



Merewood

Arboricultural Consultancy Services

**Arboricultural survey to British
Standard B.S. 5837: 2012 'Trees in
relation to design, demolition and
construction - Recommendations'
at
Heathrow Medical Centre
1 St Peter's Way
Harlington**

Prepared by

Simon Hawkins N.D Arbor M. Arbor. A.

05/01/2016



Merewood.
Gregory Road, Hedgerley, Bucks. SL2 3XW

M. 07784 915944 T. 01753 647236
E. simon.hawkins@hotmail.co.uk

VAT No: 990 9313 90

Table of Contents

Introduction	2
Summary	3
Site Description	3
Observations	4
Implications Assessment	5
Conclusions	6
Appendix 1: Key to Tree Survey Data	8
Appendix 2: Tree Survey Data Sheets	11
Appendix 3: Tree Protection Plan	13
Appendix 4: Qualifications and Experience	15

1.0 Introduction

1.1 Brief

- 1.1.1. I am instructed by Natarajan Sukin to carry out an arboricultural survey at Heathrow Medical Centre 1 St Peter's Way Harlington. I am to assess the health and condition of the trees, provide an estimate as to their longevity and to provide recommendations for tree work or other operation to ensure the trees are kept in safe a condition as can be reasonably expected.
- 1.1.2. I am to advise on the likely impact of development proposals to the trees on and adjacent to the site. I am to provide recommendations for tree retention and protection, including appropriate measures that are to be undertaken in order to minimize the impact of development.
- 1.1.3. I have carried out the survey, collecting data in accordance with the recommendations of British Standard B.S. 5837: 2012 'Trees in relation to design, demolition and construction - Recommendations' and in line with best practice procedures.

1.2 Report Limitations

- 1.2.1 This survey assesses the condition of the trees based on a visual inspection made at ground level, including the use of binoculars. Typically, instruments such as a nylon hammer or a simple core sampler may be used if necessary. If further inspection of any specific tree is required, including the use of more sophisticated decay detection equipment, the recommendation to do so is made clear, both in the report and as a note to the tree survey sheets.
- 1.2.2 Trees are dynamic living organisms that are subjected constantly to external stresses and to biological and non-biological influences. As such the structure of trees can change at any given time and it is therefore recommended that trees are inspected regularly and assessed for risk. It is normally recommended that such inspections are undertaken every five years, unless otherwise advised.
- 1.2.3 The assessment of the trees made in this report may be considered valid for a period of twelve months, after which a further assessment is normally recommended.
- 1.2.4 This report is restricted to those trees shown on the plans and described in the schedule.

1.2.5 It has been established that the property is situated within the Harlington Conservation Area. Under the provisions of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (Tree Regulations 2012) Section 211, any tree in excess of 75mm diameter (measured 1m from ground level) not already protected by the tree preservation order, is protected. Prior to working any such tree in a Conservation Area (including pruning or felling), it is necessary to give a six week notice of intent to carry out the work to the Local Planning Authority.

1.3 Survey Date

I surveyed the trees at Heathrow Medical Centre 1 St Peter's Way Harlington on Tuesday 22nd December 2015.

2.0 Summary

- 2.1 The proposal to extend the medical centre will involve the loss of a few small trees from the back of the site. The loss of these trees could be mitigated by replacement planting.

3.0 Site Description

- 3.1 1 St Peter's Way Harlington is a detached building currently used as a medical centre just off Harlington High Street, south of the M4 motorway. The property has a front and rear garden with the front mostly given over to parking and is served by a double entrance driveway.
- 3.2 The site is located to the north of Harlington village centre in a medium high density residential area to the north of Heathrow airport. The surrounding neighbourhood has an urban feel about it and is typified by detached and semi-detached houses.
- 3.3 The topography of the site is more or less level. I have not formally assessed the soil at the site, although the National Soil Resources Institute 'soilscales' viewer indicates this is a free draining slightly acid loam soil.

4.0 Observations

- 4.1 The property functions as a health centre and consequently has a parking requirement that has meant that most of the front garden has had to be dedicated to parking. A mature magnolia shrub is growing

adjacent to the front wall surrounded by the parking, whilst to the south west corner of the plot, near to the driveway entrance, there is a holm oak (T5) (fig.1).



