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1.0 Introduction

1.1 This Arboricultural Report has been prepared by Ruskins Tree Consultancy to accompany the detailed planning application being submitted by the Applicant, Leopard UK Kensington PropCo Ltd, to the Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea (RBKC).

1.2 The proposal is for three townhouses, extra care facility including units, communal facilities and service areas, community hall and on-site affordable housing. This is a new planning application following withdrawal of the planning application planning reference pp/18/00329.

1.3 The proposed development includes the “Reinstatement of three townhouses on Kensington Square (currently known as part of 23 and 24 Kensington Square); refurbishment of the existing college building (currently known as part of 23 Kensington Square) and use as extra care. Demolition of all other buildings on the site. Erection of a deck over the adjacent London Underground line and construction of buildings for use as extra care including units, communal facilities and services areas, community hall and on-site affordable housing. These proposals include associated access, parking, servicing and landscaping proposals.”

1.4 Within this report we will assess the condition and amenity value of the existing tree resource and assess the impact of the proposed tree removals, the impact of the proposed works on the retained trees, and provide preliminary advice on the protection of the retained trees.

1.5 We first visited the site in May 2016 to give preliminary advice on the Arboricultural issues associated with the proposed re-development of this site. We have visited the site on number of occasions including visits to undertake a Pre-Development Tree Condition Survey, undertake climbing inspections of the London planes, meet with various members of the design team, and we have also met with the Local Authority Tree Officer and attended design team meetings.

1.6 Only trees growing within or in close proximity to the site have been surveyed. The tree numbers used in this report refer to the tree numbers used in our Tree Condition Survey (See Appendix 1). This report relates to the Proposed Layout Drawings prepared by Kohn Pedersen Fox Associates.
2.0 Report Limitations

2.1 Trees are living organisms as well as self-supporting dynamic structures. Their physiological and structural condition can change rapidly in response to a wide range of biotic/abiotic factors. They have the potential to fail structurally, both with and without prior manifestation of any reasonably observable symptoms.

2.2 This report is prepared for the planning application purposes only and does not evaluate the degree of risk posed by trees.

2.3 It is beyond the scope of this report to comment in relation to structural damage – direct or indirect, existing or potential – that might be associated with vegetation growth, or vegetation-related soil subsidence or heave.

2.4 Any management recommendations set out within this report are of an advisory and preliminary nature only and relate to trees within the context of current site use.

2.5 Any physical alterations to site conditions subsequent to the date of the site survey will have the potential to change/invalidate the findings and recommendations of this report.

2.6 Findings relate to the condition of the trees as found at the time of survey. The findings and recommendations of this report are limited to a period of 24 months from the date of this report. In the event of any changes in the rooting environment of the trees including excavation works, waterlogging or removal of any underground structures/services the condition of the trees should be reviewed.

2.8 After extreme weather events or if any large branch failure, storm damage, structural failure or symptoms of disease of decay including fungi are observed then we recommend that the condition of the trees should be reviewed.

3.0 Statutory Protection

3.1 The trees growing within the site are protected by virtue of their location within a Conservation Area and a number of the trees growing within site are protected by a Tree Preservation Order TPO 3/90 (See Appendix 2).

3.2 This site is located within the Kensington Square Conservation Area, therefore in addition to the TPO all the trees with a stem diameter in excess of 75mm (unless exempt) are subject to protection under the Conservation Area status.
3.3 For the trees which are protected by a TPO, it is necessary to make a formal application for consent to undertake treeworks. If this is refused it is possible to appeal.

3.4 There are some relevant exemptions from the normal procedures:

1. Removing or making safe any trees that are dead, or which are ‘imminently dangerous’ does not need consent but in such cases the council must be given five days’ notice. If works are proposed due to the trees being ‘imminently dangerous’ only the minimum works necessary to make the trees safe should be undertaken under this exemption.

2. Any treeworks which are necessary to directly implement a full planning permission are deemed to be exempt from the TPO and are covered by the planning consent for the development.

3. Removal of deadwood can be undertaken without TPO consent.

3.5 Unless tree works are explicitly approved within a full planning consent or are exempt from this statutory protection, no works should be undertaken to trees with a stem diameter of more than 75mm without the necessary Conservation Area notification (or if the trees are subject to a TPO a consent application for tree works) being submitted to Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea.

3.6 Within this report unless stated otherwise the tree numbers used to relate to the tree survey numbers used in our Tree Condition Survey, where TPO tree numbers are used the prefix ‘TPO’ will be used followed by the TPO tree number, for example TPO-T9.

4.0 Site Description

4.1 The northern part of the site forms the south-western edge of Kensington Square and comprises a series of buildings which developed over time. The existing buildings largely form two parts to the site – north and south – separated by open space between.

4.2 The buildings on the northern portion of the site include 23 Kensington Square which was originally constructed as two townhouses between 1837 and 1839; a connected ‘college’ building which was constructed between 1859 and 1870; a series of later connected buildings and extensions constructed up to 1956; and 24 Kensington Square which was originally constructed as a townhouse in 1790.

4.3 The original townhouses at 23 Kensington Square and connected ‘college’ building are considered to be Buildings of Merit, while 24 Kensington Square is a Grade II Listed building.

4.4 The buildings on the northern part of the site have been extended and altered over time including heavy alterations to 24 Kensington Square and a range constructed in the 1920s to connect 23 Kensington Square to the adjoining ‘college’ building.
4.5 The buildings on the southern portion of the site range in height including two and three storeys (along South End, adjoining the terraces along South End Row and adjoining the railway line), and also up to nine storeys along the railway line. These buildings range in appearance and character, including poor quality mid-20th century buildings adjacent to the railway line.

4.6 The site is predominantly occupied by Heythrop College (part of the University of London) which is a theology and philosophy college. Heythrop College comprises teaching facilities, student accommodation (approximately 110 bed spaces), academic offices, libraries, study space, conference rooms and support facilities such as common rooms, kitchen, dining room and social space.

4.7 Due to falling student numbers, Heythrop College will vacate the site in October 2018. As a result of the planned closure, Heythrop College has been letting a small proportion of floorspace to Fordham College for education purposes (including teaching, student accommodation and conference space). There are two additional occupiers of the site including the Dyslexia Training Centre and Counselling in Companies.

5.0 Arboricultural Background Information

5.1 For all trees but particularly those growing in urban areas, root growth is not predictable. Tree roots are opportunistic they grow most prolifically in areas where conditions are favourable and will be deflected by natural features and man-made structures, when hostile conditions are encountered root growth will be limited.

5.2 It is generally agreed that the majority of tree roots, even for a mature tree are found in the top 90cm of the soil and these roots are vulnerable to sudden changes in the rooting environment. These roots absorb the moisture and nutrients needed for growth and contrary to popular belief mature trees in the UK do not have a deep taproot that obtains moisture from great depth.

5.3 An ideal soil for tree root growth is about 50% pore space (in urban areas this is often significantly reduced), these pores, the spaces between soil particles, are filled with water and air. Construction activity can compact the soil and can dramatically reduce the amount of pore space. This not only inhibits root growth and penetration but also decreases oxygen levels within the soil and reduces the available soil moisture that is essential to the growth and function of the existing roots.
5.4 For retained trees it is essential that the structurally important roots will remain undisturbed, these important larger roots radiate outwards from the trunk, they are characterised by being relatively few in number and tapering rapidly from the base of the tree. Even for mature trees they are only 2-3m in length, at this length they are likely to be 2-5cm in diameter and they have lost their rigidity and physical strength. (See Tree Root Systems AAIS 1995).

5.5 The two main possibilities for injury to trees during and following the construction process are from direct and indirect damage.

- Direct Damage can be defined as injury resulting from physical contact including contact with machinery or fire, and excavation of the root area.
- Indirect Damage can be defined as injury resulting from activities that take place near the tree such as level changes, compaction of the soil, or contamination by chemical spillage in proximity to the root plate.

5.6 The British Standards Institute published BS5837:2012 ‘Trees in relation to design, demolition and construction – Recommendations’ this document gives clear and current best practice recommendations and guidance on the principles to be applied to achieve a satisfactory juxtaposition of trees with structures.

