

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:
25 Linksway, Linksway, HA6 2XA**

Dated: 5th August 2024

Our reference: GHA/DS/222160:24

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	7
	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: 25 Linksway, Linksway, HA6 2XA

Our reference: GHA/DS/222160:24

Client: A Masood

Dated: 5th August 2024

Prepared by: Glen Harding MICFor, MSc (Forestry), MARborA

Date of Inspection: 30th July 2024

Instructions

Issued by – A Masood

TERMS OF REFERENCE – GHA Trees were instructed to survey the subject trees within and adjacent to 25 Linksway, Linksway, 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 a new padel court to the north east of the house within the rear garden. The proposed scheme does not require the removal of any of the trees; therefore, the landscape character of the site will be unaffected by the proposal. A small number of relatively insignificant (C category) shrubs will be cut back, which will not significantly impact the local or wider landscape; this is also work that would be required regardless of the proposals. The proposal requires a new structure to be installed within the root protection areas of nearby trees; however, mitigations are proposed to ensure these structures will not adversely affect these trees. 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:

- Topographical survey
- 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 Dense vegetation or climbers (such as ivy) also prohibited full inspections for some trees; this is noted where applicable.
- 1.6 No discussions took place between the surveyor and any other party.
- 1.7 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)
- 1.8 The survey was undertaken in accord with British Standard 5837: 2012 – Trees in relation to design, demolition and construction – recommendations.
- 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 Linksway, a 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.

The Proposal

- 5.1 The proposal for the site is to install a new padel court to the north east of the house within the rear garden.
- 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 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 ACCOMODATE 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 structure from the crowns of T23 and T25. The defining branch structure of these trees is however well clear of the padel court and installation works can progress safely without the need for any facilitation pruning.
- 6.4 A small number of relatively insignificant (C category) shrubs will be cut back, which will not significantly impact the local or wider landscape; this is also work that would be required regardless of the proposals.

ASSESSMENT OF RETAINED TREES ROOT PROTECTION AREAS

6.5 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. The assessed RPAs can be seen on the appended plan.

ASSESSED IMPACT ON RPAS BY PROPOSED STRUCTURES & PROPOSED MITIGATIONS

6.6 There is a small encroachment into the RPAs of T21, T23 and T25 as shown on the appended plan. The new padel court will however be installed to ensure that all existing ground levels are retained in their current form, as well as ensuring that satisfactory moisture and oxygen can be obtained from the underlying soil by any tree roots in this area as it will be porous to ensure the rainwater can reach the underlying soil.

6.7 Where sections of new padel court fencing are located within the RPA of any tree, this work must be undertaken by hand using hand tools only. The locations of the new fence upright posts will be finalised following trial digs to confirm there are no major (over 25mm) roots present; if any such roots are found, the location must be altered. If any smaller roots are found, these can be cut using sharp hand sharp tools to leave a 'clean' cut, in order to minimise the risk of infection by decay pathogens. The post holes within the RPAs should then be lined with plastic sheeting before any concrete or cement is placed into the hole, in order that there is no risk of leaching into the nearby soil as the mixture dries.

INSTALLATION OF SERVICES

6.8 The full details of existing and proposed new services have not been made available at the time of writing.

6.9 New services must be routed to avoid all RPAs of retained trees on site and within nearby sites. From an assessment of the subject site, undertaken in conjunction with the project architect, there is no reason to assume this isn't possible. Inspection chambers must also be sited outside the RPAs of any nearby trees.

Post Development Pressure

FUTURE TREE AND STRUCTURE RELATIONSHIPS

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

7.2 The court may be in shade during parts of the day, which will be beneficial to users and the trees will therefore be valued as an asset to the new court.

7.3 It is accepted that leaf fall will occur onto the new court; however, this will be dealt with as part routine weekly maintenance undertaken by a gardening contractor.

7.4 Regular inspections of the retained trees by a suitably qualified Arboriculturalist and subsequent remedial works will ensure that the trees are maintained in a suitable manner, to exist in harmony with the new structures and its occupants for many years to come.

