
Arboricultural Impact Assessment and Method Statement

Site – 125 Albert Street, London, NW1

Client – D Ridley

Contact – Caroline Harte, Mors + Harte Architects www.morsharte.com

Date - 12-01-2023

To be read in conjunction with – Tree Constraints and Protection Plan Drawing No. MH/125AS/01



MoorePartners Ltd

Contents

Part A - BS5837:20012 Tree Assessment

- 1 – Instruction and client brief
- 2 – Site details
- 3 – Proposed Works
- 4 – Tree assessments
- 5 – Arboricultural Impact assessment

Part B - Arboricultural method statement

- 6 - Statement or purpose
- 7 – Tree works
- 8 – Communication and supervision
- 9 – Phasing
- 10 – Hoarding and fencing
- 11 - Access
- 12 – Excavation
- 13 – Muck away
- 14 – Concrete pouring
- 15 – Site levels
- 16 – Materials storage
- 17 – Drainage
- 18 – General site management

Appendix 1 – Caveats

Appendix 2 – References

Prepared by

J M Moore BSc Dip Arb (RFS) M Arbor A

Moore Partners Ltd, Blue House Cottage,

Maldon Road, Bradwell on Sea, Essex, CM0 7HR

01621 776590

www.moorepartners.co.uk

judith.moore@moorepartners.co.uk

Part A Tree assessment and implications assessment

1.0 Scope of works and client brief.

1.1 Mors Harte have requested a survey of the tree in the road to the front of the site. The survey is to accompany the application for under pinning the building. The report should be read in conjunction with the tree constraints and protection plan, drawing number MH/125AS/01

1.2 The report was to:

- Section A assess the trees in line with BS5837:2012.
- Provides an implications assessment.
- Section B is a method statement to minimise impact on the tree
- Tree protection plan

2.0 Site

The site is to the west side of Albert Street. The site is accessed to the front from Albert Street. There are no trees within the site, but a mature London Plane is growing in the street to the north of the site.



fig 1 – site outlined in red

3.0 Proposed Development

3.1 The proposal is for the under pinning of the front elevation wall and party wall with 123 and 127 Albert Street. The structural engineers propose to under pin the existing structure with mass concrete underpins. These are specified as being cast in 1000mm widths to a depth of 2600mm below the existing ground level. This is detailed in the report by Blue Engineering.

3.2 Reference documents supplied.

Drawing/ Document references	Author	Title	Date
Job no. 8136	Blue Engineering	Structural drawings	19-01-23
Geotechnical survey report	Geotechnical	Geotechnical report for subsidence management services	August 2022
Method statement MS-001	Engel construction	Method statement	July 2022

4.0 Tree assessment

4.1 Survey method and limitations

The report is based on a ground level visual tree assessment, using recognised non-invasive techniques, (Mattheck). It is an external inspection only. Condition of the tree was assessed only on date of inspection. Trees are living entities and are subject to natural processes and changes. Physiological and structural assessments are valid for a period of no more 12 months for planning purposes but changes to trees can occur at any time particularly after an acute event such as a storm. It remains valid only if no environmental changes occur around the tree, including acute events. If any changes should occur, re-inspection should be carried out. Environmental changes around the tree will render this report invalid. There has been no assessment of potential for indirect damage because of soil heave or subsidence that trees may have on existing properties, this is outside the remit of this report.

No internal diagnostic equipment was used, and no pest and disease samples were taken or sent away for analysis. No soil samples were taken for testing. If Soil analysis is required, a soil engineer should be employed. There has been no examination of existing drains or service runs for the presence of roots. No trial pits were dug to examine roots at the time of the tree survey.

The trees were surveyed in line with the process laid out in BS5837:2012. The trees were assessed against the criteria laid out in the British Standard. Data was collated on species, age, height, crown spread, stem diameter at 1.5m high. A base line assessment of physiological and structural condition was made. All trees were categorised in line with BS5837:2012 guidance. Trees of the highest quality were rated 'A', good quality 'B'. Trees rated 'C'; are worthy of retention but of lower quality. Those given an 'R' rating are poor quality with either less than 10 useful life years remaining, small and of limited significance in the wider landscape, or could easily be replaced in a new landscape scheme with a tree of similar size and impact. Greater detail on the rating is given in the key in below.

Trees under 75mm in diameter were not recorded in line with BS5837 guidance. The details of the trees as required under BS5837:012 were recorded in tree data for this report.

Where trees have been noted for works an assessment of condition has been made but this survey is an overview and cannot be relied on as a full health and safety assessment of the trees. The report is not a full safety or subsidence risk assessment survey.

