

ARBORICULTURAL IMPLICATIONS ASSESSMENT

REGARDING THE PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT
WITHIN LAND AT BRIDGNORTH STATION,
WORCESTERSHIRE, WV16 5DT

Prepared on behalf of:
The Severn Valley Railway

Prepared by:
Ben Anderson BSc (For), Abbey Forestry

CONTENTS

| | Page |
|---|------|
| 1.0 Instructions | 1 |
| 2.0 Introduction and Information Received | 1 |
| 3.0 Arboricultural Implications Assessment | 1 |
| 3.1 Presence of Tree Preservation Orders / Conservation Area Designation | 1 |
| 3.2 Effect of New Building on Amenity Value of Trees On or Near the Site | 2 |
| 3.3 Construction Processes of the Proposed Development and above and below ground constraints | 2 |
| 3.4 Infrastructure Requirements | 2 |
| 3.5 Mitigating Tree Loss / New Planting | 3 |
| 3.6 RPA | 3 |
| 3.7 Tree Protection Plan | 6 |
| 4.0 Conclusion | 6 |
| Appendices | |
| Appendix 1 Arboricultural Assessment | 7 |
| Appendix 2 Fencing | 24 |

Arboricultural Report

To redevelop the station complex

1 Instructions

1.1 I have been instructed by Severn Valley Railway, with regard to a planning application made in respect of the above site, to report on the following in full accordance with British Standard 5837:2012 Trees in Relation to Design, Demolition and Construction: Recommendations. To that end, my instructions are to:

- i) Produce an Arboricultural Implications Assessment using the survey data gathered on 31.07.15 and 04.08.15.

2 Introduction and Information Received

2.1 The site of the proposed development is situated on and adjacent to the existing station building at Bridgnorth.

2.2 The development takes into consideration construction works within close proximity to listed buildings and scheduled ancient monuments, and the views to and from same.

2.3 I have been provided with a topographical survey of the site showing the proposed draft site layout to assist with the production of this report.

3 Arboricultural Implications Assessment

3.1 Presence of Tree Preservation Orders or Conservation Area Designation

3.1.1 The site has not been checked for conservation area status or for the existence of Tree Preservation Orders (TPO).

3.2 Effects of Development on the Amenity Value of Trees On or Near the Site

- 3.2.1 The proposed development will require the removal of several trees. The majority of which are growing in un-thinned groups. The groups comprise trees which can realistically only stand on in groups, due to the quality and character of the trees within the groups. The low quality of the trees on site and the scale of the landscape dictate that the proposed development will not detract from the aesthetic value.
- 3.2.2 Of those trees present whose condition dictates that they form a material planning consideration, it will be necessary to remove the following trees:
- 1) 1-28
 - 2) 60-64
 - 3) 68-69
 - 4) 74-76
 - 5) 87-89
 - 6) 90-97
 - 7) 98-100
- Trees 90-97 are growing on the side of the SAM and it is thought that the removal of these trees would enhance the condition of the SAM.
- 3.2.3 I would not consider that any major alterations to the proposed layout or intended construction method be deemed necessary, other than to consider re-routing the egress road slightly in the south-west corner, bringing the road down the slope to avoid key landscape trees.

3.3 Construction Processes of Proposed Development and above/below ground constraints.

- 3.3.1 Development processes that lead to soil compaction in tree rooting zones and physical damage to trees can adversely affect long-term tree health. This can lead to unnecessary tree loss if not controlled properly on site.

3.4 Infrastructure Requirements

- 3.4.1 The installation of services within the rooting zones of trees can have a large detrimental impact on the long-term survival of retained trees leading to their unnecessary loss or root failure in high winds.

It is unclear at this stage, if any services are to be installed within the RPA of any trees to be retained.

- 3.4.2 Undisclosed siting of above ground services, CCTV cameras, electrical sub-stations, refuse stores, lighting and other infrastructure requirements can lead to unnecessary pruning of tree crowns or root loss during or post development.

3.5 Mitigating Tree Loss / New Plantings

- 3.5.1 In this instance a new planting policy would be beneficial to the landscape. The amount of trees lost through the development should be replanted in more suitable locations. The intention is to recreate the historic landscape, enhance key vistas, to and from the listed buildings, and to enhance the prominence of the scheduled ancient monument (SAM). The SAM will be opened up by removing the poor quality trees from around the base.

It would also be beneficial to manage the hedgerows, cutting back and to beat-up the gaps.

A more detailed report on the proposed new planting will be produced independently to this report.

