BS5837 Arboricultural Impact Assessment & Method Statement

15 The Avenue, Ickenham, Uxbridge, UB10 8NR

Client: Multi Creation

Job Reference: 05257R

Planning Ref: -

Consultant: Keiron Hart (BSc Hons, C.Env, F.Arbor.A, MICFor, MEWI, AARC, APAEWE, VETcert)

Tamla Trees
consulting arborists

March 2025

Contents

1. Executive Summary

1.1 Tamla Trees ltd has been appointed by Multi Creation to provide advice and a report on the arboricultural issues relating to the advised development: *"Erection of part single, part two storey side/rear extensions. Installation of a rear dormer."*

1.2 We surveyed the site in February 2025. No trees are pruned or removed to facilitate the proposed works, but we have indicated the removal of T4 & % (Apple). TG1 (Cherry x 1, Oak x 2) and S1 (Cherry Laurel) on the basis these are all small/ low quality trees, and their removal creates a better spatial arrangement with the revised layout (rear) of the property.

1.3 The main constraint trees T1 (Oak), T2 & T3 (Hornbeam) close to the main site access point and T13 (Hornbeam) a large 3rd party tree with Root Protection Area which extends into the site. There are no development excavation/ footprint incursions into the Root Protection Area (RPA) of surveyed trees as works to the existing garage building to integrate it to the separate dwelling are modifications rather than removal and replacement.

1.4 The main tree issue is therefore the revised/ upgraded access. 2 separate areas of no dig driveway construction are shown. This will be installed to subbase level prior to any on site development activity. Vehicles can then track the relevant areas for construction before a final permeable gravel wearing course is installed at the end of the construction process. The retained trees will be protected with herras fencing as indicated at Appendix 6. The proposed no dig surface covers the RPA's for access and any unforeseen works can be supplemented with temporary ground protection which will cover any RPA overspill (if required, not currently shown).

1.5 The tree issues can be summarised as: **Effective Tree Protection (No dig & tree protective fencing)> Service Connections> Site operative knowledge of tree protection issues> Soft landscaping to make good.**

1.6 The site is within the London Borough of Hillingdon administrative area. The surveyed trees are not the subject of a Tree Preservation Oder (TPO). The property and surveyed trees are located within the Ickenham Village Conservation Area.

1.7 This report is based on the client plans ref: 3788/07/JG and associated drawings.

2. Statutory Protection

2.1 At the time of writing, we are advised as follows:

Conservation Area Status	
Is the site located within a Conservation Area?	Yes Ickenham Village
Notes: (i)All trees larger than 7.5cm diameter at 1.5m above ground level are subject to regulations within a Conservation Area. Exemptions apply for trees which are dead and dangerous but clarification before any tree works is advised. A notification is required in many circumstances.	
Tree Preservation Order Status	
Are inspected trees subject to a TPO?	No
Type of TPO	~~**Area**~~
	~~**Individual**~~
	~~**Group**~~
	~~**Woodland**~~
TPO Reference	NA
Date TPO Made	NA
Notes: (i) The type and details of any TPO determine which trees are 'protected'. Exemptions apply for trees which are dead and dangerous but clarification before any tree works is advised. An application may be required before undertaking works. (ii) Reference to London Borough of Hillingdon website confirms the above.	

Fig 1 – The trees surveyed within this report are located within a Conservation Area but are not the subject of a Tree Preservation Order.

3. Terms of Reference

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

3.2 BS3998:2010 'Tree work – recommendations'

3.3 Arboricultural Associations Approved Tree Work Contractors List

3.4 https://www.trees.org.uk/Help-Advice/Help-for-Tree-Owners/Guide-to-Tree-Pruning

3.5 NJUG 4 – National Joint Utilities Group "Guidelines for the planning, installation and maintenance of utility apparatus in proximity to trees. Volume 4, issue 2. London: NJUG 2007" To include Operatives Hand-out Guidance

3.6 Foundation design, tree species water use - NHBC Chapter 4.2 Building near trees

3.7 TDAG Trees Planning & Development – A guide for delivery

3.8 TDAG Trees in Hard Landscapes – a guide for delivery

3.9 TDAG Tree Species Selection for Green Infrastructure – a guide for specifiers

3.10 BGS Open-Source Soil Data http://www.bgs.ac.uk/nercsoilportal/maps.html

3.11 HSE (2014) Avoiding danger from underground services: https://www.hse.gov.uk/pubns/books/hsg47.htm

3.12 Eissenstat & Yanai (1997) The ecology of root lifespan. *Advances in Ecological Research*, 27, 1-60.

3.13 Hendricks & Pregitzer (1992) The demography of fine roots in a northern hardwood forest. *Ecology*, 73, 1094-1104.

3.14 BRE Digest 412: Desiccation in clay soils.

3.15 Matheny & Clark (1998) Trees and Development: A Technical Guide to Preservation of Trees During Land Development.

3.16 https://www.hillingdon.gov.uk/protected-trees

4. The Trees

4.1 The trees can be summarised as follows:

BS 5837 Cat	A	B	C	U
Specific Trees	-	T3, T8, T10, T11, T13	T1, T2, T4, T5, T7, T9, T12 TG1, TG2, TG3, TG4, TG5 H1, H2, H3 S1	T6
Total Number	None	5 trees	7 trees, 5 tree groups, 3 hedged and 1 shrub.	1 tree*

**Based on available access.*

4.2 There were no hedgerows that qualify for consideration under the 1997 Hedgerow Regulations.

5.1 Site Specific Soils

5.1.1 Soil is an important factor in tree growth and the type of underlying soil can impact on successful integration of new developments.

5.1.2 A free draining sandy soil containing sand/gravel is likely to lead to water being accessible in the upper horizons during the growing season and available at greater depths and trees will generally be forced to explore a larger volume/ depth on such soils. The structure of such soil also makes compression more difficult (by heavy construction plant), and root penetration is easier for the trees. By comparison, a clay soil is more easily compressed, particularly when wet and compression can have a greater impact on tree health.

5.1.3 British Geology Survey (BGS) data indicates the following:

Soil Description
Bedrock Deposits: Lambeth Group - Clay, silt and sand. Sedimentary bedrock formed between 59.2 and 47.8 million years ago during the Palaeogene period.[1] **Superficial Deposit: None recorded**

[1] https://webapps.bgs.ac.uk/lexicon/lexicon.cfm?pub=LMBE

Underlying Soil Material contains Clay	**Yes**
Soil Type increased rooting depth profile?	**No**
Increased risk of soil compaction due to soil type	**Yes**

5.1.4 All comments regarding soils should be verified with onsite geotechnical investigations and laboratory testing with foundation depth and design undertaken by a structural engineer comment regarding soils should be verified with onsite geotechnical investigations and laboratory testing with foundation depth and design undertaken by a structural engineer in accordance with the requirements of NHBC Chapter 4.2.

5.1.5 BS5837 indicates: 4.6.2 "*The RPA for each tree should initially be plotted as a circle centred on the base of the stem. 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*." It advises at Section 4.6.3 That any deviation in the RPA from the original circular plot should take account of a number of site-specific factors.

5.1.6 BS5837 recognises that the root morphology of trees may be affected by a number of factors and in certain situations the plotting of RPA's will deviate from the circle to reflect site specific considerations. It is our experience that to consider structures such as driveways, houses and garages as areas trees cannot utilise for rooting (and to then modify RPA plotting where they exist within an identified RPA) is too simplistic and not aligned with how trees actually utilise soil.