5.7 Where development is proposed, the standard also provides guidance on how to assess the value and quality of trees and to decide which trees are appropriate for retention. The BS Categories referred to in this report are described in detail in Appendix 1. In summary the quality of the trees is assessed, and the trees are divided into 4 categories based a number of factors including; their condition, remaining life-expectancy, landscape, arboricultural and cultural/conservation vale,

   Category U: Those in such a poor condition that they cannot realistically be retained
   Category A: Trees of high quality
   Category B: Trees of moderate quality
   Category C: Trees of low quality

5.8 The BS5837 (2012) also provides information on the protection of trees during the development process. It includes a calculator for Root Protection Areas (RPA) which aims to ensure a sufficient volume of soil and proportion of the root system is protected to maintain the health and vigour and ensure the longevity of the trees.
5.9 The Root Protection Area is not related to the canopy spread of the tree, in simple terms it is an area calculated as a multiple of the trunk diameter. For trees with a trunk diameter in excess of 1250mm the Root Protection Area is capped at a total area of 707m². See Attached Tree Survey Plan in Appendix 1 for further details.

5.10 The RPA is in a theoretical area that if all the soil and roots around the periphery of the RPA were removed, there would be sufficient area around the tree to maintain the tree in a healthy condition.

5.11 The RPA does not show the expected extent of root growth but indicates an area of ground considered necessary to support the tree both at the time of surveying but into the future. The RPA assumes that there will be no intervention or care to enhance or maintain its rooting environment by cultural operations, mulching, de-compaction, feeding, improving soil conditions and / or irrigation.

6.0 The Tree Resource

6.1 The on-site tree resource is described in detail in the Tree Condition Survey and the locations shown on the Tree Protection Plan. See Appendix 3. The larger trees include a Sycamore T1, a Fulham Oak T2, 7 x London Planes T3-T9, a mature Lime tree T17 and Cherry T18. The remaining trees are a mix of smaller ornamental trees of variable age and quality.

6.2 The tree resource is generally in reasonable condition, there has been some management including the removal of 2 TPO’d London planes along the railway boundary (Stumps ST1 and ST2, TPO Numbers TPO-T6 and TPO-T9) and most recently the crown reduction of the lime T17 and the recent removal of a large failed limb from the mulberry tree T14. In addition to the removal of these two London planes it appears that an additional 6 of the TPO’d trees (TPO-T3, TPO-T10, TPO-15, TPO-T18, TPO-T21 and TPO-T23), have been removed since the order was served in 1990.

6.3 In 2017 the London Planes were subject to climbing inspections and the symptoms of Massaria has been observed. Massaria is a fungal disease which results in the death of limbs within otherwise apparently healthy London planes; at this time the recommended management of London Planes trees infected with Massaria is to regularly inspect and when dead limbs are observed remove these limbs. The presence of this disease will impact on the tree inspection regime and ongoing management of the retained London planes.
6.4 Massaria is one of number of diseases that are impacting on London planes in the UK including Anthracnose, and Massaria both of which are disfiguring and impact on the foliage and vigour of new growth, and structural integrity of limbs rather than result in the death of the tree. However London planes are considered to be at risk of plane tree wilt / canker stain of plane (*Ceratocystis platani*) which is prevalent on the continent, but is yet to be found in the UK. Despite these disease threats we have adopted a conservative approach with regard the remaining life-expectancy of the London planes and kept their Life expectancy at 40 years plus which is the maximum afforded under BS5837 (2012).

6.5 We have reviewed any information held by RBKC on the management of trees at this site but can find no information on the reason for the removal of the 2 London planes ST1 and ST2, (TPO Numbers T6 and T9) identified in our survey as stumps ST1 and ST2. These trees have been removed since the TPO was served. From Google Earth it is apparent that the southernmost London plane ST2 was removed at sometime between 2006 and 2008, the other London plane ST1 was removed at sometime between 2010-2013.

6.6 We are aware there has been a history of London Underground Limited (LUL) requesting that the trees along this boundary are managed to avoid conflicts with the railway infrastructure and to reduce the impact from falling leaves and debris on the maintenance and safe operation of the railway. From reviewing the information on the RBKC website it is apparent that the Tree Preservation Order 3/90 was served in 1990 and was the direct result of Conservation Area notification being submitted by London Underground Limited for the removal of London plane trees located along the railway boundary of the site.

6.7 In 2008, 2009 and 2014 Norton & Associates inspected the trees at this site growing close to the railway boundary on behalf of London Underground Limited. (See Appendix 2 for copies of these reports).

6.8 In the 2008 report summary it stated:

*These trees cause leaf fall problems which are a risk to the operation of trains and a fire hazard.*

*There are records from 2006 stating that one tree (T1366) is causing structural damage to the trackside retaining wall. Due to there (sic) size and proximity to the retaining wall these trees are highly likely to cause further structural damage in the future.*

*The London Plane with disease should be removed as a tree of this size has the potential to cause significant damage to property and trains.*

*Other trees appear in good health however due to there (sic) size any limb drop or stem failure has the potential to cause significant damage to property and trains.*
6.9 In the 2009 report summary it stated:

There are repeat problems caused by leaf fall from the overhanging trees which result in the following:
- Delayed service (especially a problem during rush hour)
- Signals passed at danger (risk of collision)
- Blocking of points
- Uneconomic use of public funding for additional man power
- Risk to response teams (even with control measures in place) who have to enter track during traffic hours.

6.9 In the 2014 report it stated

There are repeat problems caused by leaf fall from the overhanging trees which result in the following:
- Delayed service (especially a problem during rush hour)
- Signals passed at danger (risk of collision)
- Blocking of points
- Potential for fire at points
- Uneconomic use of public funding for additional man power
- Risk to response teams (even with control measures in place) who have to enter track during traffic hours.

There is also the potential for limbs to drop onto the track.

6.10 It appears that the London plane stump ST1 is the London Plane T1365 identified in the 2008 report which was observed to have an Inonotus decay fungal fruiting body growing on the main stem. Within the 2008 report it was recommended that ‘The London Plane with disease should be removed as a tree of this size has the potential to cause significant damage to property and trains’.

6.11 The direct damage to the retaining wall noted in the 2008 report is likely to have been caused by the growth of the lower trunk and increasing root mass exerting direct pressure onto the wall. This type of damage can be amplified by wind loading increasing pressure onto the wall. This damage is caused by a tree identified within the Norton & Associates Limited report as T1366 which appears to be the London plane T6 in our report.

6.12 It is not possible to prevent this type of direct damage to brick-built structures as it is a consequence of the annual incremental growth of the tree. The two London planes T5 and T6 closest to the railway boundary, are growing within a narrow strip of raised open ground within 2m of the retaining boundary wall. With regard to the proximity of these trees to the boundary wall, and their potential for further growth particularly in terms of increasing lower stem diameter further direct damage to this wall is considered to be highly likely.

6.13 The TPO application for consent to undertake treeworks which followed the recommendations outlined in the Norton & Associates report in 2014 report was refused by RBKC.
6.14 There is also correspondence dating from November 2017 from LUL to the site owners which confirm the points raised in the Norton & Associates report remain an operational issue for London Underground Limited. (See Appendix 2).

6.15 It is apparent that 2 of the 4 London planes growing on the raised bed next to the railway line have been removed at some-time between 2006-2013. There is some anecdotal information that one of these trees failed or partially failed damaging the railway boundary retaining wall. From the written information available it is considered highly likely that both trees were removed due to their condition, proximity to the railway lines and the risks associated with the retention of these trees.

6.16 It should be noted that structural damage to the boundary retaining wall has been reported in close proximity to the London plane T5.


What is the exception for work to prevent or abate a nuisance?
The authority’s consent is not required for carrying out the minimum of work on a tree protected by an Order that is necessary to prevent or abate a nuisance. Here ‘nuisance’ is used in its legal sense, not its general sense. The courts have held that this means the nuisance must be actionable in law – where it is causing, or there is an immediate risk of it causing, actual damage. When deciding what is necessary to prevent or abate a nuisance, tree owners and, where applicable, their neighbours and local authorities, should consider whether steps other than tree work might be taken. For example, there may be engineering solutions for structural damage to buildings.

