

**GHA Trees
5 South Drive
High Wycombe
Bucks
HP13 6JU**



**Glen Harding MICFor
MSc (Forestry), MA ArborA
t: 07884 056025
e: info@ghatrees.co.uk
www.ghatrees.co.uk**

Arboricultural and Planning Integration Report: 26A Chesterford Gardens, London, NW3 7DE

27th April 2020

Ref: GHA/DS/126260:20

CONTENTS

Section	Subject	Page
	Instructions	3
	Executive Summary	3
	Documents Supplied	4
	Scope of Survey	4
	Survey Method	5
	The Site	6
	Subject Trees	6
	The Proposal	6
	Arboricultural Impact Assessment	6
	Post Development Pressure	7
	Tree Protection Measures and Preliminary Method Statement for Development Works	8
	Conclusion	9
	Recommendations	10
Appendix A	Site Plan / Arboricultural Impact Plan	
Appendix B	Tree Table	
Appendix C	Extract from BS5837:2012 – Protective Fencing	

Arboricultural Report

Location: 26A Chesterford Gardens, London, NW3 7DE
Ref: GHA/DS/126260:20
Client: Mr Frieser
Date: 27th April 2020
Prepared by: Glen Harding MICFor, MSc (Forestry), MArborA
Date of Inspection: 23rd April 2020

Please note that abbreviations introduced in (brackets) may be used throughout the report.

Instructions

Issued by – Mr Frieser

TERMS OF REFERENCE – GHA Trees were instructed to survey the subject trees within and adjacent to 26A Chesterford Gardens, London, in order to assess their general condition and to provide a planning integration statement for the indicative proposed development that safeguards the long term well being of the retained trees in a sustainable manner.

The writer retains the copyright of this report and its content is for the sole use of the client(s) named above. Copying of this document may only be undertaken in connection with the above instruction. Reproduction of the whole, or any part of the document without written consent from GHA Trees is forbidden. Tree work contractors, for the purpose of tendering only, may reproduce the Schedule for tree works included in the appendices.

Executive Summary

The proposal for the site is to replace the dilapidated summer house in the rear garden, with a new, slightly larger structure. The proposed scheme requires the removal of a small number of relatively insignificant shrubs, which will not significantly impact the local or wider landscape. The retained trees require protection in accordance with industry best practice and BS 5837: 2012 – Trees in relation to design, demolition and construction – recommendations, in order to ensure their longevity.

Documents Supplied

The client supplied the following documents:

1. Existing layout plans
2. Proposed layout plans

Scope of Survey

- 1.1 The survey is concerned with the arboricultural aspects of the site only.
- 1.2 The planning status of the subject property was not investigated in detail.
- 1.3 A qualified Arboriculturist undertook the report and site visit and the contents of this report are based on this. Whilst reference may be made to built structure or soils, these are only opinions and confirmation should be obtained from a qualified expert as required.
- 1.4 Trees in third party ownership were surveyed from within the subject property, therefore a detailed assessment was not possible and some (if not all) measurements were estimated. Where the stem location of a third party tree has been estimated, this is noted on the plan.
- 1.5 No discussions took place between the surveyor and any other party.
- 1.6 The trees were inspected on the basis of the Visual Tree Assessment method expounded by Mattheck and Breleor (The body language of tree, DoE booklet Research for Amenity Trees No. 4, 1994)
- 1.7 The survey was undertaken in accord with British Standard 5837: 2012 – Trees in relation to design, demolition and construction – recommendations.
- 1.8 Underground services near to trees will need to be installed in accord with the guidance given in BS5837 together with the National Joint Utilities Group Booklet 4: 2007 Guidelines for the planning, installation and maintenance of utility services in proximity to trees (NJUG4).
- 1.9 The client's attention is drawn to the responsibilities under the Wildlife and Countryside Act (1981).

Survey Method

- 2.1 The survey was conducted from ground level with the aid of binoculars if needed.

