Landmark Trees

ARBORICULTURAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT REPORT FOR:

9 Grange Gardens

London

NW3 7XG

INSTRUCTING PARTY:

Matthew Allchurch Architects Ltd

The Boathouse

27 Ferry Road

Teddington T

W11 9NN

REPORT PREPARED BY

Adam Hollis

MSc ARB MICFor FArbor A MRICS C Env

Ref: MAA/9GG/AIA/01

Date: 9th February 2018

PART 1: MAIN TEXT

PART 2 - APPENDICES

PART 3 - PLANS

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.

1.0 SUMMARY

Client / Agent:	Matthew Allchurch Architects Ltd	**Case Ref:**	MAA/9GG/AIA/01
Local Authority:	LB Camden	**Date:**	09/02/2018
Site Address: 9 Grange Gardens, London NW3 7XG			
Proposal: Extensions to detached property			

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	N
Tree Preservation Orders	N/k		
Tree Protection Plan:	N/a	(Include in future method statement)	
Tree Constraints Plan:	Y		
Arboricultural Impact Assessment:	Y		

Site Layout				
Site Visit	Y	Date: 01/02/2018	Access Full/Partial/None	F/P
Trees on Site	Y		Off-site Trees	Y
Trees affected by development	Y		O/s trees affected by development	N
Tree replacement proposed:	Y		On or off-site trees indirectly affected by development	N

Trees with the potential to be affected

Felling of category C T2 assessed as being of low impact – replacement planting proposed as mitigation.

Rear extension encroaches within theoretical RPAs of off-site T1 and T6 but not within modified areas so assessed as being of no impact to these trees – trial pits proposed to confirm this assessment.

Comments

Recommended works for G5 trees regardless of development, but also pertinent to maintaining a safe work site.

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	TBC
6	The Proposal will result in significant root damage to retained trees	TBC
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'

2. INTRODUCTION

2.1 Terms of Reference

2.1.1 LANDMARK TREES were asked by Matthew Allchurch Architects Ltd to provide a survey and an arboricultural impact assessment of proposals for the site: 9 Grange Gardens, London NW3 7XG. The report is to accompany a planning application.

2.1.2 The proposals are for two ground floor extensions to the detached dwelling. This report will assess the impact on the trees and their constraints, identified in our survey. Although the proposals were known at the time of the survey, Landmark Trees endeavour to survey each site blind, working from a topographical survey, wherever possible, with the constraints plan informing their evolution.

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 25 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 and 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: Location Plan PDF*

Proposals: Location Plan PDF

*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, I surveyed the trees on site on 1st February 2018, 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. General husbandry recommendations are distinguished at Appendix 2 from the minimum requirements to facilitate development / form part of the planning application at Appendix 3. The former may still be relevant to providing a safe site of work, of course. Similarly, if for whatever reason the development does not go ahead, our recommendations in Appendix 2 would still apply.

2.4.2 A site plan identifying the surveyed trees, based on the Instructing Party's drawings / topographical survey is provided in Part 3 of this report.

2.4.3 This plan 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. This plan also contains the Instructing Party's proposals and doubles as an Arboricultural Impact Assessment Plan. General observations and discussion follow, below.

3.0 OBSERVATIONS

3.1 Site Description

Photograph 1: 9 Grange Gardens, London NW3 7XG (Source: Google Maps)

3.1.1	The application site is located at the end of Grange Gardens Close, London, NW3 7XG and occupies a secluded plot, neighbouring other residential properties also designed by late Ted Levy circa 1970 and measuring approximately 0.06Ha. The site is located on the south edge of the Redington Frognal Conservation Area, but does not form part of it.
3.1.2	The site itself is relatively level but there are significant level changes to the properties around it.
3.1.3	In terms of the British Geological Survey, the site overlies the Bagshot Sand Formation.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	Sand and gravel soils are less prone to compaction during development than clay soils, potentially reducing the threat to tree health from construction traffic. The design of foundations near problematic tree species will also need to take into consideration subsidence risk in relation to the clay subsoil and its depth. 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 8 surveyed trees 3 are A category *(High Quality), 1 is B category *(Moderate Quality), 4 are C category *(Low Quality) and none are U category *(Unsuitable for Retention).
3.2.2	The tree species found on site comprise English oak, western red cedar, sycamore, Myrobalan plum and Lawson cypress.
3.2.3	In terms of age demographics there are 2 young trees, 2 early mature specimens and 4 mature trees on or adjacent to the site.

3.2.4	Full details of the surveyed trees can be found in Appendix 1 of this report.
3.2.5	There are recommended works for 1 on-site group (G5). These are listed in Appendix 2.

