

BS5837 Arboricultural Impact Assessment & Method Statement



94 Vine Lane, Hillingdon, Hillingdon, Uxbridge, UB10 0BE

Client: **Mr F Patel**

Job Reference: **04056R**

Planning Ref: **-**

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

Contents

1. Executive Summary	3
2. Statutory Protection	4
3. Terms of Reference.....	6
4. The Trees	7
5.1 Site Specific Soils.....	8
5.2 Root Protection Area (RPA) Incursions	16
5.3 Tree Pruning & Removal.....	19
5.4 Demolition & Foundations.....	22
5.5 Surfaces near Trees	26
5.6 Site Service Provision	26
5.7 Ground Level Changes, Landscaping & Soil Remediation.....	29
5.8 Tree Shading of Proposal	33
5.9 Arboricultural Project Supervision	33

Appendix 1 – BS5837 Survey Key	35
Appendix 2 – BS5837 Tree Classification	36
Appendix 3 – BS5837 Survey Data.....	38
Appendix 4 – Tree Works Schedule	39
Appendix 5 - Tree Constraints Plan	40
Appendix 6 - Tree Protection Plan.....	42
Appendix 7 - Tree & Services Plan	45
Appendix 8 – Site Photographs	47
Appendix 9 – Limitations	49


1. Executive Summary

- 1.1 Tamla Trees Ltd has been appointed by Multi Creation to provide advice on the arboricultural issues relating to the advised development: "*Extension to the existing property*".
- 1.2 We surveyed the site in September 2023. The survey accorded with BS5837:2012 "Trees in relation to design, demolition and construction – Recommendations". T2 (Bay Laurel), T3 (Yew), T4 (Apple) and TG1 (Cypress, Arbutus and Birch) will be removed to allow the proposal and tidy up what is a neglected and overgrown rear garden area. None of these trees are of size or visual prominence.
- 1.3 In terms of the development works the main constraint tree is T1 (Weeping Silver Birch). This tree is small in size but of good form and character and can be a valuable retained feature within the newly extended property garden. It is again of minimal wider visual significance but worthy of retention based on its apparent condition and good form for the species.
- 1.4 The proposed works do not encroach into the Root Protection Area (RPA) of T1. A system of robust herras fencing will be used to protect the RPA. Temporary ground protection is not required.
- 1.5 The tree issues can be summarised as: **Tree removal> Effective Tree Protection> Service Connections> Site operative knowledge of tree protection issues> Soft landscaping to make good.**
- 1.6 The site is within the [Hillingdon Council](#) administrative area. The site is affected by a Tree Preservation Order (TPO) but not located within a designated Conservation Area. The TPO predates any of the on-site trees meaning none of the trees within this report appear affected by it.
- 1.7 Subject to adherence to the protection measures detailed within this report there should be no impact on T1 from the proposed works.
- 1.8 This report is based on the client plans ref: 2023/082 -01

2. Statutory Protection

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

Conservation Area Status	
Is the site located within a Conservation Area?	No
Notes: (i) All trees larger than 7.5cm diameter at 1.5m above ground level are subject to regulations within a Conservation Area. Exemptions apply for trees which are dead and dangerous but clarification before any tree works is advised. A notification is required in many circumstances.	
Tree Preservation Order Status	
Are inspected trees subject to a TPO?	No
Type of TPO	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Area <input type="checkbox"/> Individual <input type="checkbox"/> Group <input type="checkbox"/> Woodland
TPO Reference	TPO 7
Date TPO Made	02/03/1967
Notes: (i) The type and details of any TPO determine which trees are 'protected'. Exemptions apply for trees which are dead and dangerous but clarification before any tree works is advised. An application may be required before undertaking works. (ii) At the time of writing Hillingdon Council website site confirms the presence of a TPO but it dates from before any of the surveyed trees were planted and as such none of the surveyed trees are therefore considered affected.	