- 2.2 No tissue samples were taken nor was any internal investigation of the subject trees undertaken.
- 2.3 No soil samples were taken.
- 2.4 The height of each subject tree was estimated using a clinometer and recorded to the nearest half metre.
- 2.5 The stem diameter for each tree was measured in line with the requirements set out in BS 5837: 2012 – Trees in relation to design, demolition and construction – recommendations.
- 2.6 The crown spreads were measured with an electronic distometer and recorded to the nearest half metre. Where the crown radius was notably different in any direction this has been noted on the Plan (appendix A) and within the tree table (Appendix B). The crowns of those trees that are proposed for removal, or trees where the crown spread is deemed insignificant in relation to the proposed development are not always shown on the appended plan; however their stem locations are marked for reference.
- 2.7 The Root Protection Area (RPA) for each tree is included in the tree table, both as an area, and as the radius of a circle.
- 2.8 The crown clearance was measured using a clinometer and recorded to the nearest half metre. Where it is significantly lower in one direction, this is noted within the tree table at appendix B.
- 2.9 All of the trees that were inspected during the site visit are detailed on the plan at Appendix A; this plan was produced in colour and **MUST** only be scanned or reproduced in colour. The trees on this plan are categorised and shown in the following format:

COLOUR CODING AND RATING OF TREES:

Category A – Trees of high quality with an estimated remaining life expectancy of at least 40 years. Colour = light **green** crown outline on plan.

Category B – Trees of moderate quality with an estimated remaining life expectancy of at least 20 years. Colour = mid **blue** crown outline on plan.

Category C – Trees of low quality with an estimated remaining life expectancy of at least 10 to 20 years, or young trees with a stem diameter below 150mm. Colour = uncoloured crown outline on plan.

Category U – Those in such a condition that they cannot realistically be retained as living trees in the context of the current land use for longer than 10 years. Colour = **red** crown outline on plan.

All references to tree rating are made in accordance with BS 5837: 2012 – Trees in relation to design, demolition and construction – recommendations’, Table 1.

The Site

- 3.1 The site is located on Chesterford Gardens, a residential through road located in the Camden area of north west London.

The Subject Trees

- 4.1 The details of the subject trees are set out in the Schedule at Appendix B.
- 4.2 Of the six individual trees, and groups of trees surveyed, two have been assessed as BS 5837 category B, with the remaining trees being assessed as BS 5837 category C.

Category B	2 trees
Category C	4 trees / groups

The Proposal

- 5.1 The proposal for the site is to replace the dilapidated summer house in the rear garden, with a new, slightly larger structure.
- 5.2 The proposed location of the above structures can be seen on the appended plan.

Arboricultural Impact Assessment

PROPOSED TREE REMOVAL / RETENTION:

- 6.1 A small section of G3 (small managed shrubs) is proposed for removal as part of the project, as these shrubs could not be effectively retained as they are located within the outline of the new structure.
- 6.2 The proposed site layout and all of its associated structures allows for the healthy retention of all of the other trees on the site itself, and within nearby adjacent sites; therefore, the arboricultural landscape character of the site will be retained.

TREE PRUNING TO ACCOMODATE THE PROPOSAL OR ACCESS TO THE SITE

- 6.3 The implementation of the proposal does not lead to the requirement to prune any of the retained trees, or shrubs. Site works can progress safely without the need for any facilitation pruning.

ASSESSMENT OF RETAINED TREES ROOT PROTECTION AREAS

- 6.4 Section 4.6.3 of BS 5837: 2012 states that the Root Protection Area (RPA) of each tree should be assessed by an arboriculturalist considering the likely morphology and disposition of the roots, when known to be influenced by past or existing site conditions.
- 6.5 Following the assessment described in section 6.4, the RPAs have all been drawn as notional circles as there are no existing site structures (visible from the available access) which are assessed to have the potential to significantly affect tree root morphology. The adjacent gardens to the north and west sit at different levels to the subject property, however this has been assessed not to have impacted the RPA layouts. There is also a small section of made-up ground which is shown on the appended plan; this is outside the outline of the existing and proposed structures.
- 6.6 The proposed new summer house would be situated within a small section of the assessed Root Protection Areas of T4, T5 and T6 as can be seen on the appended plan. The construction design process has shown consideration of this issue (of working within the RPA) by ensuring the new structures can be built without the need for any excavations in this area.
- 6.7 The new structure will utilise the existing summerhouses sub-base and where the new structure sits outside the outline of the existing, additional slabs will be laid (above ground) to support the increased building outline. This will ensure there is no impact on the nearby trees and no need for any harmful excavations near these trees.
- 6.8 The proposed new building(s) are situated outside of the assessed RPA's of all of the trees proposed for retention, therefore these trees pose no below ground constraints on the new buildings or vice versa.

