SIMON JONES ASSOCIATES Ltd.
ARBORICULTURAL PLANNING CONSULTANTS
Arboricultural Consultancy - Tree Surveys
Planning & Development · Hazard & Safety
Tree & Woodland Management - Expert Witnesses

17 CROSS ROAD
TADWORTH
SURREY KT20 5ST

Tel: (01737) 813058
E-mail: sja@sjatrees.co.uk

Principal: Simon R. M. Jones Dip. Arb. (RFS), F. Arbor. A., Arb. Assoc. Registered Consultant
Associate: Mark Mackworth-Praed BA (Cantab), M.Sc., F. Arbor. A., Arb. Assoc. Registered Consultant

Arboricultural Implications Report

Proposed re-development at

Witanhurst

41 Highgate West Hill

Highgate

London N6

August 2013

Ref. SJA air 13050-01

SUMMARY

Simon Jones Associates has undertaken a survey of 19 individual trees, and five groups of trees growing on or immediately adjacent to this site, in accordance with British Standard BS 5837: 2012, *Trees in relation to design, demolition and construction – Recommendations*.

An assessment of the impacts of the proposed development on these trees shows that none of the individual trees or groups of trees are to be removed.

No trees are to be pruned.

There are no incursions into the root protection areas (RPAs) of any of the trees to be retained.

The retention of all the trees means that there will be no alteration to the key arboricultural features of the site and there will be no adverse impact on the character and appearance of the conservation area or impact on the local landscape, and thus the proposal complies with national planning policy.

CONTENTS

APPENDICES.

1. INTRODUCTION.

1.1. Instructions.

1.1.1. Simon Jones Associates Ltd. has been instructed by Witanhurst Construction Ltd. to visit Witanhurst, 41 Highgate West Hill, London N6 and to survey the trees growing on or immediately adjacent to part of this site.

1.1.2. We are instructed to record the trees' locations, species, dimensions, ages, condition, and visual importance; and to categorise them in accordance with British Standard BS 5837: 2012, *Trees in relation to design, demolition and construction — Recommendations*.

1.1.3. We are further asked to identify which trees are worthy of retention within a proposed construction of tennis court changing rooms; to assess the implications of the development proposals on these specimens, and to advise how they should be protected from unacceptable damage during construction.

1.2. Scope of report.

1.2.1. This report and the appended tree protection plan (TPP) reflect the scope of our instructions, as set out above.

1.2.2. The proposed development comprises the construction of changing rooms and associated facilities for the use of the outdoor swimming pool within the grounds at Witanhurst. It is proposed to construct the changing rooms adjacent to the swimming pool, beneath the north western part of the raised replacement tennis court. The access to the changing rooms is to be linked to the existing paved area surrounding the swimming pool.

1.2.3. The report is intended to accompany a planning application to be submitted to the London Borough of Camden, and complies with local validation requirements, and with the recommendations of BS 5837: 2012.

1.3. Site inspection.

1.3.1. A site visit and tree inspection was undertaken Matt Rew & Andrew Bigg of Simon Jones Associates Ltd., on the 1st & 2nd of April 2009, and revised by Simon Jones on various occasions up to and including May 2011. Weather conditions at all times were clear, dry and bright. Deciduous trees were surveyed in partial, and then full leaf.

1.3.2. The tree protection plan at **Appendix 2** is based on the proposed site layout plan by Scott & Twine Architects and Interior Designers, drawing no. 2228-01/01/01 Rev H.

1.4. National policy context.

1.4.1. Paragraph 14 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), (March 2012), states that there is a presumption in favour of sustainable development:

"At the heart of the National Planning Policy Framework is a presumption in favour of sustainable development, which should be seen as a golden thread running through both plan-making and decision-taking."

1.4.2. The NPPF makes it clear that planning permission for development should be granted unless the proposal is inconsistent with policies within the development plan, any adverse effects significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, or the NPPF itself indicates that the proposal should be restricted.