3.6 Root Protection Area (RPA)

- 3.6.1 The following table shows the RPA of the surveyed trees to be retained.

| Tree No | Stem Diameter (mm) | RPA radius (m) |
|----------------|---------------------------|-----------------------|
| 001 | 860 | 10.32 |
| 002 | 370 | 4.44 |
| 003 | 580 | 6.96 |
| 004 | 560 | 6.72 |
| 005 | 360 | 4.32 |
| 006 | 430 | 5.16 |
| 007 | 490 | 5.88 |
| 008 | 470 | 5.64 |
| 009 | 510 | 6.12 |
| 010 | 410 | 4.92 |
| 011 | 270 | 3.24 |
| 012 | 750 | 9.00 |
| 013 | 230 | 2.76 |
| 014 | 360 | 4.32 |
| 015 | 370 | 4.44 |

SVR Bridgnorth Station Arboricultural Implications Assessment – August 2015

| | | |
|-----|-----|------|
| 016 | 380 | 4.56 |
| 017 | 320 | 3.84 |
| 018 | 650 | 7.80 |
| 019 | 360 | 4.32 |
| 020 | 440 | 5.28 |
| 021 | 360 | 4.32 |
| 022 | 550 | 6.60 |
| 023 | 310 | 3.72 |
| 024 | 530 | 6.36 |
| 025 | 310 | 3.72 |
| 026 | 410 | 4.92 |
| 027 | 540 | 6.48 |
| 028 | 510 | 6.12 |
| 029 | 340 | 4.08 |
| 030 | 390 | 4.68 |
| 031 | 390 | 4.68 |
| 032 | 320 | 3.84 |
| 033 | 430 | 5.16 |
| 034 | 440 | 5.28 |
| 035 | 630 | 7.56 |
| 036 | 270 | 3.24 |
| 037 | 380 | 4.56 |
| 038 | 410 | 4.92 |
| 039 | 550 | 6.60 |
| 040 | 450 | 5.40 |
| 041 | 370 | 4.44 |
| 042 | 420 | 5.04 |
| 043 | 370 | 4.44 |
| 044 | 360 | 4.32 |
| 045 | 370 | 4.44 |
| 046 | 380 | 4.56 |
| 047 | 660 | 7.92 |
| 048 | 440 | 5.28 |
| 049 | 270 | 3.24 |
| 050 | 370 | 4.44 |
| 051 | 410 | 4.92 |
| 052 | 480 | 5.76 |
| 053 | 370 | 4.44 |
| 054 | 510 | 6.12 |
| 055 | 370 | 4.44 |
| 056 | 500 | 6.00 |
| 057 | 400 | 4.80 |
| 058 | 500 | 6.00 |
| 059 | 410 | 4.92 |

SVR Bridgnorth Station Arboricultural Implications Assessment – August 2015

| | | |
|-----|------|-------|
| 060 | 200 | 2.40 |
| 061 | 820 | 9.84 |
| 062 | 800 | 9.60 |
| 063 | 140 | 1.68 |
| 064 | 600 | 7.20 |
| 065 | 490 | 5.88 |
| 066 | 100 | 1.20 |
| 067 | 380 | 4.56 |
| 068 | 1050 | 12.60 |
| 069 | 1400 | 16.80 |
| 070 | 100 | 1.20 |
| 071 | 350 | 4.20 |
| 072 | 390 | 4.68 |
| 073 | 100 | 1.20 |
| 074 | 190 | 2.28 |
| 075 | 60 | 0.72 |
| 076 | 100 | 1.20 |
| 077 | 850 | 10.2 |
| 078 | 100 | 1.20 |
| 079 | 1100 | 13.2 |
| 080 | 1200 | 14.4 |
| 081 | 1320 | 15.8 |
| 082 | 650 | 7.80 |
| 083 | 1000 | 12.0 |
| 084 | 980 | 11.76 |
| 085 | 290 | 3.48 |
| 086 | 100 | 1.20 |
| 087 | 640 | 7.68 |
| 088 | 660 | 7.92 |
| 089 | 800 | 9.60 |
| 090 | 100 | 1.20 |
| 091 | 270 | 3.24 |
| 092 | 100 | 1.20 |
| 093 | 1200 | 14.4 |
| 094 | 810 | 9.72 |
| 095 | 700 | 8.52 |
| 096 | 550 | 6.60 |
| 097 | 80 | 0.96 |
| 098 | 120 | 1.44 |
| 099 | 380 | 4.56 |
| 100 | 620 | 7.44 |
| 101 | 550 | 6.60 |
| 102 | 270 | 3.24 |
| 103 | 420 | 5.04 |

3.7 Tree Protection Plan

- 3.7.1 Fencing should be erected around the RPA of trees to be retained (see appendix 2), and it is recommended that construction work is phased to reduce contractors' car-parking requirements and space needed.

