



ARBORICULTURAL REPORT

21 Maresfield Gardens
London

REV 1

5th August 2020

Prepared by

Andrew Day HND Arb. M.Arbor.A, CEnv

All rights in this report are reserved. No part of it may be reproduced or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, or stored in any retrieval system of any nature, without our written permission. Its content and format are for the exclusive use of the addressee in dealing with this site. It may not be sold, loaned, hired out or divulged to any third party not directly involved in this site without our written consent.

© (Andrew Day Arboricultural Consultancy Ltd)

Scope

The purpose of this report is to provide Arboricultural advice in relation to identifying the constraints of trees which are present on site, in relation to the proposed extension to the existing property. Providing advice on how the trees could be impacted and protection measures to be implemented using the guidelines and principles of BS5837:2012 for those to be retained.

Table of Contents

	Page
1 Introduction	4
2 Appraisal	5
3 Conclusions	8
4 Other Considerations	8

Appendices

1 Qualifications and Experience	9
2 Photographs	10
3 Site Specific Information	11
4 Limitations and Qualifications	15
5 Tree Protection Plan	17

1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Brief:

This report has been prepared at the request of Mr Pine the site owner, to provide advice on the arboricultural constraints that the trees on site present to the scheme, and what protection measures will need to be implemented to safeguard the trees to remain from construction pressures.

1.2 Qualifications and experience:

I have based this report on my site observations and the provided information, and I have come to conclusions in the light of my experience. I have experience and qualifications in arboriculture and list the details in **Appendix 1**.

1.3 Documents and information provided:

A plan showing the revised layout of the front of the site.

1.4 Relevant background information:

Planning permission for an extension to the rear of the building has been approved previously under permission ref. 2019/4254/P. This element is being re-applied for as part of the current application. The removal of T2, T3 & T5 was approved under 2019/4254/P, therefore the only new issue is the proposed removal of T1.

This report focuses on the alterations proposed to the front of the site affecting T1 and also covers the alterations proposed to the rear and how they will affect T2, T3 and T5.

1.5 Scope of this report:

This report is concerned with all trees at the site which are will be impacted by construction works to implement the proposed layout, and the measures required to provide protection for those to be retained as best prescribed in the guidance of BS5837: 2012 'tree in relation to design, demolition and construction'. Any issues regarding construction methods etc. is outside the remit of an Arborist and remedy should be sought with suitably qualified persons, for example builder, engineer etc. For the purposes of this report an Arborist / Arboriculturalist is someone who through training and experience has the knowledge to assess tree and their condition in a competent manner.

2 APPRAISAL

2.1 Brief site description:

The site is a detached residential property that has a small frontage with planted areas either side of the pedestrian access. A small path runs adjacent to the southern side of the property that leads to the rear garden, which has a small area directly behind the house that is laid to lawn. Beyond this the remainder of the garden is occupied by a large outbuilding taking up most of the rear garden space. Other residential properties of a similar nature are present in close proximity.

2.2 Condition of tree:

The tree appears to be in a healthy condition with no signs of pests or diseases normally associated with the species.

A more detailed analysis of the trees can be found in **Appendix 3**.

2.3 Suitability of trees for location and management requirements at present:

At present I consider T1 unsuitable for long term retention given its size, growth potential and proximity to the building. In time the encroachment of the crown spread could cause abrasion damage, which could lead to other problems such as damp entering the structure. As the stem continues to mature it is likely to displace the boundary wall of the raised bed, this could impact on people using the pedestrian access. There is a compression fork where the stem divides at approx. 1m, which could be a bio mechanical weakness and lead failure of one of the main leaders. I would suggest this tree is unsuitable for long term retention. T2 & T3 in my opinion offer no amenity value and would be best removed. T5 appears to be in decline and would be best removed.

2.4 Potential effects of development on the tree:

To implement the proposal of constructing an extension to the rear of the property, T2 & T3 will be removed. These are low quality trees that offer no wider public amenity and could be considered unsuitable for long term retention because of their growth potential and proximity to the building and neighbouring property. Two new trees could be planted further down the garden space once the old outbuilding has been removed and the garden restored back to lawn. I suggest a Hornbeam and Silver Birch with a stem girth of 14cm – 16cm at the time of planting. These species are native and will provide seasonal interest, screening to the rear of the building, wildlife habitat and would suit the location for long term retention.

