



ARBORICULTURAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT REPORT  
& OUTLINE METHOD STATEMENT:

80 Greencroft Gardens  
London  
NW6 3JQ

REPORT PREPARED FOR:

80 Greencroft Gardens c/o  
Quorum Project Management Ltd  
42 Crown Road  
St Margarets  
Middlesex  
TW1 3EH

REPORT PREPARED BY

Adam Hollis  
MSc ARB MICFor FArbor A MRICS C Env

Ref: QPM/80GRC/AIM/01

Date: 26<sup>th</sup> October 2017

The content and format of this Report are for the exclusive use of the Client. It may not be sold, lent, hired out or divulged to any third party, not directly involved in the subject matter without Landmark Trees written consent.

**Web:** [www.landmarktrees.co.uk](http://www.landmarktrees.co.uk)  
**e-mail:** [info@landmarktrees.co.uk](mailto:info@landmarktrees.co.uk)  
**Tel:** 0207 851 4544



**London Office:** Holden House, 4th Floor, 57 Rathbone Place London W1T 1JU

**Registered Office:** 15 Abbey Road, Oxford OX2 0AD

Landmark Trees is the trading name of Landmark trees Ltd. Registered in Wales. Reg No. 3882076



Section	Content	Page N <sup>o</sup>
1.0	SUMMARY	5
2.0	INTRODUCTION	6
3.0	OBSERVATIONS	8
4.0	DEVELOPMENT CONSTRAINTS	10
5.0	ARBORICULTURAL IMPACTS	13
6.0	DISCUSSION	14
7.0	CONCLUSION	17
8.0	GENERAL RECOMMENDATIONS	18
9.0	METHOD STATEMENT	19
10.0	REFERENCES	27
Appendices		
Appendix 1	Tree Survey	28
Appendix 2	Recommended Tree Works to Facilitate Development	32
Appendix 3	Trees for Constricted Sites	34
Appendix 4	General Guidelines & Sample Site Monitoring Sheet with Checklist	35
Appendix 5	Tree Constraints Plan	38
Appendix 6	Arboricultural Impact Assessment Plans	40
Appendix 7	Tree Protection Plan	43

## Caveats

This report is primarily an arboricultural report. Whilst comments relating to matters involving built structures or soil data may appear, any opinion thus expressed should be viewed as qualified, and confirmation from an appropriately qualified professional sought. Such points are usually clearly identified within the body of the report. It is not a full safety survey or subsidence risk assessment survey. These services can be provided but a further fee would be payable. Where matters of tree condition with a safety implication are noted during a survey they will of course appear in the report.

A tree survey is generally considered invalid in planning terms after 2 years, but changes in tree condition may occur at any time, particularly after acute (e.g. storm events) or prolonged (e.g. drought) environmental stresses or injuries (e.g. root severance). Routine surveys at different times of the year and within two - three years of each other (subject to the incidence of the above stresses) are recommended for the health and safety management of trees remote from highways or busy access routes. Annual surveys are recommended for the latter.

Tree works recommendations are found in the Appendices to this report. It is assumed, unless otherwise stated ("ASAP" or "Option to") that all husbandry recommendations will be carried out within 6 months of the report's first issue. Clearly, works required to facilitate development will not be required if the application is shelved or refused. However, necessary husbandry work should not be shelved with the application and should be brought to the attention of the person responsible, by the applicant, if different. Under the Occupiers Liability Act of 1957, the owner (or his agent) of a tree is charged with the due care of protecting persons and property from foreseeable damage and injury.' He is responsible for damage and/or nuisance arising from all parts of the tree, including roots and branches, regardless of the property on which they occur. He also has a duty under The Health and Safety at Work Act 1974 to provide a safe place of work, during construction. Tree works should only be carried out with local authority consent, where applicable.

Inherent in a tree survey is assessment of the risk associated with trees close to people and their property. Most human activities involve a degree of risk, such risks being commonly accepted if the associated benefits are perceived to be commensurate.

Risks associated with trees tend to increase with the age of the trees concerned, but so do many of the benefits. It will be appreciated, and deemed to be accepted by the client, that the formulation of recommendations for all management of trees will be guided by the cost-benefit analysis (in terms of amenity), of tree work that would remove all risk of tree related damage.

Prior to the commencement of any tree works, an ecological assessment of specific trees may be required to ascertain whether protected species (e.g. bats, badgers and invertebrates etc.) may be affected.

## Tree Constraints &amp; Protection Overview

Client:	80 Greencroft Gardens LLP c/o Quorum Project Management Ltd	Case Ref:	QPM/80GRC/AIM/01
Local Authority:	LB Camden	Date:	26/10/2017
Site Address: 80 Greencroft Gardens, London NW6 3JQ			
Proposal: Conversion of property to 7 flats including rear extension and formation of basement level			
Report Checklist	Y/N		Y/N
Arboricultural constraints on site	Y	Trees removal proposed	Y
Tree Survey	Y	Topographical Survey	N
BS5837 Report	Y	Conservation Area	Y
Tree Preservation Orders	N		
Tree Protection Plan:	Y		
Tree Constraints Plan:	Y		
Arboricultural Impact Assessment:	Y		
Site Layout			
Site Visit	Y	Date: 14/09/17	Access Full/Partial/None
			F
Trees on Site	Y	Off-site Trees	Y
Trees affected by development	Y	O/s trees affected by development	Y
Tree replacement proposed:	Y	On or off-site trees indirectly affected by development	N
Trees with the potential to be affected			
Felling of 4 category C trees (T1, T2, T12 & T14) and 2 category U trees (T13 & T15) assessed as being of low impact – replacement planting proposed as mitigation.			
Construction of wall within RPA of off-site T3 assessed as being of very low impact – low-invasive foundations proposed as mitigation.			
Comments			
Recommendations			
1	Proposal will mean the loss of important trees (TPO/CA)		N
2	Proposal has sufficient amelioration for tree loss		Y
3	Proposals provide adequate tree protection measures		Y
4	Proposal will mean retained trees are too close to buildings		N
5	Specialist demolition / construction techniques required		Y
6	The Proposal will result in significant root damage to retained trees		N
7	Further investigation of tree condition recommended		N

RPA= Root Protection Area

TPP= Tree Protection Plan

AMS= Arboricultural Method Statement

AIA = Arboricultural Implication Assessment

BS5837: 2012 'Trees in relation to design, demolition and construction – Recommendations'

Arboricultural Impact Assessment & Outline Method Statement: 80 Greencroft Gardens, London NW6 3JQ

Prepared for: 80 Greencroft Gardens LLP c/o Quorum Project Management Ltd, 42 Crown Road, St Margarets, Middlesex TW1 3EH

Prepared by: Adam Hollis of Landmark Trees, Holden House, 4th Floor, 57 Rathbone Place, London W1T 4JU

