

14 Eton Road, NW3 4SS

Arboricultural Report

June 2017



Chapter 1 Introduction

Chapter 2 Background

Chapter 3 Tree Survey

Chapter 4 Development Implications

Chapter 5 Conclusions

Drawing(s)

ARB/3604/Y/200 Arboricultural Plan

Appendices

1 Spreadsheets

2 Heads of Terms Method Statement

ACS Consulting is a UK industry leader in arboriculture. We offer a range of services involving trees, woodlands and forestry in the built and rural environment:

Planning

Hazard Evaluation

Management

Law

Limitation

ACS Consulting (ACS) has prepared this Report for the sole use of Mr. R. Leeming in accordance with the Agreement under which our services were performed. No other warranty, expressed or implied, is made as to the professional advice included in this Report or any other services provided by us. This Report may not be relied upon by any other party without the prior and express written agreement of ACS. Unless otherwise stated in this Report, the assessments made assume that the sites and facilities will continue to be used for their current purpose without significant change. The conclusions and recommendations contained in this Report are based upon information provided by others and upon the assumption that all relevant information has been provided by those parties from whom it has been requested. Information obtained from third parties has not been independently verified by ACS, unless otherwise stated in the Report.

1.0 Introduction

1.01

A. C. S. Consulting is instructed by Mr. R. Leeming to report on trees and the implications of development at 14 Eton Road, NW3 4SS. The assessment and report was undertaken by Ian Murat, Registered Consultant of the Arboricultural Association.

1.02

In accordance with Guidance on information requirements and validation for planning applications, this report fulfils the recommended national list criteria for tree survey/arboricultural information. More specifically, it contains the following:

- A full tree survey to the requirements of BS5837 (2012) Trees In Relation To Design, Demolition and Construction – Recommendations.
- A plan showing tree survey information, retention categorisation and root protection areas,
- An assessment of the arboricultural implications of development detailing trees to be retained/removed and appropriate protection measures,
- A Heads of Terms Arboricultural Method Statement detailing a set of agreed principles for tree protection, implementation and phasing of works.

1.03

The site was visited during June 2017. A survey of the trees was completed recording; species type, age, height, crown spread, diameter-at-breast-height, and condition.

Copyright of ACS Consulting. All rights described in Chapter IV of the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988 have been generally asserted ©, June 2017.

2.0 Background

2.01 The Site

The site comprises a semi-detached villa.

2.02 Statutory Protection/Planning Policies

The development proposal for this site will be assessed against the policies of The London Borough of Camden and the London Plan. Further details relating to the planning policies covering this site can be found in the planning statement that supports the application. The application is not the subject of the National Planning Policy Framework in terms of trees. This document is concerned with ancient woodland and Veteran Trees. These do not appear at this site. The site has no known TPO. The site is located in the Eton Conservation Area.



3.0 Tree Survey

3.01

I have identified eight trees. Trees T3 – T6 are located off-site.

3.02

The tree data can be found at Appendix 1. There is no requirement in BS 5837 to repeat the details of the Constraints information save for confirming that the trees were surveyed for species type, age, height, crown spread, diameter-at-breast-height, condition, and their suitability for retention from ground level. Heights were measured with a digital Hypsometer and diameters were taken, where possible, with a diameter tape to give an average stem measurement. Canopy spreads have been measured at the cardinal points or where they significantly extend in other directions.

Each tree has been assessed using the BS 5837 2012 category ratings (see Appendix 1). Consideration has been given to any Supplementary Planning Documents. The data collection is compliant with the advice set out at Subsection 4.4.2.5 of BS 5837:2012.

4.0 Development Implications

4.01

The site comprises a semi-detached villa.

4.02

The application is described in detail in the design and access statement by Undercover Architects. In simple terms, the application comprises the:

“Demolition and erection of a single storey garden studio, following the lowering of the existing garden level, erection of an additional 2.0 m rear extension with enlarged roof terrace following the demolition and replacement of the existing external staircase and balustrade at upper-ground floor level, erection of an infill extension to the flank elevation, erection of an enclosed cycle storage area to the front elevation and new hard soft landscaping” [sic].

Whilst it is acknowledged that all trees within the planning process are a material consideration, it is generally accepted that those trees rated as C or U are excluded from consideration regarding development implications, retained only where they pose no constraint on development.

Based on the proposals, two implications were noted.

Loss for Development

The development of the site will result in the loss of two trees from within the rear garden. The trees are Category C specimens of no merit. Their loss has no implications for the tree character of the Conservation Area, the trees are unremarkable trees of very limited merit or such impaired condition that they do not qualify in higher categories. Trees present offer low or only temporary/transient landscape benefits.

