



Tree Survey and Tree Constraints Plan Bourne Court

Document information

Prepared for:
Richard Henley
HGH Consulting

Date of current issue:
27/07/2018

Issue number: 1

Our reference:
3162 - Bourne Court - Tree Survey - 1807-
27rc.docx

Assessment information

Prepared by:
James Percy-Lancaster

Quality assured by:
Rachel Crookes

Disclaimer

This report is made on behalf of Eight Associates. By receiving the report and acting on it, the client - or any third party relying on it - accepts that no individual is personally liable in contract, tort or breach of statutory duty (including negligence).

Contents

Executive Summary	1
Introduction	2
Site Details and Trees Within the Survey.....	3
Composition of the Tree Constraints Plan	4
Appendix 1: Explanation of Category Headings.....	5
Appendix 2: Tree Categorisation	6
Appendix 3: Tree Survey Details	7
Appendix 4: Limitations of the Tree Report.....	13
Appendix 5: Statutory Constraints Check	15



Executive Summary

Tree Survey and Tree Constraints Plan

Bourne Court

Executive summary

Eight Associates has been appointed by HGH Consulting to carry out a Tree Survey and produce a Tree Constraints Plan to the British Standard 5837:2012 'Trees in relation to design, demolition and construction', at Bourne Court, Station Approach, South Ruislip in the London Borough of Hillingdon.

A site visit was made on the 27th July 2018 to survey the trees, hedges and vegetation to the British Standard. The condition of all trees on site was assessed and a Category Rating was allocated; this information is provided in table form in Appendix 3 to this report.

Tree positions and root protection areas (RPA) have been outlined on the Tree Constraints Plan (TCP) using AutoCAD. It is recommended that both this report and the Tree Constraints Plan be used to help achieve a proposal with minimal impact on the trees.

This report does not include an Arboricultural Implication Assessment (AIA), an Arboricultural Method Statement (AMS), or Tree Protection Plan (TPP).

Summary of the trees on site with their category rating:

BS 5837 Category Rating	No. of Individual Trees	No. of Groups	No. of Hedges	Total
A	0	0	0	0
B	8	1	0	9
C	1	3	0	4
U	6	1	0	7
Total	15	5	0	20

Introduction

Tree Survey and Tree Constraints Plan

Bourne Court

Introduction

Eight Associates has been appointed by HGH Consulting to carry out a Tree Survey and produce a Tree Constraints Plan to the British Standard 5837:2012 'Trees in relation to design, demolition and construction', at Bourne Court, Station Approach, South Ruislip in the London Borough of Hillingdon.

The tree survey and following report are based on documents and information provided, including a topographical survey reference 6368_SITE_R1, dated June 2017.

The survey was undertaken on 27th July 2018 in partnership with Eight Associates Ltd and James Percy-Lancaster from Writtle Forest Consultancy Ltd.

The Tree Survey included within this report categorises and evaluates trees to identify those suitable for retention. The Tree Survey list details species name, dimensions of the trees, observations of the structural and physiological condition of the trees and categorizes the trees as to their retention value. The survey is based on the Visual Tree Assessment (VTA) method developed by Mattheck and Breloer (1994); it is preliminary in nature and should not be interpreted as a detailed tree condition inspection. Works are recommended to those trees that present an immediate and serious hazard to life or property, or maybe affected by a pest or pathogen that may spread to other trees on the site.

This report also contains a Tree Constraints Plan (TCP) showing the position of the trees and their root protection areas (RPA).

Consideration of modified RPA is made once knowledge of proposed development/ work is known unless otherwise specified. Considerations of light obstructions can be made if so requested.

There are some aspects that are not dealt with within the report (please also refer to Appendix 4). The Tree Survey does not include recommendations in regard to future management of the trees. Neither do the works recommended consider works that may be required prior to development works or to facilitate access to the site. This report does not include an Arboricultural Implication Assessment (AIA), an Arboricultural Method Statement (AMS), or Tree Protection Plan (TPP), which are to be covered in separate, respective reports.

