SJA trees
ARBORICULTURAL PLANNING CONSULTANTS

THE OLD POST OFFICE
DORKING ROAD
TADWORTH
SURREY KT20 5SA

Tel: (01737) 813058
E-mail: sja@sjatrees.co.uk

Directors: Simon R. M. Jones Dip. Arb. (RFS), FArborA., RCArborA. (Managing)
Frank P. S. Spooner BSc (Hons), MArborA, TechCert (ArborA), RCArborA. (Operations)

Arboricultural Implications Report

Proposed re-development at

19 Beacon Close

Uxbridge

March 2023

Ref. SJA air 23075-01

SUMMARY

S1. On the basis of our assessment, we conclude that the arboricultural impact of this scheme is of negligible magnitude, as defined according to the categories set out in ***Table 1*** of this report.

S2. Our assessment of the impacts of the proposals on the existing trees concludes that no trees of high landscape or biodiversity value are to be removed. The proposed removal of individuals and groups of trees will represent no alteration to the main arboricultural features of the site, only a minor alteration to the overall arboricultural character of the site and will not have an adverse impact on the arboricultural character and appearance of the local landscape.

S3. There is no proposed pruning to any retained trees within or adjacent to the site.

S4. There will be no incursions into the Root Protection Areas (RPAs) of any of the trees to be retained.

S5. None of the proposed dwellings or private gardens are likely to be shaded by retained trees to the extent that this will interfere with their reasonable use or enjoyment by incoming occupiers, which might otherwise lead to pressure on the Local Planning Authority to permit felling or severe pruning that it could not reasonably resist.

S6. As the proposed development will not result in the removal of trees which are natural features of merit, it complies with Policies DMH6 DMHB14 of the London Borough of Hillingdon Local Plan 2012.

CONTENTS

APPENDICES

1. INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND INFORMATION

1.1. Instructions

1.1.1. SJAtrees has been instructed by PRAK Properties Ltd. to visit 19 Beacon Close, Uxbridge and to survey the trees growing on or immediately adjacent to this site.

1.1.2. We are further asked to identify which trees are worthy of retention within a proposed re-development of the site; to assess the implications of the development proposals on these specimens, and to advise how they should be protected from unacceptable damage during demolition and construction.

1.2. Scope of report

1.2.1. This report and its appendices reflect the scope of our instructions, as set out above. It is intended to accompany a planning application to be submitted to the London Borough of Hillingdon ("the LPA") and complies with local validation requirements.

1.2.2. It complies also with the recommendations of British Standard BS 5837:2012, *Trees in relation to design, demolition and construction – Recommendations* ('BS 5837'). However, the British Standard is not a Code of Practice that consists of written rules outlining how actions or decision must be taken and it "should not be quoted as if it were a specification[1]" ; it is a set of recommendations intended to "assist decision-making with regard to existing and proposed trees in the context of design, demolition and construction[2]". It doesn't form part of planning policy; but it is a material consideration to which weight is likely to be given.

[1] British Standard BS 5837:2012. Trees in relation to design, demolition and construction – Recommendations; Foreword. *The British Standards Institution*.

[2] Ibid*., p*.1, Introduction.

1.2.3. The proposed development comprises the demolition of the existing dwelling and detached garage and construction of four semi-detached dwellings with associated off-street parking with hard standing and rear amenity gardens.

1.2.4. This report summarises and sets out the main conclusions of the baseline data collected during the tree survey and identifies those trees whose removal could result in a significant adverse impact on the character or appearance of the local area (Section 3). It then details and assesses the impacts of the proposed development on individual trees including those to be removed (Section 4), those to be pruned (Section 5), those which might incur root damage that might threaten their viability (Section 6) and those that might become under pressure for removal after occupation because of shading (Section 7). A summary and conclusions, with regard to local planning policy, are presented in Section 8.

1.3. Site inspection

1.3.1. A site visit and tree inspection were undertaken by Tom Southgate of SJAtrees on Thursday the 23rd February 2023. Weather conditions at the time were overcast but dry. Deciduous trees were not in leaf.

1.4. Site description

1.4.1. The site is approximately 760m^2 in size and is located at the southern end of Beacon Close, north of Harefield Road (B467) , as shown at ***Figure 1*** below. The east and west boundaries adjoin residential properties on Beacon Close and the south boundary adjoins the rear garden of a property on Harefield Road. The north boundary fronts Beacon Close.

Figure 1: Site location shown on aerial image

1.4.2. The site is on ground that rises by 3m from its western boundary to its eastern boundary, and currently comprises a single storey dwelling with associated garage, front hard standing and rear garden.