5.1.7 Within around 3 to 4m of the base of mature trees there will generally be a structural root system providing both support and the main structure/ root architecture for smaller roots to originate. These larger roots have the very real capacity to be influence by any significant structures (footings, roads to adoptable standard construction etc) where there may be a physical obstruction close to them and this can affect root morphology in such locations. In addition to this there will generally be a noticeable increase in structural rooting to the southwest of mature trees in the UK to reflect the prevailing wind direction, particularly where a tree may be isolated/ open grown increasing its wind exposure. Root growth and location will also be influenced by the presence of other trees, structures sheltering trees etc all of which can combine to affect the shape and location of a structural root system.



Fig 2 – Open grown trees or those with minimal obstructions close to their stems will have a network of structural roots supporting feeder/ fine root growth beyond (above left). In certain situations, root morphology can be affected by structures close to the main stem (above right: Mattheck).

5.1.8 Beyond the structural (and generally permanent) root system will be a network of smaller roots which in turn subdivide to fine roots. Fine roots will also be found throughout the root system (i.e. both close to and distant from a tree) to maximise soil resource uptake and reflect underlying soil conditions. Some larger roots (>25mm and sometimes much larger) can extend away from this area and remain permanent particularly where there may be a constant supply of water (such as a broken downpipe on a building some distance away) which encourages a roots development. Generally, the smaller roots (<10mm and particularly fibrous roots) outside of the immediate structural root plate can be considered to be in a state of constant change. They will grow seasonally, and tree roots generally grow at night. Small fibrous roots are also mostly short lived (ranging from anything

between 10 days to over a year[2]). The cyclical death and decay of roots releases both nitrogen and carbon into the soil and is an important part of soil nutrient cycling process. The extent and location of the trees fine root system reflects a trees resource requirement (as resources are removed from certain areas of the soil and exploited in others) as well as the resource capacity required to form such a fibrous root system. Fine roots produced near the soil surface tend to live longer than those deeper in the soil[3]. The fine root system shows species variation and will also vary in depth (depending on species dynamics and underlying soil conditions). Adopted highways generally have a footing that extends < 0.5m and most UK residential properties have footings in the range of 0.5-1.5m depth.

[2] Eissenstat & Yanai (1997) The ecology of root lifespan. *Advances in Ecological Research,* 27, 1-60.
[3] Hendricks & Pregitzer (1992) The demography of fine roots in a northern hardwood forest. *Ecology*, 73, 1094-1104.



Fig 3 – Fine root growth is (generally) seasonal peaking in late spring and again in early autumn but dying back in winter dormant periods when photosynthetic production ceases. This is an important part of the soil nutrient cycle and demonstrates that a static RPA as calculated by BS5837 is a 'simplistic' view of the tree rooting dynamic. (Image Source: Tamla Trees**)**

5.1.9 The fine root system shows species variation and will also vary in depth (depending on species dynamics and underlying soil conditions). Adopted highways generally have a footing that extends < 0.5m and most UK residential properties have footings in the range of 0.5-1.5m depth. Trees will easily root below these depths, and this is evidenced by the fact that every year in the UK there are thousands of tree related subsidence cases.



Fig 4 – Borehole log 10m from mature Oak tree on clay soil detailing fine roots to depths of 2.5m indicated with arrows (Source: Tamla Trees project) and annotated soil moisture depletion by trees showing a peak influence at 2m and extending to 5m (above right)

5.1.10 Against this backdrop rooting information seeking to manipulate RPA shapes to account for the presence of houses, garages etc outside of the immediate zone of structural rooting (3-4m) is not considered appropriate. Unless ground obstructions are present within the immediate structural rooting area or to such a depth as to nullify potential fine root growth (below basements or retaining wall step changes in levels for example) Tamla Trees ltd will show RPA's in a circular fashion but seek to maximise the quality and positioning of specified tree protection measures and encourage ground treatments (such as mulching – see Section 5.7). **Clients and developers must implement these measures for them to be effective. A failure to protect trees during the development process adversely affects soil and roots. Symptoms may not present themselves for a number of years following the development as the tree(s) enter a spiral of potentially irreversible decline.**

Fig 5 - Manion's spiral of tree decline for Norway Spruce (modified by Mrkva 1993)

5.1.11 BS5837 Section 4.6.3 Site Specific Assessment:

Section	Consideration	Site Specific Comments
4.6.3 (a)	*the morphology and disposition of the roots, when influenced by past or existing site conditions (e.g. the presence of roads, structures, and underground apparatus);*	• The existing site layout relative to the surveyed trees is such that we would not expect any significant root morphology influences. This opinion is formed on the basis the trees are in open garden settings. Note: The basal are of some 3rd party trees could not be seen.
4.6.3.(b)	*topography and drainage;*	• The site is level and there was no evidence of water pooling or localised flooding relative to trees.
4.6.4.(c)	*the soil type and structure;*	• Soil is indicated by the BGS as Lambeth Group (clay). Clay decreases the soil aeration and increases the risk associated with potential ground compaction. • This risk is reduced by a design that places all building construction work outside retained tree RPA's and delivers the tree protection measures, to include the no dig driveway, detailed within this report. • It should be noted that clay is present. Detailed foundation design and further comment on soil is deferred to the project structural engineer. • **Tree protection and ground protection measures detailed in this report will only be effective if these are instated immediately prior to all site works and maintained for the duration of the works. These must be briefed to all contractors, so they understand their purpose.**
4.6.4.(d)	*the likely tolerance of the tree to root disturbance or damage, based on factors such as species, age, condition and past management.*	• On the basis that there are no development (building) footprint RPA incursions, and the tree protection measures are installed prior to any on site activity and maintained for the duration of the works, there should be no discernible impact on the retained trees.

5.2 Root Protection Area (RPA) Incursions

5.2.1 The following incursions into the RPA's of trees to be retained have been identified:

BS 5837 Cat	A	B	C	Summary
RPA Incursion	-	T3 & T13	T1, T2 & TG5	**Pedestrian/ Machinery Access (Demolition & Construction) –** Protection provided by no dig driveway surface and herras fencing (see Appendix 6)
	-	All	All	**Demolition/ Construction (Works) –** All tree protection measures will be installed prior to any construction. Maintained throughout.
	-	All	All	**Site Storage –** Storage will be in the designated area to the west on the existing driveway/ installed no dig surface or other areas outside of the protection measures.
	-	-	-	**Services** – To tie into existing building, any new connections/ RPA incursions hand dug as indicated at Section 5.6. Please refer to Appendix 6 for identification of areas within rear garden outside RPA in the event of a new soakaway installation. The general principles of NJUG 4 – National Joint Utilities Group "Guidelines for the planning, installation, and maintenance of utility apparatus in proximity to trees. Volume 4, issue 2. London: NJUG 2007" should be adhered to. Special guidance (overview) on hand digging is included within this report for any service excavation which may be required within the RPA. All new manhole chambers must be located outside the RPA of any retained tree. **Contractors (demo & construction) must be made aware of this requirement.** **Landscaping (Soft) –** All making good must be with BS3882 compliant topsoil raked out by hand. See Section 5.7 for further details. Further comments on soft landscaping works are outside the scope of this report.