Site Details and Trees Within the Survey

Tree Survey and Tree Constraints Plan

Bourne Court

Description and general aspects of the site

The existing site is currently vacant, all buildings and foundations and areas of hard standing have been demolished. Multiple piles of building rubble are scattered throughout the site. The site is accessed via Bourne Court, a private residential cul-de-sac.

The site is predominantly level throughout.

Previous relevant surveys and site history

We are not aware of any other previous surveys that have been carried out in relation to the site other than the provided Topographical Survey. Nor are we aware of any historical or cultural values relating directly to the trees.

Tree Preservation Orders (TPO) and Conservation Areas (CA)

According to the interactive map included on the London Borough of Hillingdon website (viewed 27.07.18), there are no trees subject to a TPO located within the site. The site is not located within a Conservation Area.

Statutory status of the trees should be checked prior to carrying out any tree works.

Identification and location of the trees

The relevant trees are located within the site and on neighbouring land. Where deemed appropriate trees are sometimes considered as a group. The individual trees, hedges and groups have been numbered, sequence T01 – T15 and TG01 – TG05, but have not been physically tagged.

The locations of the trees are illustrated on the attached Tree Constraints Plan. Tree locations have been based entirely on the provided Topographical Survey.

Trees included in the survey

Trees included are those present at the time of the survey, with a stem diameter greater than 75mm at 1.5m from ground level.

Also included are those trees on adjacent land which are within a distance equal to 12 times their stem diameter from the boundary, where the tree is identified/ observed. Such trees will be surveyed only from within the confines of the boundary of the site considered unless prior consent is obtained to inspect these trees.

Categorisation and data collection

Trees are categorised in accordance with the cascade chart given as Table 1 in B.S. 5837, a copy of this chart is included within Appendix 2.

Data collected within the survey is explained within Appendix 1. This data is collected considering the guidelines given within B.S. 5837:2012.



Composition of the Tree Constraints Plan

Tree Survey and Tree Constraints Plan

Bourne Court

The aim of the Tree Constraints Plan (TCP)

The Tree Survey enables the development of a Tree Constraints Plan (TCP). The TCP shows the influence that the trees on, and adjacent to, the site will have on a site development layout/ proposed works and to inform areas that can be developed.

Where a site development has already been outlined the trees are none-the-less evaluated independently of the proposed development.

What is included in the TCP

The plan identifies the root protection area (RPA). This is the minimum area (in metres squared) which should be left undisturbed around each retained tree. The RPA for each tree is initially plotted as a circle with a radius 12 times the stem diameter, centred on the tree stem. The RPA whilst not affecting the total area can be modified to a polygon according to the morphology and disposition of roots, the soil type and structure, topography and drainage. In this case it is considered that the circular RPA around the trees should be maintained for all trees.

The report does not consider in this instance a consideration of the growth potential.

Further considerations

An Arboricultural Implications Assessment (AIA) will take into account issues relating to Tree Preservation Orders, Conservation Area protection as well as the effect on the amenity value of the trees.

The assessment will further take into account issues relating to the TCP and deal with issues regarding the proposed design and layout of the site. This in turn will affect possible relevant tree work proposals and new tree planting.