1.5. Soil type

1.5.1. The British Geological Survey Solid and Drift Geology map of the area indicates the site overlies a bedrock of London Clay deposits.

1.5.2. We are not aware of a site investigation or soil analysis having been undertaken; but the indications of the British Geological Survey map suggest that the soil is likely to be susceptible to compaction.

1.6. Statutory controls

1.6.1. At the time of writing none of these trees are covered by a tree preservation order (TPO).

1.7. Non-statutory designations

1.7.1. There are no woodlands within or abutting the site that are classified as ‘Ancient’. Ancient woodland is defined as “any area that’s been wooded continuously since at least 1600 AD” and is considered an important and irreplaceable habitat.

1.7.2. There are no trees within or abutting the site that can be classified as ‘Ancient’ or ‘Veteran’. Ancient and veteran trees are also considered to be irreplaceable habitats, and contribute to a site’s biodiversity, cultural and heritage value, and the National Planning Policy Framework (see below) states that development resulting in the loss or deterioration of ancient or veteran trees should be refused, unless there are wholly exceptional reasons and a suitable compensation strategy exists.

2. METHODOLOGY

2.1. National policy context

2.1.1. Under Section 197 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, local authorities have a statutory duty to consider the protection and planting of trees when considering planning applications. The effects of proposed development on trees are therefore a material consideration, and this is normally reflected in local planning policies.

2.1.2. The National Planning Policy Framework ('NPPF')[3] sets out the Government's planning policies for England and how these should be applied in both plan and decision-making. Paragraph 2 makes it clear that the NPPF is itself a material consideration in the determination of planning application. Paragraph 11 states that "**Plans and decisions should apply a presumption in favour of sustainable development.**"

2.1.3. In paragraph 130, within Section 12 "Achieving well-designed places" the NPPF states: "**Planning policies and decisions should ensure that developments:**

a) will function well and add to the overall quality of the area, not just for the short term but over the lifetime of the development;

b) are visually attractive as a result of good architecture, layout and appropriate and effective landscaping;

c) are sympathetic to local character and history, including the surrounding built environment and landscape setting, while not preventing or discouraging appropriate innovation or change (such as increased densities);

d) establish or maintain a strong sense of place, using the arrangement of streets, spaces, building types and materials to create attractive, welcoming and distinctive places to live, work and visit;

[3] The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (July 2021) Ministry of Housing, Communities & Local Government

e) optimise the potential of the site to accommodate and sustain an appropriate amount and mix of development (including green and other public space) and support local facilities and transport networks; and

f) create places that are safe, inclusive and accessible and which promote health and well-being, with a high standard of amenity for existing and future users; and where crime and disorder, and the fear of crime, do not undermine the quality of life or community cohesion and resilience."

2.1.4. Paragraph 131 in this section states: "**Trees make an important contribution to the character and quality of urban environments, and can also help mitigate and adapt to climate change. Planning policies and decisions should ensure that new streets are tree-lined, that opportunities are taken to incorporate trees elsewhere in developments (such as parks and community orchards), that appropriate measures are in place to secure the long-term maintenance of newly-planted trees, and that existing trees are retained wherever possible. Applicants and local planning authorities should work with highways officers and tree officers to ensure that the right trees are planted in the right places, and solutions are found that are compatible with highways standards and the needs of different users.**"

2.1.5. The section titled Planning for climate change states at paragraph 153: "**Plans should take a proactive approach to mitigating and adapting to climate change, taking into account the long-term implications for flood risk, coastal change, water supply, biodiversity and landscapes, and the risk of overheating from rising temperatures. Policies should support appropriate measures to ensure the future resilience of communities and infrastructure to climate change impacts, such as providing space for physical protection measures, or making provision for the possible future relocation of vulnerable development and infrastructure."**

2.1.6. In paragraph 174, within Section 15 "Conserving and enhancing the natural environment" the NPPF states: "**Planning policies and decisions should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by:**

a) protecting and enhancing valued landscapes, sites of biodiversity or geological value and soils (in a manner commensurate with their statutory status or identified quality in the development plan);

b) recognising the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside, and the wider benefits from natural capital and ecosystem services – including the economic and

other benefits of the best and most versatile agricultural land, and of trees and woodland;…

d) minimising impacts on and providing net gains for biodiversity, including by establishing coherent ecological networks that are more resilient to current and future pressures;

e) preventing new and existing development from contributing to, being put at unacceptable risk from, or being adversely affected by, unacceptable levels of soil, air, water or noise pollution or land instability. Development should, wherever possible, help to improve local environmental conditions such as air and water quality, taking into account relevant information such as river basin management plans;

2.1.7. In paragraph 180, under the 'Habitats and biodiversity' section, the NPPF states: "**When determining planning applications, local planning authorities should apply the following principles:**

c) development resulting in the loss or deterioration of irreplaceable habitats (such as ancient woodland and ancient or veteran trees) should be refused, unless there are wholly exceptional reasons and a suitable compensation strategy exists…."