Retained Trees that may be affected by Disturbance

The proposals seek to erect a bin store adjacent to T8 (Robinia). Such structures are light and shallow founded and as such, there are no implications. The matter can be addressed by way of a method statement and planning condition. The garden studio is to be constructed on a slightly larger footprint that currently exists. The structure has no implication for trees in the neighbouring property. There is a substantial wall as the boundary feature that will have significantly reduced root spread from the adjacent birch.

4.03

The over-arching policy guidance in respect of the site is that contained within LB Camden Council’s Core Strategy and London Plan Policy 3D.15. The application recognises that the retention of existing trees can add scale and maturity to the proposed development. The development in arboricultural terms, accords with the council’s current local plan policy. The loss of two mediocre trees from the rear garden has no implications for the treed character of the area.

5.0 Conclusions

5.01

The application is for residential use.

5.02

The application is described in detail in the submissions of Undercover Architecture, London. In arboricultural terms, the development has a good spatial relationship with the off-site trees. The loss of two trees from within the site has no implications for visual amenity or the treed character of the Conservation Area. The bin store is a light structure and can be easily constructed as indicated on the plans with no implications for the Robinia (T8). The garden studio has no implications for off-site trees.

5.03 Conclusions

The applicant submits an implication study that accords with Central Government advice and the requirements of the Council in respect of Best Practice.

A draft method statement is appended to demonstrate the scheme is feasible. Certain matters listed therein may alternatively be addressed satisfactorily by means of a condition(s). This requires detailed discussions with the LPA on the principle that conditions should always be used in the first instance as per government guidance and that contained in BS 5837 – 2012 Table B.1 Delivery of tree-related information into the planning system; the method statement fulfils the recommended criteria for arboricultural information.

Appendix 1

Contents

Key

BS5837: 2012

Tree Tables

KEY

<p>Age</p>	<p>Y – Young: Out-planted trees that have not yet established SM – Semi-mature: Established trees up to 1/3 of expected height and crown EM – Early mature: Between 1/3 and 2/3 of expected height and crown M – Mature: Between 2/3 and full expected height and crown FM – Fully mature: Full expected height and crown OM – Over mature: Crown beginning to break-up and decrease in size S – Senescent: Crown in advanced stage of break-up</p>
<p>Physiological Condition</p>	<p>Good – Very few defects a reasonable long life expectancy depending on age class Fair – Some defects giving the tree a shortened life expectancy Poor – Limited life with major problems</p>
<p>Structural Condition</p>	<p>Good – Very few defects Fair – Some defects rectifiable with minor tree surgery Poor – Significant defects rectifiable with major tree surgery or felling</p>

Table 1 – Cascade chart for tree quality assessment

Category and definition	Criteria			Identification on Plan
<p>Category U</p> <p>Those 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.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 U category trees (i.e. 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. <p><i>NOTE Category U trees can have existing or potential conservation value which might be desirable to preserve; see 4.5.7</i></p>			RED
	1 Mainly arboricultural qualities	2 Mainly landscape qualities	3 Mainly cultural values, including conservation.	
Trees To Be Considered For Retention				
<p>Category A</p> <p>Trees of high quality with an estimated remaining life expectancy of at least 40 years</p>	Trees that are particularly good examples of their species, especially if rare or unusual, or essential components of groups, or of formal or semi-formal arboricultural features (e.g. the dormant and/or principal trees within an avenue)	Trees, groups or woodlands of particular visual importance as arboricultural and/or landscape features.	Trees, groups or woodlands of significant conservation, historical, commemorative or other value (e.g. veteran trees or wood-pasture)	GREEN
<p>Category B</p> <p>Trees of moderate quality with an estimated remaining life expectancy of at least 20 years.</p>	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 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.	Trees present in numbers, usually growing as groups or woodlands, such that they attract a higher collective rating than they might as individuals; or trees occurring as collectives but situated so as to make little visual contribution to the wider locality.	Trees with material conservation or other cultural value.	BLUE
<p>Category C</p> <p>Trees of low quality with an estimated remaining life expectancy of at least 10 years, or young trees with a stem diameter below 150 mm.</p>	Unremarkable trees of very limited merit or such impaired condition that they do not qualify in higher categories.	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/transient landscape benefits.	Trees with no material conservation or other cultural benefits	GREY