Tree Protection Measures and Preliminary Method Statement for Development Works

8.1 TREE PROTECTION BARRIERS

The position of the fence **MUST** be marked out with biodegradable marker paint on site and agreed with appropriate representatives from the LPA and contractor. The fencing **MUST** be erected **prior** to any works in the vicinity of the trees and removed only when all development activity is complete. The protective fencing **MUST** be as that shown in BS 5837 (see Appendix C). The herras panels **MUST** be joined together using a minimum of two anti-tamper couplers which **MUST** be installed so they can only be removed from the inside of the fence. The panels **MUST** be supported by stabilizer struts, which **MUST** be installed on the inside and secured to the ground using pins or appropriate weights.

The Fence must be marked with a clear sign reading:

"Construction Exclusion Zone – No Access"

8.2 GROUND PROTECTION – LIGHTWEIGHT ACCESS ONLY

Where any additional ground protection is required during installation, 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.



Above: ground protection make-up

8.3 NO DIG SURFACING METHODOLOGY:

- Eradication of all existing ground vegetation **MUST** be undertaken using a translocated herbicide. Any product used for this purpose **MUST** be selected to ensure that it will not have an adverse affect on the health of the retained trees, and carried out by a suitably trained operative.
- Any major protrusions within the soil **MUST** be removed, such as large rocks or existing tree stumps. Any holes **MUST** be filled with sharp sand.

- Lay a geotextile membrane over the entire area(s) to be protected, ensuring a one 1m overlap where necessary. All new surfacing **MUST** be positioned at least 500mm from tree stems or buttress roots.
- A porous material can now be placed on top to complete the construction.
- Graded top soil will be used to bring the adjacent grassed areas to the same level as the new paddle court.

8.4 INCOMING SERVICES, DRAINAGE AND SOAKAWAYS

New services **MUST** be routed to avoid all RPAs of retained trees on site and within nearby sites. From an assessment of the subject site, undertaken in conjunction with the project architect, there is no reason to assume this isn't possible. Inspection chambers **MUST** be sited outside the RPA.

8.5 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.

Key personnel:

Name	Position	Contact number / email:
Glen Harding	Retained arboriculturalist	07884 056 025 Or info@ghatrees.co.uk
TBC	Local authority Arboricultural Officer	TBC
TBC	Site manager	TBC

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.

8.6 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.

8.7 HARD / SOFT LANDSCAPING NEAR RETAINED TREES

All new pathways and hard landscaping areas within the Root Protection Areas (RPAs) of the retained trees **MUST** be designed using no-dig, up and over construction techniques, and be specified in close co-ordination with the retained Arboriculturalist. Porous materials **MUST** also be used when surfacing near the trees. No machinery will be used for this work, which **MUST** all be done by hand.

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.

5th August 2024

Signed:

A handwritten signature in blue ink that reads "Glen Harding". The signature is fluid and cursive, with "Glen" on the left and "Harding" on the right, connected by a flourish.

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
T20	Cypress	9	173	3	2.08	2	2	2	2	M	0	10-20	C1	Small tree of limited value.
T21	Thuja	22	900	1	10.80	4	4	4	4	M	3	10-20	C1	Off site - full inspection not possible.
T22	Oak											Removed since last survey		
T23	Oak	19	620	1	7.44	7	7	7	4	M	7	10-20	C1	Slightly sparse crown.
T24	Leyland cypress	14	350	1	4.20	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.5	M	2	10-20	C1	No notable defects recorded during inspection.
T25	Oak	19	820	1	9.84	7	7	7	7	M	5	20-40	B1	No notable defects recorded during inspection.
T26	Leyland cypress	16	350	1	4.20	3.5	3.5	3.5	3.5	M	3	10-20	C1	No notable defects recorded during inspection.
T27	Oak	21	600	1	7.20	7	7	7	7	M	10	20-40	B1	Off site - full inspection not possible.
T28	Norway maple	17	300	1	3.60	5	5	5	5	MA	4	10-20	C1	Off site - full inspection not possible.

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