2.2. Regional policy context

2.2.1. Policy G1 'Green infrastructure' of the London Plan[4] states:

"A London's network of green and open spaces, and green features in the built environment, should be protected and enhanced. Green infrastructure should be planned, designed and managed in an integrated way to achieve multiple benefits.

B Boroughs should prepare green infrastructure strategies that identify opportunities for cross-borough collaboration, ensure green infrastructure is optimised and consider green infrastructure in an integrated way as part of a network consistent with Part A.

C Development Plans and area-based strategies should use evidence, including green infrastructure strategies, to:

[4] The London Plan (March 2021); Greater London Authority

1) identify key green infrastructure assets, their function and their potential function

2) identify opportunities for addressing environmental and social challenges through strategic green infrastructure interventions.

D Development proposals should incorporate appropriate elements of green infrastructure that are integrated into London's wider green infrastructure network."

2.2.2. Policy G7 'Trees and woodlands' of the London Plan states:

"A London's urban forest and woodlands should be protected and maintained, and new trees and woodlands should be planted in appropriate locations in order to increase the extent of London's urban forest – the area of London under the canopy of trees.

B In their Development Plans, boroughs should:

1) protect 'veteran' trees and ancient woodland where these are not already part of a protected site[139]

2) identify opportunities for tree planting in strategic locations.

C Development proposals should ensure that, wherever possible, existing trees of value are retained.[140] If planning permission is granted that necessitates the removal of trees there should be adequate replacement based on the existing value of the benefits of the trees removed, determined by, for example, i-tree or CAVAT or another appropriate valuation system. The planting of additional trees should generally be included in new developments – particularly large-canopied species which provide a wider range of benefits because of the larger surface area of their canopy.

[140] Category A, B and lesser category trees where these are considered by the local planning authority to be of importance to amenity and biodiversity, as defined by BS 5837:2012".

2.3. Local policy context

2.3.1. Local planning policies are contained in the London Borough of Hillingdon Local Plan 2012.

2.3.2. Policy DMH 6 of the local plan states:

There is a presumption against the loss of gardens due to the need to maintain local character, amenity space and biodiversity. In exceptional cases a limited scale of backland development may be acceptable, subject to the following criteria:

i) **neighbouring residential amenity and privacy of existing homes and gardens must be maintained and unacceptable light spillage avoided;**

ii) **vehicular access or car parking should not have an adverse impact on neighbours in terms of noise or light. Access roads between dwellings and unnecessarily long access roads will not normally be acceptable;**

iii) **development on backland sites must be more intimate in mass and scale and lower than frontage properties; and**

iv) **features such as trees, shrubs and wildlife habitat must be retained or re-provided.**

Policy DMHB 14 of the Local Plan states:

A) **All developments will be expected to retain or enhance existing landscaping, trees, biodiversity or other natural features of merit.**

B) **Development proposals will be required to provide a landscape scheme that includes hard and soft landscaping appropriate to the character of the area, which supports and enhances biodiversity and London Borough of Hillingdon Local Plan Part 2 - Development Management Policies 55 amenity particularly in areas deficient in green infrastructure.**

C) **Where space for ground level planting is limited, such as high rise buildings, the inclusion of living walls and roofs will be expected where feasible.**

D) **Planning applications for proposals that would affect existing trees will be required to provide an accurate tree survey showing the location, height, spread and species of trees. Where the tree survey identifies trees of merit, tree root protection areas and an arboricultural method statement will be required to show how the trees will be protected. Where trees are to be removed, proposals for replanting of new trees on-site must be provided or include contributions to offsite provision.**

2.3.3. The Council has prepared a Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) dealing with the protection of trees on development sites. The guidance presented in this document has been closely followed in the preparation of this report.

2.4. Neighbourhood policy context

2.4.1. At the time of writing there is no Neighbourhood Plan covering the area within which the site is found.

2.5. Tree survey and baseline information

2.5.1. We surveyed individual trees with trunk diameters of 75mm and above[5] growing within or immediately adjacent to the site; and recorded their locations, species, dimensions, ages, condition, and visual importance in accordance with BS 5837 recommendations.

2.5.2. The baseline information collected during the site survey was recorded on site using a hand-held digital device. This information was then imported into an Excel spreadsheet and used to produce the tree survey schedule at **Appendix 2**. The numbers assigned to the trees in the tree survey schedule correspond with those shown on the appended tree protection plan.