1.4.3. Under Section 197 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, local authorities have a statutory duty to consider the protection and planting of trees when granting planning permission for proposed development. The effects of proposed development on trees are therefore a material consideration in dealing with planning applications. As the overriding principle of national policy in the NPPF is that planning permission should be granted unless the proposal is not consistent with development plan policies, or where the adverse effects significantly outweigh its benefits, it follows that development should only be refused on arboricultural grounds where loss of trees would have a significant and adverse impact on the character and appearance of the local landscape, on amenity or biodiversity. Against this

background, the effects of the current proposal are evaluated in the following sections of this report.

1.5. Site description.

1.5.1. The application site is located in the north corner of Witanhurst, and consists of the existing tennis courts. To the north and east of the application site is the property boundary of Witanhurst which adjoins the residential properties within Highfields Grove (to the north) and Nos. 4 and 5 the Grove (to the east). To the west and south of the application site is the remaining grounds within Witanhurst.

1.5.2. The tennis courts are on level ground, and are approximately 3m higher than the adjacent ground further to the west and south.

2. THE TREES.

2.1. Survey findings.

2.1.1. We surveyed a total of 19 individual trees, and five groups of trees, with trunk diameters of 75mm and above, growing within or immediately adjacent to the site[2]. Their details are found in the tree survey schedule at **Appendix 1**.

2.1.2. The numbers assigned to the trees in the tree survey schedule correspond with those shown on the appended tree locations and protection plans.

2.1.3. In our assessment, the key arboricultural features within or immediately adjacent to the site, whose loss would have a significant and adverse impact on the character and appearance of the local landscape, on amenity or biodiversity are:

- The belt of trees growing alongside the north boundary (nos. 153-160g, 306 and 313 to 315 and G3);
- The belt of trees growing alongside the east boundary (nos. 401 to 504 and G401 to G501)
- The individual 14m tall English oak (no.148) that is growing to the south of the application site.

2.2. Statutory controls.

2.2.1. At the time of writing we understand that none of these trees are covered by a tree preservation order (TPO).

2.2.2. The site is within the boundaries of the Highgate Village Conservation Area.

2.2.3. There are no woodlands within or abutting the site that are classified as 'Ancient'. Ancient woodland, which is considered to be an important and threatened

[2] British Standard BS 5837: 2012, *Trees in relation to design, demolition and construction – Recommendations* recommends that all trees over 75mm stem diameter should be included in a pre-planning land and tree survey.

habitat, is defined by Natural England as “Land that has had continuous woodland cover since at least 1600 AD”.

2.3. Assessment of suitability for retention.

2.3.1. The trees have been categorised in accordance with BS5837. Details of the criteria used for this process can be found in the notes that accompany the tree survey schedule.

2.3.2. None of the trees have been assessed as category 'U'.

2.3.3. There are no category ‘A’ trees, but there are two Category ‘B’ trees; the off-site pagoda tree (no. 404) and the off-site coast redwood (no. 503). The remaining 17 individual trees are assessed as category 'C' trees, being either of low quality, very limited merit, only low landscape benefits, no material cultural or conservation value, or only limited or short-term potential; or young trees with trunk diameter below 150mm; or a combination of these.

2.3.4. Of the groups of trees, all have been assessed as category ’C’.

2.3.5. Whilst trees in categories ‘A’, ‘B’ and ‘C’ are all a material consideration in the development process, the retention of category ‘C’ trees, being of low quality or of only limited or short-term potential, will not normally be considered necessary where they impose a significant constraint on development. Furthermore, BS 5837 makes it clear that young trees, even those of good form and vitality, which have the potential to develop into quality specimens when mature “*need not necessarily be a significant constraint on the site’s potential*”[3].

2.3.6. Furthermore, BS 5837 states that “....care should be taken to avoid misplaced tree retention; attempts to retain too many or unsuitable trees on a site can result in excessive pressure on the trees during demolition or construction work, or post-completion demands for their removal”[4].