5.2.2 There is a proposed no dig surface and the RPA incursions for this are detailed below:

Tree Number	RPA Total (Sqm)	Existing Incursion (Sqm)	As % of trees RPA	Proposed Incursion (Sqm)	As % of trees RPA	Difference +/-
T1	707	57	8%	57	8%	**No change**
T2	65	2	3%	2	3%	**No change**
T3	150	32	21%	32	21%	**No change**
T13	707	-	-	144	20%	**+20%**
TG5	14	8	57%	8	57%	**No Change**
Increase in RPA covered		**Decrease in RPA covered**				

5.2.3 It is recognised that BS5837 recommends all structures be placed outside the RPA of retained trees: *5.3.1 The default position should be that structures (see 3.10) are located outside the RPAs of trees to be retained. However, where there is an overriding justification for construction within the RPA, technical solutions might be available that prevent damage to the tree(s) (see Clause 7). If operations within the RPA are proposed, the project arboriculturist should: a) demonstrate that the tree(s) can remain viable and that the area lost to encroachment can be compensated for elsewhere, contiguous with its RPA; b) propose a series of mitigation measure.*

5.2.4 It is considered in this instance that there is 'overriding justification' on the basis the design places all new construction works outside the RPA of retained trees. The incursion is for a no dig driveway surface which subject to correct installation should not have a discernible negative impact on the identified trees.

Tree & Development Risk Indicator



- **Note:** This level of risk if a visual guide only and is only relevant **if all advised tree protective measures are put in place prior to any on site activity and maintained for the duration of the works.**
- **LOW risk on the basis the no dig surface and tree protection measures are installed as indicated.**
- **Note:** Only on-site testing can confirm the local soil conditions below foundation level, but available information suggests the presence of a Lambeth Group (clay).



Fig 6 – Diagram showing the typical particulate composition and air/ water content at field capacity for mineral soil types[4] The variation in soil type has a direct bearing on the potential impact of adverse construction techniques (such as soil compaction) as well as overall root system morphology & development. Clay soils tend to have shallower rooting as moisture remains readily available while soils containing free draining gravel and sand can encourage deeper rooting based on reduce soil bulk density and greater seasonal variations in moisture availability.

[4] Forestry Commission (2005) The Influence of Soils and Species on Tree Root Depth

5.3 Tree Pruning & Removal

5.3.1 No trees are pruned or removed to facilitate the proposed works. The following tree removals are identified to deliver a between balance between the extended property and trees given the revised footprint/ proximity.

Tree Surgery

Tree No.	Species	Proposed Tree Works	BS Cat

Proposed Removal

Tree No.	Species	Proposed Tree Works	BS Cat
T4	Apple	Remove	**C1**
T5	Apple	Remove	**C1**
TG1	Cherry x 1 Oak x 2	Remove	**C1**
S1	Cherry Laurel	Remove	**C1**

5.3.2 **Birds -** In the event future tree works are required to be completed between 1st March & the 31st of July (inclusive) a due diligence check for nesting birds must be completed before work starts in order to comply with the Wildlife & Countryside Act 1981. This check should be recorded in the Site-Specific Risk Assessment. If active nests are found work should not take place until the young have fledged.

5.3.3 **Bats** – It should be noted that in England and Wales, the relevant legislation is the Wildlife and Countryside Act (1981) (as amended); the Countryside and Rights of Way Act, 2000; the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act (NERC, 2006); and by the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations (2010).

Tree Pruning Indicator



- Design unlikely to create pruning pressures given spatial design relative to existing trees.
- Local Authority retain control given the site location within a designated Conservation Area.
- **Note:** This is an indicative assessment. All and any future works should be undertaken in accordance with BS3998 (Tree Works), and we recommend the use of Arboricultural Association approved contractors.[5]

5.3.4 Please note that this is not a health and safety assessment report and that vigilance for the emergence of any fungal pathogens is advised. Please also note T1 (Oak) this is a large remaining stem included within the report based on its likely ecosystem services.

[5] https://www.trees.org.uk/ARB-Approved-Contractor-Directory

5.4 Demolition & Foundations

5.4.1 All tree protection will be installed prior to any on site activity. The proposed tree protection procedure can be summarised as follows:

Stage 1

- Remove T4, T5, TG1 & S1
- Install BS5837 Tree Protective Fencing and No Dig Driveway (See Appendix 6).
- Brief all contractors on purpose of tree protection.

Stage 2

- Construct extension/ modify existing garage building.
- Connect services.

Stage 3

- Protection remains in place for complete development cycle.
- No dig driveway topped up/ finalised at end of construction.
- BS3882 compliant topsoil imported and raked out where required to 'make good'.
- Undertake soft landscaping.

5.4.2 High quality BS5837 compliant fencing will be installed **prior to any on-site development activity.**

Tree Protection	
	**Overview** • ***Feet fencing spec (left).*** • ***Note: To be marked with signs (inset) and purpose to be briefed to all ground workers.*** • ***Maintained for duration of the build.***
Threat Level to Retained Trees	**LOW**

5.4.3 All internal tree protection must be appropriately signed to ensure that all site operatives know its purpose.

Fig 7 – Professional grade weatherproof tree protection signs no smaller than 297 x 420 mm (A3) should be placed on protective fencing.

5.4.4 A no dig surface is required to allow the new driveway and construction access through the RPA's of retained trees. This is because the existing driveway is inadequate to the front and new relative to its extent for the 3rd party tree referenced as T13. **It is indicated within this section of the report because its installation prior to any on site activity forms an integral part of the tree protection process.**



Fig 8 – 2 areas of no dig driveway will be installed prior to any on site activity.

5.4.5 An overview of the no dig surface installation is as follows (**Note:** exact dimensions/ thicknesses amended to reflect surface use).

- **Ground made up in levels with BS3882 compliant topsoil raked out by hand to no more than 150mm depth within RPA and to achieve flat surface where necessary.**
- **Cellweb 3-Dimensional Cellular Confinement System expanded (left) – *thickness proposed to reflect end use.***
- **Laid on Permatex 300 Separation Geotextile**
- **Secured with Cellweb Staking Pins**
- **Mesh joined by Cellweb Stapler and Staples**
- **Mesh filled with 4/20mm Clean angular stone to BS EN 13242 and 12620**
- **Edge supported with suitable timber edging or floating concrete set as appropriate.**
- **Wearing course (gravel – topped up at end of works) then installed.**

Fig 9 – No Dig Surface Overview

5.4.5 The process can be summarised as follows:

Step 1

- Remove surface vegetation/ existing surface by hand or with suitable herbicide/ or existing hard surface. Rake out topsoil.
- Fill any hollows in the exposed ground with sharp sand or 4/20mm clean angular stone.
- Install timber / graniute set (floating) edge treatment.
- Place Permatex 300 Geotextile over the area to be protected ensuring laps are a minimum of 300mm

Step 2

- Place the collapsed panel on the geotextile and pin through 3 cells across the driveways secure using cellweb staking pins.
- Expand the panel to its full length of and pin across the opposite panel end using cellweb staking pins.
- Staple any adjacent panels together using the cellweb stapler and staples.
- The panels can be cut to shape if required with a heavy duty Stanley Knife
- Install final edge treatment (floating set or similar) to abutt existing timber edge.

Step 3

- Fill the pockets with a 4/20mm **clean** angular stone.
- Allow for any settlement of the stone in the cells and top up if necessary.
- Ensure edge oversite to abut resin/ block surface.
- Lay top wearing course/ top up as required. .
- Remove tree protective fencing at end of project.

Note: Exact specifications to be agreed with structural engineers/ architects as appropriate

- Area of no dig surface marked out.
- Edge treatment installed
- Geo-fabric laid following localised levelling/ veg removal.
- Geo-cell expanded.