2.5.3. We surveyed trees as groups where they have grown together to form cohesive arboricultural features, either aerodynamically (trees that provide companion shelter), visually (e.g., avenues or screens) or culturally[6]. However, where it might be necessary to differentiate between specific trees within these groups, we also surveyed these individually.

2.5.4. We inspected the trees from the ground only, aided by binoculars as appropriate, but did not climb them. We did not undertake a full hazard or risk assessment of the trees, and therefore can give no guarantee, either expressed or implied, of their safety or stability.

---

[5] BS 5837, paragraph 4.2.4 b), recommends that all trees over 75mm stem diameter should be included in a pre-planning land and tree survey.

[6] Ibid., 4.4.2.3

2.5.5. We have categorised the trees in accordance with BS 5837, and details of the criteria used for this process can be found in the notes that accompany the tree survey schedule. We applied this methodology in line with the NPPF's presumption in favour of sustainable development, giving greater weighting to the contribution of a tree to the character and appearance of the local landscape, to amenity, or to biodiversity, where its removal might have a significant adverse impact on these factors.

2.6. Tree constraints

2.6.1. In line with the NPPF's presumption in favour of sustainable development, we assessed whether any trees should be retained in the context of the proposed re-development. Our assessment of which trees might have to be retained, and which can be removed, is based on:

- whether any trees are classed as 'ancient' or 'veteran', and thereby are designated as 'irreplaceable habitats';[7]
- which trees contribute to local character and history, including to the surrounding landscape setting; which trees contribute to biodiversity; and which trees help mitigate and adapt to climate change; and whose removal would thereby be unlikely to comply with national planning policy guidance;
- which trees are significant features of the local landscape, such that their removal would be contrary to local planning policies set out above;
- our assessment of the trees' quality, value and remaining life expectancy, in accordance with BS5837:2012, as summarised in the notes that accompany the tree survey schedule.

2.6.2. As trees growing outside the boundaries of the site are in the control of others, we have assumed they will be retained, irrespective of their size, age or condition.

2.6.3. Whilst we have categorised trees in accordance with BS 5837, we have not used these categorisations as the main criterion of whether specimens might be removed or should be retained. Trees in categories 'A', 'B' and 'C' are all a material

[7] The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (July 2021). Paragraph 180 (c).

consideration in the development process; but the retention of category 'C' trees, being of low quality or of only limited or short-term potential, will not normally be considered necessary should they impose a significant constraint on development.

2.6.4. Furthermore, BS 5837 makes it clear that young trees, even those of good form and vitality, which have the potential to develop into quality specimens when mature "**need not necessarily be a significant constraint on the site's potential**"[8].

2.6.5. Moreover, BS 5837 states that "**.... care should be taken to avoid misplaced tree retention; attempts to retain too many or unsuitable trees on a site can result in excessive pressure on the trees during demolition or construction work, or post-completion demands for their removal**"[9].

2.6.6. The 'Root Protection Areas' (RPAs)[10] of the trees identified for retention were calculated in accordance with Section 4.6 of BS 5837; and were assessed taking account of factors such as the likely tolerance of a tree to root disturbance or damage, the morphology and disposition of roots as influenced by existing site conditions (including the presence of existing roads or structures), as well as soil type, topography and drainage.

2.6.7. To assess whether the trees identified for retention would be in a sustainable relationship with the proposed development (without casting excessive shade or otherwise unreasonably interfering with incoming residents' prospects of enjoying their properties, and thereby leading inevitably to requests for consents to fell), we plotted a segment or "shading arc" from each trunk, with a radius equal to the current height of the tree concerned, from due north-west to due east. This gave an indication of potential direct obstruction of sunlight and the shadow pattern cast through the main part of the day[11].

---

[8] BS 5837, 4.5.10.

[9] Ibid., 5.1.1.

[10] Ibid., paragraph 3.7. "The minimum area around a retained tree "deemed to contain sufficient roots and rooting volume to maintain the tree's viability, and where the protection of the roots and soil structure is treated as a priority."

[11] Ibid., paragraph 5.2.2 Note 1.

2.7. Arboricultural impact assessment and tree protection plan

2.7.1. Once finalised, we assessed the arboricultural impacts of the proposed layout, and produced the tree protection plan (TPP) presented at **Appendix 3.** This is based on the proposed landscape drawings by Consilio Town Planning Ltd., drawing no. 003.

2.7.2. The TPP identifies the trees to be removed to accommodate the proposed development, either because they are situated within the footprints of proposed structures or surfaces, or because in our judgment they are too close to these structures or surfaces to enable them to be retained. These are shown by means of **red crosses** on the TPP.

