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1 Executive Summary

1.1 The Project and Commissioned Work

1.1.1 Outline Trees Limited was instructed by Aida McManus of AM Planning Consultants Limited on behalf of Danielle Westlake to carry out a British Standards 5837:2012 Tree Survey in order to support a planning application whilst providing guidance on the constraints posed by the trees.

1.1.2 A current topographical survey of the site in AutoCAD format has formed the basis for the Tree Survey Plan, whilst an AutoCAD file of the proposed application site and associated access road has been used to produce the Arboricultural Impact Assessment & Tree Constraints Plan.

1.1.3 The content and scope of this report is listed below:

- BS 5837:2012 Tree Survey and Categorisation
- Tree Constraints Plan

1.2 Findings and Recommendations

1.2.1 The survey assessed 15 individual trees, 1 group of trees and 3 sections of hedgerow with 1 individual tree, located outside of the site boundary, attaining a Category ‘B’ assessment value.

1.2.2 At best the overall condition of the trees can only be described as fair and regardless of any development proposals the recommended tree works made in the context of the sites’ current use should be considered in the interests of good arboricultural practice.

1.2.3 In the absence of any site specific layout no trees are proposed for removal. A small section of hedgerow will require removal to facilitate the new access point into the development site although its loss from an public amenity aspect is not considered to be detrimental to the wider area and will have a negligible impact on the immediate street scene.

1.2.4 Upon consideration of the above points it is considered that there are no significant arboricultural constraints that should preclude any proposed development of the site.

1.2.5 In the context of the sites current use, the Tree Survey Schedule at appendix A details appropriate arboricultural works that should be considered irrespective of any development proposals.
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2 Introduction and Background

2.1 Purpose and Scope of this Report

2.1.1 The purpose of the report is to accompany a planning application to the Local Planning Authority whilst also providing guidance on the constraints that the trees on site might present and also provide general guidance on how development can be achieved by minimising the potential for any detrimental impact to any of the retained trees on site.

2.1.2 In preparing this report, consideration has been given to the proposed layout, the condition of the trees and the final use of the site with a focus on providing a desirable living environment.

2.1.3 Whilst not definitive, the findings and any associated recommendations detailed within this report are considered to be reasonable, practicable and in the interests of promoting sensible arboricultural management.

2.1.4 Recommendations included within this report are the professional opinion of an experienced Arboriculturist and are the view of Outline Trees Limited. This is based on a review of the information provided by The Client, the brief and a survey of the site. This report pertains to these results only.

2.1.5 This report and the survey(s) on which it depends have been carried out by a competent Arboriculturist.

2.2 Regulatory and Policy Framework

2.2.1 Tree Preservation Orders (TPOs) and Conservation Areas place various statutory restrictions on the felling, pruning or damaging of trees, subject to various exemptions (Department for Communities and Local Government, 2014).

2.2.2 Tree felling on non-residential land is also controlled by the need to obtain a Felling Licence from the Forestry Commission before felling more than 5m³ of timber in any calendar quarter subject to various exemptions and variations (Forestry Commission, 2007).

2.2.3 There is an overriding exemption for the above statutory controls for tree felling and pruning for works where it has been deemed necessary to implement development that has already received full planning permission.

---

1 As per the Terms and Definitions detailed in British Standards 5837:2012-Trees in relation to design, demolition and construction – Recommendations.
2.3 Site Location

2.3.1 The application site is an area of land, used as a former paddock located immediately south of Brookfield Farm, Dunstall Road, Tatenhill DE13 9RY (approximate OS Grid reference SK 203 214), pedestrian access to the site was made via gated access at the south of the survey area.

2.3.2 The location of the site is shown in Figure 2.1 below, with the approximate extents of the tree survey area indicated by a red line.

Figure 2.1: Map view of the Site © Crown Copyright and Database rights 2014 Ordnance Survey.
3 Survey Methodology

3.1 Survey Methods

3.1.1 The site was visited on Thursday 12th June 2014 to carry out an assessment in accordance with BS 5837:2012 – Trees in relation to Design, Demolition and Construction - Recommendations. The weather at the time was dry, bright, still and adequate for conducting the survey during which, the following information was collected for each tree:

- Sequential reference number;
- Species;
- Height;
- Stem diameter @ 1.5m height;
- Branch spread;
- Existing height above ground level of:
  1. First significant branch and direction of growth (e.g. 3 NW);
  2. Canopy;
- Life stage;
  Y – Young,
  SM – Semi Mature,
  EM – Early Mature,
  M – Mature,
  OM – Over Mature;
- General observations, particularly of structural and/or physiological condition;
- Estimated remaining contribution;
- Category ‘U’ or ‘A’ to ‘C’ grading with the subcategory 1, 2 or 3 reflecting arboricultural, landscape or cultural values, respectively.