3. Terms of Reference

- 3.1 [BS5837:2012](#) 'Trees in relation to design, demolition and construction – recommendations'
- 3.2 [BS3998:2010](#) 'Tree work – recommendations'
- 3.3 Arboricultural Associations Approved Tree Work Contractors [List](#)
- 3.4 <https://www.trees.org.uk/Help-Advice/Help-for-Tree-Owners/Guide-to-Tree-Pruning>
- 3.5 [NJUG 4 – National Joint Utilities Group](#) "Guidelines for the planning, installation and maintenance of utility apparatus in proximity to trees. Volume 4, issue 2. London: NJUG 2007" To include [Operatives Hand-out Guidance](#)
- 3.6 Foundation design, tree species water use - [NHBC Chapter 4.2 Building near trees](#)
- 3.7 TDAG Trees Planning & Development – [A guide for delivery](#)
- 3.8 TDAG Trees in Hard Landscapes – [a guide for delivery](#)
- 3.9 TDAG Tree Species Selection for Green Infrastructure – [a guide for specifiers](#)
- 3.10 BGS Open-Source Soil Data <http://www.bgs.ac.uk/nercsoilportal/maps.html>
- 3.11 HSE (2014) Avoiding danger from underground services: <https://www.hse.gov.uk/pubs/books/hsg47.htm>
- 3.12 Eissenstat & Yanai (1997) The ecology of root lifespan. *Advances in Ecological Research*, 27, 1-60.
- 3.13 Hendricks & Pregitzer (1992) The demography of fine roots in a northern hardwood forest. *Ecology*, 73, 1094-1104.
- 3.14 BRE Digest 412: Desiccation in clay soils.
- 3.15 Matheny & Clark (1998) Trees and Development: A Technical Guide to Preservation of Trees During Land Development.
- 3.16 https://www.london.gov.uk/sites/default/files/the_london_plan_2021.pdf
- 3.17 <https://www.hillingdon.gov.uk/protected-trees>

4. The Trees

4.1 The trees can be summarised as follows:


BS 5837 Cat	A	B	C	U
Specific Trees	-	T1	T2, T3, T4, TG1	-
Total Number	None	1 tree	3 trees, 1 tree group.	None

*Based on available access.

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

5.1 Site Specific Soils

- 5.1.1 Soil is an important factor in tree growth and the type of underlying soil can impact on successful integration of new developments.
- 5.1.2 A free draining sandy soil containing sand/gravel is likely to lead to water being accessible in the upper horizons during the growing season and available at greater depths and trees will generally be forced to explore a larger volume/ depth on such soils. The structure of such soil also makes compression more difficult (by heavy construction plant) and root penetration is easier for the trees. By comparison, a clay soil is more easily compressed, particularly when wet and compression can have a greater impact on tree health.
- 5.1.3 British Geology Survey (BGS) data indicates the site is located within a Black Park Gravel Member.¹

Soil Description
 <div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-between; width: 100%;"> <div style="flex: 1;"> <p>Bedrock Deposits: London Clay Formation - Clay, silt and sand. Sedimentary bedrock formed between 56 and 47.8 million years ago during the Palaeogene period.</p> <p>Superficial Deposit: Black Park Gravel Member - Sand and gravel. Sedimentary superficial deposit formed between 480 and 423 thousand years ago during the Quaternary period.</p> </div> </div>

¹ <https://webapps.bgs.ac.uk/lexicon/lexicon.cfm?pub=BPGR>

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

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

5.1.5 BS5837 indicates: 4.6.2 "*The RPA for each tree should initially be plotted as a circle centred on the base of the stem. Where pre-existing site conditions or other factors indicate that rooting has occurred asymmetrically, a polygon of equivalent area should be produced. Modifications to the shape of the RPA should reflect a soundly based arboricultural assessment of likely root distribution.*" It advises at Section 4.6.3 That any deviation in the RPA from the original circular plot should take account of a number of site-specific factors.

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

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




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

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

between 10 days to over a year²). The cyclical death and decay of roots releases both nitrogen and carbon into the soil and is an important part of soil nutrient cycling process. The extent and location of the trees fine root system reflects a trees resource requirement (as resources are removed from certain areas of the soil and exploited in others) as well as the resource capacity required to form such a fibrous root system. Fine roots produced near the soil surface tend to live longer than those deeper in the soil³. The fine root system shows species variation and will also vary in depth (depending on species dynamics and underlying soil conditions). Adopted highways generally have a footing that extends < 0.5m and most UK residential properties have footings in the range of 0.5-1.5m depth.

