

## Record of Arboricultural Inspection

**Location:** The Dana, Shrewsbury

**Site Type:** Public Land

**Zone:** Red

**Exposure:** Sheltered

**Soils:**

**QTRA Target Score:** 2

**Date:** September 2021

**Inspector:** S. Shields

**Weather:** Clear

**Notes:**

Tree #	Species	Size Class*	Age Class*	Structural Condition	Health & Vitality	Notes	Target	Size	Risk of failure	QTRA Score*
G1	<i>Acer pseudoplatanus</i> (Sycamore)	M	M	G	G	<p><b>Environment:</b> The trees are situated in an area of open space between the River Severn and Victoria Street / The Dana in Shrewsbury. The land slopes down from Victoria Street and has been terraced with dwellings at the top of the bank and their garden below.</p> <p><b>General Description:</b> G1 is comprised 3 trees that form an aerodynamic and visual group. This group is in a prominent location and is protected by the Shrewsbury Conservation Area.</p> <p><b>Structural Condition:</b> <i>Structural Root System &amp; Root Buttress:</i> Examined visually no significant defects noted. A small clump of fruit bodies that appeared to be honey fungus (<i>Armillaria sp.</i>) were noted close to the base of the eastern most tree, but there was no</p>	2	1	6	<b>&lt;1M V. Low</b>

					<p>indication that the tree was infected with this fungus at this time and it</p> <p><i>Main Stem</i> Examined visually. The stem height – diameter ratios of all trees is well within acceptable limits for an open grown trees and there were no indications of significant defects or decay. Ivy on the trees did hinder inspection slightly.</p> <p><i>Crown Structure</i> Minor deadwood and some past branch failure of small branches.</p> <p><i>Foliage</i> Size, density and colour were all normal. Minor tar spot and some mould associated with honey dew from the tree.</p> <p><i>Health &amp; Vitality:</i> No indication of any significant pests or diseases, vitality normal.</p> <p><b>Amenity Value and Residential Impact:</b> The group of trees is in a prominent position close to the river and has a high public amenity value.</p> <p>Concerns have been raised by the owners of the adjacent house that the trees impact on their residential amenity and reasonable enjoyment of the property. These concerns centre around worries that the trees may fail, impact of shade on the house and garden and impacts on health</p>					
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

					<p>of the occupants from mould spores associated with the tree, encroachment over the lower part of the garden and leaf litter</p> <p>The trees have been inspected and there is no indication that they are at an increased risk of failure or that they pose and unacceptable risk to people or property.</p> <p>The trees are to the south of the property and will cast some shade during the middle of the day however, sunlight would reach the property in the mornings and later in the afternoon. The trees are approximately 12 metres from the house (measured to the centre of the trunk) and are on land that is significantly lower than the house and garden. This reduces the impact of shade on the house and garden. Building Research Establishment guide to good practice (BR209) Site Layout Planning for Daylight and Sunlight advises that, in order to appear reasonably sunlit a dwelling should have at least one main window wall that faces within 90° of due south and that on this wall, all points on a line 2m above ground level are within 4m of a point which receives at least a quarter of the annual probable sunlight hours. The guide also advises that for gardens to appear adequately sunlit, no more than two-fifths and preferably no more than a quarter should be prevented from receiving any sunlight on 21st March. In this case,</p>				
--	--	--	--	--	---	--	--	--	--

					<p>although no formal assessment has been undertaken, it is very likely that the level of sunlight and daylight at the property would exceed these minimum requirements.</p> <p>Encroachment by the crown over the lower part of the garden does affect a small part of the garden to some degree.</p> <p>Leaf litter is common to all trees and whilst clearing it is inconvenient it is not usually considered reason to remove trees.</p> <p>I am not in a position to comment on the health issues, other than to note that the complaints arise from issues that are common to many trees and are not specific to this species.</p> <p><b>Conclusions and Recommendations:</b> There are no reasonable arboricultural grounds for undertaking any work to these trees other than to remove the ivy from the stem and to periodically re-inspect them. Minor crown reduction may help alleviate some of the issues with encroachment over the garden and leaf fall.</p>				
--	--	--	--	--	---	--	--	--	--

---

## KEY

**Size Class**      Stem

- S      Less than 5m height and / or 150mm trunk diameter
- M      5m– 15m height and /or 150mm – 500mm trunk diameter
- L      16m – 25m height and / or 501mm -1000mm trunk diameter
- VL     Over 26m height and or over 1001mm trunk diameter

**Age Class:**

- NP -    New Planting less than 5 yrs
- Y -     Young Trees less than 1/3 life expectancy
- EM -    Early Mature 1/3 – 2/3 life expectancy
- M -     Mature over 2/3 life expectancy
- OM -    Late Mature exceeds normal life expectancy for species
- VET -   Veteran Tree has characteristics of veteran tree, see Read (2000)

**Health & Vitality:**

- Good - No significant health problems
- Fair -    Some health problems that will reduce vitality
- Poor -   Significant health problems that are affecting the tree's ability to survive
- Dead -   Dead

**Structural Conditions:**

- Good - No significant faults
- Fair -    Some faults that can be rectified through surgery or are not significant at this time
- Poor -   Major faults that cannot be rectified through surgery

**Risk Rating:**

- Green - Very Low
- Yellow - Low
- Amber - Moderate
- Red – High

*Numeric rating refers to QTRA score. E.g. 1m = 1 in 1 million.*