- Cells then filled working from filled cells only



- Wearing course then installed (gravel shown in example)

Fig 10 – Simple overview flow of surface installation process

5.4.6 Temporary ground protection is not required but will be kept under review and installed in the event of any unforeseen access/ storage requirements within tree RPA's. The specification of ground protection should reflect the movements across it. An overview of this is provided below:



Fig 11 – Overview of ground protection. The contractor must ensure the specification is suitable for the works (overview of this above right). To be installed where hard surfacing is not already in place prior to any on site construction activity within RPA's – See TPP (Appendix 6) for locations - to be kept under review and installed as required if any deviations required to protection measures/ locations.

Fig 12 – Temporary ground protection is an effective way of allowing access through the RPA of retained trees. It must be installed prior to any on site activity and maintained for the duration of all works to be effective. Above left Tamla Trees project ground protection in place and above right being removed following the completion of site works. (**Note:** *depending on the length of time it is in place it will adversely affect underlying grass ground cover which will need reseeded/ turfed accordingly*)

5.4.7 **Site Manager/ Consultant Sign Off:** At this point a site inspection is required to confirm the appropriate tree protection measures have been completed.

Date of Inspection	Compliance with Tree Protection Plan?			
	Yes		No	
Rectification Actions (insert notes)				
Site Manager Signature:				
Print Name:				
Arboricultural Consultant Signature:				
Print Name:				

SITE TREES ARE NOW ADEQUATELY PROTECTED AND DEMOLITION/ CONSTRUCTION ACTIVITY CAN COMMENCE

5.5 Surfaces near Trees

5.5.6 Because of its role in tree protection please see Section 5.4 as the no dig driveway installation must be installed prior to any on site activity.

5.6 Site Service Provision

5.6.1 All services should be designed outside the RPA where possible and no manhole/ chambers should be located within the retained tree RPA. Where further excavations are required, these will be undertaken by hand if within the RPA of retained trees.



***Note**: Fine tree root growth extends deeper than shown above*

Fig 13 – Annotated service installation depth drawing (source: Thorne & Derrick**). Service installations occupy the same soil volume/ depth where the greatest level of tree roots will likely be found. It is envisaged that services will connect to the existing property and that no new service connections are required.**

5.6.2 **Soakaway** – A new soakaway is not advised, and the underlying soil type (clay) suggests such an installation will not be used but space exists outside retained tree RPA's.



Fig 14 – Any soakaway (if being installed) should be located in the part of the garden not affected by the RPA of retained trees.

5.6.3 **Services -** Any activity to excavate within the RPA (not currently indicated – for information/ guidance as required) has the capacity to cause root damage and should be hand dug in accordance with the principles detailed as follows:

PLEASE NOTE THIS OPERATION HAS AN ELEVATED CAPACITY TO CAUSE DAMAGE TO TREE ROOTS

5.6.4 **Planning the excavation:** A 'toolbox talk' will spot mark and agree the locations and working practices. In the event tree roots (multiple &/or roots >25mm in diameter) are encountered work will stop and progress with hand tools only.

				
Narrow Face Spade & Hand Trowel	**Stiff Hand Brush**	**Hi Vis Paint (for spot marking roots)**	**Hessian (to wrap exposed roots)**	**Duct Tape (to secure hessian)**

Fig 15 – Advised tools/ materials which should be available for all excavation works within RPA.

5.6.5 Digging around tree roots is a skill and operatives must proceed with caution. Once a root is located it is often necessary to use a combination of hand tools and a stiff hand brush to track and 'trace' the roots location. Spot marking roots >25mm with spray paint is advised. **All roots >25mm in diameter will be retained. Please also note that retention of all roots where possible (including fibrous ones) is advised.**

5.6.6 **How deep?** – The excavation need only be as deep as the relevant service to be installed requires. **WARNING:** Breaking the ground has the potential to uncover services/ destabilise adjacent structures etc. Some general advice from the HSE can be found here.

5.6.7 **Root Wrapping/ Protection:** In the event the footing works expose any roots >25mm in diameter these must be wrapped or protected with a covering of soil if left exposed overnight or for longer than any single 4-hour period before backfilling following service install.

Root Wrapping	
  	**Overview** • ***Any exposed roots >25mm should be wrapped in hessian (example left) if exposed overnight or for any 4-hour period.*** • ***Spot marking with spray paint to highlight locations also advised.*** • ***Alternatively, roots can be covered over with topsoil to maintain moisture retention.*** • ***Example Tamla Trees project on London Plane (left).***
Threat Level to Retained Trees	**HIGH**

5.7 Ground Level Changes, Landscaping & Soil Remediation

5.7.1 All ‘making good’ will be with BS3882 compliant topsoil raked out by hand (to no more than 100mm depth within any tree RPA) and then seeded/ planted as appropriate. Further comments on full landscaping details are beyond the scope of this report.

Fig 16 – All ‘making good’ topsoil will be BS3882 compliant and raked out by hand to no greater depth than 100mm.

5.7.2 Any new boundary fencing will be installed to supplier's detail. Post positions should be set out to maximise spatial separation from trees which may be close to the boundaries.

Post Positioning



Overview

- ***Post positions set out prior to works to maximise positioning from tree stems.***
- ***This approach reduces the risk of large roots being encountered.***
- ***Visual representation of approach (example) left.***
- ***This MUST be conveyed to contractors prior to works.***
- ***May result in bespoke, extra length panel sections being required.***
- ***Gravel boards (if utilised) must sit at existing ground level (with wildlife gaps) with NO EXCAVATION to incorporate (where within RPA). . Localised soil feathering in can achieve levels.***

Threat Level to Retained Trees	LOW

5.7.3 Post excavation will be by hand. (Note: it may be possible to reuse existing posthole excavations where existing fencing is located/ replaced).

Post Hole Excavation

Overview

- ***Post holes excavated by hand.***
- ***Repositioned in the event any roots >25mm encountered.***

Threat Level to Retained Trees	LOW

5.7.4 All fibrous roots to be cleanly cut by secateurs or similar.

Root Pruning	
	**Overview** • ***All roots >25mm retained (see left for example).*** • ***Fine fibrous roots <25mm cleanly cut with secateurs or similar (inset).***
Threat Level to Retained Trees	**LOW**

5.7.5 Any excavation is then lined to prevent concrete to root contact.

Excavation Lined	
	**Overview** • ***All excavations are lined prior to postcrete or similar being used.*** • ***This approach prevents root to concrete contact (as concrete is poisonous to tree roots).***
Threat Level to Retained Trees	**LOW**

5.7.6 We encourage the use of composted bark mulch below tree canopies where possible to aid water retention and increase soil microbial activity. This is particularly relevant to mature retained trees.

Mulching	
	**Overview** • ***Circular area edged to 50-100mm depth to stop mulch from 'creeping' on to surround lawn.*** • ***Composted mulch then spread around below tree by hand – no need to lift or remove underlying grass.*** • ***Mulch topped up annually/ as required.*** • ***Positive benefits for mulched trees***
Threat Level to Retained Trees	**LOW**



Fig 17 – Benefits of Mulch (Image Source 1st Stop Landscape Supply (US)

5.7.7 Where soft landscape planting occurs within the RPA of retained trees, we advise the use of small pot sizes and plug planting where possible to minimize the risk of root disturbance.

Plug and Pot Planting	
	**Overview** • ***Within 1.5m of retained trees planting should be with plug stock (left)*** • ***Small plant pot sizes <3l utilised for new planting in further areas.*** • ***Hand dug planting holes.*** • ***Top dressed in compacted bark mulch/ soil as appropriate.*** • ***Watered weekly May – September during season 1 & 2.***
Threat Level to Retained Trees	**LOW**

5.8 Tree Shading of Proposal

5.8.1 The level of tree cover combined with an open plan design with large bifold doors and windows means shading is not considered an issue.