3.2 Survey Personnel

3.2.1 Jason Humphreys (The Author) is a former Local Planning Authority Arboricultural Officer and experienced Arboriculturalist with approximately 13 years of experience in the Arboricultural Industry.

3.2.2 He is a Technician grade Member of the Arboricultural Association (Tech Arbor. A), a Professional member of the Consulting Arborist Society and holds the Technician’s Certificate in Arboriculture and the LANTRA Professional Tree Inspection certificate.
4 Limitations

4.1 Survey

4.1.1 The information contained within this report is based on the author’s knowledge and experience of dealing with tree related issues. Whilst skill and care have been used, no investigative method can eliminate the possibility of obtaining partially imprecise, incomplete or not fully representative information.

4.1.2 Any survey work undertaken will have been subject to limitations, including seasonal and phenological aspects.

4.1.3 Trees were assessed from ground level using the Visual Tree Assessment (VTA) method (Mattheck 2007). No climbed inspection, removal of ivy or detailed investigation of decay was made.

4.1.4 No liability can be accepted by the consultant in respect of the trees unless the recommendations of this report are carried out under his supervision and within his timescale. Acceptance of this report represents an agreement with the guiding principles and the terms listed.

4.1.5 The findings and recommendations contained within this report are, assuming its recommendations are observed, valid for a period of twelve months from the date of survey. Trees are living organisms and their condition can change significantly over a relatively short period of time – good practice dictates they are inspected on a regular basis for reasons of safety.

4.1.6 Tree rooting characteristics and soils are both enormously variable as are their interactions. This makes attempts to quantify subsidence risk assessment impossible. No effort has been made to assess subsidence risk potential nor should any be construed.

4.1.7 The report relates only to the trees shown on the attached tree survey schedule.

4.1.8 Where trees were extensively ivy clad this was recorded in the survey schedule. It is not possible to ascertain the presence of cavities or other defects beneath the ivy and, therefore, ivy should be removed and a re-inspection carried out.
5 Results

5.1 Statutory Tree Protection

5.1.1 No formal check has been made to establish whether any of the trees on site are afforded any degree of statutory protection from Tree Preservation Orders or Conservation Areas.

5.1.2 If it subsequently transpires that any trees are subject to Statutory Protection then it should be understood that no pruning works are to be carried out to those trees unless the works are considered exempt or prior consent for tree works has first been granted by the respective LPA following either:

- a formal tree works application (Trees protected by a TPO),
- a 6 weeks notification period is submitted to carry out works to trees with a stem diameter greater than 75mm or (Trees in Conservation Areas).
- or the submission of a 5-day notice under section 198(6)(a) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

5.1.3 Pruning works can also be carried out if the works are considered necessary to implement full planning consent.

5.2 Tree Survey

5.2.1 The survey assessed 15 individual trees, 1 group of trees and 3 sections of hedgerow; the quality and value of which are summarised below.

5.2.2 No individually assessed trees of high quality and value (Category ‘A’) were recorded during the survey.

5.2.3 Trees assigned to this category include attractive trees with high visibility and no significant defects, which are able to make a substantial contribution for a minimum of 40 years.

5.2.4 1 individually assessed tree (T15 Walnut) of moderate quality and value category (Category ‘B’) was identified during the survey.

5.2.5 Trees assigned to this category include healthy attractive trees with remediable defects that are in a condition as to be able to make a significant contribution for a minimum of 20 years.

5.2.6 13 individually assessed trees and 1 tree group of low quality and value category (Category ‘C’) were identified during the survey.

5.2.7 Trees in this category include unremarkable trees of limited merit that are easily replaced, small-growing, young species which have a relatively low potential amenity value, and low landscape benefits.

5.2.8 Trees assigned to this category typically include self-seeded trees of limited life span, small and young trees and trees of poor form and limited amenity value.

5.2.9 1 individually assessed tree (T7 Ash) was identified as being unsuitable for retention (Category ‘U’).

5.2.10 Trees assigned to this category are in such a condition that they cannot realistically be retained as living trees in the context of the current land use for longer than 10 years and/or are unsuitable for retention in the proximity of new dwellings or areas of public open space.