² Eissenstat & Yanai (1997) The ecology of root lifespan. *Advances in Ecological Research*, 27, 1-60.

³ Hendricks & Pregitzer (1992) The demography of fine roots in a northern hardwood forest. *Ecology*, 73, 1094-1104.




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

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





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

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



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

5.1.11 BS5837 Section 4.6.3 Site Specific Assessment:

Section	Consideration	Site Specific Comments
4.6.3 (a)	<i>the morphology and disposition of the roots, when influenced by past or existing site conditions (e.g. the presence of roads, structures, and underground apparatus);</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • T1 (Weeping Silver Birch) is within open soft ground garden areas and the morphology of rooting should generally be as expected in such conditions.
4.6.3.(b)	<i>topography and drainage;</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The site is generally level. There is no evidence of adverse drainage or water pooling.
4.6.4.(c)	<i>the soil type and structure;</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Soil is indicated by the BGS as gravel overlying a London Clay at depth. It is our experience that gravel soils increases aeration and reduces risk associated with compaction. This risk is reduced further by the protection measures detailed within this report. • Tree protection and ground protection measures detailed in this report will only be effective if these are instated immediately prior to all site works and maintained for the duration of the works. These must be briefed to all contractors so they understand their purpose.
4.6.4.(d)	<i>the likely tolerance of the tree to root disturbance or damage, based on factors such as species, age, condition and past management.</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are no detailed encroachments into the RPA of retained trees for the proposed works. • On the basis that the tree protection measures are installed prior to any on site activity and maintained for the duration of the works there should be a minimal impact on the retained trees.

5.2 Root Protection Area (RPA) Incursions

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

BS 5837 Cat	A	B	C	Summary
RPA Incursion	-	T1	-	<p>Surface works – There are no RPA encroachments.</p> <p>Construction/ Footings – There are no RPA encroachments.</p> <p>Access/ Site Storage – There is ample space on site for storage of materials outside the RPA of T1.</p> <p>Services – The proposal is envisaged to tie into the service connections. Any new connections to the public highway area to the east of the site will be located in the area outside the retained tree RPA's. The general principles of NJUG 4 – National Joint Utilities Group “Guidelines for the planning, installation, and maintenance of utility apparatus in proximity to trees. Volume 4, issue 2. London: NJUG 2007” should be adhered to. Special guidance (overview) on hand digging is included within this report for any service excavation which may be required within the RPA. All new manhole chambers must be located outside the RPA of any retained tree. Contractors (demo & construction) must be made aware of this requirement.</p> <p>Landscaping (Soft) –All making good must be with BS3882 compliant topsoil raked out by hand. See Section 5.7 for further detail.</p>

5.2.2 There are no RPA incursions from the proposal:

Tree Number	RPA Total (Sqm)	Existing Incursion (Sqm)	As % of trees RPA	Proposed Incursion (Sqm)	As % of trees RPA	Difference +/-
Increase in RPA covered		Decrease in RPA covered				

(b) building (nd) no dig surface

Tree & Development Risk Indicator



- There are no development works proposed within the RPA of retained trees.
- T1 (Weeping Silver Birch) is well away from the proposed works.
- **Note:** This level of risk is a visual guide only and is only relevant if all advised tree protective measures are put in place prior to any on site activity and maintained for the duration of the works.
- **Note:** Only on-site testing can confirm the local soil conditions below foundation level but available information suggests the presence of a GRAVEL overlying a CLAY.




Fig 6 – Diagram showing the typical particulate composition and air/ water content at field capacity for mineral soil types⁴ The variation in soil type has a direct bearing on the potential impact of adverse construction techniques (such as soil compaction) as well as overall root system morphology & development. Clay soils tend to have shallower rooting as moisture remains readily available while soils containing free draining gravel and sand can encourage deeper rooting based on reduce soil bulk density and greater seasonal variations in moisture availability.

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

5.3 Tree Pruning & Removal

5.3.1 T2 (Bay Laurel), T3 (Yew), T4 (Apple) and TG1 (Cypress, Arbutus and Birch) will be removed to facilitate the works and allow landscaping of what is a very overgrown rear garden area.



Fig 7 - T4 & TG1 – Trees of small size in an overgrown garden (left) and T3 (Yew) right – these trees will be removed.