5.9 Arboricultural Project Supervision

5.9.1 Most damage to trees on developments sites is caused inadvertently and to ensure continued protection during development a system of site monitoring is normal.

5.9.2 Basic checks will be undertaken as the construction phase progresses to ensure that protective fencing remains intact and ensure the proposed works close to trees are completed in accordance with this report. Any unforeseen issues can be identified and discussed with the consulting arboriculturalist before any damage to trees occurs.

5.9.3 This approach allows a strong working relationship with the site manager/ construction staff to identify issues that may affect retained trees and ensure they are addressed before they escalate.

5.9.4 After each site inspection is completed, a formal record will be sent to the local authority. On this basis we would advise the following inspection regime:

Visit Detail	Date	Status
1st Site Inspection Attend site once tree protection is in place. Inspect/ Toolbox talk with site operatives regarding tree protection measures but prior to any on site works. Update local authority on findings.	**TBC**	**Incomplete**
Final Site Inspection Final site visit to confirm that no damage has been done to retained trees/ identify any remedial actions in the event damage has occurred. Assess any required tree surgery following construction. Update local authority and project team on findings.	**TBC**	**Incomplete**

Note: Actual visit dates subject to change/ confirmation depending on project program. Note: On small residential developments confirmation of tree protection can often be achieved with exchange of photographs.

Appendix 1 – BS5837 Survey Key

BS 5837 Cat	Description
A	Those of high quality and value: in such a condition as to be able to make a substantial contribution (> 40 years)
B	Those trees of moderate quality and value: those in such a condition as to make a significant contribution (> 20 years)
C	Those trees of low quality and value: currently in an adequate condition to remain until new planting could be established (> 10 years)
U	Those in such a condition that any existing value would be lost within 10 years, and which should, in the current context, be removed regardless of development (< 10 years)

Note: Subcategories are denoted in the tree survey data (A1, B1, C2 etc.). You are referred to BS5837 for further detail if required.

Tree No.	T (tree), G (group), H (hedge), W (woodland) + Ref No.
Species	Common Name
Ht (m)	Measured height in metres
DBH (m)	Diameter at 1.5m above ground level
No of stems	An indication of the trees form @1.5m (1 = single stem, m/s = multi-stemmed)
Branch Spread	In m to cardinal points
Cr Ht Clearance (m)	Overall height of lowest branches from the ground level on side of proposed development
Life Stage	Young, Semi-Mature, Early Mature, Mature, Over-Mature
General Observations	Observations on the condition of the tree(s)
Tree Work Specification	Proposed tree works in accordance with BS3998
BS Cat	See above
Life Exp	Estimated remaining contribution in years.
RPA Radius(m)	Radius of the trees Root Protection Area measured from the trunk to the edge of the RPA circle in metres

Appendix 2 – BS5837 Tree Classification

The classification of trees is undertaken during the survey to inform decisions as they relate to designs and retention/ removal. The 'value' of a tree in terms of its visual amenity is subjective and the full condition of a tree may not be apparent given access and other site-specific factors. If a tree is proposed for retention in many respects its BS category is irrelevant. We encourage the retention of all trees where the design realistically allows this with the exception of U cat trees (as these are usually 'defect' trees). There should not be a presumption that all C category trees can or should be removed. Generally, A & B Category trees are those of greatest value to a development and designs should be manipulated to retain these where possible. Further detail on classification of trees is contained at Section 4.5 of BS5837. Some selective extracts are detailed below:

4.5.2 *The purpose of the tree categorization method, which should be applied by an arboriculturist, is to identify the quality and value (in a non-fiscal sense) of the existing tree stock, allowing informed decisions to be made concerning which trees should be removed or retained in the event of development occurring.*

4.5.5 *When determining the appropriate category for any given tree, group, or woodland (see* ***4.4****), the arboriculturist should start by considering whether the tree falls within the scope of category U. Assuming that it does not, the arboriculturist should then proceed on the presumption that all trees are considered according to the criteria for inclusion in category A. Trees that do not meet these criteria should then be considered in light of the criteria for inclusion in category B. This process should be repeated, as required, until the appropriate quality or value assessment is reached.*

4.5.6 *Trees of generally high quality and/or value which have a defect or defects that do not reduce their retention span below the suggested 40-year threshold, should be placed in category A, i.e. they should not be downgraded as a result of minor imperfections.* **Tamla Trees Note:** We do not apply a simple >40 = Cat A approach as many trees will have retention values in excess of 40 years but not be considered Cat A.

4.5.11 *The tree survey might identify the presence of veteran trees on the site. The implications of their presence on the use of the surrounding land should be assessed at the earliest possible stage of the design process. Where such trees are to be retained, particular care should be taken in the design to accommodate them in a setting that aids their long-term retention.*

Please note assessments are made based on available access and factors can affect full inspections (3rd party tree location, extensive basal undergrowth, Ivy etc). This survey is not a full health and safety inspection although obvious defects (where noted) will be identified.

BS5837 Table 1 is shown on the following page and provides detail on the relevant categorisation. Elements of this remain subjective and if a tree is shown for retention its category is somewhat irrelevant as we consider all trees should be afforded the same value/ protection if to be retained.

Table 1 Cascade chart for tree quality assessment

Category and definition	Criteria (including subcategories where appropriate)			Identification on plan
Trees unsuitable for retention (see Note)				
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	• Trees that have a serious, irremediable, structural defect, such that their early loss is expected due to collapse, including those that will become unviable after removal of other category U trees (e.g. where, for whatever reason, the loss of companion shelter cannot be mitigated by pruning) • Trees that are dead or are showing signs of significant, immediate, and irreversible overall decline • Trees infected with pathogens of significance to the health and/or safety of other trees nearby, or very low quality trees suppressing adjacent trees of better quality *NOTE Category U trees can have existing or potential conservation value which it might be desirable to preserve; see 4.5.7.*			See Table 2
	1 Mainly arboricultural qualities	**2 Mainly landscape qualities**	**3 Mainly cultural values, including conservation**	
Trees to be considered for retention				
Category A **Trees of high quality** with an estimated remaining life expectancy of at least 40 years	Trees that are particularly good examples of their species, especially if rare or unusual; or those that are essential components of groups or formal or semi-formal arboricultural features (e.g. the dominant and/or principal trees within an avenue)	Trees, groups or woodlands of particular visual importance as arboricultural and/or landscape features	Trees, groups or woodlands of significant conservation, historical, commemorative or other value (e.g. veteran trees or wood-pasture)	See Table 2
Category B **Trees of moderate quality** with an estimated remaining life expectancy of at least 20 years	Trees that might be included in category A, but are downgraded because of impaired condition (e.g. presence of significant though remediable defects, including unsympathetic past management and storm damage), such that they are unlikely to be suitable for retention for beyond 40 years; or trees lacking the special quality necessary to merit the category A designation	Trees present in numbers, usually growing as groups or woodlands, such that they attract a higher collective rating than they might as individuals; or trees occurring as collectives but situated so as to make little visual contribution to the wider locality	Trees with material conservation or other cultural value	See Table 2
Category C **Trees of low quality** with an estimated remaining life expectancy of at least 10 years, or young trees with a stem diameter below 150 mm	Unremarkable trees of very limited merit or such impaired condition that they do not qualify in higher categories	Trees present in groups or woodlands, but without this conferring on them significantly greater collective landscape value; and/or trees offering low or only temporary/transient landscape benefits	Trees with no material conservation or other cultural value	See Table 2

