

GHA Trees
5 South Drive
High Wycombe
Bucks
HP13 6JU



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

**BS5837:2012 TREE SURVEY AND
ARBORICULTURAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT:
15 Nicholas Way, Northwood, HA6 2TR**

Dated: 15th December 2023

Our reference: GHA/DS/162220:23

CONTENTS

Section	Subject	Page
	Instructions	3
	Executive Summary	3
	Documents Supplied	4
	Scope of Survey	4
	Survey Method	5
	The Site	6
	Subject Trees	6
	The Proposal	6
	Arboricultural Impact Assessment	6
	Post Development Pressure	8
	Tree Protection Measures and Preliminary Method Statement for Development Works	8
	Conclusion	9
	Recommendations	9
Appendix A	Site Plan / Arboricultural Impact Plan (Attached as a separate PDF file to maintain its integrity / accuracy)	
Appendix B	Tree Table	
Appendix C	Extract from BS5837:2012 – Protective Fencing	

Arboricultural Impact Assessment

Location: 15 Nicholas Way, Northwood, HA6 2TR
Our reference: GHA/DS/162220:23
Client: M Thakrar
Dated: 15th December 2023
Prepared by: Glen Harding MICFor, MSc (Forestry), MArborA
Date of Inspection: 28th September 2023

Instructions

Issued by – M Thakrar

TERMS OF REFERENCE – GHA Trees were instructed to survey the subject trees within and adjacent to 15 Nicholas Way, Northwood, in order to assess their general condition and to provide a planning integration statement for the indicative proposed development that safeguards the long term wellbeing of the retained trees in a sustainable manner.

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

Executive Summary

The proposal for the site is to install new entrance gates on new support piers. The proposed scheme does not require the removal or pruning of any of the trees on site, or of trees within nearby adjacent sites; therefore, the landscape character of the site will be unaffected by the proposal. The retained trees require protection in accordance with industry best practice and BS 5837: 2012 – Trees in relation to design, demolition and construction – recommendations, in order to ensure their longevity.

Documents Supplied

The client supplied the following documents:

- Existing layout plans
- Proposed layout plans

Scope of Survey

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

Survey Method

- 2.1 The survey was conducted from ground level with the aid of binoculars if needed.
- 2.2 No tissue samples were taken nor was any internal investigation of the subject trees undertaken.
- 2.3 No soil samples were taken.

- 2.4 The height of each subject tree was estimated using a clinometer and recorded to the nearest half metre.
- 2.5 The stem diameter for each tree was measured in line with the requirements set out in BS 5837: 2012 – Trees in relation to design, demolition and construction – recommendations.
- 2.6 The crown spreads were measured with an electronic distometer and recorded to the nearest half metre. Where the crown radius was notably different in any direction this has been noted on the Plan (appendix A) and within the tree table (Appendix B). The crowns of those trees that are proposed for removal, or trees where the crown spread is deemed insignificant in relation to the proposed development are not always shown on the appended plan; however their stem locations are marked for reference.
- 2.7 The Root Protection Area (RPA) for each tree is included in the tree table, both as an area, and as the radius of a circle.
- 2.8 The crown clearance was measured using a clinometer and recorded to the nearest half metre. Where it is significantly lower in one direction, this is noted within the tree table at appendix B.
- 2.9 All of the trees that were inspected during the site visit are detailed on the plan at Appendix A; this plan was produced in colour and **MUST** only be scanned or reproduced in colour. The trees on this plan are categorised and shown in the following format:

COLOUR CODING AND RATING OF TREES:

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

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

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

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

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

The Site

- 3.1 The site is located on Nicholas Way, a private residential through road located to the south of Northwood.
- 3.2 A good tree cover is present on the site itself as well as adjacent sites, with many semi-mature and mature trees of both native and exotic origin characterising the local area.
- 3.3 Access to the property is currently gained via a driveway to the front of the site.

The Subject Trees

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

Category B	2 trees
Category C	1 group

The Proposal

- 5.1 The proposal for the site is to install new entrance gates on new support piers.
- 5.2 The proposed location of the above structures can be seen on the appended plan.