Fig: 1 The holm oak (T5) at the front of the site is close to the entrance of the medical centre

- 4.2 The rear garden has no trees of significance growing, but there are some larger shrubs providing some screening. At the side and back of

the garden are brick walls, the rear one thought possibly to date back to the 16th century.

- 4.3 There are newly planted trees beyond the rear boundary wall that are growing larger and beginning to cause problems.
- 4.4 The first of these is the oriental plane (T1). This is a young tree with the potential to grow considerably larger. In doing so the tree is likely to cause problems with the wall foundations and general structure if only by the growth and expansion of roots. The block paving surrounding the tree is already being lifted up and this looks as if it will continue to get worse.
- 4.5 The fastigate hornbeam (T2) is a more moderately sized tree and at present this is not causing any serious issues.
- 4.6 The Norway maple (T3), like the oriental plane (T1) has the potential to grow considerably larger and to cause damage to the wall and driveway. However, the tree has a god deal of damaged bark on the south west side, leaving the inner wood exposed, which is now decaying.
- 4.7 To the north side of the property, the ash (T4) has been crudely lopped in the past. There is evidence of decay on the main stem which appears quite extensive. However, the tree is not the responsibility of Heathrow Medical Centre as it is not on their land.
- 4.8 The tree survey has shown that of the 5 trees (and 1 shrub) surveyed, 0 are category 'A' 1 is a category 'B' tree (plus a category 'B' shrub; 4 are category 'C' and 0 are category 'U' trees.

5.0 Implications Assessment

- 5.1 I have been asked to comment on proposals to re-develop the site including the construction of a single storey side and rear extension to the back of the site. I refer specifically to the proposed site plan (ref. PD/671) and to the tree protection plan (appendix 3).
- 5.2 The proposed footprint would extend into the back garden as far as the boundary wall, requiring the removal and replacement of the wall. This would involve the removal of the shrubs from the back garden with the subsequent loss of screening.
- 5.3 The roots of the new trees on the other side of the wall are unlikely to have grown extensively beyond the wall at the present time, and will more likely be exploiting the earth beneath the driveway.

- 5.4 However, given the proximity of these trees to the new wall, the need to provide new foundations would certainly result in the need to remove these trees.
- 5.5 The loss of the trees as such is not altogether detrimental. The trees are still of a small size and appear to be causing damage to the driveway already. There is almost certainly potential for these trees to cause further damage to the existing wall if things stay the same.
- 5.6 The new development gives rise to the opportunity to plant new screening, but this would have to take place on the neighbouring property, subject to agreement from the neighbours. It is suggested that a screening hedge, such as Photonia 'Red Robin' would be more manageable than trees and would provide effective screening, whilst causing less damage to the driveway.
- 5.7 However, tree removal and replacement would require agreement from the neighbours and probably could not be the subject of a planning condition, as the trees are off site.
- 5.8 It is suggested that if an alternative design was to be produced, siting the extension back off the wall by a metre or so, the existing wall, could be retained. Whilst the trees could be retained also, the oriental plane would need to be pruned back to accommodate the new extension. This would only be needed for branches interfering with the building, so higher branches could be kept.
- 5.9 All the same, the oriental plane (T1) remains the wrong tree in this position and it is probable that the tree will have to be removed and replaced in time anyway. The Norway maple (T3) is also in bad shape and in my opinion this tree too should be removed and replaced.
- 5.10 During construction work, it is proposed that the driveway entrance to the south, adjacent to the holm oak (T5) should be sealed off, affording the holm oak maximum protection. The tree protection plan (appendix 3) shows how that can be achieved.

6.0 Conclusions

- 6.1 The proposed development of the site would result in the loss of trees and shrubs from the back of the site, including some small trees on neighbouring land. These are young trees, but are clearly the wrong trees for this position as evidenced from the disruption to the driveway surface and the potential for the trees to damage the boundary wall.
- 6.2 Removal and replacement of these trees with suitable hedging would provide a satisfactory resolution to the problem, but would have to be the subject of a separate agreement with the neighbours. Any proposed works to the trees would also require formal notification to the Local

Authority as they are in a designated Conservation Area.