Appendix 1: Explanation of Category Headings

Tree Survey and Tree Constraints Plan

Tree No	The tree number as given to the tree or group of trees as shown on the site plan. The plotting of these trees are approximations.
Species	This is the general common usage name given to the tree. The Latin genus is sometimes given as clarification where deemed necessary.
Height	This is an approximate figure given in metres. Measurements are taken using a digital clinometer.
Stem Diameter	The measurement is given in millimetres using a standard girth tape. This is an approximate measurement of the diameter of the trunk at a height of 1.5m from ground level.
Crown Spread	This is an approximate figure given in metres where 'm' denotes metres. It is an approximate measurement of the radial crown spread to north, east, south and west.
Height of crown clearance	This is the height in metres of the crown clearance above adjacent ground level. This measurement pertains to information on ground clearance for access and shading.
Height to first major limb	This is the height in metres to the first major limb that would not normally be removed as a consequence of crown lifting works. The orientation of this limb is also recorded (N=North, E=East, S=South, W=West, All=To all points).
Age Class	The following abbreviations are used to give the age of the tree; Y= Young trees aged less than one fifth of life expectancy. SM= Semi mature, approx. one fifth of life expectancy. EM = Early mature tree trees between one to two fifths of life expectancy. M = Mature tree over two fifths of life expectancy. OM= Over mature trees exceeding life expectancy.
Physiological Condition	The following considerations are used to evaluate the physiological condition of the tree (foliage and vitality): Good, Fair, Poor, Dead, with intermediate descriptions using the same phrasing.
Structural Condition and Observations	These are observations and comments on the visible structural condition of the tree on the day of the survey. They are brief and relate to unaided observations from the ground, unless otherwise stated. These observations are made to categorise the tree and they do not replace a more comprehensive condition survey.
Preliminary Management Recommendations:	These are initial recommendations including the following; highlighting the need for more detailed inspections, those trees that present an immediate hazard to life or property. The tree works recommended do not consider general or required management of the trees. Similarly, the works outlined do not consider works that may be required prior to development works or to facilitate access to the site.
Estimated remaining contribution of the tree	This is the estimated number of years that the tree will contribute to the landscape. The following bands are used: Less than 10 years, 10+ years, 20+ years and 40+ years.
Category grading:	This is the categorisation for trees following a tree quality assessment. Trees are categorized in accordance with the cascade chart given as Table 1 in B.S. 5837. A copy of this chart is included within Appendix 2.

Appendix 2: Tree Categorisation

Tree Survey and Tree Constraints Plan

TREES TO BE CONSIDERED FOR REMOVAL				
CATEGORY AND DEFINITION	CRITERIA			Identification on plan
Category 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 for reasons of sound arboricultural management	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 U category trees (i.e. 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 (e.g. Dutch elm disease), or very low quality trees suppressing adjacent trees of better quality NOTE Habitat reinstatement may be appropriate (e.g. U category tree used as a bat roost: installation of bat box in nearby tree).			DARK RED
TREES TO BE CONSIDERED FOR RETENTION				
CATEGORY AND DEFINITION	CRITERIA — Subcategories			Identification on plan
	1. Mainly arboricultural values	2. Mainly landscape values	3. Mainly cultural values, including conservation	
Category A Those of high quality and value: in such a condition as to be able to make a substantial contribution (a minimum of 40 years is suggested)	Trees that are particularly good examples of their species, especially if rare or unusual, or essential components of groups, or of formal or semi-formal arboricultural features (e.g. the dominant and/or principal trees within an avenue)	Trees, groups or woodlands which provide a definite screening or softening effect to the locality in relation to views into or out of the site, or those of particular visual importance (e.g. avenues or other arboricultural features assessed as groups)	Trees, groups or woodlands of significant conservation, historical, commemorative or other value (e.g. veteran trees or wood-pasture)	LIGHT GREEN
Category B Those of moderate quality and value: those in such a condition as to make a significant contribution (a minimum of 20 years is suggested)	Trees that might be included in the high category, but are downgraded because of impaired condition (e.g. presence of remediable defects including unsympathetic past management and minor storm damage)	Trees present in numbers, usually as groups or woodlands, such that they form distinct landscape features, thereby attracting a higher collective rating than they might as individuals but which are not, individually, essential components of formal or semi-formal arboricultural features (e.g. trees of moderate quality within an avenue that includes better, A category specimens), or trees situated mainly internally to the site, therefore individually having little visual impact on the wider locality	Trees with clearly identifiable conservation or other cultural benefits	MID BLUE
Category C Those of low quality and value: currently in adequate condition to remain until new planting could be established (a minimum of 10 years is suggested), or young trees with a stem diameter below 150 mm	Trees not qualifying in higher categories	Trees present in groups or woodlands, but without this conferring on them significantly greater landscape value, and/or trees offering low or only temporary screening benefit	Trees with very limited conservation or other cultural benefits	GREY
	NOTE Whilst C category trees will usually not be retained where they would impose a significant constraint on development, young trees with a stem diameter of less than 150 mm should be considered for relocation			