5.2.11 Full results of the tree survey are provided in the Tree Survey Schedule whilst a chart summarising the Individual Tree Assessment Categories for the trees can be viewed below (Figure 5.2).
Figure 5.1: Summary of Individual Tree Assessment Categories.
6 Preliminary Arboricultural Impact Assessment

6.1 Tree Survey

6.1.1 General tree works detailed in the Tree Schedule (Appendix A) have been identified solely in the context of the current layout and existing site use.

6.2 Trees Suitable for Retention

6.2.1 Where possible, it is generally considered desirable for Category ‘A’ and Category ‘B’ trees to be retained and incorporated into new developments and layouts. Category ‘U’ trees are not considered to be appropriate for retention. No Category ‘B’ trees are proposed for removal as a result of the proposed development.

6.2.2 In assessing the Arboricultural Impact on the trees as a result of the proposed development and identifying which trees might be suitable for retention in the context of the proposed layout the following factors should all be considered.

- Shading
- Future Pressure for Tree Removal and Pruning
- Seasonal Nuisance
- Infrastructure
- Direct Damage
- Root Protection Areas
- Future Management
- Demolition/Ground Works
- Construction Activity

6.3 Shading

6.3.1 Shading can be represented using drawn segments, with radii equivalent of the current tree height, taken from the centres of those surveyed tree stems that are considered to be relevant, drawn from due north-west to due-east.

6.3.2 These segments represent a basic illustration of the shade pattern through the main part of the day and based on advisory comments detailed in section 5.22, Note 1 of BS 5837:2012.

6.3.1 Upon consideration of the above points, no further investigation, illustration or mitigation is considered necessary in the absence of any site specific layout.

6.4 Direct Damage

6.4.1 Any proposed layout should consider the likelihood of direct damage occurring from incremental root and stem growth and the possibility of the fabric of any new structure being damaged by the whipping of branches against it.

6.4.2 The implementation of tree removals associated with the proposals will reduce the likelihood of direct damage occurring in the manner described above, in respect of retained trees.

6.4.3 Table 6.1, taken from Annex A of BS 5837:2012 provides distances that are advised as minimum distances of trees from new structures for new plantings.
Table 6.1, Minimum distance between young trees or new planting and structure to avoid direct damage to a structure from future tree growth.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of structure</th>
<th>Minimum distance between young trees or new planting and structure, in metres (m)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stem dia. &lt;300 mm A)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buildings and heavily loaded structures</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lightly loaded structures such as garages, porches etc.</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;1 m deep</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;1 m deep</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masonry boundary walls</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Path and drives with flexible surfaces or paving slabs</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A) Diameter of stem at 1.5 m above ground level at maturity

6.5 Root Protection Areas (RPAs)

6.5.1 The RPA is a ‘layout design tool indicating the minimum area around a tree deemed to contain sufficient roots and rooting volume to maintain the tree’s viability, and where the protection of the roots and soil structure is treated as a priority’ (BS 5837:2012).

6.5.2 The erection of protective fencing combined with the use of ground protection, where necessary, as per the Tree Protection Plan (TPP) prior to the commencement of any works on site will assist in minimising any adverse effect and/or impact on the retained trees.

6.5.3 Existing ground levels should be retained within the RPAs. Intrusions into soil within the RPAs is generally not acceptable and topsoil within it should remain in situ.

6.5.4 The erection of protective fencing can place constraints on the construction and its associated activities and possibly limit the working space available, with the subsequent result that incursions into the RPAs of some of the retained trees may prove necessary, requiring the use of additional ground protection measures (See Section 6.5.6).

6.5.5 Suitable existing hard surfacing that is not proposed for re-use as part of the finished design should be retained to act as temporary ground protection during the construction and, development rather than being removed. The suitability of such surfacing for this purpose should be evaluated by the project arboriculturist and an engineer as appropriate (BS 5837:2012).

6.5.6 British Standards 5837:2012 advises that new temporary ground protection should be capable of supporting any traffic entering or using the site without being distorted or causing compaction to underlying soil and further provides the following note:

NOTE The ground protection might comprise one of the following:

a) for pedestrian movements only, a single thickness of scaffold boards placed either on top of a driven scaffold frame, so as to form a suspended walkway, or on top of a compression-resistant layer (e.g. 100 mm depth of woodchip), laid onto a geotextile membrane;

b) for pedestrian-operated plant up to a gross weight of 2 t, proprietary, inter-linked ground protection boards placed on top of a compression-resistant layer (e.g. 150 mm depth of woodchip), laid onto a geotextile membrane;
c) for wheeled or tracked construction traffic exceeding 2 t gross weight, an alternative system (e.g. proprietary systems or pre-cast reinforced concrete slabs) to an engineering specification designed in conjunction with arboricultural advice, to accommodate the likely loading to which it will be subjected.