---

[3] Ibid. 4.5.10.

[4] Ibid. 5.1.1.

2.3.7. This assessment has been used as a key component of the process of designing the proposed layout. The tree survey was undertaken in conjunction with the detailed architectural and design work, and together with the assessment of suitability for retention informed the production of a tree constraints plan (TCP) which showed the most suitable trees for retention, based on their quality, life expectancy, and value, which was based on their visibility, screening, and cultural benefits.

2.3.8. The TCP also showed how close to those trees selected for retention the proposed development could be located, in terms of three key criteria:

a). avoidance or minimization of unacceptable root damage;

b). avoidance or minimization of the necessity for unacceptable pruning works.

2.3.9. The TCP was then used to inform the siting of the proposed structures and areas of hard surfacing. In this way it has been ensured that the existing trees have made a significant contribution to the location of these proposed structures, rather than the proposals dictating which trees are to be removed.

3. ARBORICULTURAL IMPACTS.

3.1. Trees to be removed.

3.1.1. The development proposals, as shown on the proposed layout drawing, indicate that no individuals or groups of trees are to be removed.

3.2. Trees to be pruned.

3.2.1. No trees are to be pruned to facilitate implementation of the proposals.

3.3. Root Protection Area incursions.

3.3.1. The 'Root Protection Areas' (RPAs)[5] of the trees to be retained have been calculated in accordance with BS 5837; and have been assessed taking account of factors such as the likely tolerance of a tree to root disturbance or damage, the morphology and disposition of roots as influenced by existing site conditions (including the presence of existing roads or structures), as well as soil type, topography and drainage. Where considered appropriate, the shapes of the RPAs (although not their areas) have been modified as a result of these considerations, so that they reflect more accurately their likely root distribution.

3.3.2. As can be seen on the TPP, no parts of the proposed buildings or associated hard surfacing are within the RPAs of any of the trees to be retained.

[5] The minimum area around a retained 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, paragraph 3.7.

4. ASSESSMENT.

4.1. Tree removals.

4.1.1. As the proposals will not require the felling of any trees or groups of trees there will be no alteration to the key arboricultural features of the site, and therefore the proposals will result in no impact on views from surrounding public areas, and on the character and appearance of the conservation area.

4.2. Pruning.

4.2.1. No trees are to be pruned to facilitate implementation of the proposals.

4.3. RPA incursions.

4.3.1. No parts of the proposed structures abut or are within the RPAs of any of the trees to be retained; and therefore, subject to the implementation of protective measures specified below and on the TPP, their construction will not cause unacceptable damage to roots or rooting environments as a result of root severance or damage, or compaction or pollution of the soil.

4.3.2. The necessary precautions to protect the RPAs of retained trees during construction can be assured by the retention of existing hard surfacing, as shown on the TPP.

5. CONCLUSION.

5.1. Summary.

5.1.1. On the basis of the above considerations we consider that there are no arboricultural impacts as a result of this scheme that might otherwise have any impact on the local landscape. Thus the proposal complies with national planning policy.

5.1.2. The TPP shows the general and specific provisions to be taken during construction of the proposed development, to ensure that no unacceptable damage is caused to the root systems, trunks or crowns of the trees identified for retention. These measures are indicated by coloured notations in areas where construction activities are to occur either within, or in close proximity to, retained trees, as described in the relevant panels on the drawing.

5.1.3. The LPA can readily secure the implementation of and adherence to the measures shown on the TPP by the use of appropriate planning conditions.

5.1.4. Accordingly we conclude that, subject to the above, the proposed development does not constitute any long-term threat to the character or landscape of the conservation area, insofar as this is contributed to by trees; and accordingly it complies with national planning policy.