It is conceivable that development may penetrate the RPA of some of the trees but until detailed planning permission is agreed this cannot be fully ascertained. This however will not and should not exceed 20% of the RPA. Due to the fact that there is existing hard surfacing where part of the proposed development lies, this need not be exceeded. This therefore is satisfactory for tree health. Whilst operations are being undertaken, care should be taken to minimise damage to roots.

It is essential that current ground levels are maintained and that arisings' from any excavation works are not distributed within the RPAs' of any remaining trees.

4 Conclusion

- 4.1.0 All trees surveyed are of uniformly poor to average condition with very few noteworthy specimens. The landscape scale of this project and the intention to replant more suitable species in a more suitable location, outweigh the initial tree losses necessary to proceed with the proposed developments.

In my opinion the proposed development will not be of detriment to the health and stability of the remaining adjacent tree stock.

Appendix 1 – Schedule of Tree Condition and Retention Category

| Tree No on plan | Species | Ht (m) | Crown spread (M) | Trunk Dia @ 1.5m (mm) | Ht of lowest branch (M) | Age class | Estimated Remaining contribution in years | Physiological and Structural condition. Observations- negative and positive | Preliminary Management Recommendations | Category of retention |
|-----------------|---------|--------|--------------------------|-----------------------|-------------------------|-----------|---|---|--|-----------------------|
| 001 | PO | 21 | N 8 E 8 S 8 W 8 | 860 | 2.5 | MA | 20 | P = normal S = normal | n/a | B1 |
| 002 | LC | 15 | N 4 E 4 S 4 W 4 | 370 | 0 | EM | 20 | P = normal S = normal | n/a | B2 |
| 003 | LC | 20 | N 3 E 3 S 3 W 3 | 580 | 0.5 | EM | 20 | P = normal S = normal | n/a | B2 |
| 004 | LC | 19 | N 3 E 3 S 3 W 3 | 560 | 0 | EM | 20 | P = normal S = normal | n/a | B2 |
| 005 | LC | 16 | N 2 E 2 S 2 W 2 | 360 | 1.5 | Y | 20 | P = normal S = normal | n/a | B2 |
| 006 | NM | 16 | N 5 E 5 S 3 W 4 | 430 | 2 | EM | 15 | P = normal S = Heavy pruning, good occlusion unbalanced crown, weak union | n/a | C2 |
| 007 | LC | 20 | N 2 E 2 S 2 W 2 | 490 | 2 | EM | 20 | P = normal S = shows signs of fire damage lower (s) branches | n/a | B2 |

SVR Bridgnorth Station Arboricultural Implications Assessment – August 2015

| Tree No on plan | Species | Ht (m) | Crown spread (M) | Trunk Dia @ 1.5m (mm) | Ht of lowest branch (M) | Age class | Estimated Remaining contribution in years | Physiological and Structural condition. Observations- negative and positive | Preliminary Management Recommendations | Category of retention |
|-----------------|---------|--------|--------------------------------|-----------------------|-------------------------|-----------|---|---|--|-----------------------|
| 008 | NM | 16 | N 1 E 4 S 5 W 4 | 470 | 4 | EM | 15 | P = normal S = weak main union, bark inclusion, significant old fire damage (w) side | n/a | C2 |
| 009 | NM | 16 | N 7 E 7 S 4 W 8 | 510 | 2 | MA | 20+ | P = normal – full crown S = leaning bole, previous pruning – acute compression fork in crown | n/a | B2 |
| 010 | NM | 15 | N 4 E 8 S 5 W 8 | 410 | 2.5 | MA | 20+ | P = normal – full crown S = normal – previous pruning to the east | n/a | B2 |
| 011 | LC | 12 | N 1.5 E 2 S 1.5 W 2 | 270 | 2 | EM | 20 | P = normal S = compression fork, swept stem | n/a | B2 |
| 012 | PO | 28 | N 8 E 12 S 6 W 10 | 750 | 2 | MA | 20 | P = normal S = normal | n/a | B2 |
| 013 | LC | 13 | N 2 E 1.5 S 1.5 W 2.5 | 230 | 2 | EM | 20 | P = normal – suppressed S = swept stem, otherwise normal | n/a | B2 |
| 014 | NM | 16 | N 2 E 5 S 1 W 8 | 360 | 2.5 | MA | 10+ | P = normal S = severe pruning to east, crown unbalanced | n/a | C2 |