2.7.3. The TPP also shows how trees to be retained will be protected from damage during demolition and construction, and the measures identified are set out and described at **Appendix 1** to this report. The implementation of, and adherence to, these measures can readily be secured by the imposition of appropriate planning conditions.

2.7.4. For the trees shown to be retained, all measurements for pruning specifications, percentage estimates of RPA incursions and shading issues have been calculated using AutoCAD software. Details of the impacts identified within these categories, and our assessment of their respective significance, are analysed in Sections 4 to 7 below. Based on these findings, we have assessed the magnitude of the overall arboricultural impact of the proposals according to the categories defined in ***Table 1*** below.

Impact	Description
High	Total loss of or major alteration to main elements/ features/ characteristics of the baseline, post-development situation fundamentally different
Medium	Partial loss of or alteration to main elements/ features/ characteristics of the baseline, post-development situation will be partially changed
Low	Minor loss of or alteration to main elements/ features/ characteristics of the baseline, post-development changes will be discernible but the underlying situation will remain similar to the baseline
Negligible	Very minor loss of or alteration to main elements/ features/ characteristics of the baseline, post-development changes will be barely discernible, approximating to the 'no change' situation

Table 1: Magnitude of impacts[12]

[12] Determination of magnitude based on DETR (2000) Guidance on the Methodology for Multi-Modal Studies, as modified and extended.

3. THE TREES

3.1. Survey findings

3.1.1. We surveyed 9 individual trees, four groups of trees and three hedges growing within or immediately adjacent to the site. Their details can be found in the tree survey schedule at **Appendix 2**.

3.1.2. The site currently consists predominantly of planted ornamental individuals and hedges. Trees are concentrated along the southern boundary and along the raised area adjacent to the eastern boundary. The site consists of coniferous and broad-leaved specimens of which there is a mixture of native and exotic individuals.

3.1.3. Due to landscaped and ornamental nature of the site, no single species is dominant. However, as Lawson cypress is the most numerous species as well as individual cypresses being larger than other species around the site, it does stand out as the most prominent species. The mixed coniferous and broadleaved structure of the site is consistent with other nearby residential gardens.

3.2. Assessment of suitability for retention

3.2.1. As noted above in Section 2.3, local planning policies require the retention of trees that are "**natural features of merit**." However, none of the trees or groups of trees within or directly adjacent to the site currently meet this criteria.

3.2.2. None of the individual trees or groups have been assessed as category 'U'.

3.2.3. There are no category 'A' trees and 1 category 'B' specimen (yew no. 4). The remaining eight trees are assessed as category 'C' trees, being either of low quality, very limited merit, only low landscape benefits, no material cultural or conservation value, or only limited or short-term potential; or young trees with trunk diameters below 150mm; or a combination of these.

3.2.4. All of the surveyed groups of trees and hedges have been assessed as category 'C'.

4. TREES TO BE REMOVED

4.1. Details

4.1.1. To accommodate the proposed development, as shown on the proposed layout plan, five individual trees (nos. 5 – 9) and five groups/hedges (nos. G2 – G5 & H3) are to be removed, either because they are situated within the footprints of proposed structures or surfaces, or because they are too close to these to enable them to be retained.

4.1.2. Details of the trees to be removed, including their dimensions, age class and British Standard categorisation, are shown and listed on the TPP and at ***Table 2*** below.

Tree no.	TPO No.	Species	Height	Trunk diameter	Age class	BS category
5	-	Chusan palm	10m	280mm 250mm	Semi-mature	C (1)
6 – 7	-	Lawson cypress	10m	200mm 185mm	Semi-mature	C (1)
8	-	Paper plant	2m	20 stems @ 20mm est.	Young	C (12)
9	-	Holly	4m	150mm	Semi-mature	C (12)
G2	-	Various	4m	Max 150mm est.	Young	C (1)
G3	-	Various	1.5m	Max 50mm	Young	C (1)
G4	-	Various	3m	Max 95mm	Semi-mature	C (12)
G5	-	Leyland cypress	6m	Max 150mm	Young	C (1)
H3	-	Various	2.5m	Max 100mm est.	Young	C (1)

Table 2: Trees to be removed

4.2. Assessment

4.2.1. One of the trees and four groups of trees to be removed are young specimens, which BS 5837 states "**need not necessarily be a significant constraint on the site's potential**".

4.2.2. None of the individual trees to be removed are covered by a TPO (see 1.6.1 above); these are shown on the TPP and identified in ***Table 2*** above.

4.2.3. All five trees and five groups to be removed are category ’C’ trees as seen in ***Table 2*** above and are either of low quality, low value, or short-term potential. For these reasons, their removal will have no significant impact on the character or appearance of the local area.