August 2013

APPENDIX 1

SIMON JONES ASSOCIATES Ltd.
ARBORICULTURAL PLANNING CONSULTANTS

Arboricultural Consultancy - Tree Surveys
Planning & Development · Hazard & Safety

17 CROSS ROAD
TADWORTH
SURREY KT20 5ST

Tel: (01737) 813058
E-mail: sja@sjatrees.co.uk

Director: Simon R. M. Jones Dip. Arb. (RFS), F. Arbor. A., Arb. Assoc. Registered Consultant
Associates: Mark Mackworth-Praed BA (Cantab), M.Sc., F. Arbor. A., Arb. Assoc. Registered Consultant

Tree Survey Schedule

Witanhurst Tennis Court Changing Rooms

July 2013

Tree Survey Schedule: Explanatory Notes

Witanhurst Tennis Court Changing Rooms

This schedule is based on a tree inspection undertaken A site visit and tree inspection was undertaken Matt Rew & Andrew Bigg of Simon Jones Associates Ltd., on the 1st & 2nd of April 2009, and revised by Simon Jones on various occasions up to and including May 2011. Weather conditions at all times were clear, dry and bright. Deciduous trees were surveyed in partial, and then full leaf.

The information contained in this schedule covers only those trees that were examined, and reflects the condition of these specimens at the time of inspection. We did not have access to the trees from any adjacent properties; observations are thus confined to what was visible from within the site and from surrounding public areas.

The trees were inspected from the ground only and were not climbed, and no samples of wood, roots or fungi were taken. A full hazard or risk assessment of the trees was not undertaken, and therefore no guarantee, either expressed or implied, of their safety or stability can be given.

Trees are dynamic organisms and are subject to continual growth and change; therefore the dimensions and assessments presented in this schedule should not be relied upon in relation to any development of the site for more than twelve months from the survey date.

1. Tree no.
Tree numbers correspond with numbering on the Tree Protection Plan.

2. Species.
'Common names' are given, taken from MITCHELL, A. (1978) A Field Guide to the Trees of Britain and Northern Europe.

3. Height.
Estimated with the aid of a hypsometer, given in metres.

4. Trunk diameter.
Trunk diameter measured at approx. 1.5m above ground level; or where the trunk forks into separate stems between ground level and 1.5m, measured at the narrowest point beneath the fork. Given in millimetres.

5. Radial crown spread.
The linear extent of branches from the base of the trunk to the main cardinal points, to the closest quarter of a metre. In the cases of small trees with reasonably symmetrical crowns, a single averaged figure is quoted.

6. Crown clearance.
Distance from adjacent ground level to lowest part of lowest branch, in metres.

7. Age class.
Young: Age less than 1/3 life expectancy
Semi-mature: 1/3 to 2/3 life expectancy
Mature: Over 2/3 life expectancy
Over-mature: Mature, and in a state of decline
Veteran: Surviving beyond the typical age range for species

8. Physiology.
Health, condition and function of the tree, in comparison to a normal specimen of its species and age.

9. Structure.
Structural condition of the tree – based on both the structure of its roots, trunk and major stems and branches, and on the presence of any structural defects or decay.
Very good: No significant physiological or structural defects, an upright and reasonably symmetrical structure; a particularly good example of its species.
Good: No significant physiological or structural defects, and an upright and reasonably symmetrical structure.
Moderate: No significant pathological defects, but a slightly impaired physiological structure; however, not to the extent that the tree is at immediate or early risk of collapse.
Indifferent: Significant physiological or pathological defects; but these are either remediable or do not put the tree at immediate or early risk of collapse.
Poor: Significant and irremediable physiological or pathological defects, such that there may be a risk of early or premature collapse.
Hazardous: Significant and irremediable physiological or pathological defects, such that there is a risk of imminent collapse.

10. Comments.
Where appropriate comments have been made relating to:
-Health and condition
-Safety, particularly close to areas of public access
-Structure and form
-Estimated life expectancy or potential
-Visibility and impact in the local landscape

11. Category.
Based on the British Standard "Trees in relation to design, demolition and construction - Recommendations", BS 5837: 2012, Table 1.