## 1. SUMMARY

- 1.1 This report comprises an arboricultural impact assessment and an outline method statement for the proposed development at 80 Greencroft Gardens, London NW6 3JQ, reviewing any conflicts between the proposals and material tree constraints identified in our survey.
- 1.2 15 trees were surveyed on or around the site, of which none are category A \*(High Quality), 2 are B category \*(Moderate Quality), 7 are C category \*(Low Quality), and 6 are U category \*(Unsuitable for Retention). In theory, only moderate quality trees and above are significant material constraints on development.
- 1.3 The principal impacts in the current proposals are the removal of the category C trees T1, T2, T12 and T14 and the category U trees T13 and T15. The loss of these low quality, interior site trees is rated as a low impact and will be mitigated through the provision of replacement plantings.
- 1.4 Further impacts to retained trees comprise the encroachment of the theoretical RPA of T3 by the new garden / retaining wall that bounds the southwestern extent of the proposed basement by some 0.6sqm or 0.2% of the total area. This has been assessed as being likely to be of very low impact to the tree and shall be mitigated by the manual excavation of the top 750mm of the line of the wall through the RPA in conjunction with pre-emptive root pruning.
- 1.5 Even if one were to assume a worst-case scenario where the formation of the wall resulting in the severance of all roots beyond it, and this is certainly not certain given the juxtaposition of the wall in relation to the tree, the impact only amounts to 2.2sqm or 0.8% of the total area which would again be assessed as being of very low impact to the tree.
- 1.6 All of the retained trees will be protected during construction works (see Tree Protection Plan in Appendix 8).
- 1.7 The replanting scheme will offer considerable enhancement and replaces trees of low quality and those unsuitable for retention. Replacement trees will have the advantage of being specifically selected for the proposed site, healthy and fit-for-purpose. Naturally regenerated trees and saplings tend to be of pioneer / opportunist species (ash and sycamore) which can cause problems for infrastructure, springing up in unsuitable locations. Design can provide for a diverse range of native and ornamental species that will compliment rather than conflict with the proposals, so providing a more sustainable long-term resource for the future.
- 1.8 There will always be marginal secondary impacts of organic deposition and partial shade on this site, regardless of development. The status quo is unlikely to change with further development, which is the salient point for planning to consider. Thus, the secondary impacts of development are minimal.
- 1.9 The site has potential for development without impacting significantly on the wider tree population or local landscape. Thus, with suitable mitigation and supervision the scheme is recommended to planning.

\* British Standards Institute: Trees in relation to design, demolition and construction BS 5837: 2012 HMSO, London

## 2. INTRODUCTION

### 2.1 Terms of reference

- 2.1.1 LANDMARK TREES were asked by 80 Greencroft Gardens c/o Quorum Project Management Ltd to provide a survey and an arboricultural impact assessment of proposals for the site: 80 Greencroft Gardens, London NW6 3JQ. The report is to accompany a planning application.
- 2.1.2 The proposals are for the conversion of the existing property into 7 self-contained flats, including conversion of the roofspace, construction of a rear extension and formation of a basement level to the rear of the property.
- 2.1.3 I am a Registered Consultant and Fellow of the Arboricultural Association and a Chartered Forester, with a Masters Degree in Arboriculture and 20 years experience of the landscape industry - including the Forestry Commission and Agricultural Development and Advisory Service. I am a UK Registered Expert Witness, trained in single joint expert witness duties. I am also Chairman of the UK & I Regional Plant Appraisal Committee, inaugurated to promote international standards of valuation in arboriculture.

### 2.2 Drawings supplied

- 2.2.1 The drawings supplied by the client and relied upon by Landmark Trees in the formulation of our survey plans are:
- Existing site survey: Final designs Greencroft\*
- Proposals: Final designs Greencroft

\*In the absence of a full topographical survey, tree positions may be approximate only.

## 2.3 Scope of survey

- 2.3.1 As Landmark Trees' (LT) arboricultural consultant, Kim Dear surveyed the trees on site on 14<sup>th</sup> September 2017, recording relevant qualitative data in order to assess both their suitability for retention and their constraints upon the site, in accordance with British Standard 5837:2012 Trees in relation to design, demolition and construction – Recommendations [BS5837:2012].
- 2.3.2 Our survey of the trees, the soils and any other factors, is of a preliminary nature. The trees were SURVEYED on the basis of the Visual Tree Assessment method expounded by Mattheck and Breloer (The Body Language of Trees, DoE booklet Research for Amenity Trees No. 4, 1994). LT have not taken any samples for analysis and the trees were not climbed, but inspected from ground level.
- 2.3.3 A tree survey is generally considered invalid in planning terms after 2 years, but changes in tree condition may occur at any time, particularly after acute (e.g. storm events) or prolonged (e.g. drought) environmental stresses or injuries (e.g. root severance). Routine surveys at different times of the year and within two - three years of each other (subject to the incidence of the above stresses) are recommended for the health and safety management of trees remote from highways or busy access routes. Annual surveys are recommended for the latter.
- 2.3.4 The survey does not cover the arrangements that may be required in connection with the laying or removal of underground services.

## 2.4 Survey Data & Report Layout

- 2.4.1 Detailed records of individual trees are given in the survey schedule in Appendix 1 to this report.
- 2.4.2 A site plan identifying the surveyed trees, based on the client's drawings / topographical survey is provided in Appendix 6 of this report.
- 2.4.3 This plan also serves as the Tree Constraints Plan with the theoretical Recommended Protection Areas (RPA's), tree canopies and shade constraints, (from BS5837: 2012) overlain onto it. These constraints are then overlain in turn onto the client's proposals to create a second Arboricultural Impact Assessment Plan in Appendix 7, which in turn is used to create the Tree Protection Plan in Appendix 8. General observations and discussion follow, below.

### 3.0 OBSERVATIONS

#### 3.1 Site description



Photograph 1: 80 Greencroft Gardens, London NW6 3JQ (Source: Google Maps)

- 3.1.1 80 Greencroft Gardens is located in the Swiss Cottage Ward, within the South Hampstead Conservation Area. It comprises a detached property with front driveway and rear garden.
- 3.1.2 The site is relatively level.
- 3.1.3 In terms of the British Geological Survey, the site overlies the London Clay Formation (see indicated location on Fig.1 plan extract below). The associated soils are generally, highly shrinkable clay; e.g. slowly permeable seasonally waterlogged fine loam over clay. Such highly plastic soils are prone to movement: subsidence and heave. The actual distribution of the soil series are not as clearly defined on the ground as on plan and there may be anomalies in the actual composition of clay, silt and sand content.
- 3.1.4 Clay soils are prone to compaction during development with damage to soil structure potentially having a serious impact on tree health. The design of foundations near problematic tree species will also need to take into consideration subsidence risk. Further advice from the relevant experts on the specific soil properties can be sought as necessary.






Figure 1: Extract from the BGS Geology of Britain Viewer

### 3.2 Subject trees

3.2.1 Of the 15 trees surveyed on or around the site, none are category A \*(High Quality), 2 are B category \*(Moderate Quality), 7 are C category \*(Low Quality), and 6 are U category \*(Unsuitable for Retention).

3.2.2 The tree species found on site comprise Lawson cypress, elder, horse chestnut, common ash, whitebeam, common lime, Portuguese laurel and rowan.

3.2.3 In terms of age demographics there is a preponderance of semi-mature and mature trees on the site with few young and early mature trees in the population.

3.2.4 Full details of the surveyed trees can be found in Appendix 1 of this report.

### 3.3 Planning Status

3.3.1 RBKC's online list shows no Tree Preservation Orders on the site, but we do understand the site stands within the South Hampstead Conservation Area, which will affect the subject trees: it is a criminal offence to prune, damage or fell such trees without permission from the local authority.

3.3.2 Relevant local planning policies comprise Policy 7.21 of the London Plan 2015 and Policies A3, A5, D1 and D3 of the Camden Local Plan (adopted 3rd July 2017).