SVR Bridgnorth Station Arboricultural Implications Assessment – August 2015

| Tree No on plan | Species | Ht (m) | Crown spread (M) | Trunk Dia @ 1.5m (mm) | Ht of lowest branch (M) | Age class | Estimated Remaining contribution in years | Physiological and Structural condition. Observations- negative and positive | Preliminary Management Recommendations | Category of retention |
|-----------------|---------|--------|------------------------------|-----------------------|-------------------------|-----------|---|---|--|-----------------------|
| 015 | LC | 21 | N 2 E 2.5 S 2 W 3 | 370 | 2 | MA | 20 | P = crown, thin, otherwise normal S = normal, suppressed | n/a | B2 |
| 016 | NM | 19 | N 2.5 E 5 S 4 W 12 | 380 | 1.5 | MA | 10+ | P = normal S = severe pruning to cyst, crown unbalanced | n/a | B2 |
| 017 | LC | 17 | N 2 E 2.5 S 2 W 2.5 | 320 | 2 | MA | 20 | P = normal S = normal, suppressed | n/a | B2 |
| 018 | POP | 20 | N 4 E 5 S 6 W 4 | 650 | 4.5 | EM | 20 | P = normal S = bark inclusion at union 8m | n/a | B1 |
| 019 | LC | 18 | N 2 E 2 S 2 W 2 | 360 | 0 | EM | 20 | P = normal S = normal | n/a | B2 |
| 020 | LC | 18 | N 1 E 3 S 2 W 2 | 440 | 0 | EM | 10 | P = normal S = heavy lean over (E) some sign of root plate movement | Long-term Remove | C2 |
| 021 | NM | 18 | N 2 E 4 S 5 W 2 | 360 | 2 | Y | 20 | P = normal S = bark inclusion in main fork forming co dominant leader | n/a | B2 |

SVR Bridgnorth Station Arboricultural Implications Assessment – August 2015

| Tree No on plan | Species | Ht (m) | Crown spread (M) | Trunk Dia @ 1.5m (mm) | Ht of lowest branch (M) | Age class | Estimated Remaining contribution in years | Physiological and Structural condition. Observations- negative and positive | Preliminary Management Recommendations | Category of retention |
|-----------------|---------|--------|--------------------------|-----------------------|-------------------------|-----------|---|---|--|-----------------------|
| 022 | POP | 19 | N 7 E 4 S 7 W 3 | 550 | 4 | EM | 25 | P = normal S = normal | n/a | B2 |
| 023 | LC | 17 | N 1 E 1 S 1 W 1 | 310 | 0 | Y | 20 | P = normal S = normal | n/a | B2 |
| 024 | POP | 19 | N 3 E 3 S 7 W 6 | 530 | 2.5 | EM | 20 | P = normal S = normal | n/a | B2 |
| 025 | LC | 10 | N 1 E 1 S 1 W 1 | 310 | 0 | Y | 20 | P = normal S = normal | n/a | B2 |
| 026 | NM | 18 | N 5 E 3 S 1 W 3 | 410 | 0.5 | EM | 15 | P = normal S = large inclusion in fork nr. base e in union at 2m some branch context lower | n/a | C2 |
| 027 | LC | 17 | N 1 E 1 S 2 W 2 | 540 | 0 | EM | 20 | P = normal S = normal | n/a | B2 |
| 028 | NM | 18 | N 5 E 5 S 1 W 1 | 510 | 2.5 | EM | 20 | P = normal S = inclusions in main forks, damage occlusion good | n/a | B2 |

SVR Bridgnorth Station Arboricultural Implications Assessment – August 2015

| Tree No on plan | Species | Ht (m) | Crown spread (M) | Trunk Dia @ 1.5m (mm) | Ht of lowest branch (M) | Age class | Estimated Remaining contribution in years | Physiological and Structural condition. Observations- negative and positive | Preliminary Management Recommendations | Category of retention |
|-----------------|---------|--------|------------------------------|-----------------------|-------------------------|-----------|---|---|--|-----------------------|
| 029 | WCH | 14 | N - E 3 S 7 W 2 | 340 | 3 | MA | 10+ | P = normal S = leaning, unbalanced, suppressed poor compression fork | n/a | B2 C1 |
| 030 | LC | 16 | N 2 E 2.5 S 2.5 W 2 | 390 | 0.5 | MA | 20+ | P = normal S = normal | n/a | B1/2 |
| 031 | NM | 15 | N 3 E 8 S 1 W 3.5 | 390 | 2 | MA | 20+ | P = normal S = acute compression fork, unbalanced crown | n/a | B1/2 |
| 032 | LC | 16 | N 2 E 2.5 S 3 W 2 | 320 | 0.5 | EM | 10+ | P = normal, shaded, suppressed S = normal | n/a | C1/2 |
| 033 | NM | 18 | N 4 E 4.5 S 8 W 7 | 430 | 1.5 | MA | 20+ | P = normal S = unbalanced, lean to south | n/a | B1/2 |
| 034 | LC | 17 | N 2 E 2 S 2.5 W 4.5 | 440 | 2 | MA | 20+ | P = normal S = normal – lean to west | n/a | B1/2 |
| 035 | PO | 22 | N 6 E 10 S 8 W 11 | 630 | 0.5 | MA | 20+ | P = normal S = normal | n/a | B1/2 |

