I hold a National Diploma in Arboriculture from Askham Bryan College and am a technical member of the Arboricultural Association. I have over 9 years of experience working within the field of arboriculture beginning my career as a tree surgeon undertaking tree climbing and ground work operations for corporate and private clients.
- 3.6 As my career has progressed I moved into arboricultural consultancy in 2013 specialising in BS5837:2012 - Trees in Relation to Design, Demolition and Construction assessments and providing professional advice on how to successfully integrate suitable trees within residential and commercial developments.

## **Appendix A**

Copy of TEMPO Assessment Sheet



# TREE EVALUATION METHOD FOR PRESERVATION ORDERS - TEMPO

## SURVEY DATA SHEET & DECISION GUIDE

Date: 31/1/19 Surveyor: EC

**Tree details**  
 TPO Ref (if applicable): \_\_\_\_\_ Tree/Group No: 1 Species: Dragon claw Willow  
 Owner (if known): \_\_\_\_\_ Location: \_\_\_\_\_

**REFER TO GUIDANCE NOTE FOR ALL DEFINITIONS**

**Part 1: Amenity assessment**

**a) Condition & suitability for TPO**

- 5) Good Highly suitable
- 3) Fair/satisfactory Suitable
- 1) Poor Unlikely to be suitable
- 0) Dead/dying/dangerous\* Unsuitable

Score & Notes 3

\*Relates to existing context and is intended to apply to severe irremediable defects only

**b) Retention span (in years) & suitability for TPO**

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

Score & Notes 2

\*Includes trees which are an existing or near future nuisance, including those clearly outgrowing their context, or which are significantly negating the potential of other trees of better quality

**c) Relative public visibility & suitability for TPO**

Consider realistic potential for future visibility with changed land use

- 5) Very large trees with some visibility, or prominent large trees Highly suitable
- 4) Large trees, or medium trees clearly visible to the public Suitable
- 3) Medium trees, or large trees with limited view only Suitable
- 2) Young, small, or medium/large trees visible only with difficulty Barely suitable
- 1) Trees not visible to the public, regardless of size Probably unsuitable

Score & Notes 4

**d) Other factors**

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

- 5) Principal components of formal arboricultural features, or veteran trees
- 4) Tree groups, or principal members of groups 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 (inc. those of indifferent form)
- 1) Trees with poor form or which are generally unsuitable for their location

Score & Notes -1

**Part 2: Expediency assessment**

Trees must have accrued 10 or more points to qualify

- 5) Immediate threat to tree inc. s.211 Notice
- 3) Foreseeable threat to tree
- 2) Perceived threat to tree
- 1) Precautionary only

Score & Notes

**Part 3: Decision guide**

- Any 0 Do not apply TPO
- 1-6 TPO indefensible
- 7-11 Does not merit TPO
- 12-15 TPO defensible
- 16+ Definitely merits TPO

Add Scores for Total: 8

Decision: Does not Merit