## 4.0 DEVELOPMENT CONSTRAINTS

### 4.1 Primary constraints

- 4.1.1 BS5837: 2012 gives Recommended Protection Areas (RPA's) for any given tree size. The individual RPA's are calculated in the Tree Schedule in Appendix 1 to this report, or rather the notional radius of that RPA, based on a circular protection zone. The prescribed radius is 12-x stem diameter at 1.5m above ground level, except where composite formulae are used in the case of multi-stemmed trees.
- 4.1.2 Circular RPA's are appropriate for individual specimen trees grown freely, but where there is ground disturbance, the morphology of the RPA can be modified to an alternative polygon, as shown in the diagram below (Figure 2). Alternatively, one need principally remember that RPA's are area-based and not linear – notional rather than fixed entities. No modifications have been made in this instance (please see overleaf).




Figure 2 – Generic BS 5837 RPA Adjustments

- 4.1.3 In BS5837, paragraph 4.6.2 states that RPA's should reflect the morphology and disposition of the roots; where pre-existing site conditions or other factors indicate that rooting has occurred asymmetrically, a polygon of equivalent area should be produced. Modifications to the shape of the RPA should reflect a soundly based arboricultural assessment of likely root distribution. Not infrequently, LT are requested by LPA Tree Officers to modify the RPA's to reflect their assumptions that e.g. a road will have drastically limited root growth.

- 4.1.4 Such assumptions cannot be proved without prior site investigations / trial pits. Where it is not always possible to conduct site investigations (e.g. below busy roads), we can always look to the published science. There seems little support for the popular myth that roads and services will curb root growth: research for the International Society of Arboriculture by Kopinga J (ISA 1994), found that “a constant high moisture content of the soil directly underneath the pavement surface can be considered as a major soil factor in attracting the trees’ roots to develop there.” By contrast, grass in lawns may actively antagonise tree roots with natural pathogens. Similarly, Professor F Miller (ISA 1994) found that service trenches at > 3m distances from trees had minimal impact on growth or crown shape.
- 4.1.5 A key misunderstanding, even among professionals, is that we conflate the RPA with the actual root system: RPA's are *prima facie* a notion / convention / treaty and almost entirely theoretical, but readily calculable. Conversely roots are a "known unknown," spatial entity that we predict at our folly. Yet, many are quick to do so.
- 4.1.6 LT favour the neutrality of a circular RPA, because in a difference of opinion, the tree officer will always have the prerogative to dictate the final modification of shape. With the best will in the world, the free allowance of modifications will tend to lead to inequitable outcomes, prejudicing the applicant and the practice is in our view, best avoided. The neutral circle dispenses with this inequity.
- 4.1.7 Ultimately, the point of the circular RPA is to illustrate areas of concern. The purpose of this report is to consider areas of concern (not to modify them to suit our argument or findings). Therefore, no modifications are made here to the RPA's, regardless of roads etc.
- 4.1.8 The quality of trees will also be a consideration: U Category trees are discounted from the planning process in view of their limited service life. Again, Category-C trees would not normally constrain development individually, unless they provide some external screening function. As discrete, internal trees, their removal will not affect the wooded envelope that encloses much of the site.
- 4.1.9 At paragraph 5.1.1. BS5837: 2012 notes that “Care should be exercised over misplaced tree preservation; attempts to retain too many or unsuitable trees on a site are liable to result in excessive pressure on the trees during demolition or construction work, or post-completion demands on their removal.”

- 4.1.10 In theory, only moderate quality trees and above are significant material constraints on development. However, the low quality trees would comprise a constraint in aggregate, in terms of any collective loss / removal, where replacement planting would be appropriate.
- 4.1.11 In this instance, the B category trees present are set back from the building, standing to the rear of the garden and within the adjacent property. They will thus not significantly

constrain development, provided it will not be necessary to build right up to the boundaries.

## 4.2 Secondary Constraints

4.2.1 The second type of constraint produced by trees that are to be retained is that the proximity of the proposed development to the trees should not threaten their future with ever increasing demands for tree surgery or felling to remove nuisance shading (Figure 3), honeydew deposition or perceived risk of harm.



Figure 3 –  
Generic Shading Constraints

4.2.2 The shading constraints are crudely determined from BS5837 by drawing an arc from northwest to east of the stem base at a distance equal to the height of the tree, as shown in the diagram opposite. Shade is less of a constraint on non-residential developments, particularly where rooms are only ever temporarily occupied.




Figure 4 – Shading Arc

4.2.3 This arc (see Figure 4) represents the effects that a tree will have on layout through shade, based on shadow patterns of 1x tree height for a period May to Sept inclusive 10.00-18.00 hrs daily.

4.2.4 Assuming that they will be retained, the orientation of the on- and off-site trees will ensure that shading constraints are minimal, with leaf deposition and honey-dew likely to be as it is today.

*Note: Sections 5 & 6 will now assess the impacts upon constraints identified in Section 4. Table 1 in Section 5 presents the impacts in tabular form (drawing upon survey data presented in Appendices 1 & 2). Impacts are presented in terms of whole tree removal and the effect on the landscape or partial encroachment (% of RPA) and its effect on individual tree health. Section 6 discusses the table data, elaborating upon the impacts' significance and mitigation*

## Table 1: Arboricultural Impact Assessment

(Impacts assessed prior to mitigation and rated with reference to Matheny & Clark (1998))



Ref: QPM/80GRC/AIM

B.S. Cat.	Tree No.	Species	Impact	Tree / RPA Affected	Age	Growth Vitality	Species Tolerance	Impact on Tree Rating	Impact on Site Rating	Mitigation
C	1	Cypress, Lawson variety	Felled to Facilitate Development	m <sup>2</sup> N/A %	Mature	Normal	N/A	N/A	Low	New planting / landscaping
C	2	Elder	Felled to Facilitate Development	m <sup>2</sup> N/A %	Mature	Normal	N/A	N/A	Low	New planting / landscaping
B	3	Chestnut, Horse	Wall Construction within RPA	0.63 m <sup>2</sup> .22 %	Mature	Normal	Moderate	Very Low	Very Low	Airspade / manual excavation
C	12	Laurel, Portugese	Felled to Facilitate Development	m <sup>2</sup> N/A %	Mature	Moderate	N/A	N/A	Low	New planting / landscaping
U	13	Cypress, Lawson variety	Felled to Facilitate Development	m <sup>2</sup> N/A %	Semi-mature	Moderate	N/A	N/A	Very Low	New planting / landscaping
C	14	Cypress, Lawson variety	Felled to Facilitate Development	m <sup>2</sup> N/A %	Semi-mature	Moderate	N/A	N/A	Low	New planting / landscaping
U	15	Elder	Felled to Facilitate Development	m <sup>2</sup> N/A %	Mature	Poor	N/A	N/A	Very Low	New planting / landscaping

## 6.0 DISCUSSION

### 6.1 Rating of Primary Impacts

- 6.1.1 The principal impacts in the current proposals are the removal of the category C trees T1, T2, T12 and T14 and the category U trees T13 and T15. The loss of these low quality, interior site trees is rated as a low impact and will be mitigated through the provision of replacement plantings.
- 6.1.2 Further impacts to retained trees comprise the encroachment of the theoretical RPA of T3 by the new garden / retaining wall that bounds the southwestern extent of the proposed basement by some 0.6sqm or 0.2% of the total area. This has been assessed as being likely to be of very low impact to the tree and shall be mitigated by the manual excavation of the top 750mm of the line of the wall through the RPA in conjunction with pre-emptive root pruning.
- 6.1.3 Even if one were to assume a worst-case scenario where the formation of the wall resulting in the severance of all roots beyond it, and this is certainly not certain given the juxtaposition of the wall in relation to the tree, the impact only amounts to 2.2sqm or 0.8% of the total area which would again be assessed as being of very low impact to the tree.
- 6.1.4 All of the retained trees will be protected during construction works (see Tree Protection Plan in Appendix 8).
- 6.1.5 The replanting scheme will offer considerable enhancement and replaces trees of low quality and those unsuitable for retention. Replacement trees will have the advantage of being specifically selected for the proposed site, healthy and fit-for-purpose. Naturally regenerated trees and saplings tend to be of pioneer / opportunist species (ash and sycamore) which can cause problems for infrastructure, springing up in unsuitable locations. Design can provide for a diverse range of native and ornamental species that will compliment rather than conflict with the proposals, so providing a more sustainable long-term resource for the future.