3.3 Planning Status

3.3.1	We are not aware of the existence of any Tree Preservation Orders and understand the site does not stand within any Conservation Area.
3.3.2	Relevant local planning policies comprise Policy 7.21 of the London Plan 2015 and Policies A3 and D1 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.



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.

4.1.4 In this instance, *a priori* modifications have been made to reflect the likely effects on root distribution the level changes and retaining walls between the site and its neighbours. Trial pits will be provided to confirm this hypothesis.

4.1.5 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.

4.1.6 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."

4.1.7 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, though no such collective impact is proposed.

4.1.8 In this instance, there are only low quality internal site trees and therefore few significant primary constraints upon 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.

5.0

Table 1: Arboricultural Impact Assessment

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

Hide irrelevant | Show All Trees

Ref: MAA/9GG/AIA

B.S. Cat.	Tree No.	Species	Impact	Tree / RPA Affected	Age	Growth Vitality	Species Tolerance	Impact on Tree Rating	Impact on Site Rating	Mitigation
A	1	Oak, English	Building Construction within RPA Note: within conventional RPA only, outside modified	m^2 N/A %	Mature	Normal	Moderate	N/A	N/A	Trial pits / further investigation
C	2	Western Red Cedar	Felled to Facilitate Development	m^2 N/A %	Young	Normal	N/A	N/A	Low	New planting / landscaping
A	6	Oak, English	Building Construction within RPA Note: within conventional RPA only, outside modified	m^2 N/A %	Mature	Normal	Moderate	N/A	N/A	Trial pits / further investigation

6.0 DISCUSSION

6.1 Rating of Primary Impacts

6.1.1 The principal impact in the current proposals is the removal of the category C T2. The loss of the low quality, interior site trees is rated as a low impact subject to the provision of replacement planting as mitigation.

6.1.2 Whilst the extension to the rear of the property encroaches within the theoretical RPAs of T1 and T6, there is no impact to the modified RPA of either tree. Our modifications are based on the significant level changes between these trees and the application site: T1 is circa 3m above the ground level of 9 Grange Gardens and separated by a series of stepped retaining walls whilst T6 is circa 1-1.5m above ground level and divided by two retaining walls. Trial pits will of course be provided to confirm this assessment.

6.1.3 The replanting scheme will offer considerable enhancement and replaces a young, low quality tree. Replacement trees will have the advantage of being specifically selected for the proposed site, healthy and fit-for-purpose. 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.

6.1.4 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.

6.1.5 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.

6.1.6 "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.*

6.1.7	BS5837 recommends (at 5.3.a) that if operations within the RPA are proposed, the project arboriculturist should demonstrate that the tree(s) can remain viable and that the area lost to encroachment can be compensated for elsewhere, contiguous with its RPA. On the basis of Thomas et al, above, it is possible to demonstrate that the tree can remain viable, and on the basis that the tree will be rooting no less freely in the garden / lawn / border /pavement than within the proposed footprint, with the RPA encroachment compensated elsewhere on contiguous land. The guide also recommends (at 5.3.b) the arboriculturist propose a series of mitigation measures (to improve the soil environment that is used by the tree for growth). These are provided at 6.3 below.

6.2 Rating of Secondary Impacts

6.2.1	There will always be marginal secondary impacts of honeydew / litter 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.

6.3 Mitigation of Impacts

6.3.1	Trial pits will be excavated to confirm our working assumption of there being no impact to the off-site high quality oaks T1 and T6.

6.3.2	Nuisance deposition can be further mitigated with routine maintenance, light pruning / deadwooding and the fitting of filtration traps on guttering (see Figure 5 below).
6.3.6	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 constricted sites is provided in Appendix 4.



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 quality of trees removed with no anticipated RPA encroachments of trees retained.
7.2	The full potential of the impacts can be largely mitigated through design and precautionary measures. These measures can be elaborated in Method Statements in 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 thereby complying with Policy 7.21 of the London Plan 2015 and Policies A3 and D1 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 Tree works recommendations in Appendix 2 are not part of the current application, but requirements of general maintenance that will need to be applied for (subject to para. 3.3 of this report and any other relevant constraints in planning or leasehold) by the client separately. Consent for the current planning application does not impart any consent for the Appendix 2 maintenance works. Please note, though, the owner and / or manager of a property have a duty to maintain a safe site of work and to protect occupiers of the surrounding land / members of the public from tree hazards. Works recommended in this report should be enacted in a timely fashion by the relevant party regardless of the progress of the development.

8.1.2 Recommendations for works required to facilitate development are found in Appendix 3 and a selection of columnar tree species cultivars for constricted sites provided in Appendix 4. Any tree removals recommended within this report should only be carried out with local authority consent.