Category U: Trees 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.
• 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.

Category A: Trees of high quality with an estimated remaining life expectancy of at least 40 years.
(1) Trees that are particularly good examples of their species, especially if rare or unusual.
(2) Trees, groups or woodlands of particular visual importance as arboricultural and/or landscape features.
(3) Trees, groups or woodlands of significant conservation, historical, commemorative or other value.

Category B: Trees of moderate quality with an estimated remaining life expectancy of at least 20 years.
(1) 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 minor 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.
(2) Trees present in numbers, usually growing as groups or woodlands, such that they form distinct landscape features, thereby attracting a higher collective rating than they might as individuals; or trees present in numbers but situated so as to make little visual contribution to the wider locality.
(3) Trees with material conservation or other cultural value.

Category C: Trees of low quality with an estimated remaining life expectancy of at least 10 years, or young trees with a stem diameter below 150mm.
(1) Unremarkable trees of very limited merit or of such impaired condition that they do not qualify in higher categories.
(2) 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 landscape benefits.
(3) Trees with no material limited conservation or other cultural value.

TREE SURVEY SCHEDULE

Witanhurst Tennis Court Changing Rooms

No.	Species	Height	Trunk diameter	Radial crown spread	Crown clear-ance	Age class	Physio -logy	Structure	Comments	Cate gory
148	English oak	14m	560mm (over ivy)	6.25m	2m N 4m S	Middle aged	Average	Moderate	Situated in the SW corner of the tennis court between the tennis court and the retaining wall; single straight trunk growing up through 147g; dominant spreading canopy, lower canopy on the N side are suppressed by 147g; tree is of moderate quality but currently only of low value as tree is only visible within the local vicinity of the pavilion due to the tree screening surrounding this specimen. Of long-term potential.	C (1)
153	Leyland cypress	16m	260mm	1.5m N 2m E 3.5m S 2m W	2m S	Middle aged	Average	Moderate	Off-site tree; drawn-up specimen with Height/Diameter ratio greater than 50: at risk of failure if companion shelter removed; one-sided crown as suppressed by adjacent specimens; of only low-level screening value; of moderate quality but low value; but of long-term potential.	C (1)
154	Sycamore	16m	150mm	0m N 1m E 4m SE 4.5m S 1m W	5m S	Young	Average	Poor	Off-site tree; situated on top of the retaining wall, self-set specimen; one sided suppressed canopy by adjacent specimens. Drawn-up with Height/Diameter ratio greater than 50: at risk of failure if companion shelter removed; of moderate quality but low value; but of long-term potential.	C (1)
155	Sweet gum	20m	500mm	3m N 4.5m E 4.75m S 4m W	5m S	Middle aged	Average	Moderate	Off-site tree situated on top of the retaining wall; single straight trunk from base, heavily ivy covered to over half height; this tree is the largest tree in the group in which it stands although has very limited visibility due to surrounding specimens and the topography of the surrounding area. Of moderate quality but low value; but of long-term potential.	C (1)
156	Leyland cypress	9m	145mm (over ivy)	1.5m	0m N 0m E 2m S 0m W	Young	Average	Moderate	Off-site tree; drawn-up specimen with Height/Diameter ratio greater than 50: at risk of failure if companion shelter removed; of only low-level screening value; of moderate quality but low value; but of long-term potential.	C (1)
159	Leyland cypress	16m	300mm (over ivy)	2.5m	0m N 0m E 2.5m S 0m W	Middle aged	Average	Poor	Off-site tree; drawn-up specimen with Height/Diameter ratio greater than 50: at risk of failure if companion shelter removed; of only low-level screening value; of moderate quality but low value; but of long-term potential.	C (1)
160g	Sycamore	8m to 14m	75mm to 305mm	3m N 3m E 6m S 3.25m W	2m	Middle aged	Average	Moderate	A linear group of sycamores situated on the NE corner of the tennis court situated between the hard surfacing of the tennis court and the retaining wall. Total of eight specimens providing a linear group of visual amenity providing low level screening between adjacent property and tennis courts. Of moderate quality but low value; but of long-term potential.	C (1)
306	Sycamore	17m	320mm 380mm	6m	2m	Young	Average	Moderate	Ivy-covered; one-sided crown as suppressed by adjacent specimens; of moderate quality but low value; but of long-term potential.	C (1)