Appendix 3 – BS5837 Survey Data

Tree No.	Species	DBH (m)	No of Stems	Ht (m)	Crown Spread				BS Cat	Age Class	Life Expect	Cr Ht (m)	Observation	Recommendations	RPR (m)
					N	E	S	W							
T1	Oak	2	1	4.4	1	1	1	1	C1	Mature	20 to 40	2	Large remnant high stump which straddles boundary. Some growth trying to establish. High habitat value even though this is potentially considered a low-quality tree in layman terms. Ivy.	No works	15
T2	Hornbeam	0.38	2	9	5.1	3.3	2	3.9	C1	Mature	20 to 40	1.4	Suppressed, one stem with decay.	No works	4.6
T3	Hornbeam	0.57	2	16	5	5.5	5	5.4	B1	Mature	> 40	2.5	Reasonable example previously reduced.	No works	6.8
T4	Apple	0.09	1	3	1.6	1	1.4	2	C1	Mature	20 to 40	0.4	Small partially tilted/ leaning fruit tree.	Remove	1.1

Tree No.	Species	DBH (m)	No of Stems	Ht (m)	Crown Spread				BS Cat	Age Class	Life Expect	Cr Ht (m)	Observation	Recommendations	RPR (m)
					N	E	S	W							
T5	Apple	0.26	1	3.5	1.7	1.2	1.6	1.6	C1	Mature	20 to 40	0.4	Small previously reduced fruit tree.	Remove	3.1
T6	Apple	0.08	1	2.4	0.4	0.5	0.4	0.4	U	Mature	<10	0.4	Small previously reduced fruit tree. Large stem wound. Unlikely to mature/ develop.	No works	1
T7	Cypress	0.3	2	7	2.2	2.2	2	2	C1	Early-mature	20 to 40	0.3	Growing close to boundary. V union at 0.4m.	No works	3.6
T8	Oak	1	1	16	8	8	8	8	B1	Mature	> 40	3	No access to inspect, unsympathetic pruning in the past.	No works	12
T9	Hawthorn	0.2	2	3.6	1.5	1	1.5	2.3	C1	Mature	10 to 20	2	Ivy covered tree with lean.	No works	2.4

Tree No.	Species	DBH (m)	No of Stems	Ht (m)	Crown Spread				BS Cat	Age Class	Life Expect	Cr Ht (m)	Observation	Recommendations	RPR (m)
					N	E	S	W							
T10	Oak	1	1	16	7	7	6.5	6.4	B1	Mature	> 40	3	unsympathetic pruning in the past.	No works	12
T11	Oak	1	1	16	8	8	8	8	B1	Mature	> 40	3	No access to inspect, unsympathetic pruning in the past.	No works	12
T12	Apple	0.22	1	3.6	2	1.5	1.7	1.7	C1	Mature	20 to 40	0.5	Small previously reduced fruit tree.	No works	2.6
T13	Hornbeam	1.5	M/S	16	8	8	8	8	B1	Mature	> 40	1.6	Large 3rd party tree with no access to inspect. Multiple stems from close to ground level. Likely some weak unions evident. Some previous canopy pruning. Large example developing features associated with veteran status.	No works	15

Tree No.	Species	DBH (m)	No of Stems	Ht (m)	Crown Spread				BS Cat	Age Class	Life Expect	Cr Ht (m)	Observation	Recommendations	RPR (m)
					N	E	S	W							
TG1	Cherry x 1, Oak x 2	0.12	1	3.2	1.9	2	1.7	2	C1	Young	> 40	1	Small closely planted establishing trees. Relocating elsewhere in the garden may be possible.	Remove	1.4
TG2	Yew, Bay Laurel, Ash	0.15	M/S	5	3	3	3	3	C1	Mature	20 to 40	0.5	Small clump of close grown trees.	No works	1.8
TG3	Cypress	0.4	1	7	3	3	3	3	C1	Mature	20 to 40	0.4	Unmanaged close grown screen planting.	No works	4.8
TG4	Apple & Yew	0.2	1	4	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	C1	Mature	20 to 40	0.4	Close grown boundary vegetation.	No works	2.4
TG5	Laurel & Prunus	0.1	1	3	2	2	2	2	C1	Young	> 40	1	Small recently reduced planting.	No works	1.2

Tree No.	Species	DBH (m)	No of Stems	Ht (m)	Crown Spread				BS Cat	Age Class	Life Expect	Cr Ht (m)	Observation	Recommendations	RPR (m)
					N	E	S	W							
H1	Beech	0.8	1	2	0.6	0.6	0.6	0.6	C1	Mature	> 40	0	Established and well managed hedge for much of boundary. Larger stems closer to property and all located within 3rd party garden.	No works	9.6
H2	Yew & Cypress	0.08	1	3	0.6	0.6	0.6	0.6	C1	Mature	20 to 40	0	Managed 3rd party hedge.	No works	1
H3	Yew	0.1	1	2.6	0.6	0.6	0.6	0.6	C1	Mature	20 to 40	0	Managed screen hedge.	No works	1.2
S1	Laurel (Cherry)	0.28	M/S	3	1.6	1.8	1.6	1.7	C1	Mature	20 to 40	2	Established multi stem shrub.	Remove	3.4

Appendix 4 – Tree Works Schedule

Tree Surgery

Tree No.	Species	Proposed Tree Works	BS Cat

Proposed Removal

Tree No.	Species	Proposed Tree Works	BS Cat
T4	Apple	Remove	**C1**
T5	Apple	Remove	**C1**
TG1	Cherry x 1 Oak x 2	Remove	**C1**
S1	Cherry Laurel	Remove	**C1**

NOTE: All tree works to be undertaken in accordance with BS 3998:2010 'Tree work - Recommendations'.

NOTE: We recommend using Arboricultural Association approved contractors who can be sourced here

Appendix 5 - Tree Constraints Plan



Tree No	Species	DBH	Height	Age Class	Life Exp	Observations	BS Cat	RPR
T1	Oak	2	4.4	Mature	20 to 40	Large remnant high stump which straddles boundary. Some growth trying to establish. High habitat value even though this is potentially considered a low-quality tree in layman terms. Ivy.	C1	15.0
T2	Hornbeam	0.38	9	Mature	20 to 40	Suppressed, one stem with decay.	C1	4.6
T3	Hornbeam	0.57	16	Mature	> 40	Reasonable example previously reduced.	B1	6.8
T4	Apple	0.09	3	Early-mature	20 to 40	Small partially tilted/ leaning fruit tree.	C1	1.1
T5	Apple	0.26	3.5	Early-mature	20 to 40	Small previously reduced fruit tree.	C1	3.1
T6	Apple	0.08	2.4	Young	<10	Small previously reduced fruit tree. Large stem wound.	U	1.0
T7	Cypress	0.3	7	Early-mature	20 to 40	Growing close to boundary. V union at 0.4m.	C1	3.6
T8	Oak	1	16	Mature	> 40	No access to inspect, unsympathetic pruning in the past.	B1	12.0
T9	Hawthorn	0.2	3.6	Early-mature	10 to 20	Ivy covered tree with lean.	C1	2.4
T10	Oak	1	16	Mature	> 40	Unsympathetic pruning in the past. Surrounded by Cypress (TG3).	B1	12.0
T11	Oak	1	16	Mature	> 40	No access to inspect, unsympathetic pruning in the past.	B1	12.0
T12	Apple	0.22	3.6	Mature	20 to 40	Small previously reduced fruit tree.	C1	2.6
T13	Hornbeam	1.5	16	Mature	> 40	Large 3rd party tree with no access to inspect. Multiple stems from close to ground level. Likely some weak unions evident. Some previous canopy pruning. Large example developing features associated with veteran status.	B1	15.0
TG1	Cherry x1, Oak x2	0.12	3.2	Young	> 40	Small closely planted establishing trees.	C1	1.4
TG2	Yew, Bay Laurel, Ash	0.15	5	Mature	20 to 40	Small clump of close grown trees.	C1	1.8
TG3	Cypress	0.4	7	Mature	20 to 40	Unmanaged close grown screen planting.	C1	4.8
TG4	Apple & Yew	0.2	4	Mature	20 to 40	Close grown boundary vegetation.	C1	2.4
TG5	Laurel & Prunus	0.1	3	Young	> 40	Small recently reduced planting.	C1	1.2
H1	Beech	0.08	2	Mature	> 40	Established and well managed hedge for much of boundary. Larger stems closer to property and all located within 3rd party garden.	C1	1
H2	Yew & Cypress	0.08	3	Mature	20 to 40	Managed 3rd party hedge.	C1	1.0
H3	Yew	0.1	2.6	Mature	20 to 40	Managed screen hedge.	C1	1.2
S1	Laurel (Cherry)	0.28	3	Mature	20 to 40	Established multi stem shrub.	C1	3.4