- 6.1.6 The principal of RPA encroachment is established within BS5837:2012 and supported by the source document, National Joint Utilities Guidelines 10 / Vol. 4 1995 / 2010. NJUG introduced the x12 diameter *Precautionary Zone* for supervised working and *Prohibited Zone* at a universal 1m from the base of the tree. RPA's are frequently confused with the NJUG Prohibited Zone, when they clearly correlate with the NJUG Precautionary Zone.

- 6.1.7 An RPA encroachment of <20% of RPA may be considered as low impact, given the permissive references to 20% RPA relocation and impermeable paving within BS5837:2012 and other published references to healthy trees tolerating up to 30-50% root severance (Coder, Helliwell and Watson in CEH 2006). The trees in question are healthy specimens of species with a good resistance to development impacts, and quite capable of tolerating these low impacts.
- 6.1.8 "In practice 50% of roots can sometimes be removed with little problem, provided there are vigorous roots elsewhere. Inevitably, this degree of root loss will temporarily slow canopy growth and even lead to some dieback" (Thomas 2000). LT do not recommend annexing such high proportions of the root system; rather that within the context of the published science, planning should not be unduly concerned by impacts that are well below the subcritical threshold – *tree health is not at stake*.

## 6.2 Rating of Secondary impacts

- 6.2.1 There will always be marginal secondary impacts of organic deposition and partial shade on this site, regardless of development. The status quo is unlikely to change with further development.

## 6.3 Mitigation of Impacts

- 6.3.1 All plant and vehicles engaged in excavation works should either operate outside the RPA, or should run on a temporary surface designed to protect the underlying soil structure.
- 6.3.2 The path of the retaining wall foundations through the RPA of T3 will be manually excavated to 750mm depth under arboricultural supervision; any roots encountered within the trenches / pits will be cleanly pruned back to an appropriate junction with a sharp pruning saw or secateurs back to a junction. Roots larger than 25mm diameter may only be cut in consultation with an arboriculturalist.

- 6.3.3 Nuisance deposition can be further mitigated with routine maintenance, light pruning / deadwooding and the fitting of filtration traps on guttering (see Figure 5 below).
- 6.3.5 The landscape impact of tree losses can be offset by the landscape proposals, ideally involving new planting of ornamental varieties of native species, and where appropriate with columnar or compact form. A selection of columnar tree species cultivars for urban sites is provided in Appendix 3.




Figure 5: Filtration traps, as shown above, could be fitted on the gutters which can easily be maintained at 2-3m above ground.



## 7.0 CONCLUSION

- 7.1 The potential impacts of development are all relatively low in terms of both quality of trees removed and also RPA encroachments of trees retained.
- 7.2 The full potential of the impacts can be mitigated through design and precautionary measures. These measures are provided in the Outline Method Statement in Section 9.0 of this report, to assist the discharge of planning conditions.
- 7.3 The species affected are generally tolerant of root disturbance / crown reduction and the retained trees are generally in good health and capable of sustaining these reduced impacts.
- 7.4 The trees that are recommended for felling are of little individual significance, such that their loss will not affect the visual character of the area.
- 7.5 Therefore, the proposals will not have any significant impact on either the retained trees or wider landscape and therefore comply with Policy 7.2.1 of the London Plan 2015 and Policies A3, A5, D1 and D3 of the Camden Local Plan (adopted 3rd July 2017). Thus, with suitable mitigation and supervision the scheme is recommended to planning.

## 8.0 RECOMMENDATIONS

### 8.1 Specific Recommendations

- 8.1.1 Current tree works recommendations to facilitate development are provided within Appendix 2 and a selection of tree species cultivars suitable for urban sites provided in Appendix 3. Any tree removals recommended within this report should only be carried out with local authority consent.
- 8.1.2 Excavation and construction impacts within the RPA's of trees identified in Table 1 above, will need to be controlled by the outline method statement below.
- 8.1.3 Replace felled trees with native ornamental nursery stock to be agreed with the Tree Officers and planted under current best practice; i.e. conforming to and planted in accordance with the following:

- BS8545: 2014 Code of Practice for Trees from Nursery to Landscape
- BS 3936:1980 Nursery Stock;
- BS 4043:1966 Transplanting Semi-Mature Trees; and
- BS 5236:1975 Cultivation and Planting of Trees in the Advanced Nursery Stock Category.
- All replacement stock should be planted and maintained as detailed in BS 4428:1989 (Section 7): Recommendations for General Landscape Operations.

## 9.0 METHOD STATEMENT

### 9.1 Outline Method Statement (to be read in conjunction with Appendix 8: Tree Protection Plan)

- 9.1.1 This outline method statement has been prepared for assistance with the discharge of planning conditions at 80 Greencroft Gardens, London NW6 3JQ. The statement will address the precautions that will be undertaken to protect the trees on and around this site during the proposed construction works.
- 9.1.2 This section of the report lays down the methodology for any proposed works that may have an effect upon the retained trees. It is essential within the scope of any contracts related to the development proposals that this method statement is observed and adhered to. It is recommended that this section form part of the work schedule and specification issued to the building contractors and can be used to form part of the contract.
- 9.1.3 Copies of this method statement and the Tree Protection Plan (see Appendix 9) will be available for inspection on site. The developer will inform the local planning authority within twenty-four hours if the arboricultural consultant is replaced.

### 9.2 Sequence of Works

- 9.2.1 The sequence of works should be as follows:
- i) initial tree works: felling and stump grinding for working clearances;
  - ii) installation of TPB and ground protection;
  - iii) installation of underground services;
  - iv) main construction;
  - v) removal of TPB and ground protection;
  - vi) soft landscaping;
- 9.2.2 On this site, a site manager will be nominated to be responsible for all arboricultural matters on site. A pre-commencement site briefing/meeting between the site manager and arboricultural consultant will be held (see Table 1 below). The site manager's details will be issued to LB Camden in the minutes / site monitoring report for this meeting. During this meeting all the tree protection methods below will be studied and familiarization with requirements of this AMS. The site manager will also:
- be present on site for the majority of the time;
  - have the authority to stop any work that is causing, or has the potential to cause harm to any tree;
  - be responsible for ensuring that all site operatives are aware of their responsibilities toward trees on site and the consequences of the failure to observe these responsibilities;

- make immediate contact with the Arboricultural consultant in the event of any tree related problems occurring, whether actual or potential, in accordance with a tree protection protocol (see below).