No.	Species	Height	Trunk diameter	Radial crown spread	Crown clear-ance	Age class	Physio - logy	Structure	Comments	Cate gory
313	London plane	17m	330mm	5m	5m S	Middle aged	Average	Moderate	Off-site specimen; single straight trunk; lower canopy is slightly suppressed to the E and W; tree is of moderate quality but of only low value. Drawn-up specimen with Height/Diameter ratio greater than 50: at risk of failure if companion shelter removed; of reduced potential .	C (1)
314	Common walnut	17m	230mm	2m N 2.5m E 5m S 4.75m W	3m S	Middle aged	Average	Moderate	Ornamental specimen; single straight trunk slightly leaning to S; one sided suppressed canopy by adjacent specimens. Drawn-up specimen with Height/Diameter ratio greater than 50: at risk of failure if companion shelter removed; of moderate quality but low value; of reduced potential.	C (1)
315	London plane	17m	340mm	4m N 4m E 5m S 3.75m W	3m S	Middle aged	Average	Moderate	Off-site tree; dense surface rooting to the N; single straight trunk from base; one sided suppressed canopy by adjacent specimens, canopy is overhanging adjacent dwelling. Of moderate quality but low value; but of long-term potential.	C (1)
401	Black mulberry	7m	530mm @1m	3m N 4m E 6.75m S 5m W	4.5m W	Middle aged	Average	Poor	Trunk leans to SE before sub-dividing into three main stems at approx. 1.5m above ground level. Significant decay from ground level on E side into main fork with evidence that a further fork to the N has broken off in the past. Hence significant weak point at base of all remaining forks; wide spreading crown; stem to the NW has been cabled to the stem to the SE; sub-dominant branch/stem to the SW has been heavily cut back to approx. the boundary line with Witanhurst and consequently has very little foliage. Indeed this branch contributes to the overall shape of the crown of the tree in only a minor way. Some epicormic growth particularly on the latter branch, probably as a response to its recent reduction (recent as cuts can be seen to be reasonably fresh); leaf size, colour and density indicate that otherwise tree is in a healthy condition; some deadwood and	C (2)
402	Flowering cherry	8.5m	310mm	3.75m N 5.25m E 3m S 3m W	4m W	Middle aged	Average	Moderate	Single upright trunk dividing into separate ascending stems between 1.8 and 2.5m; dense crown densely foliaged; suppressed to the S by the foliage of the mulberry tree, to the W by the foliage of the group of sycamores in the grounds of Witanhurst and to the N by the foliage of the adjacent tree in garden of No. 4. Small ornamental specimen, slightly above average deadwood in crown but would provide some significant screening between garden of No. 4 and Witanhurst tennis courts	C (1)
403	Pittosporum	5m	65mm	1.5m N 1m E 0m S 1m W	3m W	Young	Average	Indifferent	Single trunk, bowed at base; high and narrow crown; very one-sided and grows mainly to N; completely overtopped by adjacent tree in garden of No. 4. Small ornamental specimen of low quality and value; of short-term potential only.	C (12)
404	Pagoda tree	11.5m	420mm	6.5m N 7.25m E 6.75m S 7m W	3.5m W	Middle aged	Average	Moderate	Single upright trunk; lifting of paving slabs and bricks around base consistent with tree root growth; slight lean to S; crown break at 3m; two sub-dominant stems to E and N, dominant stem to W; no evidence of included bark at main junction points; wide spreading and largely dominant crown overhangs many smaller trees and shrubs below, minor deadwood in crown; leaf size and density suggests tree is of normal physiology; no evidence of significant disease or decay. Of moderate quality and value; probably visible in views from the west and south across the tennis courts at Witanhurst but unlikely to be a significant component of the local landscape. Of long-term potential.	B (12)