A topographical survey was available for the tree positions. The tree protection plan is based on this, and the current proposed site lay out available at the time of writing the report.

Key to survey schedule

Tree number on plan - T1 individual tree on the site

BS 5837:2012 Age class

Y – Young first third of life expectancy, EM – Early mature second third of life expectancy, Ma – Mature final third of life expectancy, OM – Over mature showing signs of senescence, V – Veteran over mature and of special conservation value

Remaining years in age bands - <10, 10-20, 20-40, >40

Physiological or structural condition - **Good** no significant health problems, or no significant structural problems, **Fair** some symptoms of ill health, or currently insignificant or remediable structural problems, **Poor** significant symptoms of ill health, or significant structural problems

Moribund (physiological only in serious and irreversible decline, **Dead** (physiological only) not alive

Other Abbreviations.

Esti estimated

M/S multi stem the number of stems and diameter are given in line with BS5837:2012 requirements.

N north, E east, S south, W west

BS 5837:2012 Category of quality/retention

Category	Description		
A Green	Trees of high quality A1 – Mainly arboricultural value A2 - Mainly landscape value A3 – Mainly cultural value, including conservation	C Grey	Trees of low quality C1 – Mainly arboricultural value C2 – Mainly landscape value. C3 – Mainly cultural value, including conservation
B Blue	Trees of moderate quality B1 – Mainly arboricultural value B2 - Mainly landscape value B3 – Mainly cultural value, including conservation	U red	Trees that are in a poor condition, so that any existing value will be lost in the next 10 years, and should, for reasons of sound arboricultural management, be removed.

4.2 Tree data

No.	Species English & Latin	Approx Height (M)	Dia. @1.5 (CM)	Spread (M)	Height Crown Clearance (m)	Age Class	Physiological condition	Structural condition	Preliminary management recommendation	Years remaining	Category grading
T1	<i>London Plane</i> <i>Platanus x hispanica</i>	10	53	N 2.0 S 3.2 E 3.0 W 2.0	4 First main limb at 4m high on the west side	Ma	Fair The secondary growth has been removed so the elongation growth is not assessable.	Fair The tree is a high pollard, which has been pruned on a cyclical basis. The most recent cycle of pruning is very recent, there is no secondary growth within the crown.	The tree is in council ownership.	40+	A123
<p>The tree has been given an 'A' rating as part of the street scene, mature pollard planes run along Albert Street and are important landscape features.</p> <p>The root area of the tree is covered in hard surfacing of the footpath, road and parking bays. There is a small open area around the base of the tree which shows signs of compaction from street users. There are some large surface roots visible on the west side of the trunk.</p> <p>Photos on next page</p>											



T1 with site to the left side



Root zone of T1

5.0 Arboricultural Impact Assessment

5.1 The arboricultural impact is based on the following parameters.

- All trees that are to be retained will be protected by tree protection fencing in line with BS5837:2012 section 6.2
- Should be read in conjunction with Tree Constraints and Protection Plan drawing number MH/125AS/01.

5.2 The root protection area (RPA) is an area of ground around the tree that should be retained, undisturbed, for the benefit of the tree roots. The RPA is calculated, as set out in BS5837:2012. This determines the square metres of ground area that should be retained. This is often shown as a circle, with a radius as determined by the calculation. However, it is not always essential that this is a circle, and, in some situations, the geography of the site can make an alternative shape more appropriate. It must still equate to the same area as the circle calculated under the approved calculation, paragraph 4.6.3 of BS5837.

Tree no.		RPA m/sq	Radi of RPA (M)	Tree implications assessment	Mitigation
T1	London Plane	124	6.3	<p>The excavation works are outside the root protection area of the tree</p> <p>The works are also outside the crown spread of the tree.</p> <p>Access will be required over the root zone.</p>	<p>The root zone over which access is required is existing highway, parking, or footpath. These will act as ground protection over the roots for access to carry out the works.</p> <p>The site is enclosed at the front of the site by a 2m+ high wooden hoarding, which will also protect the tree.</p> <p>The crown is managed by the local authority on a pollard cycle that manages the over all size of the crown.</p>

Part B Arboricultural method statement

6 Statement of Purpose

This Method Statement (**AMS**) has been written for Mors Harte, to accompany the application for underpinning the front elevation and party walls of 125 Albert Street.

The purpose of the method statement is to minimise the impact of the development and provide an adequate level of protection for the tree on the site. A copy should be available on site throughout the build.