Appendix 3: Tree Survey Details

Tree Survey and Tree Constraints Plan

Tree Ref. No:	Species	Ht. (m)	Stem Dia. (mm)	Crown Spread				Ht. of crown clear. (m)	Ht to first major limb (m)	Age	Phys. Con.	Structural condition and observations	Preliminary Management Recommendations	Est. Remain Con.	Cat. grade	RPA Radius (m)	RPA Area (m ²)
				N	E	S	W										
T01	Apple	8	360	5	5	6	6	1.5 West	2.5 West	VET	Poor	• Moribund. • Significant canker on main stem. • Inactive <i>Ganoderma</i> sp. fungal bracket at 1m. • Dieback expressed throughout crown. • Major deadwood throughout crown, approx. 15%. • Limited life expectancy.	Fell to ground level	<10	U	4.3	58.6
T02	Ash	10	310	5	5	5	4	2.5 South	2.8 West	SM	Good	• Trifurcation at 3.5m, adequate unions. • Minor deadwood throughout crown, approx. 10%.	No works presently required	40+	B2	3.7	43.5
T03	Sycamore	11	280	4.5	3.5	4	3	1.5 East	2 North	SM	Fair	• Disruption to soil, affecting 50% rooting zone; significant damage caused. • Significant squirrel damaged branches present. • Major deadwood throughout crown, approx. 10%.	Fell to ground level	<10	U	3.4	35.5



Appendix 3: Tree Survey Details

Tree Survey and Tree Constraints Plan

Tree Ref. No:	Species	Ht. (m)	Stem Dia. (mm)	Crown Spread				Ht. of crown clear. (m)	Ht to first major limb (m)	Age	Phys. Con.	Structural condition and observations	Preliminary Management Recommendations	Est. Remain Con.	Cat. grade	RPA Radius (m)	RPA Area (m ²)
				N	E	S	W										
T04	Box Elder	10.5	295	5	5	4	3	1.5 East	2 East	SM	Poor	• Moribund. • Disruption to soil levels, suspected root damage. • Included bark union within bifurcation at 2m. • Significant squirrel damage, causing dieback expressed throughout crown, with 40% loss.	Fell to ground level	<10	U	3.5	39.4
T05	Birch	9.5	250	4.5	5	5.5	5	2 North	2 East	SM	Poor/Fair	• Boundary tree. • Moribund. • Dieback expressed throughout upper crown, attributed to thermal stress.	No works presently required	20+	B2	3.0	28.3
T06	Birch	9	250	4	4	4	4	2 North	2 West	SM	Good	• Third party tree. • Asymmetrical crown. • Companion tree. • Minor deadwood throughout crown, approx. 5%.	No works presently required	20+	B2	3.0	28.3
T07	Birch	9	250	4	4	4	4	2.5 East	2 East	SM	Good	• Third party tree. • Asymmetrical crown. • Companion tree. • Minor deadwood throughout crown, approx. 5%.	No works presently required	20+	B2	3.0	28.3