4.2.4. Furthermore, the proposals incorporate replacement tree planting; this is shown on the landscaping plan submitted with the application (No. 003) on which this report is also based. This will mitigate the proposed removals, improve the age class balance of the trees on site, enhance the local landscape, and re-establish a framework for the ongoing and long-term character of the site.

4.2.5. In the light of these considerations, and taking account of the numbers, sizes and locations of the trees to be retained, including those that are off-site, the felling of the trees and groups identified for removal will represent no alteration to the main arboricultural features of the site.

5. TREES TO BE PRUNED

5.1. Details

5.1.1. No trees or groups to be retained are to be pruned to facilitate implementation of the proposals.

5.2. Assessment

5.2.1. As no trees are to be pruned, and none of the proposed dwellings will be within 7.3m of the extents of the canopies of trees to be retained, there will be adequate working space for construction close to trees, and a reasonable margin of clearance for future growth.

6. ROOT PROTECTION AREA INCURSIONS

6.1. Details

6.1.1. No parts of any proposed buildings or associated hard surfacing are within the RPAs of any of the trees to be retained.

6.2. Assessment

6.2.1. As no parts of the proposed buildings or other structures abut or are within the RPAs of any of the trees to be retained, subject to the implementation of protective measures specified below and on the TPP, their construction will not cause unacceptable damage to roots or rooting environments as a result of root severance or damage, or compaction or pollution of the soil.

6.2.2. Implementation of measures to prevent other incursions into the RPAs of retained trees and to protect them during demolition and construction can be assured by the erection of appropriate protective fencing, as shown on the TPP at **Appendix 3**.

6.2.3. Accordingly, subject to implementation of the above measures, and considering the ages, current physiological condition and tolerance of disturbance of these retained trees, no significant or long-term damage to their root systems or environments will occur as a result of the proposed development.

7. RELATIONSHIP OF RETAINED TREES TO NEW DWELLINGS

7.1. Details

7.1.1. The windows and gardens of the proposed new dwellings will not be shaded by retained trees to the extent that this will interfere with their reasonable use or enjoyment by incoming occupiers.

7.2. Assessment

7.2.1. As none of the proposed dwellings lie within the shadow patterns of any retained trees, they will not be shaded by retained trees to the extent that this will interfere with their reasonable use or enjoyment by incoming occupiers; which might otherwise lead to pressure to permit felling or severe pruning that the LPA could not reasonably resist.

7.2.2. The sizes and dispositions of the proposed private gardens are such that in our assessment they will not be unduly shaded and will receive reasonable sunlight and daylight. Their use is thus unlikely to lead to demands for felling or severe pruning of trees that the LPA would find difficult to resist.

8. CONCLUSIONS

8.1. Summary

8.1.1. Our assessment of the impacts of the proposals on the existing trees concludes that no trees of high landscape or biodiversity value are to be removed. The proposed removal of individuals and groups of trees will represent no alteration to the main arboricultural features of the site, only a minor alteration to the overall arboricultural character of the site and will not have an adverse impact on the arboricultural character and appearance of the local landscape.

8.1.2. There is no proposed pruning to any retained trees within or adjacent to the site.

8.1.3. There will be no incursions into the Root Protection Areas (RPAs) of any of the trees to be retained.

8.1.4. None of the proposed dwellings or private gardens are likely to be shaded by retained trees to the extent that this will interfere with their reasonable use or enjoyment by incoming occupiers, which might otherwise lead to pressure on the Local Planning Authority to permit felling or severe pruning that it could not reasonably resist.

8.2. Compliance with national planning policy

8.2.1. As the proposals will retain the off-site main arboricultural features of the site, its arboricultural attractiveness, history and landscape character and setting will be maintained, thereby complying with Paragraph 130 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

8.2.2. Whilst trees are to be removed, there is no duty in planning policy to retain all existing trees in all circumstances. Paragraph 131 of the NPPF states *(italics added for emphasis)*: "**Planning policies and decisions should ensure… that existing trees are retained *wherever possible***"; and thereby recognises circumstances in which it might not be possible to retain every tree. Accordingly, the proposed removal of trees does not mean that this application must thereby be refused; and does not mean it conflicts with Paragraph 131 of the NPPF.

8.2.3. As the proposals will not result in the loss or deterioration of any ancient woodland or any ancient or veteran trees, they comply with paragraph 180 (c) of the NPPF.

8.3. Compliance with regional planning policy

8.3.1. As there are no existing trees assessed as being significant features in the existing built environment, in arboricultural terms the proposed development complies with Policy G1 ‘Green infrastructure’ of the London Plan.