(Paragraph: 082 Reference ID: 36-082-20140306 Revision date: 06 03 2014)

6.18 With regard to the guidance information above and the proximity of T5 and T6 to the railway boundary, it is my opinion that there will be further requests from LUL to remove these trees and in the foreseeable future their condition or the damage / nuisance caused by these trees will make them exempt from protection under the Tree Preservation Order. We would therefore suggest the removal of the London plane trees T5 and T6 is likely to be undertaken under a TPO exemption and therefore the weight given to the presence of a Tree Preservation Order and the impact of these tree removals are being considered should be limited.
6.19 **Amenity Value of the Tree Resource**

6.20 The public amenity value of the tree resource is very limited, as the gardens are surrounded by buildings to the north, east and south with the railway running along the western boundary. There is no public access into the gardens and the views of the trees from the public realm are very limited. There are no views of the trees or any part of the trees from the public highways to the north or south of the site.

6.21 From the east there is a very restricted view into the site of the London Plane T8 from the western end of the roadway ‘South End’. T8 is to be retained. South End forms the vehicle access route into Heythrop College gardens. (See Appendix 1 for Photographs).

6.22 Beyond the railway cutting to the west of the site is the Copthorne Tara Hotel and the public realm Scarsdale Place is some 75m from the western site boundary with the 14-storey hotel building and railway cutting located between the public highway (Scarsdale Place) and the site boundary. (See Appendix 1 for Photographs). The hotel has floor to ceiling net curtains and since these rooms are generally occupied at night I would suggest that hotel guests are unlikely to be particularly aware of the presence of these trees.

6.23 From the southern end of the platforms of High Street Kensington London Underground Station some of the canopies of trees growing within Heythrop College are visible. This vantage point is approximately 55m to the north-west of the sycamore T1. The view of the trees is limited to a view of part of the canopies of the sycamore T1, oak T2, and the London planes T4, T5, T6.

6.24 It should be noted that this vantage point is to the far (southern) end of the platform, away from the pedestrian access and these views are largely obstructed by railway equipment including ducting, barriers, mirrors and the platform canopies. (See Appendix 1 for Photographs).

6.25 The passengers stood on the platform are more that 60m to the north of the site, they are unlikely to be particular aware of the partially visible canopies someway down the line. Anyone getting off a train would have their back to these trees as they walk towards the exit and only people who walk southwards towards the end of the platforms would be able to see the trees.

6.26 We are aware that the trees growing within the site are protected by virtue of their Conservation Area location and by a Tree Preservation Order. However, it is our opinion that the contribution of the trees to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area is limited. We are aware that the limited public visibility of the trees growing within this was raised during the serving of the Tree Preservation Order in 1990.
6.27 It is my opinion that the TPO is poorly drafted there are a number of the trees protected by the order are small insignificant trees which have absolutely no public amenity being screened by buildings or growing in close proximity to the boundary walls.

6.28 For example there can be absolutely no justification for including TPO numbers TPO-T10, TPO-T11, TPO-T12, TPO-T13, TPO-T14, TPO-T15 within any TPO. (TPO-T10 has been removed, TPO-T11 is T22 within our tree survey, TPO-T12 to TPO-T14 relate to T24-T26 within our survey and TPO-T14 is T20 within our survey). Likewise, TPO-numbers TPO-T19 to TPO-T23, TPO-T26 to TPO-T29 and TPO-T32 have absolutely no public amenity being small trees located to the eastern side of the garden area.


What does ‘amenity’ mean in practice?
‘Amenity’ is not defined in law, so authorities need to exercise judgment when deciding whether it is within their powers to make an Order.
Orders should be used to protect selected trees and woodlands if their removal would have a significant negative impact on the local environment and its enjoyment by the public. Before authorities make or confirm an Order they should be able to show that protection would bring a reasonable degree of public benefit in the present or future.
(Paragraph: 007 Reference ID: 36-007-20140306 Revision date: 06 03 2014)

What might a local authority take into account when assessing amenity value?
When considering whether trees should be protected by an Order, authorities are advised to develop ways of assessing the amenity value of trees in a structured and consistent way, taking into account the following criteria:

Visibility
The extent to which the trees or woodlands can be seen by the public will inform the authority’s assessment of whether the impact on the local environment is significant. The trees, or at least part of them, should normally be visible from a public place, such as a road or footpath, or accessible by the public.

Individual, collective and wider impact
Public visibility alone will not be sufficient to warrant an Order. The authority is advised to also assess the particular importance of an individual tree, of groups of trees or of woodlands by reference to its or their characteristics including:
• size and form;
• future potential as an amenity;
• rarity, cultural or historic value;
• contribution to, and relationship with, the landscape; and
• contribution to the character or appearance of a conservation area.

Other factors
Where relevant to an assessment of the amenity value of trees or woodlands, authorities may consider taking into account other factors, such as importance to nature conservation or response to climate change. These factors alone would not warrant making an Order.
(Paragraph: 008 Reference ID: 36-008-20140306)
6.30 With regard to the guidance information above and due to the low amenity value of the trees we would suggest the weight given to the presence of a Tree Preservation Order when the impact of the tree removals are being considered should be limited.
7.0 Arboricultural Impact Assessment

7.1 Tree Removals

7.2 The trees to be removed to allow the proposed development are identified within the Tree Condition Survey and shown on the Tree Removals Plan. In total 26 trees are identified for removal with 4 trees (T3, T8, T9, T17) being retained. The trees listed for removal are identified below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tree No.</th>
<th>TPO No.</th>
<th>Species</th>
<th>BS Cat</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T1</td>
<td>T1</td>
<td>Sycamore</td>
<td>C1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T2</td>
<td>T2</td>
<td>Fulham oak</td>
<td>C1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T4</td>
<td>T4</td>
<td>London plane</td>
<td>B2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T5</td>
<td>T5</td>
<td>London plane</td>
<td>B2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T6</td>
<td>T8</td>
<td>London plane</td>
<td>B2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T7</td>
<td>T7</td>
<td>London plane</td>
<td>B2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T10</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Gingko</td>
<td>C1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T11</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Lime</td>
<td>C1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T12</td>
<td>T27</td>
<td>Hawthorn</td>
<td>C1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T13</td>
<td>T26</td>
<td>Mulberry</td>
<td>C1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T14</td>
<td>T29</td>
<td>Mulberry</td>
<td>C1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T15</td>
<td>T28</td>
<td>Magnolia</td>
<td>C1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T16</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Snowy mespil</td>
<td>C1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T18</td>
<td>T16</td>
<td>Cherry</td>
<td>C1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T19</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Cupressus</td>
<td>C1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T20</td>
<td>T15</td>
<td>Sorbus</td>
<td>C1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T21</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Foxglove tree</td>
<td>C1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T22</td>
<td>T16</td>
<td>Cherry</td>
<td>C1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T23</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Himalayan Birch</td>
<td>C1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T24</td>
<td>T12</td>
<td>Crab Apple</td>
<td>C1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T25</td>
<td>T13</td>
<td>Crab Apple</td>
<td>C1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T26</td>
<td>T14</td>
<td>Cherry</td>
<td>C1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T27</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Ash-Leafed Maple</td>
<td>C1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T28</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Cupressus</td>
<td>C1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T29</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Cupressus</td>
<td>C1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T30</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Bay Laurel</td>
<td>C1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7.3 4 of the trees to be removed are BS5837 Category B (moderate quality) with the remaining 22 trees Category C (low quality).

7.4 10 of the trees to be removed are not protected under the Tree Preservation Order. It is our opinion that it is likely that these trees were not included within the TPO either due to either or a combination of their age / size (T10, T11, T16, T19, T23, T27), condition (T21) or location, (T28, T29, T30) are all located within the small enclosed garden to the north of the site.
7.5 Please 8 of the TPO’d trees (TPO-T3, TPO-T6, TPO-T9, TPO-T10, TPO-15, TPO-T18, TPO-T21 and TPO-T23) have been removed since the order was served in 1990.