Tree Survey Drawing Key



See Tamla Trees, Tree Survey for Individual Tree Details

KEY

Please refer to Tamla Trees report for details

- Category A - Trees of high quality
- Category B - moderate quality
- Category C - low quality
- Category U - Dead, Dying or Defect trees with <10 years retention value

RPA - root protection area as defined by Table 2 BS 5837:2012

NOTE # Tree positions indicatively mapped due to lack of detailed topographical plan

REV	AMENDMENTS	DRAWN	DATE	AUTH'D

PROJECT
15 The Avenue,
Ickenham, Uxbridge,
UB10 8NR

CLIENT
Multi Creation

TITLE
Tree Constraint Plan (TCP)

Job	Scale	DRG NO	Revision
05257R	1:200 @ A1	05257P_TCP_01	-
Dated	Sheet		
09/01/2025	1		

Tel: 01252 811 233
Email: info@tamlatrees.com
Web: www.tamlatrees.com
Tamla Trees consulting arborists



Tree No	Species	DBH	Height	Age Class	Life Exp	Observations	BS Cat	RPR
T1	Oak	2	4.4	Mature	20 to 40	Large remnant high stump which straddles boundary. Some growth trying to establish. High habitat value even though this is potentially considered a low-quality tree in layman terms. Ivy.	C1	15.0
T2	Hornbeam	0.38	9	Mature	20 to 40	Suppressed, one stem with decay.	C1	4.6
T3	Hornbeam	0.57	16	Mature	> 40	Reasonable example previously reduced.	B1	6.8
T4	Apple	0.09	3	Early-mature	20 to 40	Small partially tilted/ leaning fruit tree.	C1	1.1
T5	Apple	0.26	3.5	Early-mature	20 to 40	Small previously reduced fruit tree.	C1	3.1
T6	Apple	0.08	2.4	Young	<10	Small previously reduced fruit tree. Large stem wound.	U	1.0
T7	Cypress	0.3	7	Early-mature	20 to 40	Growing close to boundary. V union at 0.4m.	C1	3.6
T8	Oak	1	16	Mature	> 40	No access to inspect, unsympathetic pruning in the past.	B1	12.0
T9	Hawthorn	0.2	3.6	Early-mature	10 to 20	Ivy covered tree with lean.	C1	2.4
T10	Oak	1	16	Mature	> 40	Unsympathetic pruning in the past. Surrounded by Cypress (TG3).	B1	12.0
T11	Oak	1	16	Mature	> 40	No access to inspect, unsympathetic pruning in the past.	B1	12.0
T12	Apple	0.22	3.6	Mature	20 to 40	Small previously reduced fruit tree.	C1	2.6
T13	Hornbeam	1.5	16	Mature	> 40	Large 3rd party tree with no access to inspect. Multiple stems from close to ground level. Likely some weak unions evident. Some previous canopy pruning. Large example developing features associated with veteran status.	B1	15.0
TG1	Cherry x1, Oak x2	0.12	3.2	Young	> 40	Small closely planted establishing trees.	C1	1.4
TG2	Yew, Bay Laurel, Ash	0.15	5	Mature	20 to 40	Small clump of close grown trees.	C1	1.8
TG3	Cypress	0.4	7	Mature	20 to 40	Unmanaged close grown screen planting.	C1	4.8
TG4	Apple & Yew	0.2	4	Mature	20 to 40	Close grown boundary vegetation.	C1	2.4
TG5	Laurel & Prunus	0.1	3	Young	> 40	Small recently reduced planting.	C1	1.2
H1	Beech	0.08	2	Mature	> 40	Established and well managed hedge for much of boundary. Larger stems closer to property and all located within 3rd party garden.	C1	1
H2	Yew & Cypress	0.08	3	Mature	20 to 40	Managed 3rd party hedge.	C1	1.0
H3	Yew	0.1	2.6	Mature	20 to 40	Managed screen hedge.	C1	1.2
S1	Laurel (Cherry)	0.28	3	Mature	20 to 40	Established multi stem shrub.	C1	3.4

Tree Survey Drawing Key



See Tamla Trees, Tree Survey for Individual Tree Details

KEY

Please refer to Tamla Trees report for details

- Category A - Trees of high quality
- Category B - moderate quality
- Category C - low quality
- Category U - Dead, Dying or Defect trees with <10 years retention value

RPA - root protection area as defined by Table 2 BS 5837:2012

NOTE # Tree positions indicatively mapped due to lack of detailed topographical plan

REV	AMENDMENTS	DRAWN	DATE	AUTH'D

PROJECT
15 The Avenue, Ickenham, Uxbridge, UB10 8NR

CLIENT
Multi Creation

TITLE
Tree Constraint Plan (TCP)

Job	Scale	DRG NO	Revision
05257R	1:200 @ A1	05257P_TCP_02	-
Date	Size		
09/01/2025	A		

Tel: 01252 811 233
Email: info@tamlatrees.com
Web: www.tamlatrees.com
Tamla Trees consulting arborists

Appendix 6 - Tree Protection Plans

Tree protection is essential to successfully integrate the proposal into the surrounding trees. It is designed to manage the impact on the underlying soil and rooting environment. It must therefore be installed prior to any further site activity. Even apparently minimal tracking of the soil near trees has the capacity to irretrievably modify the soil environment to the detriment of tree health and stability.

All our fencing specifications accord with advice and guidance within BS 5837. Modifications to fence types are possible but should be discussed prior to implementation. In all other instances the form detailed below should be shown. This offers the best protection to retained trees.