Tree Ref No.	Species	Height M	Stem Diameter MM	Branch Spread M				Height of Crown Clearance M	Clear Branch Height M	Age Class	Physiological Condition	Structural Condition	Preliminary Management Recommendations/ Comments	Estimated Remaining Contribution Years	Category Grading
				N	E	S	W								
1	Prunus	7	145	2	1.5	#3	2.5	1 (N)	3 (N)	SM/ EM	Good	Good	A tree of low quality and value in the landscape. Loss to development.	10+	C1/2
2	Japanese Maple	4	85	2	2	2	2	2	1	SM	Fair	Good	Dead branches. A tree of low quality and value in the landscape. Loss to development.	10+	C1/2
3	Lime	15	#500	3	3	3	3	4	4	M	Good	Fair	Third party tree. Pollarded. A tree of low quality and value in the landscape.	10+	C1/2
4	Lime	15	#400	2	2	2	2	5	5	EM/M	Good	Fair	Twin stemmed with a partly included stem union. Third party tree. Pollarded/topped. A tree of low quality and value in the landscape.	10+	C1/2
5	Birch	15	#400	#5	#5	#6	3	5	5		Good	Good	Third party tree. A tree of moderate quality and value in the landscape.	20+	B1/2
6	Birch	5	#250	1	3	#5	2	1	1		Good	Good	Third party tree of low quality and value in the landscape.	10+	C1/2
7	Magnolia ?	6	210	1	2	2	2	2	2	SM/ EM	Good	Poor	Twin stemmed with included stem union. Included branch unions. Possibly been topped in the past. A tree of low quality and value in the landscape.	10+	C1/2

Tree Ref No.	Species	Height M	Stem Diameter MM	Branch Spread M				Height of Crown Clearance M	Clear Branch Height M	Age Class	Physiological Condition	Structural Condition	Preliminary Management Recommendations/ Comments	Estimated Remaining Contribution Years	Category Grading
				N	E	S	W								
8	Robinia	15	660	2	4	6	3	2	2 (E)	FM/ OM	Fair	Fair	Pronounced lean south. Stem injury with reasonable wound occlusion. Eccentric root plate. Large pieces of dead wood. A tree of moderate quality and value in the landscape. <u>Work</u> Crown clean.	10+	B1/2

Appendix 2

Contents

Heads of Terms Method Statement

Heads of Terms of an Arboricultural Method Statement

The purpose of this document is to serve as a live record of the Heads of Terms which are suggested for the proposed development. The Heads of Terms are in draft form and are therefore themselves subject to further discussion and/or agreement. Certain matters listed herein may alternatively be addressed satisfactorily by means of a Condition. This requires detailed discussions with the LPA on the principle that conditions should always be used in the first instance as per government guidance and that contained in BS 5837 – 2012 Table B.1 Delivery of tree-related information into the planning system, this method statement fulfils the recommended criteria for arboricultural information.

The Draft Heads of Terms and obligations are as follows:-

Tree Works

- Specification to be agreed on site
- Works to BS 3998 - 2010

Construction Exclusion Zone Protection

- Timing for setting out, laying down of ground protection generally in accordance with the phasing plan. Relocation of ground protection under supervision.
- Specification for ground protection to be in accordance with BS 5837:2012.
- Specification for protective fencing to be in accordance with BS 5837: 2012.

Storage of Materials/Offices/Fuels

- Identification and reservation of land for storage of materials, parking of vehicles, location of offices and welfare facilities and, fuels.

Services

- Location of services, installation in accordance with NJUG 4.2.
- Timing of excavations where they pass within or close to retained trees in accordance with the phasing plan.

Emergency Procedure/Contacts

- Spill kit available.
- On site fuels to be located away from RPA/CEZ and contained in a bunded tank at 110% capacity. all incidents involving trees to be reported by telephone and email.

Review/Site Inspection

- Review to be undertaken prior to the commencement of development to address: phasing and land uses.
- Arrangements for Review (monitoring).
- Review to allow for amendment / variation by agreement.

Head Office

Suite 1, 9 - 11 Princess Street, Knutsford, WA16 6BY

☎ 01565 755 422

✉ manchester@acsconsulting.co.uk

🌐 www.acsconsulting.co.uk

Ian Murat

M.Sc, F.Arbor.A, CEnv, MCIEEM, RC. Arbor.A

Registered Consultant of the Arboricultural Association.

✉ ian.murat@acsconsulting.co.uk

Scotland Office

272 Bath Street, Glasgow, G2 4JR

☎ 0141 354 1633

✉ glasgow@acsconsulting.co.uk

🌐 www.acsconsulting.co.uk