Tree Surgery

Tree No.	Species	Proposed Tree Works	BS Cat

Proposed Removal

Tree No.	Species	Proposed Tree Works	BS Cat
T2	Bay Laurel	Remove	Cat C
T3	Yew	Remove	Cat C
T4	Apple	Remove	Cat C
TG1	Cypress, Arbutus & Birch	Remove	Cat C

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

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

Tree Pruning Indicator



- T1 (Weeping Silver Birch) does not pose a long-term pruning conflict with the proposed layout.
- **Note:** This is an indicative assessment. All and any future works should be undertaken in accordance with BS3998 (Tree Works) and we recommend the use of Arboricultural Association approved contractors.⁵

5.3.4 Please note that this is not a health and safety assessment report and that vigilance for the emergence of any fungal pathogens is advised.

⁵ <https://www.trees.org.uk/ARB-Approved-Contractor-Directory>

5.4 Demolition & Foundations

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

Stage 1

- Remove T2, T3, T4 & TG1.
- Install all proposed BS Fencing (T1).
- Brief Contractors on purpose.

Stage 2


- Complete construction.

Stage 3

- Fencing remains in place.
- Finalise service connections outside RPA's.
- Remove tree protection and implement soft landscaping.
- Mulch below T1.

5.4.2 High quality BS5837 compliant fencing will be installed prior to on-site works for T1 (to the rear).

Tree Protection



Threat Level to Retained Trees

LOW

Overview

- *Braced feet fence spec (left).*
- *Note: To be marked with signs (inset) and purpose to be briefed to all ground workers.*
- *Maintained for duration of the build.*

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



Fig 8 – Professional grade weatherproof tree protection signs no smaller than 297 x 420 mm (A3) should be placed on basal shuttering.

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

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

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

5.5 Surfaces near Trees

5.5.1 No new surfacing near trees is proposed.

5.6 Site Service Provision

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




Fig 9 – Annotated service installation depth drawing (source: Thorne & Derrick). Service installations occupy the same soil volume/ depth where the greatest level of tree roots will likely be found. It is envisaged that services will connect with existing ones present on site serving the existing property with ample space for installations outside the RPA.

5.6.2 **Services** - In the event of a need to undertake works close to any retained trees (T1 in this instance which is unlikely given its location relative to the proposal) this has the capacity to cause root damage and should be hand dug in accordance with the principles detailed as follows:

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

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

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

Fig 10 – Advised tools/ materials which should be available for all excavation works within RPA

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

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

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

Root Wrapping		
	 	<p>Overview</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Any exposed roots >25mm should be wrapped in hessian (example left) if exposed overnight or for any 4-hour period.</i> • <i>Spot marking with spray paint to highlight locations also advised.</i> • <i>Alternatively roots can be covered over with topsoil to maintain moisture retention.</i> • <i>Example Tamla Trees project on London Plane (left).</i>
Threat Level to Retained Trees		HIGH

5.7 Ground Level Changes, Landscaping & Soil Remediation

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



Fig 11 – All 'making good' topsoil will be BS3882 compliant and raked out by hand to no greater depth than 100mm.

5.7.2 We encourage the use of composted bark mulch below tree canopies where possible to aid water retention and increase soil microbial activity. This is particularly relevant to mature retained trees. This is recommended for T1 (Weeping Silver Birch) to the rear of the site.

Mulching



Overview

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

Threat Level to Retained Trees

LOW




Fig 12 – Benefits of Mulch (Image Source 1st Stop Landscape Supply (US)

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

<h2>Plug and Pot Planting</h2>	
	<p>Overview</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Within 1.5m of retained trees planting should be with plug stock (left)</i> • <i>Small plant pot sizes <3l utilised for new planting in further areas.</i> • <i>Hand dug planting holes.</i> • <i>Top dressed in compacted bark mulch/ soil as appropriate.</i> • <i>Watered weekly May – September during season 1 & 2.</i>
<p>Threat Level to Retained Trees</p>	<p>LOW</p>

5.8 Tree Shading of Proposal

5.8.1 The property has open aspects and only a small ornamental (T1) to the north and as such shading is not considered an issue.