6.5.7 Further guidance follows, which upon adoption, will help to minimise the potential for any detrimental effect that associated ground works and construction might have in respect of the retained trees and their RPAs.

6.6 Excavation/Ground Works

6.6.1 The erection of protective fencing combined with the use of ground protection, where necessary, within the RPAs of retained trees, prior to the commencement of any works on site, will allow excavations and ground works to take place whilst minimising any adverse effect and/or impact on the retained trees.

6.6.2 All plant and vehicles engaged in ground works should either operate outside the RPAs, or run on ground protection (see 6.5.6) in the proximity of retained trees.

6.6.3 Where trees stand adjacent to hard surfaces and/or buildings to be removed, excavation should be undertaken inwards, from within the footprint of the existing hard surfacing or outside of the RPAs.

6.7 Hard Surfacing Within the Root Protection Areas

6.7.1 In the absence of any site specific layout it is unknown whether or not there will be a requirement for any hard surfacing within the RPAs of retained trees. In the subsequent event that a requirement is identified then the following guidance should be considered at an early stage.

6.7.2 Arboricultural Practice Note No. 12 describes in detail the requirements of no-dig type installation whilst BS 5837:2012 suggests ‘Appropriate sub-base options for new hard surfacing include three-dimensional cellular confinement systems’.

6.7.3 In this instance it is considered that the existing site topography lends itself to the installation of a three-dimensional cellular no-dig product upon anticipation of the required and final level changes. Final on-site measurements should be taken to ascertain the extent of any incursions into the RPA and provide subsequent guidance on the extent of the ‘no-dig’ installation.

6.7.4 Cross sectional drawings of a suitable product can be seen overleaf (figures 6.1 & 6.2)
6.8 Construction Activity

6.8.1 The erection of protective fencing combined with the use of ground protection, where necessary, within the RPAs of retained trees, prior to the commencement of any works on site, will allow the construction and its associated activities to take place whilst minimising any adverse effect and/or impact on the retained trees.

6.8.2 All plant and vehicles engaged in construction works should either operate outside the RPA, and/or run on ground protection (see section 6.5.6).

6.9 Future Pressure for Tree Pruning/Removal

6.9.1 Whilst the presence of retained trees can often enhance the immediate environment upon completion, any proposed layout should provide sufficient space that will allow for future tree growth and to provide a subsequently reduced need for future, frequent remedial pruning.

6.9.2 As well as those tree works necessary to implement any development proposals additional tree works should be considered and identified that will assist in providing an environment and
balanced layout juxtaposition between structures and trees, which should allow for the future growth of the retained trees without anticipated pruning pressures.

6.10 **Seasonal Nuisance**

6.10.1 Foliage, fruit and cone fall can be considered by some to be a nuisance and requests to Local Planning Authorities to carry out pruning works to negate these issues are often refused due in part to their brief, seasonal nature of the problem.

6.10.2 Providing a suitable juxtaposition when considering new layouts will help in minimising issues experienced by people living in close proximity to trees.

6.10.3 The use of ‘gutter guards’ for new dwellings that might be affected by autumnal leaf fall would help reduce the often associated, seasonal occurrence of blocked guttering.

6.11 **Infrastructure**

6.11.1 Infrastructure requirements should be considered in order to assess any impact that retained trees will have an impact on lighting, signage, CCTV sightlines or visibility splays.

6.11.2 No formal details of any service runs have been provided at the time of writing; particular care should be taken in their routeing and methods of installation of any underground apparatus and drainage should wherever possible, be routed outside RPAs.

6.11.3 Where routeing services outside RPAs is not possible then detailed plans showing the proposed routeing should be drawn up in conjunction with the project Arboriculturist. Trenchless insertion methods are considered to be appropriate for this purpose and British Standards 5837:2012 details solutions for differing utility apparatus requirements (see table 6.2 below).