Arboricultural Impact Assessment

PROPOSED TREE REMOVAL / RETENTION:

- 6.1 The proposed site layout and all of its associated structures allows for the healthy retention of all of the trees on the site itself, and within nearby adjacent sites; therefore, the arboricultural landscape character of the site will be retained.

TREE PRUNING TO ACCOMMODATE THE PROPOSAL OR ACCESS TO THE SITE

- 6.2 The implementation of the proposal does not lead to the requirement to prune any of the retained trees.

- 6.3 There is a slight overhang of the new pier from the crown of T2. The defining branch structure of this tree is however well clear and therefore works can progress safely without the need for any facilitation pruning.

ASSESSMENT OF RETAINED TREES ROOT PROTECTION AREAS

- 6.4 Section 4.6.3 of BS 5837: 2012 states that the Root Protection Area (RPA) of each tree should be assessed by an arboriculturalist considering the likely morphology and disposition of the roots, when known to be influenced by past or existing site conditions.
- 6.5 Following the assessment described in section 6.5, the RPAs have all been drawn as notional circles as there are no existing site structures (visible from the available access) which are assessed to have the potential to significantly affect tree root morphology.
- 6.6 Nicholas Way is not assessed to be sufficiently engineered to have restricted any root growth in this direction.

ASSESSED IMPACT ON RPAS BY PROPOSED STRUCTURES

- 6.7 There is an encroachment into the RPA of T2 from the new piers as shown on the appended plan. This encroachment equates to 0.7% for both piers and is therefore assessed to be within acceptable levels. This is a healthy tree which will tolerate this small amount of root loss and recover quickly.
- 6.8 Given the proximity to the tree, trial digs have been undertaken to confirm not significant roots (over 25mm) are present where the new piers will be located.
- 6.9 The proposed new structures are situated outside of the assessed RPAs of all of the other trees; therefore, these trees pose no below ground constraints on the new structures or vice versa.

PROPOSED ACCESS TO THE NEW DEVELOPMENT

- 6.10 The existing driveway and parking areas will be retained and there are no plans to upgrade or extend these areas as part of the proposed site works.

INSTALLATION OF SERVICES

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

Post Development Pressure

FUTURE TREE AND STRUCTURE RELATIONSHIPS

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

Tree Protection Measures and Preliminary Method Statement for Development Works

8.1 GROUND PROTECTION – LIGHTWEIGHT ACCESS ONLY

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

8.2 MIXING OF CONCRETE

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

8.3 HAND TOOL EVCAVATION

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

8.4 ON SITE SUPERVISION

Regular site supervision is essential to ensure all potentially damaging activities near to trees are properly supervised. A pre start site meeting **MUST** occur to ensure all parties are aware of their responsibilities relating to tree protection on site; this **MUST** include a site induction for key personnel. After this pre start meeting, day-to-day responsibility for tree protection will be devolved to the site manager who will make contact with the retained arboriculturalist as needed.

8.5 OTHER TREE PROTECTION PRECAUTIONS

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

8.6 DISMANTLING PROTECTIVE BARRIERS

Protective barriers must only be completely removed when all machinery, and equipment has left site.

Conclusion

- 9.1 In conclusion, the principal arboricultural features within the site can be retained and adequately protected during development activities.
- 9.2 Subject to precautionary measures as detailed above, the proposal will not be injurious to trees to be retained.

Recommendations

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

15th December 2023

Signed:



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

Appendix A
TREE PLAN
(see separate PDF)

Appendix B

TREE TABLE

Tree Number	Tree Name (species)	Ht (m)	Calculated Stem Diameter (mm)	Number of Stems	Root Protection Area (Radius, m)	N (m)	E (m)	S (m)	W (m)	Age Class	Clearance (m)	Estimated life expectancy	BS Category	Comments / Recommendations
T1	Oak	14	640	1	7.68	4	4	7	7	M	6	20-40	B1	Slightly sparse upper crown noted.
T2	Oak	14	560	1	6.72	2	2	5	3	M	6	20-40	B1	Slightly sparse upper crown noted.
G3	Cypress and thuja	12 to 16	240	1	2.88	2.5	2.5	2.5	2.5	M	3	10-20	C2	Lapsed hedge.

C

KEY :

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

Appendix C
TREE FENCING DETAIL

Figure 3 Examples of above-ground stabilizing systems