No other trees at the rear of the site would need to be removed or worked on to implement this planning proposal. The RPA (Root Protection Area) of T4, T6 & T7 can be suitably fenced off to prevent encroachment into this protected area during works, as well as to stop collision damage from accidentally happening. Protective fencing will be erected as shown on the tree protection plan in Appendix 5. If there is a need for access over the RPA (Root Protection Area) on soft ground, there is a risk of soil compaction occurring. Therefore, suitable ground protection will be in place to prevent compaction happening. It is unlikely this will be required given the RPA associated with these trees is outside of the construction zone. Details of this and other protection measures can be found in Appendix 3.

The main risk to the trees will be from indirect actions associated with construction works such as, careless storage / manoeuvring of plant or materials or if toxins are allowed to leach into the soil. This can be prevented from following the measures outlined in the tree protection method statement in Appendix 3. There is space on site for material storage / manoeuvring and plant parking, this will need to be carefully considered by the site manager prior to works commencing on site to ensure the trees are not impacted in anyway. The Tree Protection Method Statement in Appendix 3 will be adhered to prevent the trees being damaged. In this case the potential impact of the proposal in relation to the trees to be retained is considered to be moderate to low with measures being able to be put in place to prevent unnecessary harm.

2.5 Tree management works

T1 will be removed. A replacement will be installed in the front garden space in the area allocated. T2, T3 and T5, which have previously been consented to be removed under 2019/4254/P, will also be removed as part of the current application.

3 CONCLUSIONS

- This report focuses on the alterations proposed to the front of the site affecting T1 and also covers the alterations proposed to the rear and how they will affect T2, T3 and T5.
- T1 appears to be in good health with no signs of pests or diseases normally associated with the species. However, even if the proposal was not a consideration, its removal is likely to be desired by the residents due to the excessive shading, potential abrasion damage to the building and its unsuitableness for long term retention.
- The layout design has space to accommodate a replacement tree to offer amenity within the street scene.
- The council and client can decide which species and size will be used for the replacement tree.
- To facilitate the construction of the extension T2 & T3 will be removed. These are low quality trees with no wider public amenity, and that could be considered unsuitable for long term retention despite the development proposal in this location. T5 is in decline and would be best removed. The removal of these trees has already been approved as part of a previous application.
- The removal of T2 & T3 can be compensated for by planting two more trees further down in the garden, where they will have space to develop and offer more amenity and wildlife benefit for many years to come.
- The remainder of the trees at the rear of the site are to be retained and will be protected with suitable fencing to prevent collision damage or access across the RPA. If access over the RPA is required on soft ground, suitable ground protection will be in place.
- No excavation work in the RPA of trees to be retained is needed.
- The trees can be retained and adequately protected from construction pressures by implementing and adhering to the protection measures provided in the method statement in Appendix 3.

4 OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

4.1 Tree subject to statutory controls:

I do not know if the tree is the subject of a tree preservation order or other protection legislation. I suggest that the local authority is contacted to confirm this and kept updated with any proposed tree works to form a good working relationship and to prevent misunderstandings or contravention of protection measures. This is an advisory for readers of this report and not meant as a confirmation as to the protection status of the tree commented on.

*Andrew Day HND Arb
For Andrew Day Arboricultural Consultancy Ltd.*

Brief qualifications and experience of Andrew Day

I hold a Higher National Diploma in Arboriculture. I have been working in the field of arboriculture for approximately 10 years, spending time as a contracting arborist undertaking all aspects of practical arboriculture both in the UK and Europe. I have also worked within local government as a tree officer working for a variety of local authorities. I have a broad experience of both the practical and theoretical aspects of arboriculture having worked within the public and private sector. I am currently a consulting arborist for Andrew Day Arboricultural Consultancy.

1. Qualifications:

Higher National Diploma in Arboriculture (1996)

NPTC (National Proficiency Training Council) units 20, 21 and 22

Lantra professional tree inspection certificate

2. Practical experience:

Prior to establishing my company, I worked for a private Arboriculture company for three years undertaking many practical aspects of Arboriculture. I moved on from this to become a local authority tree officer for five years, my duties included consultation on planning matters about tree, advice to the public, managing the council's tree stock and liaising with other professionals on Arboricultural related issues. I was approached by an established tree contracting and consulting company in Essex to develop and run the consultancy department as their principle consultant which I did for three years.