7.5 The BS5837 Category C trees are dominated by small ornamental trees that do not have any amenity value beyond the boundary of the site. The removal of these relatively small, low-quality trees will can be mitigated by the proposed planting within the development. Please refer to Landscape Planning Report by Andy Sturgeon Design for further details on the proposed planting associated with this development.

7.6 The sycamore T1 which is at the forefront of views from Kensington High Street Station has significant dieback and deadwood including a hanging dead branch. This tree is growing in close proximity to the railway boundary and close to the brick-built gardeners store, regardless of the proposed development is considered to have a limited safe remaining life-expectancy.

7.7 During the design process the retention of the mulberry trees T13, T14 and magnolia T15, has been considered, however retaining these trees would significantly impact on access during construction works. There is the option of transplanting the mulberry trees, by containerising the trees and maintaining them on or off-site with regular irrigation and then planting these trees within the final landscaping scheme. Mulberry trees are very suitable for transplanting, their rooting habit and known species characteristics makes them very resilient to the disturbance associated with transplanting the trees.

7.8 It should be noted that during 2017 a large limb failed on the mulberry T13, a Section 211 notification for treeworks was submitted to RBKC (by others) for remedial pruning. T14 has a large section of bark missing on the lower stem. With regard to their condition it is preferred that these trees are replaced with better quality, mature specimens within the final landscaping scheme. If necessary this matter can be addressed through use of a landscaping conditions.

7.9 The Category B London Plane trees to be removed are all growing to the western (railway) boundary of the site. The removal of these trees is necessary to allow for the proposed construction of the decking over the railway line. This decking is necessary to improve the relationship between the site and the adjacent London Underground line and mitigate the impact of the line on the local environment, whilst allowing for the provision of extra care units.
7.10 For further details on the proposed development please refer to the Design and Access Statement prepared by KPF. As outlined in Section 6 it is our opinion that notwithstanding their size these trees currently have a very limited public amenity value, they make a very limited contribution to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area and due to their proximity to the railway line the future risks / nuisance posed by these trees is considered likely to result in exemption to protection under the TPO and demands for their removal.

7.11 The limited visual impact of the removal of the 4 Category B trees will in the longer-term be mitigated by the proposed planting of larger specimen trees in more prominent locations within the development. The landscaping details have been prepared by Andy Sturgeon Design, the landscaping report identifies planting of 4 large canopy trees to mitigate the loss of the 4 London plane and planting a minimum of 93 small trees including some to be planted in planters which will result in an uplift of 70 trees (minimum) within the site. Please refer to Landscape Planning Report by Andy Sturgeon Design for further details. This planting can be secured by use of standard planning condition.

7.12 The increased public access, and proposed landscaping including new tree planting will enhance the quality, landscape and amenity value of the site, whilst increasing the climate change resilience, increasing the bio-diversity and improving the value of the tree resource within the wider area.

7.13 The proposed trees will be planted in suitably specified and prepared planting pits with sufficient soil volume to ensure their long-term future and appropriate maintenance to assist with their establishment. All tree planting will be subject to ongoing management to ensure the trees become successfully established.

7.14 It should be noted that the proposed new planting will be protected by the standard Landscaping Condition which ensures any trees that fail to establish within the first five years are replaced by the site owner. The newly planted trees, which will have a stem diameter of over 75mm will be further protected by the Conservation Area status which ensures that RBKC will be notified prior to any pruning works or tree removals being undertaken and if RBKC consider the works inappropriate or unnecessary they can prevent works from being undertaken by service a Tree Preservation Order.
7.15 The principle of removing trees to allow for an appropriate design is supported in all relevant planning policies, planning guidance and in BS5837 (2012) which states that:

5.1.1 The constraints imposed by trees, both above and below ground (see Note to 5.2.1) should inform the site layout design, although it is recognized that the competing needs of development mean that trees are only one factor requiring consideration. Certain trees are of such importance and sensitivity as to be major constraints on development or to justify its substantial modification.

7.16 It is my opinion that for the proposed redevelopment of this site the pertinent point in terms of arboriculture is ‘that trees are only one factor requiring consideration’. Clearly the proposed tree removals are a material consideration during the determination of the planning application, however the impact of the tree removals needs to be considered in conjunction with the proposed new tree planting and landscaping and considered alongside the wider benefits associated with the proposed development.

7.17 With regard to the secluded nature of the site and the relatively low amenity value of the trees to be removed, it is my opinion that the proposed tree removals will not have a significant negative impact on the character and appearance of the area, or the setting of the buildings or wider area.

7.18 The 3 retained London planes are located centrally within the site, they will add to the setting of the proposed development and along with the proposed new planting will continue to contribute to the landscape within the site for many decades.

7.19 One of the significant benefits associated with the proposed development is the public access which is proposed as part of overall scheme. This will result in trees which for many decades have been hidden from public view becoming part of the local landscape.

7.20 Tree Pruning

7.21 To allow for the proposed development the London plane T3 will require crown reduction. The proposed pruning would leave the canopy extending to the west by more than 8m, to the north by 8m, (where it currently over-sails the existing building) and to the east and south it would be reduced back to a lateral spread of approximately 9m. This would leave the tree with an overall canopy spread of between 16-17m.

7.22 The canopy would be reduced to appropriate pruning points to help reduce the impact of the works and will allow this tree to maintain an attractive form within the site. The pruning works would not be detrimental to the health or longevity of the tree and the regrowth would be managed by regular cyclical pruning.
7.23 This type of crown management of London planes is common throughout London and the south east, they respond well to crown reduction works.

_London plane is the ideal tree for urban locations for many reasons, it is tolerant of pollution, soil compaction, drought and heavy pruning often being pollarded_
Deepdale Trees Limited

_Platanus x hispanica is one of the most popular trees for urban planting; being planted extensively across London due to its tolerance of air pollution and pruning_
Barcham Trees PLC

_Probably the most widely planted street tree in Britain and other European countries. The tree will also tolerate hard pruning and can be shaped accordingly_
Hilliers Nurseries Limited

_Platanus x hispanica is too large for many urban locations and is therefore heavily pruned it is also tolerant of such treatment_
Principles of Tree Hazard Assessment and Management by David Lonsdale DETR

7.24 The London planes T8 and T9 have matured in close proximity to each other and other London planes, compared to T3 these trees have developed taller much narrower canopies. The proposals are to undertake the limited reduction to the canopy of T8 to clear the proposed building to the west and then maintain the remaining canopies at their current dimensions.

7.25 The retained London planes will benefit from regular inspection and when necessary appropriate management. These trees will continue to be protected by the TPO and any pruning works would require consent from RBKC which ensures these trees are subject to appropriate management. Irrigation will be included as part of the proposed development and this will help to maintain favourable growing conditions for the retained and newly planted trees.

7.26 **Arboricultural Impact Assessment of Construction Works**

7.27 The retained trees all have a sufficient area of protected undisturbed soil necessary to maintain the trees in a healthy condition during the proposed works.

7.28 The proposed works will result in the loss of a proportion of the finer root system, however the loss will be compensated by cultural actions to ensure a sufficient volume of the root system and rooting environment is retained in the optimum conditions to successfully support the retained trees. (See Tree Protection Plan in Appendix 3).
7.29 The RPA calculation within BS5837 gives an estimate on the area of soil which should be protected around a tree to allow a tree to be retained during construction. This calculation assumes that the tree will be protected by a rigid barrier but assumes that no action will be undertaken to improve the growing condition of the tree. Irrigation and mulching the tree will compensate for the loss of root system and will ensure the trees are successfully retained.

7.30 As recommended in BS5837 (2012) it is proposed that the retained trees will be cared for during the construction programme, they will be subject to automated irrigation controlled by moisture sensors, and the ground within the fenced-off tree protection area will be mulched will 150mm of well-composted woodchip. No mulch will be laid within 1000mm of the trunks and buttress roots of the London Planes. Particularly for urban soils mulching improves the soils structure and soil biology, helps conserve soil moisture and improves the environment for root growth. The soil will be tested and any soil improvement through addition of nutrients and trace elements will be undertaken. These actions will significantly improve the growing conditions for the retained trees.