SVR Bridgnorth Station Arboricultural Implications Assessment – August 2015

| Tree No on plan | Species | Ht (m) | Crown spread (M) | Trunk Dia @ 1.5m (mm) | Ht of lowest branch (M) | Age class | Estimated Remaining contribution in years | Physiological and Structural condition. Observations- negative and positive | Preliminary Management Recommendations | Category of retention |
|-----------------|---------|--------|------------------------------|-----------------------|-------------------------|-----------|---|---|--|-----------------------|
| 036 | LC | 16 | N 2 E 2 S 2 W 2 | 270 | 0.5 | EM | 10+ | P = normal, decay at base S = normal | n/a | C1/2 |
| 037 | NM | 15 | N 5 E 9 S 5 W 3 | 380 | 2.5 | MA | 20+ | P = normal S = normal, previous pruning, roots bootlacing | n/a | B1/2 |
| 038 | NM | 16 | N 8 E 8 S 2.5 W 5 | 410 | 2 | MA | 10+ | P = poor leaf size, crown thin S = unbalanced crown, lean to the north | n/a | C1/2 |
| 039 | PO | 22 | N 8 E 8 S 7 W 9 | 550 | 6 | MA | 20+ | P = normal, crown thinning S = normal | n/a | B1/2 |
| 040 | LC | 15 | N 2.5 E 1.5 S 2 W 2 | 450 | 0.5 | MA | 20+ | P = normal S = normal | n/a | B1/2 |
| 041 | WCH | 14 | N 3 E 0 S 2 W 7 | 370 | 2.5 | MA | 20 | P = normal S = suppressed, unbalanced | n/a | B1/2 |
| 042 | NM | 9 | N 4 E 0 S 0 W 3 | 420 | 2 | EM | - | P = normal S = overlapped, suppressed | n/a | U |

SVR Bridgnorth Station Arboricultural Implications Assessment – August 2015

| Tree No on plan | Species | Ht (m) | Crown spread (M) | Trunk Dia @ 1.5m (mm) | Ht of lowest branch (M) | Age class | Estimated Remaining contribution in years | Physiological and Structural condition. Observations- negative and positive | Preliminary Management Recommendations | Category of retention |
|-----------------|---------|--------|--------------------------|-----------------------|-------------------------|-----------|---|---|--|-----------------------|
| 043 | NM | 16 | N 2 E 3 S 5 W 4 | 370 | 2 | EM | 20 | P = normal S = normal | n/a | B2 |
| 044 | NM | 15 | N 1 E 5 S 5 W 2 | 360 | 2 | EM | 20 | P = normal S = normal | n/a | B2 |
| 045 | NM | 17 | N 3 E 4 S 2 W 2 | 370 | 2 | EM | 20 | P = normal S = co dom stem with bark inclusion in fork zm | n/a | B2 |
| 046 | NM | 17 | N 5 E 5 S 2 W 0 | 380 | 2 | EM | 20 | P = normal S = co dom stem with included bark in fork | n/a | B2 |
| 047 | POP | 20 | N 3 E 6 S 6 W 4 | 660 | 5 | MA | 20 | P = normal S = normal | n/a | B2 |
| 048 | NM | 16 | N 3 E 2 S 6 W 5 | 440 | 2 | EM | 20 | P = normal S = large co-dom stem slight inclusion in fork | n/a | B2 |

SVR Bridgnorth Station Arboricultural Implications Assessment – August 2015

| Tree No on plan | Species | Ht (m) | Crown spread (M) | Trunk Dia @ 1.5m (mm) | Ht of lowest branch (M) | Age class | Estimated Remaining contribution in years | Physiological and Structural condition. Observations- negative and positive | Preliminary Management Recommendations | Category of retention |
|-----------------|---------|--------|--------------------------|-----------------------|-------------------------|-----------|---|---|--|-----------------------|
| 049 | LC | 18 | N 1 E 1 S 1 W 1 | 270 | 0 | Y | 20 | P = normal S = normal | n/a | B2 |
| 050 | LC | 18 | N 2 E 2 S 2 W 2 | 370 | 0 | Y | 20 | P = normal S = normal | n/a | B2 |
| 051 | NM | 17 | N 5 E 5 S 1 W 0 | 410 | 2 | EM | 20 | P = normal S = normal | n/a | B2 |
| 052 | LC | 17 | N 3 E 1 S 1 W 1 | 480 | 0 | EM | 20 | P = normal S = normal | n/a | B2 |
| 053 | LC | 18 | N 1 E 1 S 1 W 1 | 370 | 0 | EM | 20 | P = normal S = normal | n/a | B2 |
| 054 | NM | 17 | N 6 E 2 S 1 W 2 | 510 | 2 | MA | 20 | P = normal S = large limb (w) with inclusion in union over path | Monitor union Ongoing/remove limb | B2 |