9.2.3 At this stage, the nominated Key Personnel are as follows:

Adam Hollis Tel: 0207 851 4544

Arboricultural Consultant

Landmark Trees

info@landmarktrees.co.uk

TBC

Site Manager

### 9.3 Site Monitoring

9.3.1 Landmark Trees are to be retained as Arboricultural Consultants responsible for site monitoring for the duration of the development. As noted above Adam Hollis MSc (Arb) is the key contact, with monitoring occasionally undertaken by James Bell Tech Cert. (subject to any new staff intake). Site monitoring will be undertaken by a qualified and experienced arboriculturalist at pre-determined and agreed time intervals as indicated in Table 1 below. In addition to specific task monitoring, it is recommended that general tree protection monitoring be undertaken periodically based intensity of site operations, coordinated where practical with the visits detailed in Table 1.

9.3.2 Routine visits will generally be unannounced. However, the arboriculturalist will also visit subject to advance notification (2 weeks) and agreement to supervise any agreed works within the RPA, in accordance with table 1 below.

9.3.3 A tree protection protocol for contingencies will be integrated into the site induction process at a pre-commencement meeting involving the developer, the arboricultural consultant, the site manager and the Council tree officer as appropriate. The protocol will be that, in the event of any unplanned incursion / accident / spillage within the RPA, the site agent should notify (by telephone) the retained arboricultural consultant immediately. The consultant will provide advice and attend site as soon as possible. This may require the stoppage of all or part of the works in the vicinity of the tree. The consultant will notify the LPA Tree Officer of the nature and extent of damage, the mitigation strategy and likely prognosis.



Table 1: Site Monitoring Visits

Supervision Visit No:	Details	Lead in time required by LT	Action
Visit 1: Pre-Development Site Inspection (S.9.3 of AMS)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>To included construction Site Agent briefing (S.9.2).</li> <li>To confirm position of protective fencing and that it has been erected in accordance with AMS (S.9.4 and Tree Protection Plan in Appendix 5);</li> <li>To check any pre-demolition/construction ground protection is in place.</li> <li>To check any tree works have been undertaken in accordance with this AMS (S.9.4. and Appendix 1).</li> <li>Determine if further tree work is required and seek required permission if necessary.</li> <li>To check site facilities/access are in accordance with the AMS (S.3.3).</li> </ul>	Minimum of 2 weeks	Issue a brief report with findings to Architect and Main Contractor within 5 days of site supervision visit (Site Monitoring Sheet in Appendix 3).
Visit 2: Installation of any new services within RPA (S9.6)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Attend any excavation within RPA's where arboricultural supervision is prescribed by the AMS to ensure work is undertaken in accordance with NJUG provisions or other specification.</li> <li>Date to be confirmed following formal project planning.</li> <li>2 weeks prior notice required.</li> </ul>	Minimum of 2 weeks	Issue a brief report with findings to Architect and Main Contractor within 5 days of site supervision visit (Site Monitoring Sheet in Appendix 3).
Visit 3: Excavation of wall footings within RPA of T3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Attend any excavation within RPAs where arboricultural supervision is prescribed by the AMS and any other unplanned incursions into the protection areas (subject to Local Authority agreement as noted above).</li> <li>2 weeks prior notice required.</li> </ul>	Minimum of 2 weeks	Issue a brief report with findings to Architect and Main Contractor within 5 days of site supervision visit (Site Monitoring Sheet in Appendix 3).
Ongoing Monitoring Visits	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Periodically during 12 months (or longer) of entire project.</li> <li>Visits will be based intensity of site operations; once a month is considered reasonable.</li> <li>To be carried out before, between and after detailed visits 2 and 3 above.</li> <li>Attend site to confirm protective measures are still in place. Ensure attendance is timed for any other key elements of proposed (and any other unplanned) incursions into the protection areas.</li> </ul>	TBC as project develops	Issue a brief report with findings to Architect and Main Contractor within 5 days of site supervision visit (Site Monitoring Sheet in Appendix 3).
Final Site Visit - Completion of construction phase supervision visit (S.9.10)	After it has been confirmed that the construction phase is complete, allow removal of temporary ground protection and protective fencing. Specify any remedial work if necessary.	Minimum of 2 weeks	Issue a brief report with findings to Architect and Main Contractor within 5 days of site supervision visit. (Site Monitoring Sheet in Appendix 3). Provide signed arboricultural checklist (see Appendix 3)

#### 9.4 Pre- Development Site Preparation

- 9.4.1 Specific works recommended to facilitate development are the removal of trees T1, T2, T12, T13, T14 and T15. These specific works to facilitate development are listed in Appendix 2.
- 9.4.2 The retained trees should be protected with the Tree Protection Barriers (TPB) as shown on the Tree Protection Plan (TPP) in Appendix 9. The TPBs should comprise steel, mesh panels 2.4m in height ('Heras') mounted on a scaffolding frame (this is also Figure 2 of BS5837: Trees in Relation to Design, Demolition and Construction in paragraph 6.2.2.2 – see below). The position of the TPBs are shown on the TPP in Appendix 8, which can be used as part of the discharge of conditions.
- 9.4.3 These TPBs are to be erected before any work commences on site, is to remain 'in situ' undamaged for the duration of all work or each phase, and only to be removed once all work is completed. If any work is deemed necessary prior to the erection of fencing a Landmark Trees representative should be informed to enable their presence to oversee the work being carried out. The TPBs should carry waterproof warning notices denying access within the RPA.
- 9.4.4 The only other exception is the completion of soft landscaping but if any excavations, however minor, are to be carried out as part of soft landscaping within RPAs, an arboricultural assessment must be carried out beforehand and any arboricultural protection measures incorporated.
- 9.4.5 The Tree Protection Plan in Appendix 9 illustrates where the protective fencing will be located to form the boundary of the Construction Exclusion Zone (CEZ). The CEZ is an exclusion zone and suitable steps will be taken to prevent access by pedestrians and vehicles and the storage of any works materials and equipment will be located outside of the CEZ.
- 9.4.6 Extant areas of RPA that cannot be fenced off and therefore lie outside the CEZ must be protected with fit-for-purpose ground protection. The location and type of ground protection is shown in the Tree Protection Plan at Appendix 8.
- 9.4.7 Upon completion of the tree works and installation of the protection measures, the standard of work can be checked by the retained arboricultural consultant who can then liaise with the local authority. If there are any amendments to either the tree works or additional protection measures, they will be agreed at this meeting and confirmed in writing.




Fig. 1 Tree Protection Barrier Specification  
 (Source: Figure 2 from BS5837 - Default specification for protective barrier)



## 9.5 Development Phase

- 9.5.1 The following general precautions will apply:
- No fires shall be made on any part of the site, or within 20m of any tree to be retained.
  - No spilling or pouring of fuels, oils, solvents, tar shall be made on any part of the site.
  - No materials that are likely to have an adverse effect on tree health such as oil, bitumen or cement will be stored or discharged within 10 metres of the trunk of a tree that is to be retained.
  - No spillage or discharge of wet mortar or concrete shall be made on any part of the site.
  - No storage of materials shall be made within the protective fences.
  - No breaching or moving of the protective fences without the approval of an arboriculturist.
  - Alterations in levels within the tree protection fence areas shall be avoided.
- 9.5.2 The procedures for dealing with variations and incidents are detailed in S.9.2 and S.9.3.
- 9.5.3 Site access will be as existing and accommodation will make use of the existing hardstandings to the front of the property as necessary.
- 9.5.4 The existing pedestrian access will be retained.
- 9.5.5 Delivery lorries will be excluded from RPAs by the nature of the site. Adequate allowance will be made for vehicle heights and ground clearance, where the tree canopy overhangs the access route. Any further pruning for working clearances must be discussed first with the arboriculturalist; once agreed in principle these works should be approved by the appropriate tree officer and approved in writing by the LPA. Materials can be unloaded onto protected ground within RPA's and stored throughout the interior of the site away from protected trees
- 9.5.6 Numerous site activities are potentially damaging to trees e.g. parking, material storage, the use of plant machinery and all other sources of soil compaction. In operating plant, particular care is required to ensure that the operational arcs of excavation and lifting machinery, including their loads, do not physically damage trees when in use.