7.31 On construction sites the impact on trees can be two-fold, the initial loss of roots due to direct damage such as excavation and then the indirect damage such as compaction and construction activities damaging the retained part of the roots system and rooting environment.

7.32 For this project to prevent damage to the retained trees it is proposed that the root severance along the line of the proposed basement is undertaken as a separate operation prior to construction works starting using an airspade to expose the roots and hand tools to cleanly cut the roots. On the development side of the retained trees the retained root system will then be ‘boxed-in’ below ground and the above ground parts of the tree will be fenced off with tree protection fencing to effectively isolate the retained trees from the construction site.

7.33 The proposed method of root pruning and tree protection has been used on other projects involving mature London planes and allows the trees to be successfully to be protected and effectively containerises the root system on the basement elevation allowing the roots to be protected but also creating an environment where the cut roots can continue to grow and are isolated from the construction works.

7.34 The distance between the retained trees and the face of the basement or foundations indicates that the loss of these roots can be compensated by improving the rooting environment within the fenced-off protected area for the retained trees.
7.35  It is thought that a healthy tree will tolerate the removal of approximately one-third of its roots (Harris 1992, Helliwell 1985). Fraedrich and Smiley et al. (2002) proposed limits to trenching near the trunk: no closer than three times the trunk diameter. When researchers cut roots at this distance however, a significant reduction in health was not detected until roots on three or four sides of the tree were cut. Likewise Miller and Neely (1993) found reductions in tree growth only when linear trenches were closer than three times the trunk diameter.

7.36  For guidance on the relative sensitivity of different species of trees to development works Matheny and Clarke in ‘Trees and Development A Technical Guide to Preservation of Trees During Land Development’ (1998) includes a table giving the Relative Tolerance of Selected Species to Development Impacts this details the characteristics of over 220 species of tree. Matheny and Clarke classify Lime as being ‘moderately tolerant of root pruning’ having ‘considerable resistance to contractors pressures’. London plane are described as ‘Poor or Good response appears to be location dependent’ (this is from an American publication) ‘benefits from supplemental irrigation’.

7.37  With regard to the volume of soil retained, the proposed cultural operations including irrigation the proposed tree protection measures and based on experience of other similar projects it is our opinion that the proposed works will not be detrimental to the health, longevity or stability of the retained trees.

7.38  The following sections of this report outline the site works in relation to the retained trees, it is proposed as recommended in BS5837 (2012) that subject to planning consent being granted, the guidelines outlined in this report will be revisited and addressed in detail prior to site works commencing.
8.0 **Tree Protection Measures**

8.1 The main Tree Protection Issues are outlined below

- A suitably experienced Arboricultural Consultant will be appointed by the developer to fulfil the role of Arboricultural Clerk of Works (ACoW) as defined in BS5837 (2012).
- Trees identified for removal as per the approved drawings will be clearly marked with spray paint. Any Trees works including clearance, removal or facilitation pruning will be undertaken by a suitably qualified and insured Arboricultural Contractor.
- Prior to any enabling / groundworks / construction (including archaeological works) commencing on site. The tree root pruning and rootball preparation works as outlined in this report will be undertaken and the Tree Protection Measures as outlined in this report will be installed.
- The Tree Protection Measures outlined in this report will include installation of a rigid barrier of Tree Protection Fencing to form a Construction Exclusion Zone and installation of appropriate Temporary Ground Protection to allow access whilst preventing compaction of the subsoil.
- The design and specification of all Landscaping works will be reviewed by the Arboricultural Clerk of Works.
- The Tree Protection / Site Logistics Plan will be on display in the site agent’s office.
- Any variations to the agreed construction methodology that may impact on the retained trees or the ground around the retained trees will be reviewed by the ACoW.
- All works (including Landscaping works) within the fenced-off Tree Protection / Construction Exclusion Zone and as identified on the Tree Protection Plan will be specified to avoid excavation, level changes and damage to the root system of the retained trees. The specifications and construction methodologies for all these works will be reviewed by the ACoW prior to works commencing.
- The removal or movement of Tree Protection Fencing will only be undertaken following discussion with and receipt of written confirmation from the ACoW.
8.2 Arboricultural Clerk of Works

8.3 A suitably experienced Arboricultural Consultant will be appointed by the developer to fulfil the role of Arboricultural Clerk of Works (ACoW) as defined in BS5837 (2012).

8.4 The ACoW will be responsible for briefing the Site Manager on the tree protection issues relating to the proposed development prior to works commencing on site. This briefing will include a review of the proposed works, discussion of the construction methodology and ensuring that the tree protection measures are installed to avoid damage to the rooting system and rooting environment of the retained trees.

8.5 All site operatives will be briefed on the Tree Protection Issues as part of the induction process. The tree protection measures will be explained to all contactors and sub-contractors who will read, and sign the induction forms before they undertake any works on site.

8.6 The Arboricultural Clerk of Works (ACoW) role shall be to:
   
a. To assess the specification and methodology of the proposed works and ensure these works have the minimum impact on the retained trees.
   b. Oversee the root pruning and preparation of the rootball
   c. Brief the workers on the necessity to protect the retained trees.
   d. To ensure the agreed methodology is followed by direct on-site supervision.
   e. To provide direction on tree protection issues as they arise.
   f. To monitor and photograph the works undertaken.

8.7 Site visits will also be undertaken during the works at a maximum interval of 4 weeks, it is our experience that a mix of scheduled and unannounced site visits are best suited to ensure that the construction methodology is being followed and the correct tree protection measures are in place.

8.8 During these visits the condition of the tree will be assessed, the tree protection measures will be inspected, any changes to the proposed works will be discussed, their impact assessed and recommendations for best practice will be outlined. After each of these visits a copy of the report should be sent to the Site Agent, Local Authority Tree Officer and Client. Any remedial action undertaken will be recorded on the next visit. These reports will include photographs.
8.9 The ACoW will report any non-conformance with regards to the agreed construction methodology and will also record any accidents or incidents in relation to the protection of the trees.

8.10 To deal with any emergences involving damage to trees, the Arboricultural Clerk of Works will provide a contact number that will be answered during all the hours of works on site. The Westminster City Council Arboricultural Officer will be informed of any accidents or emergencies involving the tree.

8.11 **Root Pruning and Root Preparation Works**

8.12 Prior to works commencing a 1000-1200mm deep trench will be excavated using an airspade to determine the size and density of roots that are growing along the face of the basement excavations. The aim of these works is to cleanly cut roots, and to allow shuttering to be installed to protect the exposed edge of the ‘rootball’ from further damage during construction works and to provide the best growing conditions for the newly cut and exposed roots.

8.13 All excavation works will be undertaken working within the footprint of the basement outside the rootball. A trench will be excavated using hand tools and Air Spade to remove soil, to facilitate a clean pruning cut of exposed roots in accordance with good arboricultural practice.

8.14 To allow for the proposed root pruning works, the excavation will extend a maximum of 300mm beyond the outside edge of the basement / foundation line. This will allow the exposed face of soil and any cut roots from the retained trees to be protected during the proposed works.

8.15 A mini-digger will be used to remove the soil outside this area to create a working area. All exposed roots will cleanly cut using sharp hand tools. During these works the exposed face of the soil and any cut roots will be protected from desiccation by damp hessian. The root pruning works and installation of the root protection measures will be undertaken by experienced arboricultural contractors working under the supervision of the ACoW.

8.16 The exposed face of soil will then be protected by Air Pot material, the gap between the Air Pot and face of the rootball will be back-filled with a compost and soil mix.
8.17 The outside edge of the Air Pot will then be shuttered up using sheet piling or other suitable sheet material. All works will be below the existing ground level. This will protect the root system of the retained trees and provide an idea environment for new root growth to establish.

8.18 The Air Pot will assist the tree in two ways, it will allow a hugely increased amount of air into the root system and the shape of the Air Pot will encourage roots to grow into the nodules, where they are air pruned, crucially this then causes the build-up of carbohydrates in the roots in this area, then when the air pot is removed the roots have all the reserves in place to exploit this new soil.