6.11.4 British Standards 5837:2012, Section 7.7.2 suggests that in the event roots can be retained and appropriately protected during exposure, then excavation using hand-held tools might be acceptable for shallow service runs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Accuracy</th>
<th>Bore dia. a)</th>
<th>Max. sub.</th>
<th>Applications</th>
<th>Not suitable for</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>mm</td>
<td>m</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Microtunnelling</td>
<td>&lt;20</td>
<td>100 to 300</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>Gravity fall pipes, deep apparatus, watercourses</td>
<td>Low-cost projects due to relative expense</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surface-launched</td>
<td>=100</td>
<td>25 to 1200</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>Pressure pipes, cables including fibre optic</td>
<td>Gravity fall pipes, e.g. drains and sewers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>directional drilling</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pipe ramming</td>
<td>=150</td>
<td>150 to 2000</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>Any large-bore pipes and ducts</td>
<td>Rocky and other heavily obstructed soils</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact muling b)</td>
<td>=50</td>
<td>30 to 180</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>Gas, water and cable connections, e.g. from street to property</td>
<td>Any application that requires accuracy over distances in excess of 5 m</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* a) Maximum subterranean length.
* b) Dependent on strata encountered.
* c) Pipe-laid directional drilling can be used for gravity fall pipes up to 20 m subterranean length.
* d) Impact muling (also known as thrust-bore) generally requires soft, cohesive soils.
* e) Substantial inverse relationship between accuracy and distance.
* f) Figures given relate to single pass: up to 300 mm bore achievable with multiple passes.
6.12 Trees to be removed

6.12.1 In the absence of any site specific layout no tree removals have been identified. A small section of hedgerow will require removal in order to facilitate the new access point.

6.12.2 Any proposed layout should identify those tree removals as being necessary and appropriate in order to directly implement the proposals and also to provide a balanced and desirable layout juxtaposition.

6.13 Trees to be pruned

6.13.1 The complete Tree Survey Schedule (Appendix A) details pruning works only in the context of the site’s current use that should be considered to facilitate future inspection regimes and to promote the development of retained trees irrespective of any development proposals.

6.13.2 Any proposed layout should identify those anticipated tree works considered necessary to facilitate implementation of the proposals and the construction whilst also providing a balanced and desirable layout juxtaposition.

6.14 Landscaping

6.14.1 Whilst no formal details of the proposed landscaping have been provided at the time of writing, BS 5837:2012 advises that any new tree planting and associated landscaping proposals should consider the ultimate height and spread, form, habit and colour, density of foliage and maintenance implications, in relation to both the built form of the new development, and the retained landscape features.

6.14.2 Consideration should also be given to the advice detailed in section 6.4.3 and Table 6.1 in respect of distances of newly planted trees in relation to new structures.

6.15 Tree loss evaluation

6.15.1 In the absence of any site specific layout no tree removals have been identified.

6.15.2 In terms of the level of Public Amenity Value that the small section of hedgerow requiring removal provides, it is not considered to be detrimental to the immediate or wider area.

6.15.3 It is considered that the most arboriculturally significant trees on the site can be retained during the layout design stage and that any loss of amenity value associated with anticipated tree removals can be mitigated for, if necessary, through the adoption of a considered landscaping scheme.

6.16 Issues to be addressed by an Arboricultural Method Statement

6.16.1 The Arboricultural Method Statement (Section 7) details the general methodology for the implementation of those aspects that have the potential to result in loss or damage to retained trees.

6.17 Tree Protection Plan

6.17.1 The TCP (Appendix C), when read in conjunction with this report, will inform on and describe the required tree protection measures for the retained trees in the context of the proposed layout.

6.17.2 The TCP should be read in conjunction with the Tree Survey Schedule (Appendix A) in order to establish the linear radial distances for the erection of the protective fencing and the extent of ground protection measures from the retained trees.
7 Generic Arboricultural Method Statement

7.1 Facilitation Tree Works/Removals

7.1.1 Tree works should be considered and subsequently identified as a result of one or more of the following reasons;

- to directly implement the proposal,
- to facilitate the implementation and construction of the proposals,
- to assist in the creation of a balanced and desirable layout juxtaposition and
- in the interests of sensible and reasonable arboricultural management.

7.1.2 Any tree works should be carried out using the principles and practices described in British Standards 3998:2010 – Tree Work - Recommendations

7.2 Erection of Protective Fencing

7.2.1 Protective fencing should be erected as per the Tree Protection Plan at the linear distances specified in the Tree Survey Schedule prior to the commencement of any works on site.

7.2.2 The default specification should consist of a vertical and horizontal scaffold framework, well braced to resist impacts, as illustrated in Figure 7.2 (see below).

Figure 7.1 Default specification for protective barrier © British Standards Institute
7.2.3 All-weather notices should be attached to the fencing; a suitable example for use has been attached at Appendix D.