8.1.3 Excavation and construction impacts within the RPA's of trees identified in Table 1 above, will need to be controlled by method statements specifying mitigation methods suggested in para 6.3 above and by consultant supervision as necessary. These method statements can be provided as part of the discharge of conditions.

8.1.4 Replace felled tree T2 with native ornamental nursery stock 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 3936-1: 1992 Nursery stock. Specification for trees and shrubs; 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.

8.2 General Recommendations for Sites Being Developed with Trees

8.2.1	Any trees which are in close proximity to the proposed development should be protected with a Tree Protection Barrier (TPB). Protective barrier fencing should be installed immediately following the completion of the tree works, remaining in situ for the entire duration of the development unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Council. It should be appropriate for the intensity and proximity of the development, usually comprising steel, mesh panels 2.4m in height ('Heras') and should be mounted on a scaffolding frame (shown in Fig 2 of BS5837:2012). The position of the TPB can be shown on plan as part of the discharge of conditions, once the layout is agreed with the planning authority. The TPB should be erected prior to commencement of works, remain in its original form on-site for the duration of works and be removed only upon full completion of works.
8.2.2	A TPB may no longer be required during soft landscaping work but a full arboricultural assessment must be performed prior to the undertaking of any excavations within the RPA of a tree. This will inform a decision about the requirement of protection measures. It is important that all TPBs have permanent, weatherproof notices denying access to the RPA.
8.2.3	The use of heavy plant machinery for building demolition, removal of imported materials and grading of surfaces should take place in one operation. The necessary machinery should be located above the existing grade level and work away from any retained trees. This will ensure that any spoil is removed from the RPAs. It is vital that the original soil level is not lowered as this is likely to cause damage to the shallow root systems.
8.2.4	Any pruning works must be in accordance with British Standard 3998:2010 Tree work [BS3998].
8.2.5	Where sections of hard surfacing are proposed in close proximity to trees, it is recommended that "No-Dig" surfacing be employed in accordance with BS5837:2012 and 'The Principles of Arboricultural Practice: Note 1, Driveways Close to Trees, AAIS 1996 [APN1]'.
8.2.6	If the RPA of a tree is encroached by underground service routes then BS5837:2012 and NJUG VOLUME 4 provisions should be employed. If it is deemed necessary, further arboricultural advice must be sought.
8.2.7	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.

8.2.8 To enable the successful integration of the proposal with the retained trees, the following points will need to be taken into account:

1) Plan of underground services.
2) Schedule of tree protection measures, including the management of harmful substances.
3) Method statements for constructional variations regarding tree proximity (e.g. foundations, surfacing and scaffolding).
4) Site logistics plan to include storage, plant parking/stationing and materials handling.
5) Tree works: felling, required pruning and new planting. All works must be carried out by a competent arborist in accordance with BS3998.
6) Site supervision: the Site Agent must be nominated to be responsible for all arboricultural matters on site. This person must:
   - be present on site for the majority of the time;
   - be aware of the arboricultural responsibilities;
   - have the authority to stop work that is causing, or may cause harm to any tree;
   - ensure all site operatives are aware of their responsibilities to the trees on site and the consequences of a failure to observe these responsibilities;
   - make immediate contact with the local authority and/or a retained arboriculturalist in the event of any tree related problems occurring.

8.2.9 These points can be resolved and approved through consultation with the planning authority via their Arboricultural Officer.

8.2.10 The sequence of works should be as follows:

i) initial tree works: felling, stump grinding and pruning for working clearances;
ii) installation of TPB for demolition & construction;
iii) installation of underground services;
iv) installation of ground protection;
v) main construction;
vi) removal of TPB;
vii) soft landscaping.

9.0 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, Ilinois. 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, Ilinois. 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

Landmark Trees

PART 2 – APPENDICES

APPENDIX 1

TREE SCHEDULE

Botanical Tree Names

Cypress, Lawson	: Chamaecyparis lawsonia	Sycamore	: Acer pseudoplatanus
Oak, English	: Quercus robur	Western Red Cedar	: Thuja plicata
Plum, Myrobalan	: Prunus cerasifera		

Notes 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.