SVR Bridgnorth Station Arboricultural Implications Assessment – August 2015

| Tree No on plan | Species | Ht (m) | Crown spread (M) | Trunk Dia @ 1.5m (mm) | Ht of lowest branch (M) | Age class | Estimated Remaining contribution in years | Physiological and Structural condition. Observations- negative and positive | Preliminary Management Recommendations | Category of retention |
|-----------------|---|--------|--------------------------|-----------------------|-------------------------|-----------|---|---|--|-----------------------|
| 055 | LC | 17 | N 2 E 2 S 2 W 2 | 370 | 0 | EM | 20 | P = normal S = normal | n/a | B2 |
| 056 | POP | 20 | N 4 E 3 S 3 W 4 | 500 | 5 | MA | 20 | P = normal S = normal | n/a | B2 |
| 057 | NM | 15 | N 4 E 0 S 3 W 5 | 400 | 2 | EM | 15 | P = normal S = acute forks in main union with some inc bark | n/a | C2 |
| 058 | NM | 17 | N 4 E 4 S 3 W 6 | 500 | 2 | MA | 20 | P = normal S = normal | n/a | B2 |
| 059 | LC | 7 | N 2 E 1 S 2 W 2 | 410 | 0.5 | EM | 20 | P = normal S = normal | n/a | B2 |
| 060 | MIX (Holly, crab apple + AH regeneration) | 1 – 12 | - | | | | n/a | Various – unable to fully survey, moribund hedge line, few meaningful stems remain only holly is noteworthy | Clear & replant | U |

SVR Bridgnorth Station Arboricultural Implications Assessment – August 2015

| Tree No on plan | Species | Ht (m) | Crown spread (M) | Trunk Dia @ 1.5m (mm) | Ht of lowest branch (M) | Age class | Estimated Remaining contribution in years | Physiological and Structural condition. Observations- negative and positive | Preliminary Management Recommendations | Category of retention |
|-----------------|--------------------------------|--------|----------------------------------|-----------------------|-------------------------|-----------|---|---|--|-----------------------|
| 061 | HCH | 13 | N 6 E 5 S 4 W 6 | 820 | 2 | OM | 20 | P = normal, canker in stem + limbs S = normal | n/a | B1 |
| 062 | Crab apple x 2 | 11 | N 3 E 3 S 3 W 3 | 400 x 2 | - | OM | 10 | P = normal, decay in stem + at base S = normal | n/a | C1 |
| 063 | WCH | 5 | N 2.5 E 2.5 S 2.5 W 2.5 | 140 | 0.5 | Y | 20+ | P = normal – aphid, (leaf curl) S = multi-stemmed | n/a | C1 |
| 064 | Hazel | 6 | N 5 E 5 S 5 W 5 | 600 | 0.5 | OM | 20 | S = multi-stemmed | n/a | B1 |
| 065 | WCH | 7 | N 5 E 5 S 7 W 3 | 490 | 4 | OM | 20 | P = normal – heavy fruit S = normal | Sever ivy | B1 |
| 066 | MIX – hedge with hazel + holly | 6 | N 1.5 E 1.5 S 1.5 W 1.5 | 100 | - | OM | 20 | P = normal S = overstood/not managed | Consider restoring e.g. beat up coppice or lay | B1 |

SVR Bridgnorth Station Arboricultural Implications Assessment – August 2015

| Tree No on plan | Species | Ht (m) | Crown spread (M) | Trunk Dia @ 1.5m (mm) | Ht of lowest branch (M) | Age class | Estimated Remaining contribution in years | Physiological and Structural condition. Observations- negative and positive | Preliminary Management Recommendations | Category of retention |
|-----------------|---------------------------|--------|----------------------------------|-----------------------|-------------------------|-----------|---|---|--|-----------------------|
| 067 | LOM PO | 19 | N 2 E 2 S 2 W 2 | 380 | 0.5 | MA | 20 | P = normal S = normal | Sever ivy | B1 |
| 068 | LOM PO | 26 | N 2.5 E 2.5 S 2.5 W 2.5 | 1050 | - | OM | ≤ 10 | P = normal S = hollow, unstable, not fit | Fell NB check ownership | U |
| 069 | LOM PO | 29 | N 2.5 E 5 S 4 W 3 | Check map 1400 ? | 2 | OM | ≤ 10 | P = thin canopy S = lost top – hollow, unstable | Fell | U |
| 070 | Hedge mix mainly Hawthorn | 3 – 6 | N 2 E 2 S 2 W 2 | 100 | - | OM | 10 | P = normal, some dead + dying stems S = overstood, gaps | Manage – lay, or gap up cut, etc. | C2 |
| 071 | OAK | 14 | N 7 E 5 S 6 W 8 | 350 | 2.5 | EM | 40+ | P = normal S = normal – slight lean | n/a | A1 |
| 072 | ASH | 16 | N 6 E 7 S 6 W 7 | 390 | 4 | EM | 40+ | P = normal S = normal | n/a | A1 |