- **All tree protection must be in place prior to any site activities. It is recommended that this fencing is installed prior to any site works (including demolition).**
- **To be effective Tree Protection must remain in place for the duration of the development and form part of the site induction process.**
- **Fencing spec (right) to be installed prior to any on site activity.**
- **Combined with temporary ground protection.**




At Start
TPP Fencing
For Duration
TPP Signage in Place?
For Duration
TPP Remains
For Duration
Tree Protection Part of Induction Process
For Duration
Evidence of regular review?
TREE PROTECTION AREA
If you require access contact Site Manager
Keep out
THESE TREES ARE PROTECTED BY PLANNING CONDITIONS AND/OR IS THE SUBJECT OF A TREE PRESERVATION ORDER
GROUND COMPACTION KILLS TREE ROOTS - BREACHING A TPO IS A CRIMINAL OFFENCE - HELP RETAIN HEALTHY TREES BY RESPECTING THIS FENCING

THE AVENUE

20

17

40

T1 Oak#
C1

T2 Hornbeam#
C1

T3 Hornbeam#
B1

H1 Beech#
C1

TG5 Laurel & Prunus#
C1

T13 Hornbeam#
B1

H2 Yew & Cypress#
C1

S1 Cherry Laurel#
C1

TG1 Cherry x1, Oak x2#
C1

T4 Apple#
C1

T7 Cypress#
C1

T8 Oak#
B1

T6 Apple#
U

TG2 Yew, Bay Laurel, Ash#
C1

T5 Apple#
C1

T9 Hawthorn#
C1

TG3 Cypress#
C1

T12 Apple#
C1

H3 Yew#
C1

TG4 Apple & Yew#
C1

T10 Oak#
B1

T11 Oak#
B1

Tree Survey Drawing Key

Root Protection Area m2
Tree Canopy (crown)
Stem Location / Coloured dec dences BS 5837 Category
Tree Number
See Tamla Trees, Tree Survey for Individual Tree Details

KEY

Please refer to Tamla Trees report for details

- Category A - Trees of high quality
- Category B - moderate quality
- Category C - low quality
- Category U - Dead, Dying or Defect trees with <10 years retention value

RPA - root protection area as defined by Table 2 BS 5837:2012

Proposed removal - to facilitate Development

Location of protective fencing - BS 5837 Feet Fence (or similar)

Site hoarding

Existing pea shingle driveway

Existing building

Existing building to be demolished

Proposed extension

No dig construction drive

Site hoarding

Temporary Ground Protection Specification

To be installed prior to any on site activity (demolition or construction)

- *Retain existing on site hard standing if present for as long as possible.*
- *If indicated new temporary ground protection should be installed as part of the tree protection measures prior to work starting on site.*
- *For exposed unmade ground within Root Protection Area.*
- *To be laid on non-permeable membrane*
- *We recommend 3m x 1m x 20mm matts manufactured from recycled HMPE plastic, with carrying handles and an engraved grid pattern with minimum 150mm overlap to join together.*

To cover all exposed unmade ground for tree Root Protection Area outside of Tree Protective Fencing

Tree Protection Specification



Fencing to be installed prior to any on site activity (demolition or construction)

TREE PROTECTION AREA

If you require access contact Site Manager

Keep out

THESE TREES ARE PROTECTED BY PLANNING CONDITIONS AND/OR IS THE SUBJECT OF A TREE PRESERVATION ORDER

GROUND COMPACTION KILLS TREE ROOTS - BREACHING A TPO IS A CRIMINAL OFFENCE - HELP RETAIN HEALTHY TREES BY RESPECTING THIS FENCING

- *Warning signs to be located every 5m and to be minimum A3 in size (i.e. 42cm x 29.7cm)*
- *To be checked and replaced as necessary.*

Deviations from the advised tree protection compromises tree roots and should be avoided. The purpose of tree protection measures should be briefed to all on site staff.

NOTE # Tree positions indicatively mapped due to lack of detailed topographical plan

REV	AMENDMENTS	DRAWN	DATE	AUTHD

PROJECT
15 The Avenue, Ickenham, Uxbridge, UB10 8NR

CLIENT
Multi Creation

TITLE
Tree Protection Plan (TPE)

JOB	SCALE	DRG NO	Revision
05257R	1:200 @ A1	05257P_TPP_01	–
Date	Sheet		
09/01/2025	1		

Tel: 01252 811 233
Email: info@tamlatrees.com
Web: www.tamlatrees.com
Tamla Trees consulting arborists

Appendix 7 - Tree & Services Plan

- No services information currently available.
- To be kept under review as part of site inspection process.
- **Note:** All service companies should be provided with a copy of the Tree Protection Plan as early in the design process as possible to ensure that service routes are located outside RPA's where possible.
- NJUG 4 – National Joint Utilities Group "Guidelines for the planning, installation and maintenance of utility apparatus in proximity to trees. Volume 4, issue 2. London: NJUG 2007" to be adhered to at all times. A copy is available here.



Extract from National Joint Utilities Group "Guidelines for the planning, installation and maintenance of utility apparatus in proximity to trees. Volume 4, issue 2. London: NJUG 2007"

Service information not available but likely to tie into existing property connections.

Appendix 8 – Site Photographs

Image 1 – Existing garage/ outbuilding and grass area to be converted to no dig surface.

Image 2 – T13 Hornbeam

Image 3 –TG5 and access (part) to become no dig surface/ driveway.

Appendix 9 – Limitations

Full Legal Disclaimer

This report was prepared as a report of work instructed by client (as specified). Neither Tamla Trees ltd nor any associated company, nor any of their employees, nor any of their contractors, subcontractors, or their employees, makes any warranty, express or implied, or assumes any legal liability or responsibility for the accuracy, completeness, or any third party's use or the report and its findings. Reference herein to any specific commercial product, process, or service by trade name, trademark, manufacturer, or otherwise, does not necessarily constitute or imply its endorsement, recommendation, or favouring by Tamla Trees ltd or any associated company. The views and opinions of authors expressed herein do not necessarily state or reflect those of Tamla Trees ltd or any associated company.

Copyright & Non-Disclosure Notice

The content, layout and any supporting digital files associated with this report are subject to copyright owned by Tamla Trees ltd. Exceptions to this are present where that copyright has been legally assigned to Tamla Trees ltd by another party/ organisation. In addition, Tamla Trees ltd may utilise content generated under license. Reproduction, scanning, copying or distribution of this report in any form is prohibited without prior written agreement.

Third Party Disclaimer

Tamla Trees ltd, sub-contractors or suppliers will not be responsible or liable for any claim of loss or damage resulting from the third-party use of the information contained within this report.

Specific - Trees

All tree inspections, unless specified, have been undertaken from ground level and using non-invasive techniques. Comments contained within the report on the condition and risk associated with any tree relate to the condition of the tree at the date and time of survey. Please note that the condition of trees is subject to change. This change may occur but is not limited to biological and non-biological factors as well as mechanical/ physical changes to conditions in the proximity of the tree. Trees should be inspected at intervals relative to risk/ target areas and in accordance with relevant HSE guidance. Tamla Trees ltd can provide further information on this matter if required. Where full access to trees (Ivy, materials at base, location on 3rd party land) was not possible Tamla Trees ltd accept no liability for issues that arise.

Please note no statutory control checks have been undertaken (unless specified). Where tree surgery works have been identified these works are based on the assumption that planning is approved, no tree works should be undertaken prior to determination of this application without up-to-date confirmation of the Tree Preservation Order / Conservation Area Status of the vegetation. All works should be undertaken in accordance with the appropriate Duty of Care. This should include, for example, site specific risk assessments and due diligence inspections for the presence of protected species.

Any comment/ measurements relating to 3rd party trees have been made without full access to the tree(s). Should these trees have any impact on the proposed development we would advise you to instruct us to contact the 3rd party and undertake further detailed inspection work.

A legal Duty of Care requires that any tree works specified in this report should be performed by qualified, arboricultural contractors who have been competency tested to determine their suitability for such works in line with Health & Safety Executive Guidelines. Additionally, all works should be carried out according to British Standard 3998 (2010) Recommendations for Tree Work.