8.19 An automated irrigation system controlled by soil moisture sensors will be installed, to water the retained trees during any periods of prolonged dry weather during the project.

8.20 During the construction works the ACoW will undertake regular site monitoring to check on the tree protection measures but also to check on the health of trees, and to check and adjust the irrigation system.

8.22 Tree Pruning Works

8.23 To prevent damage to the canopy of the retained trees a suitably sized piling rig which will work outside the reduced spread of the retained trees will be utilised.

8.24 These works will be undertaken by appropriately qualified and insured Tree Surgery Contractors with all works to comply with BS3998 2010.

8.25 Tree Protection Works

8.26 During the root pruning works the contractors will work within the footprint of the basement any pedestrian access along the top of the rootball will be on temporary ground protection consisting of plyboard sheets lying on a layer of woodchip mulch. Once the root pruning works have been undertaken the Tree Protection Fencing will be erected prior to any enabling works being undertaken on site. Depending on the the timing of any archeological works, temporary Tree Protection Fencing may be erected to prevent excavation and access within the Root Protection Area of retained trees.

8.27 Prior to any basement construction works commencing the Tree Protection Fencing to be installed to protect the open ground around the retained trees. This fencing will be installed as per the Tree Protection Plan which will be prepare by the ACoW. This fenced off area is the Construction Exclusion Zone (CEZ).
8.28 Within the fenced-off Construction Exclusion Zone (CEZ) there will be

- No excavation by any means
- No level changes + or -
- No storage of plant or materials
- No storage or handling of any chemicals including cement washings
- No Machinery or Vehicular Access
- Underground service routes will be located outside the fenced-off area
- No fires on site

8.29 Beyond the fenced-off area for the area of open ground beyond the footprint of the basement, the open ground will be protected by use of temporary ‘No-Dig’ hardstanding. Where the proposed temporary hardstanding crosses open ground, this will be constructed using a ‘No-Dig’ specification which does not require excavation below the existing ground level for either make-up or for the edging. The temporary hardstanding will need to be specified to prevent compaction of the underlying soil, and provide a permeable and porous sub-base and surface to allow moisture to reach the ground and the gaseous exchange necessary to maintain live roots.

8.30 The Temporary No-Dig Hardstanding areas as identified on the Tree Protection Plan are to be built utilising a flexible cellular confinement system such as ‘Protectaweb’ or ‘Cellweb’. This cellular confinement system will be installed to the manufacturers’ specifications which are summarised below: (See Appendix 3 for further information).

- No excavation is to be undertaken without agreement and supervision by the Arboricultural Consultant. This will be restricted to the removal of the existing cultivated loose soil, organic matter and turf and the rubber crumb children’s’ play area. Excavation will not exceed 100mm below ground level.
- During installation of the hardstanding all operations will be carried out using machinery located on existing hardstanding or working off temporary ground protection or the installed ground protection.
- Install ‘Protectaweb’/ ‘Cellweb’ or similar as per manufacturers specifications, we recommend in addition a permeable geotextile membrane is used to help dissipate loads and aid the recovery of material at the end of the project.
- The cellular system is spread out and the cells filled clean angular stones sizes 20-40mm, this fill must contain no fines. Crushed concrete or MOT Type 1 is not a suitable fill material.
- The temporary surface finish must be permeable to moisture penetration.
- We recommend that 2 layers of cellular confinement system are utilised. These layers should be separated by a permeable geotextile membrane. This allows the upper layer to use as a sacrificial layer which can be removed and replaced if it becomes filled with mud and spoil.
- On completion of the project this hardstanding will be removed carefully working out of the site with all machinery located on the temporary hardstanding.

8.31 The final specification for this temporary hardstanding will be prepared by engineers in conjunction with the ACoW, when the traffic loads are known.

8.32 The temporary hardstanding will be designed to ensure any run-off from any wheel washing does not waterlog the areas around the retained trees. The detailed design of the hardstanding and any other temporary works will be reviewed and approved by the ACoW prior to works commencing on site. This information will be forwarded to RBKC Arboricultural Officer prior to works commencing on site.

8.33 Dismantling the protection barriers will be required to allow completion of final landscaping. The removal of the Tree Protection Fencing is not an opportunity for machinery to access the previously fenced off area.

8.34 During the landscaping works the Plywood and Air Pot material will be removed from the outside of the ‘rootball’.

8.35 It is currently shown on the Landscape Planning Report drawings that during the landscaping works the levels of the footpaths and lawns are to be raised above existing levels the levels will remain unaltered within 5m of the trunk. We recommend that a rigid No-Dig three-dimensional cellular surface system such as ‘ArborRaft’ is utilised which maintain a void beneath the raised surface. The methodology for raising of levels will need to ensure that the make-up is fully permeable and porous. Supervision of the tree protection issues associated with this exercise thereafter will be overseen by the appointed ACoW.
9.0 Conclusion

9.1 26 trees are to be removed for the proposed development, of these trees 10 are not subject to protection under the TPO and all but 4 of the trees to be removed are ornamental trees with no significant amenity value.

9.2 The 4 London plane trees to be removed are all located to the railway boundary of the site. Since 2006 2 additional London planes along this boundary which were also subject to protection under the Tree Preservation Order have been removed. These removals were due to their condition, proximity to the railway and risks associated with the safe operation of the railway infrastructure. It appears that these works were undertaken under a TPO exemption due to the hazards posed by these trees. It is considered highly likely that there will be future pressure to remove the London planes T5 and T6 which are growing within 2m of the retaining wall boundary.

9.3 Due to the very limited views from the public realm the public amenity value of all the trees growing within this site is very limited. The trees to be removed to allow for the proposed development do not represent a significant loss to public amenity nor will the tree removals significantly impact on the character and appearance of the area when viewed from the public realm.

9.4 The limited visual impact of the removal of the trees will be mitigated by the proposed planting of trees within the development and increased public access. The landscaping details have been prepared by Andy Sturgeon Design, the landscaping report identifies planting of 4 large canopy trees to mitigate the loss of the 4 London plane and planting a minimum of 93 small trees including some to be planted in planters which will result in an uplift of 70 trees (minimum) within the site. Please refer to Landscape Planning Report by Andy Sturgeon Design for further details. This planting can be secured by use of standard planning condition.

9.5 The successful protection of the retained trees during the proposed development works can be achieved by continuing to follow the guidance outlined in this report and in BS5837 (2012). Full details on tree protection measures and continued arboricultural site supervision can be secured by use of standard planning condition.
9.6 Based on the known tree species characteristics and the existing site conditions it is my opinion that subject to appropriate tree protection measures as outlined in this report the proposed works will not have a negative impact on the health, stability or longevity of the retained trees.

9.7 It is my opinion that the public amenity value of the existing tree resource is very limited, and the remaining life-expectancy of 2 of the London planes trees closest to the railway is likely to be limited (due to risks posed to the underground railway infrastructure and safe operation) and therefore the weight given to the potential impact of the removal of the trees needs to reflect these two factors.

9.8 The proposed tree removals are a material consideration during the determination of the planning application, however the very limited impact of the tree removals on the character and appearance of the wider area needs to be considered in conjunction with the increased public access to this currently inaccessible site. During the determination of this planning application these matters alongside the landscape information prepared by Andy Sturgeon Design, the arboricultural information contained in this report and wider benefits associated with the proposed development need to be considered.