SITE PHOTOGRAPHS

	
Showing T1	Showing proximity T1 to the building
	
Showing compression fork where the stems divide, a potential biomechanical weak union	

SITE SPECIFIC INFORMATION

Explanatory Notes

Tree Survey

Explanatory Notes

Measurements/estimates: All dimensions are estimates unless otherwise indicated. Measurements taken with a tape or clinometer are indicated with a '*'. Less reliable estimated dimensions are indicated with a '?'.

Species: The species identification is based on visual observations and the common English name of what the tree appeared to be is listed first, with the botanical name after in brackets. In some instances, it may be difficult to quickly and accurately identify a particular tree without further detailed investigations. Where there is some doubt of the precise species of tree, it is indicated with a '?' after the name in order to avoid delay in the production of the report. The botanical name is followed by the abbreviation sp if only the genus is known. The species listed for groups and hedges represent the main component and there may be other minor species not listed.

Height: Height is estimate height to the nearest metre.

Spread: The maximum crown spread is visually estimated to the nearest metre of the total crown spread diameter. It should be noted that the crown of some tree can be one side, however this usually indicated within the report.

Diameter: These figures relate to 1.5m above ground level and are recorded in centimetres. Estimate measurements are banded 0-10cm, 11-20, 21-30 etc. If appropriate, diameter is measure with a diameter tape. 'M' indicates tree or shrubs with multiple stems. 'AV' indicates average and is the average of two stems when dealing with twin stem tree.

Estimated Age: Age is assessed as mature (last one third of life expectancy), semi-mature (one third to two thirds life expectancy) and young (less than one third life expectancy).

FSB: First significant branch from ground level (direction shown on tree protection / constraints plan)

SULE: This is the estimated Safe Useful Life Expectancy of the tree. Tree can live longer than this value but can pose a risk to persons or property.

RPR: Radius of root protection area around the tree /group

RPA: Root protection area for tree or group

BS 5837 2012 - On the basis of this assessment, tree can be divided into one of the following categories:

- A** - Tree whose retention is most desirable, High category
- B** - Tree where is desirable, Moderate category
- C** - Tree which could be retained, Low category
- U** - Tree that cannot realistically be retained; Fell category

Tag	Name	Age	Diameter	Height	Crown Hgt	FSB Hgt	Crown Spread (N S E W) (m)				Life Exp	Recommendations	Category	RPR	RPA
T1	Magnolia (Magnolia)	EM	250	10(2)	2	2	2	2	2	2	20+	No Works required at present. Consider selectively reducing back off of the building to prevent abrasion damage.	B3	3	28.28

Site Personnel Contact Information

As far as I am aware the only personnel associated with this site at the time of writing this report is the site owner and project architect. Table 1 shows the contact details of the project architect who is to be contacted if any enquires relating to this project need answering.

Table 2

Name	Relation to Site	Contact Details
Pinzauer	Project Architect	07824733260

LIMITATIONS AND QUALIFICATIONS

LIMITATIONS AND QUALIFICATIONS

Unless specifically mentioned the report will only be concerned with ground inspections. No below ground inspections will be carried out without prior confirmation from the client that such works should be undertaken. This report is for the purposes of identifying the constraints of tree in relation to development and not a health and safety assessment of the tree. A cursory assessment of the tree health and condition will be recorded, but this is not to be taken as a detailed assessment of its structural condition, health and management recommendations in relation to this. A separate tree inspection regime focusing on these aspects will need to be undertaken if this is required.

The validity, accuracy and findings of this report will be directly related to the accuracy of the information made available during the inspection process. No checking of independent data will be undertaken, Andrew Day Arboricultural Consultancy will not be responsible for the recommendations within this report where essential data are not made available or are inaccurate.

This report will remain valid for one year from the date of inspection but will become invalid if any tree works not recommended within the report are undertaken, soil levels around the tree are altered in any way and if any building works which were not disclosed during the inspection are undertaken. If extreme weather changes occur such as heavy winds, snow etc., the tree will need to be re-inspected to ensure their condition has not been affected or has altered from the initial inspection details obtained.

If any of the above occurs, then it is strongly recommended that a new tree inspection is carried out.

It will be appreciated, and deemed to be accepted by the client that the formulation of the recommendations for the management of the tree will be guided by the following:

1. The need to avoid reasonable foreseeable damage
2. The arboricultural considerations – Tree safety, good Arboricultural practise and aesthetics.

The client is deemed to have accepted the limitation placed on the recommendations by the sources quoted in the attached report. Where time constraints or the client limits sources, this may lead to an incomplete quantification of the risk.

TREE PROTECTION PLAN

(For reference only. Please refer to the separate A3 plan for scaling if required)