It should be read in conjunction with: -

Document	Author	Date
Tree Protection Plans MH/125AS/01	Moore Partners Ltd	Jan 2023
Method statement	Engel Construction	July 2022

7 Tree works

Tree No.	Species	Works
		None required

All tree works to be carried out by suitably qualified operatives and in line with BS3998:2010

8 Communication and supervision

Prior to commencement of works, a site meeting between all relevant parties should take place, to clarify responsibilities and site issues. This meeting should include, but is not limited to, arboricultural consultant, site manager, tree surgeon, engineer and if applicable the Councils Landscape and/or Arboricultural Officers.

A copy of the method statement will be retained on site and the site manager will be responsible for ensuring operatives adhere to the methodologies.

Issues of the method statement are to be made available to:

Project managers	Mors Harte
Architects	Mors Harte
Client	Daisey Ridley
Main Contractor/ Site manager	GSB Building Ltd
Underpinning	Subcontractor under GSB Building Ltd supervision
Any other contractor affected	

9 Phasing of works

Based on Method statement by Engel Construction

Phase	Date	Works
Activity 1	TBA	Excavation of pit 1m wide and 1m from existing foundation
Activity 2	TBA	Propping of the excavation
Activity 3	TBA	Excavation of new underpin by hand
Activity 4 & 5	TBA	Shuttering of the excavation Premixed concrete to be pumped into underpin and vibrated. Access for this will be from the road at the front
Activity 6 & 7	TBA	Shuttering to be struck
Activity 8	TBA	Propping of trench box
Activity 9 & 10	TBA	Backfill of trench box and commencement of set 2 underpins to commence (back to activity 1)

10 Tree Protective Fence

The site hoarding along the front boundary of the site will contain the site and act as protective fencing.

11 Access

The access into the site for the build will be off Albert Street over the existing access the front of the building. This will be past the London Plane (T1) in the street.

12 Excavation for underpinning

Will be carried out in line with the method statement by Engel Construction and set out in the phases in section 4 above.

13 Muck away of materials

Muck away is due to be removed by wait and load skips. These will be sited outside the crown spread of the tree. There will be no storing of material within the root area of the tree to the front of the site. Access into the site is over the existing hard surfaces.

14 Concrete pouring for underpinning

Ready mixed concrete will be delivered by lorry and pumped into the site. This can be carried out from the road to the front of the site, outside the root protection area and crown spread. The underpins are all outside the root protection area.

15 Site welfare facilities

Will be located outside the root area or crown spread of the tree.

16 Materials and Storage

Will be located outside the root protection area and crown spread of the tree.

17 Drainage and Service trenches

All the drainage trenches should be outside the root area of the tree. Any Utilities trenches should where possible avoid the RPA's of retained trees. If a route cannot avoid the RPA of a retained tree, it should be installed in one of the following two ways, to avoid excavation with machinery in the RPA or precautionary area:

The trench will be carefully excavated by hand. Any roots over 25mm will be retained and protected by wrapping in damp Hessian. Any roots less than 25mm in diameter, which cannot be preserved, will be pruned cleanly with a sharp saw or secateurs or hand saw, by a suitably qualified person. Exposed roots will be covered with damp Hessian and sharp sand. Back fill is to be of excavated soil or an inert granular fill.

18 General site care

No materials will be stored within 2m of the protective fencing.

No transferring of fuels will be permitted within 5m of the protective fencing.

No fires are permitted within 2m of the protective fencing.

Appendix 1 – Report Caveats

1. The report is based on a ground level visual tree assessment (Mattheck).
2. No soil samples were taken for testing. If Soil analysis is required a soil engineer should be employed.
3. No pest and disease samples were taken or sent away for analysis.
4. It remains the responsibility of the tree owner to check TPO status prior to carrying out any works on the tree.
5. Physiological and structural assessments are valid for a period of 12 months. It is an external inspection only.
6. VTA of the tree was assessed only on date of inspection; it remains valid only if no environmental changes around the tree. If any changes should occur re-inspection should be carried out.
7. Environmental changes around the tree will render the report invalid.
8. No internal diagnostic equipment was used.
9. Any works to the trees should comply with BS3998:2010 Tree Work

Appendix 2 – References

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

NHBC Chapter 4.2 Building near trees

D Lonsdale 'Principles of Tree Hazard Assessment and Management'
Forestry Commission 2007

Strouts and Winter 'Diagnosis of ill health in trees'
Forestry Commission 2007

C Mattheck and H Breloer 'Body Language of Trees'