INSTALLATION OF SERVICES

- 6.9 The installation of underground apparatus and drainage systems with the use of mechanical excavators will undoubtedly sever any roots that may be present and can change the hydrology and structure of the nearby soil in a way that will adversely affect the health of any nearby trees. Particular care should therefore be taken when assessing the layout of new services and consideration **MUST** be given to the methods of installation of **ALL** underground apparatus.

Post Development Pressure

FUTURE TREE AND STRUCTURE RELATIONSHIPS

- 7.1 The retained trees are at a satisfactory distance from the proposed new building, and highly unlikely to give rise to any inconvenience.

- 7.2 Regular inspections of the retained trees by a suitably qualified Arboriculturalist and subsequent remedial works will ensure that the trees are maintained in a suitable manner, to exist in harmony with the new structures and its occupants for many years to come.

Tree Protection Measures and Preliminary Method Statement for Development Works

8.1 TREE PROTECTION BARRIERS

It is essential for the future health of the trees to be retained on site, that all development activity is undertaken outside the root protection zone of these trees. The position of the fence **MUST** be marked out with biodegradable marker paint on site and agreed with appropriate representatives from the LPA and contractor. The fencing **MUST** be erected **prior** to any works in the vicinity of the trees and removed only when all development activity is complete. The protective fencing **MUST** be as that shown in BS 5837 (see Appendix C). The herras panels **MUST** be joined together using a minimum of two anti-tamper couplers which **MUST** be installed so they can only be removed from the inside of the fence. The panels **MUST** supported by stabilizer struts, which **MUST** be installed on the inside and secured to the ground using pins or appropriate weights.

The Fence must be marked with a clear sign reading:

“Construction Exclusion Zone – No Access”

8.2 GROUND PROTECTION – LIGHTWEIGHT ACCESS ONLY

Where any additional ground protection is required, these areas **MUST** be covered with a permeable membrane, with 150mm layer of compressible woodchip overlaying it; an 18mm marine ply boards will then be secured on top of the woodchip to allow a 1.5tonne mini-digger to access the area without causing major compaction or soil erosion.

8.3 MIXING OF CONCRETE

All mixing of cement / concrete **MUST** be undertaken outside of the RPA of all of the retained trees.

8.4 INCOMING SERVICES, DRAINAGE AND SOAKAWAYS

Any new underground services which are to be located within (any portion of) the RPAs of any trees which are to be retained **MUST** be installed in accord with the guidance given in BS5837 together with the National Joint Utilities Group Booklet 4: 2007 Guidelines for the planning, installation and maintenance of utility services in proximity to trees (NJUG4). Service installation layouts **MUST** be planned to keep apparatus together in common ducts, in order to minimise the need for excavations. Service trench excavation within the RPAs **MUST NOT** be undertaken with the use of any mechanised machinery (minidiggers, JCBs or alike). Instead, these service trenches must be excavated using **hand tools only**.

HAND TOOL excavations will only be undertaken by fully briefed site personnel. This operation will be done slowly and carefully to ensure the retention and protection of any roots that are discovered that are in excess of 25mm. These roots **MUST** then be covered and protected using damp hessian whilst further excavation commences; hessian must be left in situ until backfilling commences and re-wetted if needed to avoid root desiccation. **NOTE: OPERATIVES MUST CHECK FOR THE PRESENCE OF ANY EXISTING UNDERGROUND SERVICES PRIOR TO THE COMMENCEMENT OF SUCH WORK.**

Once the trench is excavated to the correct depth, care must then be taken to ensure the new service ducts are installed so as to avoid any roots present. **Any roots that require pruning should be cut using sharp tools to leave a 'clean' cut, in order to minimise the risk of infection by decay pathogens.** The trench must then be backfilled and the soil compacted using hand tools only, to ensure not air pockets are left as these can be damaging to tree roots.