No.	Species	Height	Trunk diameter	Radial crown spread	Crown clear-ance	Age class	Physio - logy	Structure	Comments	Cate gory
501	Rowan	6.5m	140mm	2m N 2.75m E 1.75m S 1.75m W	3m W	Young	Average	Moderate	Single trunk leans slightly to E; twin stemmed from 2m; no evidence of included bark; canopy suppressed particularly on W by adjacent specimen; contributes to density of tree and shrub foliage in this area but by itself not of any visibility from any public areas; of moderate quality but low value; of medium-term potential.	C (1)
502	Privet	5m	85mm	1.25m N 1m E 2m S 2.25m W	2m W	Young	Average	Moderate	Off site tree; small ornamental specimen with variegated foliage; single trunk; 3 subsidiary stems from 500mm; crown suppressed particularly on N by adjacent conifer; contributes to density of foliage alongside this boundary but not visible from any public areas; of moderate quality but low value; of short-term potential only.	C (1)
503	Coast redwood	12m	385mm	3m N 2.75m E 2.25m S 2.5m W	1.5m W	Middle aged	Average	Good	Off site tree; stout single trunk; evidence of buttress roots on S/SE only; no evidence of any other buttress roots suggesting that ground level may have been raised around base in past, consistent with anecdotal evidence that soil produced by digging out for the swimming pool was spread here; hint of a gap between the soil at base of wall and edge of wall adjacent, as wall is only 700mm from	B (1)
504	Leyland cypress	10m	330mm	1m N 3.5m E 4.25m S	1075m W	Middle aged	Average	Indifferent	Elaborate staking/propping system at base, no longer needed; single upright trunk, becoming twin stemmed at 3.5m; has been reduced in height to 5.5m on at least 1 occasion in past, this corroborated by evidence of gardener; crown heavily suppressed on N by adjacent trees within	C (2)
G3	Various	10m to 18m	100mm to 510mm	6.25m	2.5m	Various	Average	Moderate	Situated on the N edge of the tennis court between the tennis court and adjacent property to the N. Species include ten sycamores, five Leyland cypress, two London plane, two Common alder, one Common walnut, one Flowering cherry and one eucalyptus which is the largest tree of the group. All specimens are heavily ivy covered and are suppressed by each other. The property and retaining wall are situated to the N of G3 within 1m to 5m of these specimens. Tree is currently of moderate quality but of only low to moderate value although they provide some screening to adjacent building. They also provide dense shade to southern facing windows. Of moderate quality but low value; but of long-term potential.	C (1)

No.	Species	Height	Trunk diameter	Radial crown spread	Crown clear-ance	Age class	Physio - logy	Structure	Comments	Cate gory
G 401	Leyland cypress	Up to 3.25m	30mm to 85mm	0.75m E 1.25m W	1m W	Young	Below average	Moderate	Row of small trees at approx. 500mm spacings planted to form a hedge along entire W boundary of No. 4; section to S has foliage right down to ground level; section to N has a young yew hedge directly beneath it and has foliage no lower than 1.25m; has been regularly trimmed on the No. 4 side and reduced in height to a flat top; some ivy growing up stems; significant browning of foliage in patches on W side, no evidence to suggest why this is, possibly tree being cut too hard in the past, no evidence to suggest that this is going to be fatal. Specimens at the southern end of the row are less heavily foliated and provide less of a dense screen; indeed the second tree from the S is entirely dead; there are gaps between the third and fourth and the seventh and eighth trees indicative that trees may have failed in these locations. Seventh tree has dry and yellowing foliage suggesting that it is dying; drought may be a cause as this is a dry location and root activity is restricted by the retaining wall immediately to the W of the trunks. Of moderate quality but low value; of short-term potential only.	C (1)
G 402	Leyland cypress	Up to 1.75m	20mm to 40mm	0.5m E 0m W	0m E	Young	Average	Moderate	Row of trees planted to form a hedge. Completely suppressed on W side as dominated by adjacent larger row of conifers; foliage almost to ground level on west side, appears to be regularly trimmed both on top and on side. Of moderate quality but low value; of medium-term potential.	C (1)
G 501	Various	up to 4m	Up to 140mm @arf	3m W	1.75m W	Young	Average	Indifferent	Group of various shrubs, including Aucuba, privet, mahonia, growing adjacent to wall; providing low level screening; all readily replaceable; none visible from surrounding public places; of moderate quality but low value; of short-term potential only.	C (1)