7.2.4 Once erected, the protected area should be regarded as sacrosanct and should not be removed or altered without prior recommendation by the project Arboriculturist (7.3.1) and, where necessary, approval from the local planning authority.

7.2.5 Where the site circumstances and associated risk of damaging incursion into the RPA do not necessitate the default level of protection, an alternative specification should be prepared by the project Arboriculturist. For example, 2m tall welded mesh panels on rubber or concrete feet as illustrated in Figure 7.3 (see below).

![Figure 7.2 Stabilizer strut mounted on block tray © British Standards Institute](image)

7.3 **Site Monitoring**

7.3.1 Final on-site measurements should be taken to ascertain the extent of any incursions into the RPAs of the retained trees and to provide guidance on the extent of the tree protection measures.

7.3.2 It is recommended that a Project Arboriculturist is appointed prior to the commencement of any works and retained for the duration of the project.

7.3.3 The appointed person can assist in monitoring Arboricultural site activity using an auditable system.

7.3.4 The appointed person should be consulted in the event that additional ground protection measures are considered necessary, root pruning is required or incursions into the RPAs are considered necessary.

7.4 **Ground Works**

7.4.1 The erection of protective fencing and use of ground protection measures as per the TPP, prior to the commencement of any works on site will allow the ground works to take place whilst minimising the potential for any adverse effect and/or impact on the retained trees.

7.4.2 All plant and vehicles engaged in ground works should either operate outside the RPA, or run on ground protection (see 6.5.6).
7.5 **Soil Compaction and Remediation Measures**

7.5.1 Soil that has been compacted will not provide suitable conditions for the survival and growth of vegetation, whether existing or new, and is a common cause of post-construction tree loss on development sites.

7.5.2 Compacted soil will adversely affect drainage, gas exchange, nutrient uptake and organic content, and will seriously impede or restrict root growth.

7.5.3 Soil compaction should be avoided around existing vegetation, including trees, and in areas where new planting or seeding is proposed.

7.5.4 Where soil compaction has occurred in the vicinity of existing trees, remedial works might include sub-soil aeration using compressed air, and the addition of other materials, preferably of a bulky, organic nature (but excluding peat), to improve structure.

7.5.5 Heavy mechanical cultivation such as ploughing or rotavation should not occur within the RPA.

7.5.6 Any cultivation operations should be undertaken carefully by hand in order to minimize damage to the tree, particularly the roots.

7.5.7 Decompaction measures include forking, spiking, soil augering and tilted radial trenching. Care should be taken during such operations to minimize the risk of further damage to tree roots.

7.6 **Construction Works**

7.6.1 Protective fencing and use of ground protection measures as per the Tree Protection Plan should be erected prior to the commencement of any works on site.

7.6.2 All plant and vehicles engaged in construction activity should either operate outside the RPAS, or run on ground protection (see 6.5.6).

7.7 **No-Dig Surfacing**

7.7.1 Should a requirement for No-dig surfacing prove necessary then the manufacturer’s installation guidelines specific to the product used should be adhered to and no excavation or ‘top skimming’ of the soil within the RPA should take place.

7.8 **Completion**

7.8.1 Upon completion of the project, advice of the project Arboriculturist should be sought in coordination of the removal of the protective fencing and ground protection if necessary, to survey the retained trees for signs or symptoms of damage and/or stress that the construction might have had.

7.8.2 The protective fencing and ground protection measures should remain in situ until its use is considered unnecessary and any risk of damage to the retained trees and/or their respective RPAs e.g. soil compaction from vehicular plant or machinery, has passed.