5.9 Arboricultural Project Supervision

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

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

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

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

Visit Detail	Date	Status
<p>1st Site Inspection Attend site to inspect tree protection for T1. Update local authority.</p>	TBC	Incomplete
<p>Final Site Inspection Final site visit to confirm that no damage has been done to retained trees/ identify any remedial actions in the event damage has occurred. Assess any required tree surgery following construction. Update local authority and project team on findings.</p>	TBC	Incomplete

Note: Actual visit dates subject to change/ confirmation depending on project program.

Appendix 1 – BS5837 Survey Key

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

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

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

Appendix 2 – BS5837 Tree Classification

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Table 1 Cascade chart for tree quality assessment

Category and definition	Criteria (including subcategories where appropriate)	Identification on plan		
Trees unsuitable for retention (see Note)				
Category U Those in such a condition that they cannot realistically be retained as living trees in the context of the current land use for longer than 10 years	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Trees that have a serious, irremediable, structural defect, such that their early loss is expected due to collapse, including those that will become unviable after removal of other category U trees (e.g. where, for whatever reason, the loss of companion shelter cannot be mitigated by pruning) Trees that are dead or are showing signs of significant, immediate, and irreversible overall decline Trees infected with pathogens of significance to the health and/or safety of other trees nearby, or very low quality trees suppressing adjacent trees of better quality <p><i>NOTE Category U trees can have existing or potential conservation value which it might be desirable to preserve; see 4.5.7.</i></p>	See Table 2		
	1 Mainly arboricultural qualities	2 Mainly landscape qualities		
		3 Mainly cultural values, including conservation		
Trees to be considered for retention				
Category A Trees of high quality with an estimated remaining life expectancy of at least 40 years	Trees that are particularly good examples of their species, especially if rare or unusual; or those that are essential components of groups or formal or semi-formal arboricultural features (e.g. the dominant and/or principal trees within an avenue)	Trees, groups or woodlands of particular visual importance as arboricultural and/or landscape features	Trees, groups or woodlands of significant conservation, historical, commemorative or other value (e.g. veteran trees or wood-pasture)	See Table 2
Category B Trees of moderate quality with an estimated remaining life expectancy of at least 20 years	Trees that might be included in category A, but are downgraded because of impaired condition (e.g. presence of significant though remediable defects, including unsympathetic past management and storm damage), such that they are unlikely to be suitable for retention for beyond 40 years; or trees lacking the special quality necessary to merit the category A designation	Trees present in numbers, usually growing as groups or woodlands, such that they attract a higher collective rating than they might as individuals; or trees occurring as collectives but situated so as to make little visual contribution to the wider locality	Trees with material conservation or other cultural value	See Table 2
Category C Trees of low quality with an estimated remaining life expectancy of at least 10 years, or young trees with a stem diameter below 150 mm	Unremarkable trees of very limited merit or such impaired condition that they do not qualify in higher categories	Trees present in groups or woodlands, but without this conferring on them significantly greater collective landscape value; and/or trees offering low or only temporary/transient landscape benefits	Trees with no material conservation or other cultural value	See Table 2

Appendix 3 – BS5837 Survey Data

Tree No.	Species	DBH (m)	No of Stems	Ht (m)	Crown Spread				BS Cat	Age Class	Life Expect	Cr Ht (m)	Observation	Recommendations	RPR (m)
					N	E	S	W							
T1	Birch (Silver Weeping)	0.27	1	4.2	3.6	3.9	3.7	3.7	B1	Mature	20 to 40	0.4	Ivy covered but good foliage cover. Not without character. Best left unpruned in area of mulched ground.	No works/ mulch below canopy.	3.2
T2	Laurel (Bay)	0.22	1	4.6	1.6	1.6	1.6	1.6	C1	Semi-mature	20 to 40	0.2	Shrub/ tree. Minimal amenity.	Remove	2.6
T3	Yew	0.24	M/S	4.2	1.6	1.6	1.6	1.6	C1	Semi-mature	20 to 40	0.2	Managed by repeat pruning. Minimal amenity.	Remove	2.9
T4	Apple	0.14	1	3.6	1.8	1.8	1.8	1.8	C1	Semi-mature	20 to 40	0.5	No access, overgrown with Brambles.	Remove	1.7
TG1	Cypress, Arbutus (tbc), Birch	0.08	M/S	3.5	1.4	1.4	1.4	1.4	C1	Mature	20 to 40	0.5	Close grown. No access given undergrowth.	Remove	1