Appendix 3: Tree Survey Details

Tree Survey and Tree Constraints Plan

Tree Ref. No:	Species	Ht. (m)	Stem Dia. (mm)	Crown Spread				Ht. of crown clear. (m)	Ht to first major limb (m)	Age	Phys. Con.	Structural condition and observations	Preliminary Management Recommendations	Est. Remain Con.	Cat. grade	RPA Radius (m)	RPA Area (m ²)
				N	E	S	W										
T08	Birch	9	250	4	4	4	4	2.5 East	2 East	SM	Good	- Third party tree. - Asymmetrical crown. - Companion tree. - Minor deadwood throughout crown, approx. 5%.	No works presently required	20+	B2	3.0	28.3
TG01	Group of Leyland Cypress	13	275	13	4	13	4	0 North	1 North	SM	Poor/Fair	- Disruption to soil levels, suspected root damage. - Damaged branches present. - Dieback expressed throughout group. - Limited life expectancy.	Removal of major deadwood throughout group, approx. 10%. Fell to ground level all dead specimens, approx. 10%.	10+	C2	3.3	34.2
TG02	Group of Leyland Cypress	13	280	4	20	4	20	0 North	1 North	SM	Poor/Fair	- Disruption to soil levels, suspected root damage. - Damaged branches present. - Dieback expressed throughout group. - Limited life expectancy.	Removal of major deadwood throughout group, approx. 10%. Fell to ground level all dead specimens, approx. 10%.	10+	C2	3.4	35.5
TG03	Group of Leyland Cypress	12	280	5	4	5	4	0 North	1 North	SM	Fair/Good	- Disruption to soil levels within rooting zone, suspected root damage. - Damaged branches present. - Multiple dead standing specimens. - Effective evergreen screen.	Removal of damaged branches & dead specimens, approx. 5%.	20+	B2	3.4	35.5



Appendix 3: Tree Survey Details

Tree Survey and Tree Constraints Plan

Tree Ref. No:	Species	Ht. (m)	Stem Dia. (mm)	Crown Spread				Ht. of crown clear. (m)	Ht to first major limb (m)	Age	Phys. Con.	Structural condition and observations	Preliminary Management Recommendations	Est. Remain Con.	Cat. grade	RPA Radius (m)	RPA Area (m ²)
				N	E	S	W										
TG04	Group of Leyland Cypress	15	300	4	6	4	6	0 South	1 South	SM	Poor/Fair	• Moribund. • Disruption to soil levels within rooting zone, suspected root damage. • Significant dieback expressed throughout group. • Limited life expectancy.	Fell to ground level all 5x specimens.	<10	U	3.6	40.7
T09	Leyland Cypress	15	300	4	4	4	4	0 South	1 South	SM	Poor/Fair	• Moribund. • Disruption to soil levels within rooting zone, suspected root damage. • Significant dieback expressed throughout group. • Limited life expectancy.	Fell to ground level	<10	U	3.6	40.7
T10	Leyland Cypress	10	260	5	4	4	3	2 South	2.5 West	SM	Poor	• Moribund. • Partial rootplate failure. • Significant storm damage throughout crown. • Limited life expectancy.	Fell to ground level	<10	U	3.1	30.6
T11	Sycamore	7	150	4	4	5	4	1.5 South	2.5 East	SM	Fair	• Asymmetrical crown. • Squirrel damaged branches present.	No works presently required.	10+	C2	1.8	10.2



Appendix 3: Tree Survey Details

Tree Survey and Tree Constraints Plan

Tree Ref. No:	Species	Ht. (m)	Stem Dia. (mm)	Crown Spread				Ht. of crown clear. (m)	Ht to first major limb (m)	Age	Phys. Con.	Structural condition and observations	Preliminary Management Recommendations	Est. Remain Con.	Cat. grade	RPA Radius (m)	RPA Area (m ²)
				N	E	S	W										
TG05	Leyland Cypress	15	300	10	4	10	4	0 South	1 South	SM	Poor/	- Moribund. - Disruption to soil levels within rooting zone, suspected root damage. - Significant dieback expressed throughout group. - Limited life expectancy.	Fell to ground level	10+	C2/U	3.6	40.7
T12	Silver Maple	12	910	9	6	7	9	2 East	2.5 East	VET	Poor/Fair	- Moribund. - Disruption to soil levels within rooting zone, suspected root damage. - Multiple Dryads Saddle (<i>Polyporus squamosus</i>) present on main stem at 1m. - Significant internal decay within main stem, probed to 500mm. - Major deadwood throughout crown, approx. 15%. Limited life expectancy.	Fell to ground level	<10	U	11.0	375.0
T13	Indian Bean tree	11	530	7	6	6	7	2.5 West	2.5 South	M	Good	- Directional lean to north. - Multiple damaged branches present on western flank. - Major deadwood throughout crown, approx. 10%	Removal of major deadwood. Prune damaged branches back to suitable secondary growth points.	20+	B2	6.4	127.1