APPENDIX 2

Arboricultural Impacts: Summary

(For details, see below)

Impact	Nos of Trees
Trees to be removed	0
Trees where manual excavation needed within RPAs	0
Trees where above soil surfacing needed within RPAs	0
Trees with proposed underground services within RPAs	0
Trees that will require pruning	0

N

G3

313 152 314 315 155 156 159 504

153 154 160g G501

306 Sycamore

No. 5 The Grove

503 502 501

Emergency Access Gate

113.019

Cobbles

Existing Tennis Pavilion

Garden Store Above

PLANT ROOM

Tennis Pavilion Above

Toolshed Above

steps

Landing

New Cobbled Path

Existing Retaining Wall carefully dismantled and rebuilt with reused stone

113.456

113.780

114.010

Sculpture

110.343

PLUNGE POOL

BANJA

LOGGIA

111.643

MASSAGE

FAMILY MALE CHANGE

FAMILY FEMALE CHANGE

GUEST CHANGE

PREDRANIK

LINE OF TENNIS PAVILION SLAB

115.236

112.325

113.610

112.810

Rebuilt retaining wall past this line

Planting

Existing Tennis Court Changing Rooms Below

BRW 1.8H

BRW 1.5H

404 403

No. 4 The Grove

BRW 2.2H

402

BRW 1.0H

401

G402

G401

Redline application boundary

Existing hard surfacing within RPA to be retained; to act as ground protection

148 English oak

LINE OF PERGOLA ABOVE

116.238

Axial paving Feature

Line of original stairs dotted

112.900

New stairs 1

115.235

1m high hedge

NT

Shape of Root Protection Area modified to reflect restriction to root growth.

0 2m 4m 6m 8m 10m

METRES

1 : 200 @A2

Simon Jones Associates Ltd.

Project:	Tennis court changing		
Client:	Safran Holdings Ltd.		
Drawing:	TREE PROTECTION PLAN		
Drawing No:	SJA TPP 13050-01	Revision No:	
Based On:	2225-00/01/01 E		
Drawn By: MR	Date: Aug. 2013	Scale: 1:200 @ A3	
Tel:(01737) 813058	Fax:(01737) 816140	sja@sjatrees.co.uk	
Tree nos.: ● 148	Canopies of trees to be retained:	Existing hard surfacing:	
Category 'A' RPA:	Category 'B' RPA:	Category 'C' RPA:	

For further information refer to the SJA Tree Schedule

Do not scale from this drawing: please check all dimensions on site, and notify us of any discrepancies. Simon Jones Associates cannot be held responsible for inaccuracies in the topographical plan on which this drawing is based.

This drawing is designed to reflect only the principles of layout and /or design insofar as these relate to the protection of trees to be retained, and should NOT be read as a definitive engineering or construction method statement. Reference should be made to the architect or structural engineer, as appropriate, over any matters of construction detail or specification, or any engineering standards or regulatory requirements relating to proposed structures, hard surfaces or underground services.