

Mr. and Mrs. Barrow
9 Ferndale Close
Tilehurst
Reading
Berkshire
RG31 6UZ

Alison Bell
Head of Environment &
Neighbourhood Services

Civic Offices, Reading, RG1 2LU
☎ 0118 937 3787

Our Ref: 180347/TPO
Your Ref:

Direct: ☎01189 374294
sarah.duckworth@reading.gov.uk

18th April 2018

Your contact is:

Sarah Duckworth, Planning and Building Control

Dear Mr. and Mrs. Barrow,

**RE: PROPOSED WORKS TO A BEECH TO THE REAR OF 9 FERNDALE CLOSE, READING -
AND PROTECTED AS T3 OF TREE PRESERVATION ORDER NUMBER 237/07.**

Thank you for your recent email dated 8th April 2016, regarding the above.

In your original Tree works application you applied to fell the Beech (T3 of TPO 237/07) as a tree surgeon had informed you that the tree had developed 'connecting pockets of rot' which would in his opinion '*require the tree to be felled within 5 years*' and he advised you to look out for any discolouration which you now noted below a knot situated about 2m above ground level.

At my initial site visit on 4th March 2018, I identified that this tree has a clear base which is in a satisfactory condition. There are included wire plant supports around the lower trunk. At 4m there is a twin stem union with an area of bark inclusion. There are multiple old pruning cuts on the tree, some with evident pockets of decay associated with them. All have good rolls of reactive wood around the wound. The canopy of the tree appeared to be in a good condition and the bud distribution suggests good overall vitality and physiological health.

Following this site visit, I advised you in my email dated 16th March 2018, that there was insufficient information to support the removal of the tree at this time and that it would be expedient to arrange a climbing inspection from a tree surgeon so that the condition of the decay pockets and extent of any decay can be ascertained.

On 4th April 2018 you arranged for climbers Will Seaward and Matt Griffiths from Tree World Services to come and carry out a climbing inspection of the tree and I was invited

to attend.

Seven cavities were surveyed and their depths recorded. From the inspection and information passed down by the climber I made the following notes:

Scaffold 1 - West side of canopy

Scaffold 2 - East side of canopy

Scaffold 3 - North side of canopy

Dimensions were provided (in inches) and I have translated them into metric. The tree surgeon started at the top of the tree working down - cavity 1 therefore being in the upper canopy and 7 being on the main trunk.

Cavity number	Comments
1(2)	30.5cm (1ft) deep (descending into the trunk)
2(2)	5cm (2") deep (horizontal)
3(2)	23cm (9") deep (horizontal). Stem diameter at this point 330mm (13")
4(2)	43cm (17") deep (ascending), 13cm (5") (horizontal) and 20.3cm (8") deep (descending).
5(2)	17.8cm (7") deep and 23cm (9") (descending)
6(2)	15.3cm (6") deep (descending) and 10.2cm (4") deep (horizontal).
7(trunk)	Stem diameter at cavity point 610mm (2ft), cavity 20.3cm (8") descending.

When he finished his inspection I spoke to the tree climber, Mr Griffiths, who confirmed that the walls of each cavity were reasonably solid and that in many (if not all cases) the cavities appeared to be localised to the degradation of the internal branch tissues and had not spread extensively throughout the trunk.

The cavities that were more a concern were cavities 3 & 4 on stem 2. Cavity 3 has a horizontal depth nearing 2/3 the diameter of the trunk. The cavity below this (cavity 4) extends up into the branch as well as down and it is possible that the two cavities are connected.

From his climbing inspection Mr Griffiths, when asked, confirmed he did not identify any reason to remove the tree at this time. However, given the various pockets of decay in stem 2 we agreed it would be appropriate to undertake a reduction of the trees canopy in order to reduce the wind loading and weight of the upper canopy.

This work represents a light reduction of the canopy and the pruning cuts are unlikely to exceed 50mm. The aim is to reduce the weight of the branches without creating any more large pruning cuts or removing a significant amount of the canopy volume which may put the tree under stress and leave it more susceptible to decay pathogens. Work has also been identified to remove the weaker branch from a pair of crossing / rubbing limbs on the northern side of the tree's canopy.

I expect that Tree World Services will be providing you with a written report regarding the findings of their tree inspection. If you wish to forward a copy to us we will be able to keep it on the TPO file. You might also like to forward to them a copy of this letter. I trust that this review (and subsequent revised tree work specification) is an accurate response to the condition of the tree as identified from their climbing inspection and discussed on site but if they raise any concerns please ask them to contact me directly.

Therefore, in response to your tree works application ref: 180347, I can confirm that the following proposed works to T3 (Beech) of TPO 237/07, as amended, are approved subject to the conditions below:

Approved Tree Works

Undertake a 1-2m canopy reduction using suitable reduction points to create a natural looking but smaller canopy outline. Remove the weaker of two rubbing branches (as determined following a closer climbing assessment) on the north side of the canopy.

Conditions

1. The reduction to T3 (Beech) hereby approved shall only be undertaken during the summer months (July / August) when the tree's reserves are at their peak or during the winter months (January / February) during the period of dormancy. On no account should any significant canopy works be undertaken to the tree in the months immediately before or after leaf break when the tree's energy reserves are lowest.

Reason: Taking into account the trees phenological cycle in order to minimise the impact the permitted work will have on the long term health and vitality of the tree.

2. All tree surgery shall be in accordance with BS 3998: (2010) Tree Work - Recommendations.

Reason: To ensure that all works are carried out in an acceptable arboricultural manner.

3. Climbing spikes shall not be used whilst undertaking any form of works on living trees, except on trees to be felled.

Reason: Spikes can cause extensive long-term damage to trees.

Informatives

1. You are advised that this decision is valid for two years from the date of this notice after which the consent lapses and a new application will be required.

2. Removal of dead or dangerous wood: This does not require the formal consent of the Council. Where a branch is deemed to be 'dangerous', i.e. where works are 'urgently necessary to remove an immediate risk of serious harm', you are required to give notice to the Council 'as soon as practicable after the works become necessary'.

3. Disturbance of wildlife: It is an offence under the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended) to disturb roosting bats or nesting birds. It is advisable to consult your tree

surgeon/consultant to agree an acceptable time for carrying out any work. Wildlife and habitat controls are administered by Natural England who can be contacted on 0300 030 6000

If you wish to appeal against any of the conditions attached to this consent, please contact the Planning Inspectorate within 28 days of receipt of this letter to obtain the relevant forms:

The Environment Appeals Team, The Planning Inspectorate, Room 3/25, Hawk Wing, Temple Quay House, 2 The Square, Temple Quay, Bristol, BS1 6PN

Email: environment.appeals@pins.gsi.gov.uk

Tel: 0117 372 8192

If you require any further assistance, please do not hesitate to contact me on the above number.

Yours sincerely

Sarah Duckworth

Sarah Duckworth
Consultant Assistant Natural Environment Officer