Landmark Trees

Site: 9 Grange Gardens
Date: 01/02/18

Appendix 1

BS5837 Tree Constraints Survey Schedule

Landmark Trees Ltd
020 7851 4544
Surveyor(s): Adam Hollis
Ref: MAA/9GG/AIA

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	Oak, English	18	6989	9.0	1000	Mature	12.0	Normal	Good	A	2	>40	Remote survey only (RS) Deadwood throughout crown 2.75m high party wall
2	Western Red Cedar	6	2122	0.5	120	Young	1.4	Normal	Good	C	1	10+	Unsuitable species for position Zebrina variegated form
3	Sycamore	15	6665	7.0	500	Early Mature	6.0	Normal	Fair	B	2	>40	Remote survey only (RS) Ivy clad 3m regrowth last pruning / redux Down bank with low wall between
G4	Plum, Myrobalan	7	3	2.0	269	Mature	3.2	Normal	Fair	C	2	10+	Remote survey only (RS) Erratic growth habit Down bank as per T3
G5	Western Red Cedar	7	2	1.5	150	Early Mature	1.8	Normal	Good	C	1	10+	Unsuitable species for position Range of dm: 80 - 270mm
6	Oak, English	18	9	9.0	1386	Mature	16.6	Normal	Good	A	2	>40	Remote survey only (RS) Multi stem habit/weakness Two retaining walls to application site

Landmark Trees

Site: 9 Grange Gardens
Date: 01/02/18

Appendix 1

BS5837 Tree Constraints Survey Schedule

Landmark Trees Ltd
020 7851 4544
Surveyor(s): Adam Hollis
Ref: MAA/9GG/AIA

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	Cypress, Lawson	6	2	0.5	120	Young	1.4	Normal	Good	C	1	10+	Remote survey only (RS) A tree with insignificant defects
8	Oak, English	15	7	5.0	700	Mature	8.4	Normal	Good	A	2	>40	Remote survey only (RS) Deadwood throughout crown

APPENDIX 2

RECOMMENDED TREE WORKS

Notes for Guidance:

Husbandry 1 - Urgent (ASAP), 2 - Standard (within 6 months), 3 - Non-urgent (2-3 years)

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

Landmark Trees

Site: 9 Grange Gardens
Date: 01/02/18

Surveyor(s): Adam Hollis
Ref: MAA/9GG/AIA

Appendix 2

Recommended Tree Works

Hide irrelevant
Show All Trees

Tree No.	English Name	B.S. Cat	Height	Ground Clearance	Crown Spread	Recommended Works	Comments/ Reasons
G5	Western Red Cedar	C	7	1.5	2	Thin Fell	Unsuitable species for position Range of dm: 80 - 270mm Recommended husbandry 2

APPENDIX 3

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

Landmark Trees

Site: 9 Grange Gardens
Date: 01/02/18

Surveyor(s): Adam Hollis
Ref: MAA/9GG/AIA

Appendix 3

Recommended Tree Works To Facilitate Development

Hide irrelevant
Show All Trees

Tree No.	English Name	B.S. Cat	Height	Ground Clearance	Crown Spread	Recommended Works	Comments/ Reasons
2	Western Red Cedar	C	6	0.5	2122	Fell	Unsuitable species for position Zebrina variegated form To facilitate development

APPENDIX 4: TREE SELECTION FOR URBAN LOCATIONS

Table A4.1: Small Ornamental Tree Species

Common Name	Species	(Columnar Form for discrete usage)
Hawthorn	Crataegus monogyna	Stricta
Cockspur	Crataegus prunifolia	Splendens
Cherry	Prunus x hillieri	Spire
Bird cherry	Prunus padus	Albertii
Rowan / Mountain ash	Sorbus aucuparia	Cardinal Royal
Swedish whitebeam	Sorbus intermedia	Brouwers
B. whitebeam	Sorbus x thuringiaca	Fastigiata

Table A4.2: Medium Specimen Tree Species

Common Name	Species	(Columnar Form for discrete usage)
Chinese red bark birch	Betula albosinensis	Fascination
Mongolian lime	Tilia mongolica	
Hornbeam	Carpinus betulus	Fastigiata Frans Fountaine
Turkish hazel	Corylus colurna	
Maidenhair tree	Gingko biloba	
Pride of India	Koelreuteria paniculata	Fastigiata
European larch	Larix decidua	Sheerwater Seedling
Tulip tree	Liriodendron tulipfera	Fastigiata

Table A4.3: Larger Specimen Tree Species

Common Name	Species	(Columnar Form for discrete usage)
English oak	Quercus robur	f. Koster
American elm	Ulmus americana Princeton	
Cedar of Lebanon	Cedrus libani	

Landmark Trees

PART 3 – PLANS

PLAN 1

TREE CONSTRAINTS & IMPACT ASSESSMENT PLAN



Exsiting Plan With Proposed Extension

N

5m 10m

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: 9 Grange Gardens	1:100@ A2
Drawing Title: Tree Constraints Plan	February 2018

Key:

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



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