SVR Bridgnorth Station Arboricultural Implications Assessment – August 2015

| Tree No on plan | Species | Ht (m) | Crown spread (M) | Trunk Dia @ 1.5m (mm) | Ht of lowest branch (M) | Age class | Estimated Remaining contribution in years | Physiological and Structural condition. Observations- negative and positive | Preliminary Management Recommendations | Category of retention |
|-----------------|---------------------------------------|--------|------------------------------|-----------------------|-------------------------|-----------|---|---|--|-----------------------|
| 073 | MIX – hedge including holly, hawthorn | 6 | N 2 E 2 S 2 W 2 | 100 | - | OM | 20+ | P = normal S = overstood hedge | Manage hedge | B2 |
| 074 | WCH | 10 | N 4 E 2 S 5 W 3 | 190 | 1 | Y | 20+ | P = normal – leaf curl S = normal – low crown branch | n/a | B1 |
| 075 | WCH | 7 | N 3 E 2.5 S 2.5 W 3 | 60 | 1 | Y | 40+ | P = normal S = normal | Prune | U |
| 076 | Hawthorn x 2 | 5 | N 3 E 3 S 3 W 3 | 100 | - | MA | ≤10 | P = thin canopy, necrotic leaves S = normal | Remove | U |
| 077 | OAK | 17 | N 6 E 5 S 6 W 8 | 850 | 5 | OM | 20 | P = normal crown thinning S = normal | n/a | B1 |
| 078 | Mixed native hedge | 2 – 7 | N 2 E 2 S 2 W 2 | 100 | - | MA | 20 | P = normal S = normal | Manage/cut/lay | B2 |

SVR Bridgnorth Station Arboricultural Implications Assessment – August 2015

| Tree No on plan | Species | Ht (m) | Crown spread (M) | Trunk Dia @ 1.5m (mm) | Ht of lowest branch (M) | Age class | Estimated Remaining contribution in years | Physiological and Structural condition. Observations- negative and positive | Preliminary Management Recommendations | Category of retention |
|-----------------|---------|--------|---------------------------|-----------------------|-------------------------|-----------|---|---|--|-----------------------|
| 079 | OAK | 18 | N 6 E 5 S 6 W 6 | 1100 | 3 | OM | 20 | P = normal crown thinning S = normal | n/a | B1 |
| 080 | ASH | 20 | N 8 E 6 S 6 W 6 | 1200 | 4 | OM | 20 | P = normal S = normal | Crown life lowest branches | B1 |
| 081 | ASH | 24 | N 9 E 7 S 5 W 5 | 1320 | 4 | OM | 20 | P = normal S = previous branch scars with decay in canopy 8m | n/a | B1 |
| 082 | PINE | 11 | N 2 E 3 S 4 W 8 | 650 | 8 | OM | 15 | P = some needle blight S = lost top & decay in top | n/a | C1 |
| 083 | PEAR | 12 | N 3 E 3 S 3 W 3 | 1000 | 2 | OM | 20 | P = normal S = large cavity & decay at base, minor dead in top | Staged reduction + deadwood | B1 |
| 084 | AH | 20 | N 8 E 9 S 11 W 9 | 500 + 480 | 2 | OM | 20 | P = normal – heavy seeding S = normal – co-dominant stem, branch grafting weak | Na | B1 |

SVR Bridgnorth Station Arboricultural Implications Assessment – August 2015

| Tree No on plan | Species | Ht (m) | Crown spread (M) | Trunk Dia @ 1.5m (mm) | Ht of lowest branch (M) | Age class | Estimated Remaining contribution in years | Physiological and Structural condition. Observations- negative and positive | Preliminary Management Recommendations | Category of retention |
|-----------------|---------------------------------|--------|--------------------------------|-----------------------|-------------------------|-----------|---|---|---|-----------------------|
| 085 | PEAR | 8 | N 2.5 E 2.5 S 3 W 2.5 | 290 | 2.5 | EM | 40 | P = normal compression fork in crown S = normal | n/a | A1 |
| 086 | MIX hedge inc. hazel + hawthorn | 5 | N 5 E 3 S 3 W 3 | 100 | - | MA | 20 | P = normal S = normal | Manage | B2 |
| 087 | SYC | 15 | N 8 E 3 S 4 W 7 | 640 | 2 | OM | 20 | P = normal S = unbalanced, decay in base + stock damage, growing in bank | Consider felling or deducing crown by 25% | C1 |
| 088 | SYC | 15 | N 10 E 7 S 6 W 2 | 660 | 2 | OM | 20 | P = normal S = unbalanced, decay in base + stock damage, growing in bank | Consider felling or deducing crown by 25% | C1 |
| 089 | OAK ? | 18 | N - E - S - W - | 800? | - | - | - | Moribund | Fell | U |
| 090 | MIX hedge | 5 | N 2.5 E 1 S 2 W 1 | 100 | - | MA | 20 | P = normal S = normal | Manage | B2 |