Peter Wilkins  BA (Hons) MArborA
Ruskins Group Consultancy Limited
T/a  RG Consultancy Limited
4th August 2018
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Tree Condition Survey

Tree Survey Plan

Photographs
Pre-Development Tree Condition Survey at Heythrop College, Kensington Square, London. W8 5HN

Prepared for Leopard UK Kensington PropCo Ltd
## Cascade chart for tree quality assessment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trees unsuitable for retention</th>
<th>Criteria (including subcategories where appropriate)</th>
<th>Identification on plan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Category U</td>
<td>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 category U trees (e.g. 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, or very low quality trees suppressing adjacent trees of better quality</td>
<td>Red</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Trees to be considered for retention

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category A</th>
<th>1 Mainly arboricultural qualities</th>
<th>2 Mainly landscape qualities</th>
<th>3 Mainly cultural values, including conservation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Trees of high quality with an estimated remaining life expectancy of at least 40 years</td>
<td>Trees that are particularly good examples of their species, especially if rare or unusual; or those that are essential components of groups or formal or semi-formal arboricultural features (e.g. the dominant and/or principal trees within an avenue)</td>
<td>Trees, groups or woodlands of particular visual importance as arboricultural and/or landscape features</td>
<td>Trees, groups or woodlands See Table 2 of significant conservation, historical, commemorative or other value (e.g. veteran trees or woodland-pasture)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category B</td>
<td>Trees of moderate quality with an estimated remaining life expectancy of at least 20 years</td>
<td>Trees that might be included in category A, but are downgraded because of impaired condition (e.g. presence of significant though remediable defects, including unsympathetic past management and storm damage), such that they are unlikely to be suitable for retention for beyond 40 years; or trees lacking the special quality necessary to merit the category A designation</td>
<td>Trees present in numbers, usually growing as groups or woodlands, such that they attract a higher collective rating than they might as individuals; or trees occurring as collectives but situated so as to make little visual contribution to the wider locality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category C</td>
<td>Trees of low quality with an estimated remaining life expectancy of at least 10 years, or young trees with a stem diameter below 150 mm</td>
<td>Unremarkable trees of very limited merit or such impaired condition that they do not qualify in higher categories</td>
<td>Trees present in groups or woodlands, but without this conferring on them significantly greater collective landscape value; and/or trees offering low or only temporary/transient landscape benefits</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From BS 5837 (2012) Trees in relation to design, demolition and construction – Recommendations
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tree No. (TPO -T1)</th>
<th>Species</th>
<th>Hgt (m)</th>
<th>Dia. @ 1.5m (m)</th>
<th>No of stems</th>
<th>CS N (m)</th>
<th>CS E (m)</th>
<th>CS S (m)</th>
<th>CS W (m)</th>
<th>ER CY</th>
<th>Vig.</th>
<th>Form</th>
<th>Age Class</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Proposed Works</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T1</td>
<td>Sycamore</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>580</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>EM</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>40+</td>
<td>An early mature tree growing to the north-western corner of the site growing on the raised bed which runs along the western railway boundary. This tree is in close proximity to a brick-built wall and store. This tree has been managed by crown lifting to clear the nearby brick built store. This tree has extensive deadwood and a large hanging dead branch.</td>
<td>Remove to allow for the proposed development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T2</td>
<td>Fulham oak</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>620</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>EM</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>40+</td>
<td>An early mature tree growing to the north side of the lawn area. This tree is located on the edge of the tarmac car parking area.</td>
<td>Remove to allow for the proposed development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T3</td>
<td>London plane</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>1580</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>40+</td>
<td>A mature London plane growing to the northern edge of the lawn area. This tree has been subject to some past management including historic pruning works to reduce its overall height and more recently it has been lightly pruned to crown lift the broad spreading canopy and crown reduction to clear the building to the north. The trunk divides at 3m and on the eastern most branch is a cavity which extends between 3-4m. With regard to the known species characteristics we do not consider that this cavity is significant to the long-term health of this tree, the cavity has been examined by a climbing inspection. This tree has a limited potential for further growth and a long remaining life-expectancy. (See Note 1).</td>
<td>Retain and protect during proposed works. Crown reduce by a balanced overall crown reduction to give 2m clearance form the proposed building to the west, and similar clearance to the existing building to the north.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note 1: The London planes are a notable feature within this locality, with these trees making a significant contribution to the character and appearance of the area. These trees have a limited potential for significant further growth and has a long potential remaining life-expectancy. We are aware that Massaria (Splanchnonema platani) has been reported in this area. This disease was first noted in London in 2007 and can result in the failure of large limbs. Symptoms of this disease are found on the upper side of branches and consequently inspections from the ground are of limited value. While Massaria is a relatively weak pathogen and its effects long-term may not be too damaging on the overall population of London planes if managed appropriately. Canker Stain of Planes (Ceratocystis platani) is a fungal disease which is spreading northwards through Europe and has the potential to impact Planes on a par with Dutch elm disease upon the elm population. Canker Stain of Planes can be spread through pruning and it is now considered essential that when working on London planes pruning tools are sterilised. We recommend that the retained London plane trees are inspected for any symptoms of Massaria and Canker Stain of Planes on a regular basis.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tree No.</th>
<th>Species</th>
<th>Hgt (m)</th>
<th>Dia. @ 1.5m (m)</th>
<th>No. of stems</th>
<th>CS N (m)</th>
<th>CS E (m)</th>
<th>CS S (m)</th>
<th>CS W (m)</th>
<th>ER CY</th>
<th>Vig.</th>
<th>Form</th>
<th>Age Class</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Proposed Works</th>
<th>BS Cat</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T4 (TPO-T4)</td>
<td>London plane</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1240</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>40+</td>
<td>A mature London plane growing within shrubbery to the western edge of the lawn area. This tree has been crown lifted. This tree is considered to have a limited potential for further growth and a long remaining life-expectancy. (See Note 1).</td>
<td>Remove to allow for the proposed development</td>
<td>B2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T5 (TPO-T5)</td>
<td>London plane</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>920</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>40+</td>
<td>A mature London plane growing on the raised bed which runs along the western railway boundary. This tree is in close proximity to the brick-built boundary wall with a canopy which extends over the railway lines. This tree has an unbalanced canopy due to its proximity to the now removed London plane ST1 to the southern side. This tree is considered to have a limited potential for further growth and a long remaining life-expectancy. (See Note 1).</td>
<td>Remove to allow for the proposed development</td>
<td>B2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T6 (TPO-T6)</td>
<td>London plane</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1010</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>40+</td>
<td>A mature London plane growing on the raised bed which runs along the western railway boundary. This tree is in close proximity to the brick-built boundary wall with a canopy which extends over the railway lines. This tree has an unbalanced canopy due to its proximity to the now removed London plane ST1 to the northern side. This tree is considered to have a limited potential for further growth and a long remaining life-expectancy. (See Note 1).</td>
<td>Remove to allow for the proposed development</td>
<td>B2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T7 (TPO-T7)</td>
<td>London plane</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>940</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>40+</td>
<td>A mature London plane growing on the raised ground to the southern edge of the lawn area. This tree is considered to have a limited potential for further growth and a long remaining life-expectancy. (See Note 1).</td>
<td>Remove to allow for the proposed development</td>
<td>B2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T8 (TPO-T31)</td>
<td>London plane</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1340</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>40+</td>
<td>A mature London plane growing to the southern edge of the lawn area. This tree has a stem that natural leans to the north. It has been subject to some past management including historic pruning works to reduce its overall height and more recently it has been lightly pruned to crown lift the broad spreading canopy. This tree has a limited potential for further growth and a long remaining life-expectancy. (See Note 1).</td>
<td>Retain and protect during proposed works.</td>
<td>B2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tree No.</td>
<td>Species</td>
<td>Hgt (m)</td>
<td>Dia. @ 1.5m (m)</td>
<td>No of stems</td>
<td>CS N (m)</td>
<td>CS E (m)</td>
<td>CS S (m)</td>
<td>CS W (m)</td>
<td>ER CY</td>
<td>Vig.</td>
<td>Form</td>
<td>Age Class</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Proposed Works</td>
<td>BS Cat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T9</td>
<td>London plane</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>1330</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>40+</td>
<td>A mature London plane growing on the raised ground to the southern edge of the lawn area. This raised ground includes the above ground grotto but also appears to have underground structures beneath. This tree is considered to have a limited potential for further growth and a long remaining life-expectancy. (See Note 1). It has been subject to some past management including historic pruning works to reduce its overall height. This tree has a limited potential for further growth and a long remaining life-expectancy. (See Note 1).</td>