Appendix 3: Tree Survey Details

Tree Survey and Tree Constraints Plan

Tree Ref. No:	Species	Ht. (m)	Stem Dia. (mm)	Crown Spread				Ht. of crown clear. (m)	Ht to first major limb (m)	Age	Phys. Con.	Structural condition and observations	Preliminary Management Recommendations	Est. Remain Con.	Cat. grade	RPA Radius (m)	RPA Area (m ²)
				N	E	S	W										
T14	Eucalyptus	15	675	7	7	7	7	5 East	8 West	M	Good	No observable defects	No works presently required	20+	B1	8.1	206.1
T15	Apple	9	360	5	5	6	4.5	1.5 South	2 South	M	Good	- Disruption to soil levels within rooting zone, suspected root damage. - Congested crown break, adequate unions. - Open grown form.	No works presently required	20+	B2	4.3	58.6

Appendix 4: Limitations of the Tree Report

Tree Survey and Tree Constraints Plan

Bourne Court

Limitations of the tree survey and scope of the report

Please also refer to the introduction of the report.

The survey was based on unaided, visual observations made from ground level only. No climbing inspection or below ground inspections were carried out at the time of the survey. The survey is preliminary in nature and should not be interpreted as a detailed tree condition inspection. All observations were made from within the boundaries of the property, or from public land unless otherwise stated. Trees within neighbouring property are inspected as closely as is reasonably possible from within the boundaries of the property or from public land.

The report only details trees and vegetation as identified in the instructions and/or outlined within the site description in this report. This report does not consider the possible implications to any present or future built structures. This is outlined within the further considerations section of this report and will be dealt with by further reports as deemed necessary/ as and when instructed by the client.

Findings of the survey and the Report

Validity, accuracy and findings of the report will directly relate to the accuracy of information provided at the time of the survey. No checking of independent data provided will be undertaken.

Timing of the survey and the report

The considerations/ findings in this tree report and tree survey are only valid for one year. Such considerations/ findings will become invalid if any building works are undertaken, soil levels are altered, or tree work undertaken.

If there are any alterations to either the property or soil levels, or if tree works are carried out, it is recommended that a new tree survey/report is undertaken.

Trees in relation to other properties

This report/survey only considers the trees in relation to the site as identified. It does not comment on possible effects of trees on neighbouring properties, including in relation to subsidence or heave, or with regard to possible hazards presented by trees surveyed.

Neighbouring owners of trees that are identified as posing a possible risk to the property/site in question should seek their own advice as to possible effects of the recommendations given within this report.

Damage to, or possibility of damage to, any other structure that is not referred to within the report is not considered unless otherwise specified. This includes both neighbouring structures and any other structure on the property, built structures and surrounding vegetation.



Appendix 4: Limitations of the Tree Report

Tree Survey and Tree Constraints Plan

Bourne Court

Trees in relation to subsidence, heave and direct damage

This report does not deal with issues relating to subsidence or heave in relation to any built structures and surrounding vegetation. However, it may be prudent to consider the effects of heave on any property if trees are removed.

Similarly, the issue of direct damage (when the roots of a tree have physical contact with a structure) is not considered within this report.

Trees subject to statutory controls

It has been established that none of the trees mentioned within the report are covered by any statutory controls. This information is correct at the time of writing (24/07/2018). It remains best practice to undertake a further statutory check with the local authority before any pruning works, or tree felling works are carried out.

The works specified above are necessary for reasonable management and should be acceptable to the local authority. However, tree owners should appreciate that the local authority may take an alternative point of view.

Trees are subject to changes outside man's control

Trees are living organisms subject to changes outside man's control.

Changes to ground water conditions will affect the root growth of a tree. Such changes are not always the result of man's influence and other factors may be involved.

Appendix 5: Statutory Constraints Check

Scan of interactive map