8.3.2. As all trees of significant value and importance to amenity are off-site and some distance from the proposals, they will be retained, and space exists within the proposed layout for new replacement planting, the proposed development will protect, maintain and enhance the main arboricultural features of the site. As such, it complies with Policy G7 ‘Trees and woodlands’ of the London Plan.

8.4. Compliance with local planning policy

8.4.1. As the proposed development will not result in the removal of trees which are natural features of merit, it complies with Policies DMH6 DMHB14 of the London Borough of Hillingdon Local Plan 2012.

8.5. Conclusion

8.5.1. On the basis of our assessment, we conclude that the arboricultural impact of this scheme is of negligible magnitude, as defined according to the categories set out in ***Table 1*** of this report.

APPENDIX 1

Outline Arboricultural Method Statement

Outline arboricultural method statement

A1.1. Tree Protection Plan

A1.1.1. The TPP at **Appendix 3** shows the general and specific provisions to be taken during construction of the proposed development, to ensure that no unacceptable damage is caused to the root systems, trunks or crowns of the trees identified for retention. These measures are indicated by coloured notations in areas where construction activities are to occur either within, or in proximity to, retained trees, as described in the relevant panels on the drawing.

A1.2. Pre-start meeting

A1.2.1. Prior to the commencement of any site clearance, ground preparation, demolition or construction works the developer will convene a pre-start site meeting. This shall be attended by the developer's contract manager or site manager, the demolition contractor, the fencing/boarding contractor, the groundwork contractor(s) and the arboricultural consultant. The LPA tree officer will be invited to attend. If appropriate, the tree felling/surgery contractor should also attend. At that meeting contact numbers will be exchanged, and the methods of tree protection shall be fully discussed, so that all aspects of their implementation and sequencing are made clear to all parties. Any clarifications or modifications to the TPP required as a result of the meeting shall be circulated to all attendees.

A1.3. Site clearance

A1.3.1. No clearance of trees or other vegetation shall be undertaken until after the pre-start meeting and after the erection of the tree protection fencing (see below). If any vegetation clearance is required behind the line of the protection fencing this will be made clear at the pre-start meeting and arrangements will be made to do this prior to the fencing's erection, under the supervision of the arboricultural consultant, who will ensure it doesn't cause any soil compaction or damage to the roots of trees to be retained.

A1.3.2. Except where within the RPAs of trees to be retained, all trees and other vegetation to be removed may be cut down or grubbed out as appropriate; but within

the RPAs of trees to be retained, trees and vegetation will be cut by hand to ground level and stumps will be either left in place or ground out with a lightweight self-powered stump grinding machine. No excavators, tractors or other vehicles will enter the RPAs.

A1.4. Ground preparation

A1.4.1. No ground preparation or excavation of any kind, including topsoil stripping or ground levelling, shall be undertaken until after the pre-start meeting and after the erection of the tree protection fencing (see below).

A1.5. Tree protection fencing

A1.5.1. Construction exclusion zones (CEZs) will be formed by erecting protective fencing around the RPAs of all on-site trees to the specification recommended in BS 5837, Section 6.2, prior to the commencement of construction. This will be at least 2.1m in height, comprising welded mesh panels; every other one braced with a 45° strut that is pinned to the ground; and seated in concrete or plastic bases pinned to the ground by scaffold uprights sunk to a minimum depth of 600mm, as shown in ***Figure 3*** of that document. Individual panels will be fixed to each other with at least two clamps, one of which will be a security clamp. "**TREE PROTECTION ZONE - KEEP OUT**" or similar notices will be attached with cable ties to every third panel.

A1.5.2. The RPAs of the off-site trees will also be enforced by the erection of protective fencing to the same specification, prior to the commencement of construction, thereby safeguarding them from incursions by plant or machinery, storage and mixing of materials, or other construction-related activities which could have a detrimental effect on their root systems.

A1.5.3. The recommended positions of the protective fencing are shown by **bold blue lines** on the TPP. The precise positioning of the fencing around the trees will be considered in conjunction with any other protective hoarding/fencing which may be required around the site boundary.

A1.5.4. Within the CEZs safeguarded by the protective fencing, there will be no changes in ground levels, **no soil stripping**, and no plant, equipment, or materials will be stored. Oil, bitumen, diesel, and cement will not be stored or discharged within 10m

of any trees. Areas for the storage or mixing of such materials will be agreed in advance and be clearly marked. No notice boards, or power or telephone cables, will be attached to any of the trees. No fires will be lit within 10m of any part of any tree.

