

ARBORICULTURAL REPORT

Summary Report for Cumberland Council

Prepared by Alistair Hearn

Reference: 4/23/2382/TPO

Location: INGLEBERG, BECKERMET.

Officer: Chloe Wootton

Date: 19 January 2024

CONSULTANTS REPORT

DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSAL

| APPLICATION TREE NO. | SPECIES | PROPOSED WORKS |
|---|-------------------------|---|
| T1 & T2 | 1x Oak & 1x Sycamore | Removal of branch on oak tree overhanging barn roof & removal of branch from sycamore tree near house which are within a Conservation Area. |
| REASON | | |
| 'Oak T1 – Removal of branch, overhanging barn roof, covered in moss as a result. Work required repairing roof and lower branches impede this. Sycamore T2 – Removal of branch on R of tree, too close to house, and as this is on the lee side of the prevailing wind it is pulling the tree in the direction of the house.' | | |

DISCUSSION

The trees are in the mature age category and show signs of normal vitality.

From the Cumberland Council website, the site falls within the Beckermets Conservation Area. No Tree Preservation Orders (TPO) protect these trees.

We consider the work detailed in the application reasonable to prevent the trees becoming a nuisance.

Our TEMPO assessment (page 2) shows a TPO is defensible, but given the work the applicant is proposing, we consider it is unwarranted at this time.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Inform the applicant they can carry out the work in the notification or wait for the six-week determination period to lapse.

ARBORICULTURAL REPORT

Summary Report for Cumberland Council

Prepared by Alistair Hearn

| TEMPO Assessment | | | | | | | |
|---|---|----|----|---|--|----|----|
| Part 1: Amenity Assessment | | | | | | | |
| a) Condition & Suitability: | 5-Good = <i>Highly Suitable</i> 3-Fair/Satisfactory = <i>Suitable</i> 1-Poor = Unlikely to be <i>suitable</i> 0-Dead/dying/dangerous = <i>Unsuitable</i> | T1 | T2 | b) Retention span (in years) & suitability for TPO | 5-100+ = <i>Highly Suitable</i> 4-40-100 = <i>Very suitable</i> 2-20-40 = <i>Suitable</i> 1-10-20 = <i>Just suitable</i> 0-<10 = <i>Unsuitable</i> | T1 | T2 |
| | | 3 | 3 | | | 4 | 4 |
| c) Relative public visibility & suitability for TPO: | 5-Very large with some visibility, or prominent large trees = <i>Highly Suitable</i> 4-Large trees, or medium trees clearly visible to the public = <i>Suitable</i> 3-Medium trees, or large trees with limited view only = <i>Suitable</i> 2-Young, small, or medium/large trees visible only with difficulty = <i>Barely suitable</i> 1-Trees not visible to the public, regardless of size = <i>Unsuitable</i> | 3 | 3 | d) Other factors – trees must have accrued 7 or more points (with no zero score) to qualify: | 5-Principal components of formal arboricultural features, or veteran trees 4-Tree groups, or principal members of groups important for their cohesion 3-Trees with identifiable historic, commemorative or habitat importance 2-Trees of particularly good form, especially if rare or unusual 1-Trees with none of the above additional redeeming features (inc. those of indifferent form) -1-Trees with poor form or which are generally unsuitable for their location | 1 | 1 |
| Part 2: Expediency Assessment trees must have accrued 10 or more points to qualify: | | | | Part 3: Decision guide | | | |
| 5-Immediate threat to tree inc. s.211 Notice 3-Foreseeable threat to tree 2- Perceived threat to tree 1-Precautionary only | | T1 | T2 | Any 0 = <i>Do not apply TPO</i> 1-6 = <i>TPO indefensible</i> 7-11 = <i>Does not merit TPO</i> 12-15 = <i>TPO defensible</i> 16+ = <i>Definitely merits TPO</i> | | T1 | T2 |
| | | 1 | 1 | | | 12 | 12 |