Appendix 4 – Tree Works Schedule

Tree Surgery

Tree No.	Species	Proposed Tree Works	BS Cat

Proposed Removal

Tree No.	Species	Proposed Tree Works	BS Cat
T2	Bay Laurel	Remove	Cat C
T3	Yew	Remove	Cat C
T4	Apple	Remove	Cat C
TG1	Cypress, Arbutus & Birch	Remove	Cat C


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

NOTE: We recommend using Arboricultural Association approved contractors who can be sourced [here](#)

Appendix 5 - Tree Constraints Plan

COPYRIGHT RESERVED
DO NOT SCALE FROM THIS DRAWING

Tree Survey Drawing Key



See Tamla Trees, Tree Survey for Individual Tree Details


KEY

Please refer to Tamla Trees report for details


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

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


T1 Silver Weeping Birch# B1




TG1 Cypress, Arbutus, Birch# C1



T2 Bay Laurel# C1



T3 Yew# C1



Constantine
Place

VINE

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

REV AMENDMENTS DRAWN DATE AUTH'D

PROJECT

94 Vine Lane,
Hillingdon,
UB10 0BE

CLIENT
Mr G Grover


TITLE
Tree Constraint Plan (TCP)

Job	04056R	Scale	1:200 @ A3	DRG NO		Revision
Date	11/09/2023	Type	a	04056P_TCP_01	-	



COPYRIGHT RESERVED
DO NOT SCALE FROM THIS DRAWING

Tree Survey Drawing Key



See Tamla Trees, Tree Survey for Individual Tree Details

KEY

Please refer to Tamla Trees report for details

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

RPA - Root Protection Area as defined by Table 2 BS 5837:2012

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

REV AMENDMENTS DRAWN DATE AUTH'D

PROJECT

94 Vine Lane,
Hillingdon,
UB10 0BE

CLIENT
Mr G Grover

TITLE
Tree Constraint Plan (TCP)


Job	Scale	DRG NO	Revision
04056R	1:200 @ A3	04056P_TCP_02	-


Appendix 6 - Tree Protection Plan




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

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


- All tree protection must be in place prior to any site activities. It is recommended that this fencing is installed prior to any site works (including demolition).
- To be effective Tree Protection must remain in place for the duration of the development and form part of the site induction process.
- Fencing spec (right) to be installed immediately following removal of tennis court surface.








COPYRIGHT RESERVED
DO NOT SCALE FROM THIS DRAWING



KEY

Please refer to Tamla Trees report for details


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




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




Proposed removal -
to facilitate Development



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



Recommended composted bark mulch area



Proposed extension

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

REV AMENDMENTS DRAWN DATE AUTH'D

PROJECT

94 Vine Lane,

Finningdon,
UB10 0BE

CLIENT
Mr G Grever

Mr. Grover

TITLE



Tree Protection Plan (TPP)

Job 04056R	Scale 1:200 @ A3	DRG NO 04056P TPP 01	Revision
Date	Type		-

Tel: 01252 811 233
Email: Info@tamlatrees.com
Web: www.tamlatrees.com

Appendix 7 - Tree & Services Plan

- Service information not yet available.
- To be kept under review as part of site inspection process.
- **Note:** All service companies should be provided with a copy of the Tree Protection Plan as early in the design process as possible to ensure that service routes are located outside RPA's where possible.
- NJUG 4 – National Joint Utilities Group “Guidelines for the planning, installation and maintenance of utility apparatus in proximity to trees. Volume 4, issue 2. London: NJUG 2007” to be adhered to at all times. A copy is available [here](#).



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

Service information not available but not considered an issue on this project given ample space away from T1 and location of likely tie in points.

Appendix 8 – Site Photographs



Image 1 – Looking towards T1 – careful undergrowth removal (by hand) and mulching below canopy recommended.



Image 2 – T2 (Bay Laurel)



Image 3 – T3 (Yew)

Appendix 9 – Limitations

Full Legal Disclaimer

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

Copyright & Non-Disclosure Notice

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

Third Party Disclaimer

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

Specific - Trees

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

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

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

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