APPENDIX 2

Tree Survey Schedule

TREE SURVEY SCHEDULE

19 Beacon Close, Uxbridge, London

No.	Species	Height	Trunk diameter	Radial crown spread	Crown break	Crown clear-ance	Age class	Physio - logy	Structure	Comments	Cate gory
1-2	Lawson cypress	10m	205mm #T2 130mm 130mm	2m	0.2m	1.8m	Semi-mature	Below average	Indifferent	Twin-stemmed from base; large sections on upper canopies brown, consistent with *Phytophora* infection; contributes to boundary screening; however, of low landscape value due to small sizes; hidden in all long direct public views.	C (1)
3	Ash	11m	200mm est.	N 4.5m NE 4.3m E 4m S 4m W 4m	3m	3m	Semi-mature	Average	Indifferent	Off-site tree; base obscured from view; ivy covered trunk and main scaffolds; main unions obscured by ivy; maintained as a pollard; obscured from long direct public view.	C (1)
4	Yew	6m	190mm est.	N 3.8m E 3.5m S 3.5m W 3.5m NW 4m	1m	N 1.8m	Semi-mature	Average	Indifferent	Off-site tree; contributes to boundary screening; unsuppressed crown N extent overhanging boundary; of low landscape value due to small size; obscured from long direct public views.	B (1)
5	Chusan palm	10m	280mm 250mm	N 2.4m E 2.4m S 2.4m W 2.5m	2.5m	1m	Semi-mature	Average	Indifferent	Non-native species, out of character with surrounding area; twin-stemmed from base; of low landscape value due to small size; inessential component of wider landscape; contributes to boundary screening.	C (1)
6-7	Lawson cypress	10m	#T6 200mm #T7 185mm	N 2m E 2m S 2m W 2.5m	2m	1m	Semi-mature	Average	Indifferent	Small ornamental specimens; of low landscape value due to small sizes; readily visible from Beacon Close; contrbutes to boundary screening; inessential components of wider landscape.	C (1)
8	Paper plant	2m	20 stems @ 20mm est.	1.5m	0m	0m	Young	Below average	Indifferent	Small ornamental specimen; multi-stemmed from base; non-native species, out of character with surrounding area.	C (12)
9	Holly	4m	150mm	2m	0.5m	0.5m	Semi-mature	Average	Moderate	Small ornamental specimen; readily visible from Beacon Close, inessential component of group in which it stands.	C (12)
G1	Various	9m	Max 150mm	3m	0m	0m	Young	Average	Indifferent	Group of on and off-site trees and shrubs in SW corner of garden; species include mahonia, Lawson cypress, holly, paper plant and leather-leaved arrow wood; holly dominant; contributes to boundary screening; inessential component of wider landscape.	C (1)

No.	Species	Height	Trunk diameter	Radial crown spread	Crown break	Crown clear-ance	Age class	Physio - logy	Structure	Comments	Cate gory
G2	Various	4m	Min 50mm Max 150mm est.	2m	0m	0m	Young	Average	Indifferent	Group of shrubs on E boundary of garden; non-native species, out of character with surrounding area; contribute to boundary screening; inessential components of the wider landscape; species include cabbage palm, Leyland cypress and camelia.	C (1)
G3	Various	1.5m	Max 50mm	2m	0m	0m	Young	Average	Indifferent	Group of shrubs in sunken terraced bed to E of existing property; species include cabbage palm, rhododendron, and Mexican orange blossom; non-native species, out of character with surrounding area; hidden in all long direct public views.	C (1)
G4	Various	3m	Max 95mm	2m	0m	0m	Semi-mature	Average	Indifferent	Group of palms and shrubs to W of driveway, at front of property; species include cabbage palm, chusan palm and mahonia; non-native species; inssential components of local landscape.	C (12)
G5	Cherry Laurel	2.5m	Max 150mm	1.5m	0m	0m	Young	Average	Indifferent	Row of shrubs to rear of garage on E boundary of garden; non-native species, out of character with surrouding area; S section readily visible from Beacon Close.	C (1)
H1	Cherry Laurel	2m	Max 50mm est.	1.5m	0m	0m	Young	Average	Indifferent	Reguarly maintained hedge; of low landscape value, due to small size.	C (1)
H2	Cherry Laurel	2m	Max 50mm	1.5m	0m	0m	Young	Average	Indifferent	Reguarly maintained hedge; of low landscape value, due to small size; woven with bramble and ivy.	C (1)
H3	Various	3m	Max 100mm est.	1.5m	0m	0m	Young	Average	Indifferent	Informal hedge along NE boundary of garden, species include blackthorn and hawthorn; blackthorn dominant; of only low level screening value; readily visible from Beacon Close and public footpath directly to N; however, inessential component of wider landscape and unremarkable specimens of limited merit.	C (1)