<td>Retain and protect during proposed works.</td>
<td>B2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T10</td>
<td>Gingko</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>SM</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>40+</td>
<td>A small semi-mature tree growing to the southern side of the lawn area. Not worthy of consideration during the planning process.</td>
<td>Remove to allow for the proposed development</td>
<td>C1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T11</td>
<td>Lime</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>SM</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>40+</td>
<td>A small semi-mature tree growing to the eastern side of the lawn area. Not worthy of consideration during the planning process.</td>
<td>Remove to allow for the proposed development</td>
<td>C1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SG1</td>
<td>Mixed Shrubs</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>M/s</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>10-19</td>
<td>A group of mature shrubs growing within the eastern part of the lawn area. Not worthy of consideration during the planning process.</td>
<td>Remove to allow for the proposed development</td>
<td>C1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T12</td>
<td>Hawthorn</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>40+</td>
<td>A mature tree growing within the planted area to the eastern side of the lawn area.</td>
<td>Remove to allow for the proposed development</td>
<td>C1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T13</td>
<td>Mulberry</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>0-10</td>
<td>A mature ornamental tree growing within the planted area to the eastern side of the lawn area. This tree has an area of dead bark and dead exposed wood to the base of the main stem. There is extensive callous growth on the main stem. There is deadwood and dieback in the unbalanced canopy. This tree is consider to have a limited remaining life expectancy. Consider containerising this tree and including within the final Landscaping scheme.</td>
<td>Consider containerising this tree and including within the final Landscaping scheme.</td>
<td>C1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tree No.</td>
<td>Species</td>
<td>Hgt (m)</td>
<td>Dia. @ 1.5m (m)</td>
<td>No of stems</td>
<td>CS N (m)</td>
<td>CS E (m)</td>
<td>CS S (m)</td>
<td>CS W (m)</td>
<td>ER CY</td>
<td>Vig.</td>
<td>Form</td>
<td>Age Class</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Proposed Works</td>
<td>BS Cat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T14</td>
<td>Mulberry</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>470</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>40+</td>
<td>A mature ornamental tree growing within the planted area to the eastern side of the lawn area. This tree has an unbalanced canopy with over extended laterals to the southern side.</td>
<td>Consider containerising this tree and including within the final Landscaping scheme.</td>
<td>C1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T15</td>
<td>Magnolia</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>40+</td>
<td>A mature ornamental tree growing within the planted area to the eastern side of the lawn area. This tree has an unbalanced form leaning to the east.</td>
<td>Remove to allow for the proposed development</td>
<td>C1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T16</td>
<td>Snowy mespil</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>280 (M/s)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>20-39</td>
<td>A mature ornamental multi-stemmed tree growing within the planted area to the eastern side of the lawn area.</td>
<td>Remove to allow for the proposed development</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T17</td>
<td>Lime</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>620</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>40+</td>
<td>A mature tree growing to the eastern boundary of the garden area. At the time of our inspection it had been recently reduced leaving only the main scaffold branches with no regrowth present.</td>
<td>Retain and protect during proposed works.</td>
<td>B2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T18</td>
<td>Cherry</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>630</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>20-39</td>
<td>A mature tree growing within a triangular planted area to the southern side of a detached two-storey building. This tree has been reduced to clear the building</td>
<td>Remove to allow for the proposed development</td>
<td>C1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T19</td>
<td>Cupressus</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>200 (m/s)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>20-39</td>
<td>A mature ornamental conifer growing within a triangular planted area to the southern side of a detached two-storey building.</td>
<td>Remove to allow for the proposed development</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T20</td>
<td>Sorbus</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>EM</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>20-39</td>
<td>A small early-mature ornamental tree. Not worthy of consideration during the planning process.</td>
<td>Remove to allow for the proposed development</td>
<td>C1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T21</td>
<td>Foxglove tree</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>420</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>0-9</td>
<td>A mature ornamental tree growing within the narrow strip of open ground to the western boundary of the site. This tree has a sparse canopy with an unbalanced form leaning to the west and has the lower stem and top of the root system exposed</td>
<td>Remove to allow for the proposed development</td>
<td>C1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tree No.</td>
<td>Species</td>
<td>Hgt (m)</td>
<td>Dia. @ 1.5m (m)</td>
<td>No. of stems</td>
<td>CS N (m)</td>
<td>CS E (m)</td>
<td>CS S (m)</td>
<td>CS W (m)</td>
<td>ER CY</td>
<td>Vig.</td>
<td>Form</td>
<td>Age Class</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Proposed Works</td>
<td>BS Cat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T22</td>
<td>Cherry (TPO-T11)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>20-39</td>
<td>A mature ornamental tree growing within the open ground to the western boundary of the site. This tree is covered by a climbing rose which covers the boundary wall and anti-missile fencing.</td>
<td>Remove to allow for the proposed development</td>
<td>C1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T23</td>
<td>Himalayan Birch</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>SM</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>40+</td>
<td>A small semi-mature ornamental tree growing within the open ground to the western boundary of the site.</td>
<td>Remove to allow for the proposed development</td>
<td>C1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T24</td>
<td>Crab Apple (TPO-T12)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>20-39</td>
<td>A mature ornamental tree growing within the open ground to the southern boundary of the site in close proximity to the wall of the adjoining building. Ivy is becoming established on the stem of this tree.</td>
<td>Remove to allow for the proposed development</td>
<td>C1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T25</td>
<td>Crab Apple (TPO-T13)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>20-39</td>
<td>A mature ornamental tree growing within the open ground to the southern boundary of the site in close proximity to the wall of the adjoining building. There is deadwood and dieback in the canopy of this tree.</td>
<td>Remove to allow for the proposed development</td>
<td>C1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T26</td>
<td>Cherry (TPO-T14)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>20-39</td>
<td>A mature ornamental tree growing within the open ground to the southern boundary of the site in close proximity to the wall of the adjoining building. There is deadwood and dieback in the canopy of this tree.</td>
<td>Remove to allow for the proposed development</td>
<td>C1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T27</td>
<td>Ash-Leafed Maple</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>SM</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>40+</td>
<td>A small semi-mature tree growing close to the southern elevation of the main building. Not worthy of consideration during the planning process.</td>
<td>Remove to allow for the proposed development</td>
<td>C1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T28</td>
<td>Cupressus</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>150 m/s</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>40+</td>
<td>A small ornamental conifer growing within the small garden to the northern part of the site.</td>
<td>Remove to allow for the proposed development</td>
<td>C1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T29</td>
<td>Cupressus</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>120 m/s</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>40+</td>
<td>A small ornamental conifer growing within the small garden to the northern part of the site.</td>
<td>Remove to allow for the proposed development</td>
<td>C1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T30</td>
<td>Bay Laurel</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>200 m/s</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>40+</td>
<td>A small multi-stemmed shrub growing within the small garden to the northern part of the site.</td>
<td>Remove to allow for the proposed development</td>
<td>C1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tree No.</td>
<td>Species</td>
<td>Hgt (m)</td>
<td>Dia. @ 1.5m (m)</td>
<td>No of stems</td>
<td>CS N (m)</td>
<td>CS E (m)</td>
<td>CS S (m)</td>
<td>CS W (m)</td>
<td>ER CY</td>
<td>Vig.</td>
<td>Form</td>
<td>Age Class</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Proposed Works</td>
<td>BS Cat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST1 (TPO-T6)</td>
<td>Stump</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>The stump of a removed London plane growing on the raised bed which runs along the western railway boundary.</td>
<td>No Works</td>
<td>U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST2 (TPO-T9)</td>
<td>Stump</td>
<td>900*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>The stump of a removed London plane growing on the raised bed which runs along the western railway boundary.</td>
<td>No Works</td>
<td>U</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Tree Survey Plan
Photographs
Photograph 1 (Courtesy of Google Streetview)  
from South End looking west towards the London plane T8.

Photograph 2 (13th October 2017)  
From eastern end of Scarsdale Place (end of the public highway)  
looking east towards the site with the Copthorne Tara Hotel obscuring  
views over the railway towards the site.
Photograph 3 (13th October 2017)
View from platform 2 of High Street Kensington London Underground looking south towards the site with canopies of T1-T4 partially visible.

Photograph 4 (13th October 2017)
View from platform 2 of High Street Kensington London Underground looking south towards the site with canopies of T1-T3 partially visible.