SVR Bridgnorth Station Arboricultural Implications Assessment – August 2015

| Tree No on plan | Species | Ht (m) | Crown spread (M) | Trunk Dia @ 1.5m (mm) | Ht of lowest branch (M) | Age class | Estimated Remaining contribution in years | Physiological and Structural condition. Observations- negative and positive | Preliminary Management Recommendations | Category of retention |
|-----------------|-----------------------|--------|------------------------------|-----------------------|-------------------------|-----------|---|---|---|-----------------------|
| 091 | SYC | 16 | N 7 E 2 S 3 W 5 | 270 | 5 | EM | 20 | P = normal S = poor – stem – decay where tree has previously shed large limb | Fell – off SAM | C1 |
| 092 | Hawthorn scrub on SAM | 6 | N 2 E 2 S 2 W 2 | ≤100 | - | Y | 10 | P = normal S = drawn up – multi-stemmed | Clear from SAM | U |
| 093 | SYC | 18 | N 7 E 6 S 6 W 6 | 1200 | 2 | OM | 20 | P = normal S = multi-stemmed – old coppice stool | Fell off SAM | B1 |
| 094 | SYC | 18 | N 10 E 10 S 10 W 10 | 810 | 5 | OM | 10 | P = normal S = normal, compression fork at base, heavy reaction wood - not sound | Remove poor quality will detract from nap | C1 |
| 095 | SYC | 18 | N 7 E 6 S 6 W 5 | C. 700 | 0.5 | MA | 20 | P = normal S = multi-stemmed | Remove off SAM | C1 |
| 096 | AH | 21 | N 11 E 7 S 7 W 7 | C. 550 | 6 | MA | 20 | P = normal S = normal | Remove off SAM | B1 |

SVR Bridgnorth Station Arboricultural Implications Assessment – August 2015

| Tree No on plan | Species | Ht (m) | Crown spread (M) | Trunk Dia @ 1.5m (mm) | Ht of lowest branch (M) | Age class | Estimated Remaining contribution in years | Physiological and Structural condition. Observations- negative and positive | Preliminary Management Recommendations | Category of retention |
|-----------------|-------------|--------|--------------------------|-----------------------|-------------------------|-----------|---|---|---|-----------------------|
| 097 | BIRCH regen | 5 | N 2 E 2 S 2 W 2 | ≤80 | - | Y | 20+ | P = normal S = normal | Remove off SAM | U |
| 098 | LC | 9 | N 1 E - S 1 W - | ≤120 | - | EM | ≤10 | P = Normal S = planted as hedging – left to grow up, now too big | Remove | U |
| 099 | AH | 9 | N - E 2 S 1 W 4 | 380 | - | EM | ≤10 | P = normal S = poor – previously pollarded | Remove | U |
| 100 | AH | 12 | N 7 E 4 S 3 W 4 | 620 | 2 | MA | 20 | P = normal S = multi-stemmed, decay in stem | Remove | C1 |
| 101 | AH | | N 5 E 5 S 6 W 3 | 550 | 4 | EM | 20 | P = normal – ivy S = normal | Sever ivy | B1 |
| 102 | WCH | 14 | N 2 E 4 S 2 W 3 | 270 | 3 | EM | 40 | P = normal S = normal | Sever ivy | A1 |
| 103 | WCH | 15 | N 8 E 3 S 9 W 8 | 420 | 2.5 | MA | 20 | P = normal S = normal, crossing limbs, poor pruning in past | Sever ivy, remove crossing limbs, tidy pruning cuts | B1 |

Key:

Age Class: **Y M**- Young (1st 1/3rd of life expectancy) **EM** – Early mature (approaching MA) **MA** - Middle aged (2nd 1/3rd of life expectancy) **M** - Mature (final 1/3rd of life expectancy)

OM - Over mature (beyond life expectancy and declining naturally) **V** – Veteran (of great age for its species and possibly of conservation value)

Category of retention: **U** – Unsuitable for retention **A** - High quality value **B** - Moderate quality value **C** - Low quality value

Appendix 2