8.5 ON SITE SUPERVISION

Regular site supervision is essential to ensure all potentially damaging activities near to trees are correctly supervised. A pre start meeting will occur to ensure all parties are aware of their responsibilities relating to tree protection on site; this will include a site induction for key personnel.

8.6 OTHER TREE PROTECTION PRECAUTIONS

- **NO** level alterations will occur within the RPA of any tree to be retained.
- **NO** fires lit on site within 20 metres of any tree to be retained.
- **NO** fuels, oils or substances with will be damaging to the tree shall be spilled or poured on site.
- **NO** storage of any materials within the root protections zone.

8.7 HARD / SOFT LANDSCAPING NEAR RETAINED TREES

All new pathways and hard landscaping areas within the Root Protection Areas (RPA's) of the retained trees should be designed using no-dig, up and over construction techniques, and be specified in close co-ordination with the retained Arboriculturalist. Porous materials should also be used when surfacing near the trees. No machinery will be used for this work, which must all be done by hand.

Conclusion

- 9.1 In conclusion, the principal arboricultural features within the site can be retained and adequately protected during development activities.
- 9.2 No significant or important trees will be lost to facilitate the proposed scheme.
- 9.3 Subject to precautionary measures as detailed above, the proposal will not be injurious to trees to be retained.

Recommendations

- 10.1 Site supervision – An individual e.g. the Site Agent, must be nominated to be responsible for all arboricultural matters on site. This person must:
- a. Be present on the site the majority of the time.
 - b. Be aware of the arboricultural responsibilities.
 - c. Have the authority to stop any work that is, or has the potential to cause harm to any tree.
 - d. Be responsible for ensuring that all site personnel are aware of their responsibilities towards trees on site and the consequences of the failure to observe those responsibilities.
 - e. Make immediate contact with the local authority and / or retained arboriculturalist in the event of any related tree problems occurring whether actual or potential.
- 10.2 It is recommended, that to ensure a commitment from all parties to the healthy retention of the trees, that details are passed by the architect or agent to any contractors working on site, so that the practical aspects of the above precautions are included in their method statements, and financial provision made for these.

27th April 2020

Signed:



Glen Harding MICFor, MSc (Forestry), MArborA
For and on behalf of GHA Trees

Appendix A



Appendix B

Tree Number	Tree Name (species)	Ht (m)	Calculated Stem Diameter (mm)	Number of Stems	Root Protection Area (Radius, m)	N (m)	E (m)	S (m)	W (m)	Age Class	Clearance (m)	Estimated life expectancy	BS Category	Comments / Recommendations
T1	Malus	10	300	1	3.60	4	4	3	3	M	4 south	10-20	C1	Off site - full inspection not possible.
T2	Cotoneaster	5	200	1	2.40	3.5	3.5	3.5	3.5	M	4 south	10-20	C1	Off site - full inspection not possible.
G3	Mixed shrubs	2.5	50	1	0.60	1	1	1	1	M	0	10-20	C1	Small shrubs of little value.
T4	Sycamore	18	600	1	7.20	6	6	2	6	M	6 east	10-20	C1	Off site - full inspection not possible. Sparse crown.
T5	Sycamore	20	700	2	8.40	5	5	2	6	M	6 east	20-40	B2	Off site - full inspection not possible.
T6	Sycamore	20	700	1	8.40	3	5	5	6	M	8 east	20-40	B2	Off site - full inspection not possible.

KEY :

Tree No: (T= individual tree, G= group of trees, W= woodland)
Age class: Young (Y), Middle aged (MA), Mature (M), Over mature (OM),
Veteran (V)
Height (Ht): Measured in metres +/- 1m

Appendix C

Figure 3 Examples of above-ground stabilizing systems