## 9.6 Routing & Installation of Services

- 9.6.1 Every effort should be made to ensure that the routing and installation of services avoid the RPA at the design stage; however if unavoidable then it may be possible with written permission from the LPA to implement the provisions of BS5837 and NJUG VOLUME 4 (e.g. radial trenching and /or mole trenching) under arboricultural supervision.

## 9.7 Changes in Grade

9.7.1 No changes in level are proposed beyond the basement excavation itself. The landscape plans show stepped access from the lower terrace (within the basement footprint) up to the lawn, but the latter remains at existing levels.

## 9.8 Construction Measures

*Detailed method statements and risk assessments will be obtained from all specialist subcontractors involved in the new build and these will be scrutinised by the site agent to ensure the AMS requirements have been considered therein.*

9.8.1 The piling rigs should operate from inside the piling line where possible, to reduce the potential for canopy encroachment. The excavation of the basement should proceed inwards in a “pull back” fashion.

9.8.2 The path of the garden / retaining wall within the RPA of T3 will be manually pre-excavated to a min. 750mm depth and root-pruned (as applicable) under arboricultural supervision. In the unlikely event of discovering roots >25mm diameter, they should only be cut under arboricultural supervision.

9.8.3 During the construction phase and throughout dry periods on site regular hosing down will be carried out to control dust pollution. In the event of dust build up on trees occurring arboricultural advice will be sought and if necessary remedial measures such as hosing down the trees will be taken.

## 9.9 Removal of Ground Protection & Post Construction Landscaping & Treatment

9.9.1 The tree protection may be removed upon completion of the construction phase and any site machinery has been removed from the RPA.

9.9.2 All landscaping and associated ground works within RPA will be carried out manually and carefully with due regard for soil and root protection, avoiding changes of ground levels or deep digging. Mechanised cultivation must not be used within any RPA's.

## 9.10 Completion

9.10.1 Following completion of the works listed above, a Landmark Trees consultant will conduct a walkover survey of the trees to review any defects or signs of ill-health, and inform the local authority in a final report as per Table 1. It is the client's duty to notify LT that the project has been completed, in order to facilitate such an inspection. A separate LT post-development tree inspection (with specific reference to trees identified in the Appendix 1 schedules) is recommended to facilitate a constructive meeting.

## 10.0 REFERENCES

- Barlow JF & Harrison G. 1999. Shade By Trees, Arboricultural Practice Note 5, AAIS, Farnham, Surrey.
- British Standards Institute. 2012. Trees in Relation to Design, Demolition and Construction - Recommendations BS 5837: 2012 HMSO, London.
- Centre for Ecology & Hydrology. 2006. Tree Roots in the Built Environment, HMSO, London.
- Helliwell R (1980) Provision for New Trees; Landscape Design; July/August issue
- International Society of Arboriculture (ISA). 1994. The Landscape Below Ground. ISA, Champaign, Illinois. USA.
- Lonsdale D 1999. Research for Amenity Trees No.7: Principles of Tree Hazard Assessment and Management, HMSO, London.
- Matheny, N; Clark, J. R.1998. Trees and Development: A Technical Guide to Preservation of Trees during Land Development. ISA, Champaign, Illinois. USA.
- Mattheck C. & Breloer H. 1994. Research for Amenity Trees No.2: The Body Language of Trees, HMSO, London.
- Thomas P, 2000 & 2014. Trees: Their Natural History, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Trowbridge J & Bassuk N (2004) Trees in the Urban Landscape: Site Assessment, Design, and Installation; J Wiley & Sons inc. NJ USA

## APPENDIX 1

TREE SCHEDULENotes for Guidance:

1. Height describes the approximate height of the tree measured in metres from ground level.
2. The Crown Spread refers to the crown radius in meters from the stem centre and is expressed as an average of NSEW aspect if symmetrical.
3. Ground Clearance is the height in metres of crown clearance above adjacent ground level.
4. Stem Diameter (Dm) is the diameter of the stem measured in millimetres at 1.5m from ground level for single stemmed trees. BS 5837:2012 formula (Section 4.6) used to calculate diameter of multi-stemmed trees. Stem Diameter may be estimated where access is restricted and denoted by '#'.
5. Protection Multiplier is 12 and is the number used to calculate the tree's protection radius and area
6. Protection Radius is a radial distance measured from the trunk centre.
7. Growth Vitality - Normal growth, Moderate (below normal), Poor (sparse/weak), Dead (dead or dying tree).
8. Structural Condition - Good (no or only minor defects), Fair (remediable defects), Poor - Major defects present.
9. Landscape Contribution - High (prominent landscape feature), Medium (visible in landscape), Low (secluded/among other trees).
10. B.S. Cat refers to (British Standard 5837:2012 section 4.5) and refers to tree/group quality and value; 'A' – High, 'B' - Moderate, 'C' - Low, 'U' - Unsuitable for retention. The following colouring has been used on the site plans:
  - High Quality (A) (Green),
  - Moderate Quality (B) (Blue),
  - Low Quality (C) (Grey),
  - Unsuitable for Retention (U) (Red)
11. Sub Cat refers to the retention criteria values where 1 is Arboricultural, 2 is Landscape and 3 is Cultural including Conservational, Historic and Commemorative.
12. Useful Life is the tree's estimated remaining contribution in years.



Site: 80 Greencroft Gardens

Date: 14/9/17

## Appendix 1

Landmark Trees Ltd

020 7851 4544

Surveyor(s): Kim Dear

Ref: QPM/80GRC/AIM

### BS5837 Tree Constraints Survey Schedule

Tree No.	English Name	Height	Crown Spread	Ground Clearance	Stem Diamete	Age Class	Protection Radius	Growth Vitality	Structural Condition	B.S. Cat	Sub Cat	Useful Life	Comments
1	Cypress, Lawson variety	8	1.5,1.5, 11	0.5	215	Mature	2.6	Normal	Fair	C		20+	
2	Elder	5	2222	1.0	190	Mature	2.3	Normal	Fair	C		10+	
3	Chestnut, Horse	20	7565	4.5	800	Mature	9.6	Normal	Good	B		>40	Remote survey only (RS) in neighbouring garden
4	Elder	6	3210	1.0	200	Mature	2.4	Moderate	Poor	U		<10	Leaning (slightly) Trunk wounds
5	Ash, Common	18	4663	4.0	450	Mature	5.4	Normal	Fair	B		>40	Co-dominant stems Deadwood (minor) throughout crown
6	Whitebeam	4	1241	1.5	210	Early Mature	2.5	Moderate	Fair	C		10+	Leaning (slightly) Suppressed by nearby tree