7.9 **Contacts**

Jason Humphreys, Outline Trees Limited, 60 Normanton Lane, Littleover, Derby DE23 6GQ
Email: info@outlinetrees.co.uk
Appendix A  Tree Survey Schedule
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tree Ref. No.</th>
<th>Species</th>
<th>Height (m)</th>
<th>Stem Ø (mm)</th>
<th>Protective Linear Radius (m)</th>
<th>Branch Spread (m)</th>
<th>Height (m)</th>
<th>General Observations and Preliminary Management Recommendations (In bold).</th>
<th>Estimated Remaining Contribution</th>
<th>Category</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T1</td>
<td>Horse Chestnut (Aesculus hippocastanum)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Fair condition. Young, unremarkable tree with slightly suppressed crown development to the south. No works necessary.</td>
<td>20+</td>
<td>C2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T2</td>
<td>Common Lime (Tilia X europaea)</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Fair condition. Unremarkable tree with suppressed crown development to the south. Overhead utilities directly above crown with future direct conflict likely. No works necessary.</td>
<td>20+</td>
<td>C2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T3</td>
<td>Ash (Fraxinus excelsior)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Fair condition. Unremarkable tree displaying multi stemmed form. Access restricted; diameter estimated. No works necessary.</td>
<td>20+</td>
<td>C2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tree Ref. No.</td>
<td>Species</td>
<td>Height (m)</td>
<td>Stem Ø (mm)</td>
<td>Protective Linear Radius (m)</td>
<td>Branch Spread (m)</td>
<td>Height (m)</td>
<td>General Observations and Preliminary Management Recommendations (In bold).</td>
<td>Estimated Remaining Contribution</td>
<td>Category</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T4</td>
<td>Silver Birch <em>(Betula pendula)</em></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.5 1.5 1 1.5</td>
<td>SM</td>
<td>20+ C2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fair condition. Unremarkable tree with tall, spindly form. Suppressed crown development to the south. <em>No works necessary.</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T5</td>
<td>Sycamore <em>(Acer pseudoplatanus)</em></td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2 2 1 2</td>
<td>EM</td>
<td>20+ C2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fair condition. Unremarkable tree with suppressed crown development to the south. Ivy cover establishing on main stem. Compression fork observed where stem divides at approximately 1.4m height. <em>Sever Ivy.</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T6</td>
<td>Ash</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3 3 3 2</td>
<td>SM</td>
<td>20+ C2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fair condition. Unremarkable tree displaying multi stemmed form. Access restricted; diameter estimated. Compression fork and rubbing branches observed where stem divides at approximately 1m height. <em>No works necessary.</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tree Ref. No.</td>
<td>Species</td>
<td>Height (m)</td>
<td>Stem Ø (mm)</td>
<td>Protective Linear Radius (m)</td>
<td>RPA m²</td>
<td>Branch Spread (m)</td>
<td>Height (m)</td>
<td>General Observations and Preliminary Management Recommendations (In bold).</td>
<td>Estimated Remaining Contribution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T7</td>
<td>Ash (Fraxinus excelsior)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1200</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>651</td>
<td>8 6 8 6</td>
<td>6 N 4 M</td>
<td>In decline. Significant tree with dense ivy cover obscuring assessment of main stem and branch unions. Evidence of past branch removal and also notable failure to the west. Notable dead wood and branch die back present in upper crown and to the south. Consider removal (retaining monolith) or crown reduction of approximately 30% in volume. Remove deadwood over 30mm diameter. Sever Ivy.</td>
<td>&lt;10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T8</td>
<td>Aspen (Populus tremula)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>9 2.5 1.5 1.5 1.5 1.5 1 N 0.5</td>
<td>EM</td>
<td>Fair condition. Unremarkable tree with significant lean to the north of approximately 20 degrees. No works necessary.</td>
<td>10+</td>
<td>C2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tree Ref. No.</td>
<td>Species</td>
<td>Height (m)</td>
<td>Stem Ø (mm)</td>
<td>Protective Linear Radius (m)</td>
<td>Branch Spread (m)</td>
<td>Height (m)</td>
<td>General Observations and Preliminary Management Recommendations (In bold).</td>
<td>Estimated Remaining Contribution</td>
<td>Category</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<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>Aspen</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2 N 1.7 9 2 1.5 2 2 N 1 EM</td>
<td>Fair condition. Unremarkable tree with future crown development favourable to the north. No works necessary.</td>
<td>10+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T10</td>
<td>Horse Chestnut</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>0.5 NW 1.5 NW 1.5 3 1.5 1.5</td>
<td>Fair condition. Unremarkable tree with suppressed crown development and limited future potential. No works necessary.</td>
<td>20+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T11</td>
<td>Common Lime</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>1 0.5 0.5 1 0.5 W 0.5 W 0.5 Y</td>
<td>Fair condition. Unremarkable, young tree with suppressed crown development and limited future potential. Planting stake in situ. Remove stake.</td>
<td>20+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T12</td>
<td>Silver Birch</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1 1 1 1.5 2 NE 1.5 1.5 1.5</td>
<td>Fair condition. Unremarkable, young tree with notable deviation of central leading stem approximately 2.5m height. No works necessary.</td>
<td>20+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tree Ref. No.</td>
<td>Species</td>
<td>Height (m)</td>
<td>Stem Ø (mm)</td>
<td>Protective Linear Radius (m)</td>
<td>RPA m²</td>
<td>Branch Spread (m)</td>
<td>Height (m)</td>
<td>Life Stage</td>
<td>General Observations and Preliminary Management Recommendations (In bold)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T13</td>
<td>Common Lime</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>366</td>
<td>7 5 5 5</td>
<td>1.5 E</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fair condition. Dense ivy cover and epicormic growth obscuring assessment of main stem, branch unions and upper crown. Some minor dead wood present. Slightly suppressed crown development. Provisional assessment category based on restricted visual assessment. Remove deadwood over 30mm diameter. Crown Lift to 3-4m. Remove epicormic growth. Sever Ivy/reinspect.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T14</td>
<td>Beech (Fagus sylvatica)</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>7 7 9 7</td>
<td>5 SE</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fair condition. Sparse foliage cover to the north. Some evidence of minor branch tip die back. Some minor dead wood present throughout crown. Access to full circumference of main stem limited; diameter estimated. Remove deadwood over 30mm diameter.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tree Ref. No.</td>
<td>Species</td>
<td>Height (m)</td>
<td>Stem Ø (mm)</td>
<td>Protective Linear Radius (m)</td>
<td>Branch Spread (m)</td>
<td>Height (m)</td>
<td>Life Stage</td>
<td>General Observations and Preliminary Management Recommendations (In bold).</td>
<td>Estimated Remaining Contribution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T15</td>
<td>Walnut (Juglans regia)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H1</td>
<td>Hawthorn (Crataegus monogyna)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H2</td>
<td>Hawthorn &amp; Elder (Crataegus monogyna, Sambucus nigra)</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tree Ref. No.</td>
<td>Species</td>
<td>Height (m)</td>
<td>Stem Ø (mm)</td>
<td>Protective Linear Radius (m)</td>
<td>RPA m³</td>
<td>Branch Spread (m)</td>
<td>Height (m)</td>
<td>Significant Branch</td>
<td>Canopy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H3</td>
<td>Blackthorn, Elder, Hawthorn &amp; Ash</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>30 1.5 30 1.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G1</td>
<td>Blackthorn &amp; Elder (<em>Prunus spinosa, Sambucus nigra</em>)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2 11 2 11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S1</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>0 0.2 0.2 0.2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix B  Existing Layout and Tree Survey Plan
Appendix C  Proposed Development Area & Tree Constraints Plan
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## Appendix F  Life Stage & Condition Key