Site: 80 Greencroft Gardens

Date: 14/9/17

Landmark Trees

## Appendix 1

### BS5837 Tree Constraints Survey Schedule

Landmark Trees Ltd

020 7851 4544

Surveyor(s): Kim Dear

Ref: QPM/80GRC/AIM

Tree No.	English Name	Height	Crown Spread	Ground Clearance	Stem Diamete	Age Class	Protection Radius	Growth Vitality	Structural Condition	B.S. Cat	Sub Cat	Useful Life	Comments
7	Lime, Common	16	3423	1.0	310	Semi-mature	3.7	Moderate	Fair	C		20+	Remote survey only (RS)
8	Lime, Common	9	1323	1.5	310	Semi-mature	3.7	Poor	Poor	U		10+	Decay in trunk Lost lead stem in neighbouring garden.rs.
9	Lime, Common	15	3231	1.0	320	Semi-mature	3.8	Moderate	Fair	C		20+	Remote survey only (RS)
10	Rowan, variety	3	0241	2.0	200	Mature	2.4	Poor	Poor	U		<10	Decay at trunk base Leaning (slightly)
11	Cypress, Lawson variety	4	1101	0.5	90	Young	1.1	Moderate	Poor	U		<10	Suppressed by nearby tree
12	Laurel, Portugese	5	1232	0.0	300	Mature	3.6	Moderate	Fair	C		10+	Asymmetry (major)



Site: 80 Greencroft Gardens

Date: 14/9/17

## Appendix 1

Landmark Trees Ltd

020 7851 4544

Surveyor(s): Kim Dear

Ref: QPM/80GRC/AIM

### BS5837 Tree Constraints Survey Schedule

Tree No.	English Name	Height	Crown Spread	Ground Clearance	Stem Diamete	Age Class	Protection Radius	Growth Vitality	Structural Condition	B.S. Cat	Sub Cat	Useful Life	Comments
13	Cypress, Lawson variety	4	1111	1.0	60	Semi-mature	0.7	Moderate	Fair	U		<10	Suppressed by nearby tree
14	Cypress, Lawson variety	2	1221	0.0	90	Semi-mature	1.1	Moderate	Fair	C		<10	Chlorotic foliage (yellowed) Suppressed by nearby tree
15	Elder	4	1111	1.5	905	Mature	10.9	Poor	Poor	U		<10	Decay at trunk base Multi stem weakness

## Appendix 2

### RECOMMENDED TREE WORKS TO FACILITATE DEVELOPMENT (See Table 1)

#### Notes for Guidance:

RP	- Pre-emptive root pruning of foundation encroachments under arboricultural supervision.
CB	- Cut Back to boundary/clear from structure.
CL#	- Crown Lift to given height in meters.
CT#%	- Crown Thinning by identified %.
CCL	- Crown Clean (remove deadwood/crossing and hazardous branches and stubs).*
CR#%	- Crown Reduce by given maximum % (of outermost branch & twig length)
DWD	- Remove deadwood.
Fell	- Fell to ground level.
FInv	- Further Investigation (generally with decay detection equipment).
Pol	- Pollard or re-pollard.
Mon	- Check / monitor progress of defect(s) at next consultant inspection which should be <18 months in frequented areas and <3 years in areas of more occasional use. Where clients retain their own ground staff, we recommend an annual in- house inspection and where practical, in the aftermath of extreme weather events.
Svr Ivy / Clr Bs	- Sever ivy / clear base and re-inspect base / stem for concealed defects.

\*Not generally specified following BS3998:2010





Site: 80 Greencroft Gardens

Date: 14/9/17

Surveyor(s): Kim Dear

Ref: QPM/80GRC/AIM

## Appendix 2

### Recommended Tree Works To Facilitate Development

Hide irrelevant

Show All Trees

Landmark Trees

Tree No.	English Name	B.S. Cat	Height	Ground Clearance	Crown Spread	Recommended Works	Comments/ Reasons
1	Cypress, Lawson variety	C	8	0.5	1.5,1.5,11	Fell	To facilitate development
2	Elder	C	5	1.0	2222	Fell	To facilitate development
12	Laurel, Portugese	C	5	0.0	1232	Fell	Asymmetry (major) To facilitate development
13	Cypress, Lawson variety	U	4	1.0	1111	Fell	Suppressed by nearby tree To facilitate development
14	Cypress, Lawson variety	C	2	0.0	1221	Fell	Chlorotic foliage (yellowed) Suppressed by nearby tree To facilitate development
15	Elder	U	4	1.5	1111	Fell	Decay at trunk base Multi stem weakness To facilitate development

### APPENDIX 3: TREE SELECTION FOR CONSTRICTED LOCATIONS

Table A4.1: Rosaceous Tree Species for Constricted Planting Locations


Common Name	Species	Selected Form
Hawthorn	<i>Crataegus monogyna</i>	Stricta
Cockspur	<i>Crataegus prunifolia</i>	Splendens
Cherry	<i>Prunus x hillieri</i>	Spire
Bird cherry	<i>Prunus padus</i>	Albertii
Rowan / Mountain ash	<i>Sorbus aucuparia</i>	Cardinal Royal
Rowan / Mountain ash	<i>Sorbus aucuparia</i>	Rossica Major
Rowan / Mountain ash	<i>Sorbus aucuparia</i>	Sheerwater Seedling
Swedish whitebeam	<i>Sorbus intermedia</i>	Brouwers
B. whitebeam	<i>Sorbus x thuringiaca</i>	Fastigiata

Table A4.2: Specimen Tree Species for Constricted Planting Locations

Common Name	Species	Selected Form
Chinese red bark birch	<i>Betula albosinensis</i>	Fascination
Swedish birch	<i>Betula pendula</i>	Dalecarlica
Hornbeam	<i>Carpinus betulus</i>	Fastigiata Frans Fontaine
Turkish Hazel	<i>Corylus colurna</i>	
Maidenhair tree	<i>Ginkgo biloba</i>	
Pride of India	<i>Koelreuteria paniculata</i>	Fastigiata
European larch	<i>Larix decidua</i>	Sheerwater Seedling
Tulip tree	<i>Liriodendron tulipifera</i>	Fastigiata

#### Appendix 4 General Guidelines & Sample Site Monitoring Sheet with Checklist

- 5.1 All work must be to BS 3998:2010 - '*Recommendations for tree work*'.
- 5.2 Staff carrying out the work must be qualified, experienced and ideally be Arboricultural Association approved contractors, and will be covered by adequate public liability insurance.
- 5.3 Any defects seen by a contractor or the client that were not apparent to the consultant must be brought to the consultant's attention immediately.
- 5.4 No liability can be accepted by the consultant in respect of the trees unless the recommendations of this method statement are carried out under the supervision of a Landmark Trees consultant.
- 5.5 It is advisable to have trees inspected by a consultant regularly. On this site it is recommended that these inspections are made every year.