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>Life Stage *</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Good</strong></td>
<td>Newly Planted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Those trees that are relatively free from defects and any visible signs of structural defects, which also exhibit normal signs of vitality and vigour when compared with trees of a similar species in a similar environment.</td>
<td>Those trees that have been planted in the past 5 years.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fair</strong></td>
<td>Young</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Those trees that exhibit some minor/manageable defects or display evidence of minor remedial pruning, which also exhibit normal signs of vitality and vigour when compared with trees of a similar species in a similar environment.</td>
<td>Those trees that are considered to be in the first third of their life expectancy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Poor</strong></td>
<td>Semi to Early Mature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Those trees that exhibit a high level of defects and/or significant past pruning works, which also exhibit relatively low signs of vitality and vigour when compared with trees of a similar species in a similar environment.</td>
<td>Those trees that have not yet reached maturity and can be considered to be in the second third of their life expectancy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>In Decline</strong></td>
<td>Mature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Those trees that are close to the end of the useful life expectancy and displaying associated symptoms of branch die back and low vigour.</td>
<td>Those trees that can be described as being in the final third of their life expectancy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Over Mature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Those trees that can be described as having exceeded their life expectancy that have yet to replicate those features typical of Veteran trees.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Veteran</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A tree that exhibits typical signs and characteristics of such as described in the introduction of Veteran Trees: A guide to risk and responsibility (Davis, Fay &amp; Mynors 2000)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Typical useful life expectancy of common trees. (Taken from Helliwell's Amenity Tree Valuation notes)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Life Stage</th>
<th>Typical Trees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Newly Planted</td>
<td>Yew</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young</td>
<td>Oak, Sweet Chestnut, Plane, Sycamore, Lime</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semi to Early Mature</td>
<td>Scots Pine, Hornbeam, Beech, Tulip tree, N Maple, Lebanon Cedar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mature</td>
<td>Ash, Spruce, Walnut, Red Oak, Horse Chestnut, F Maple, Monkey, Puzzle, Mulberry, Pear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over Mature</td>
<td>Rowan, Whitebeam, Apple, Wild Cherry, Catalpa, Robinia, Ailanthus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veteran</td>
<td>Poplars, Willows, Cherries, Alders, Birches</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>