Landmark Trees

## Site Monitoring Report Sheet

<b>Client:</b>		<b>Planning Ref:</b>	
<b>Local Authority:</b>		<b>Date:</b>	
Site Address:			
Proposal:			
<b>Visit Checklist</b>	<b>Y/N</b>		<b>Y/N</b>
Tree protection barrier (TPB) in place		TPB as per approved	
Ground protection (GP) in place		GP as per approved	
TPB / GP breached		Trees damaged	
Site Agent briefed by LT			
LT briefed by Site Agent			
LPA informed			
Remedial action required			
<b>Comments</b>			
<b>Recommendations</b>			
<b>Outcome</b>			
1			
2			
3			
4			

**Web:** [www.landmarktrees.co.uk](http://www.landmarktrees.co.uk)  
**e-mail:** [info@landmarktrees.co.uk](mailto:info@landmarktrees.co.uk)

**Tel:** 0207 851 4544



**London Office:** 20 Broadwick Street, W1F 8HT, London

**Registered Office:** Grange Cottage, All Cannings, Devizes, Wiltshire, SN10 3NR

Landmark Trees is the trading name of Landmark trees Ltd. Registered in Wales. Reg No. 3882076




### Arboricultural Supervision Sign off Checklist

Tree No (s)	Project Phase	Task	Date Completed	Signed (Project arboriculturist)	Signed (Site Manager)
	Pre-commencement	Pre-commencement site meeting to include site manager briefing (S.1.5)			
	Pre-commencement	Confirm the location and specification of the protective measures is in accordance with AMS & Tree Protection Plan (TPP)			
	Pre-commencement	Confirm any tree works have been undertaken in accordance with this AMS (S.2.1/ App 1) and determine if further tree work is required			
	Pre-commencement	Seek required permission for further tree works if necessary.			
	Installation of any new services	Attend any excavation within RPA's where arboricultural supervision is prescribed by the AMS (S3.4) to ensure work is undertaken in accordance with NJUG provisions or other specification.			
	Demolition	Demolition of hard surfaces/ structures within RPA (S3.6) Confirm position of any additional temporary ground protection and that temporary ground protection is in accordance with AMS.			
	Completion of Demolition	Sign off of the demolition phase			
	Construction	Supervised manual excavation of foundations			
	Construction	Installation of 'No Dig' hard surfacing			
	Construction	Additional excavations (if required)			
	Completion of Construction	Completion of construction			
	Post Construction	Removal of machinery and materials from site			
	Post Construction	Dismantle & removal of protective measures			
	Landscaping	Completion of Landscaping			
	Project Completion	Sign off from project arboriculturist			

APPENDIX 5

TREE CONSTRAINTS PLAN



**NOTE:**  
 This survey is of a preliminary nature. The trees were inspected from the ground only on the basis of the Visual Tree Assessment method. No samples were taken for analysis. No decay detection equipment was employed. The survey does not cover the arrangements that may be required in connection with the laying or removal of underground services.  
 Branch spread in metres is taken at the four cardinal points to derive an accurate representation of the crown.  
 Root Protection Areas (RPA) are derived from stem diameter measured at 1.5 m above adjacent ground level (taken on sloping ground on the upslope side of the tree base).

**Landmark Trees**  
 20 Broadwick Street, London, W1F 8HT  
 Tel: 0207 851 4544 Mobile: 07812 989528  
 e-mail: info@landmarktrees.co.uk Web: www.landmarktrees.co.uk

Site: 80 Greencroft Gardens  
 Drawing Title: Tree Constraints Plan  
 1:100@ A1  
 October 2017

**Key:**


- Category A High Quality
- Category B Moderate Quality
- Category C Low Quality
- Category U Trees Unsuitable for Retention

**Category**

- Crown Spread
- Tree Number
- Species
- Category

**Root Protection Area**


Note: All The Tree Positions Are Approximate (not shown on original survey)



APPENDIX 6

ARBORICULTURAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT PLAN





Proposed Basement Plan

**NOTE:**  
 This survey is of a preliminary nature. The trees were inspected from the ground only on the basis of the Visual Tree Assessment method. No samples were taken for analysis. No decay detection equipment was employed. The survey does not cover the arrangements that may be required in connection with the laying or removal of underground services.  
 Branch spread in metres is taken at the four cardinal points to derive an accurate representation of the crown.  
 Root Protection Areas (RPA) are derived from stem diameter measured at 1.5 m above adjacent ground level (taken on sloping ground on the upslope side of the tree base).

**Landmark Trees**  
 20 Broadwick Street, London, W1F 8HT  
 Tel: 0207 851 4544 Mobile: 07812 989528  
 e-mail: info@landmarktrees.co.uk Web: www.landmarktrees.co.uk


Site: 80 Greencroft Gardens 1:100@A1  
 Drawing Title: Arboricultural Impacts Assessment Plan October 2017

**Key:**


- Category A High Quality (Green circle)
- Category B Moderate Quality (Blue circle)
- Category C Low Quality (Grey circle)
- Category U Trees Unsuitable for Retention (Red circle)

**Diagram:** A tree diagram showing Crown Spread (outer green circle), Tree Number (13), Species (Lime), Root Protection Area (inner red circle), and Category (B).

Note: All The Tree Positions Are Approximate (not shown on original survey)







Proposed Ground Floor Plan

**NOTE:**  
 This survey is of a preliminary nature. The trees were inspected from the ground only on the basis of the Visual Tree Assessment method. No samples were taken for analysis. No decay detection equipment was employed. The survey does not cover the arrangements that may be required in connection with the laying or removal of underground services.  
 Branch spread in metres is taken at the four cardinal points to derive an accurate representation of the crown.  
 Root Protection Areas (RPA) are derived from stem diameter measured at 1.5 m above adjacent ground level (taken on sloping ground on the upslope side of the tree base).

**Landmark Trees**  
 20 Broadwick Street, London, W1F 8HT  
 Tel: 0207 851 4544 Mobile: 07812 989528  
 e-mail: info@landmarktrees.co.uk Web: www.landmarktrees.co.uk

Site: 80 Greencroft Gardens 1:100@A1  
 Drawing Title: Arboricultural Impacts Assessment Plan October 2017


**Key:**

- Category A High Quality
- Category B Moderate Quality
- Category C Low Quality
- Category U Trees Unsuitable for Retention

Category — Crown Spread  
 Tree Number  
 Species  
 Category

Root Protection Area


Note: All The Tree Positions Are Approximate (not shown on original survey)



APPENDIX 7

TREE PROTECTION PLAN





Proposed Basement Plan


**NOTE:**  
 This survey is of a preliminary nature. The trees were inspected from the ground only on the basis of the Visual Tree Assessment method. No samples were taken for analysis. No decay detection equipment was employed. The survey does not cover the arrangements that may be required in connection with the laying or removal of underground services.  
 Branch spread in metres is taken at the four cardinal points to derive an accurate representation of the crown.  
 Root Protection Areas (RPA) are derived from stem diameter measured at 1.5 m above adjacent ground level (taken on sloping ground on the upslope side of the tree base).

**Landmark Trees**  
 20 Broadwick Street, London, W1F 8HT  
 Tel: 0207 851 4544 Mobile: 07812 989928  
 e-mail: info@landmarktrees.co.uk Web: www.landmarktrees.co.uk

Site: 80 Greencroft Gardens 1:100@A1  
 Drawing Title: Tree Protection Plan October 2017

**Key:**

- Category A High Quality (Green circle)
- Category B Moderate Quality (Blue circle)
- Category C Low Quality (Grey circle)
- Category U Trees Unsuitable for Retention (Red circle)
- Crown Spread (Green dashed line)
- Tree Number (Number in circle)
- Species (Text label)
- Category (Text label)
- Root Protection Area (Red dashed line)
- Ground Protection: 100mm woodchip topped with ply boards (Blue hatched area)
- Tree Protection Fencing (Pink line)



Note: All The Tree Positions Are Approximate (not shown on original survey)