- 6.3 The trees at the front can be satisfactorily protected by simply closing off that side of the access drive during building works.
- 6.4 It is concluded that a re-development of the site can take place without harming the trees to be retained. These can be protected using barriers as detailed by British Standard B.S. 5837: 2012 'Trees in relation to design, demolition and construction - Recommendations' and in line with best practice procedures.

Simon Hawkins BTec ND Arbor M. Arbor A.

Appendix 1

Key to Tree Survey Data

Tree number:

Sequential reference number corresponding to the tree survey plan. Trees are recorded either as individuals (T1, T2, etc.) or as groups (G1, G2, etc.)

Species:

These are listed in the schedule by their common name. The botanical name of the species present is as follows:

- Oriental plane (*Platanus orientalis*)
- Fastigate hornbeam (*Carpinus betulus 'Fastigiata'*)
- Norway maple (*Acer platanoides*)
- Ash (*Fraxinus excelsior*)
- Magnolia (*Magnolia spp.*)
- Holm oak (*Quercus ilex*)

Height

The height of the tree is measured using a 'Suunto' Height Meter or estimated to the nearest metre.

Stem diameter

Stem diameter as measured at 1.5m above ground level, or otherwise in accordance with Annex 'C' of the British Standard and expressed in millimetres to the nearest 10mm. Where access to the stem for measurement purposes was not possible, an estimated size is given with (est.) shown.

Crown spread (m):

Crown radius measured in metres (shown est. if estimated) to cardinal points

Height to 1st main branch:

The height from ground level of the first significant branch growth of the tree, with an indication of direction of that branch to inform on ground clearance, crown/stem ratio and shading

Height of canopy:

The height from ground level of the lowest part of the main canopy to inform on ground clearance, crown/stem ratio and shading

General observations:

A brief description summarising the form and condition of the tree, including physiological and structural defects (e.g. the presence of any decay) and preliminary management recommendations.

Life expectancy

Estimated safe useful life expectancy based on species, condition & context. The following age class bands are used: <10; 10-20; 20-40; 40+

Category

A summary of the British Standard classification:

Trees for Removal

Category U = Trees 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.

Trees to be considered for retention where

Subcategory 1 concerns mainly arboricultural values

Subcategory 2 concerns mainly landscape values

Subcategory 3 concerns mainly cultural values including conservation

Category A = **Those trees of the highest quality and value:** in such a condition as to be able to make a substantial contribution (a minimum of 40 years is suggested).

Category B = **Trees of moderate to high quality and value:** in such a condition as to be able to make a significant contribution (a minimum of 20 years is suggested).

Category C = **Trees of low quality and value:** currently in adequate condition to remain until new planting could be established (a minimum of 10 years is suggested), or young trees with a stem diameter of below 150mm

Appendix 2

Tree survey data sheets

Tree no	Species	Height	Stem diameter	Crown spread				Height to 1st main branch	Height of canopy	Age	General observations	Life expectancy	Category
				North	South	East	West						
T1	Oriental plane	6	210	3	3	3	3			Y		40+	C
T2	Fastigate hornbeam	8	140	2	2	1	1			Y		40+	C
T3	Norway maple	9	270	3	2	2	3			Y		40+	C
T4	Ash	12	550	2	3	5	3			M		10 - 20	C
T5	Holm Oak	9	310	3	3	3	3			M/A		40+	B1 + B2
	Magnolia	4		2	2	2	2			M/A		20 - 40	B2

Appendix 3

Tree protection plan



Appendix 4

Qualifications and experience

- I am Simon Hawkins, proprietor of Merewood Arboricultural Consultancy Services.
- I hold the National Diploma in Arboriculture which I attained in 1987. I have studied and practised Arboriculture for 30 years, during which time I have been involved with both the private and public sector.
- I hold professional member status of the Arboricultural Association (M. Arbor A.), recognised as a higher vocational level within the industry.
- I have undertaken an intensive course in the principles and application of VTA Visual Tree Assessment. I have been assessed and found to have attained the advanced level of technical competence of a VTA Practitioner with Elite Training.
- I hold the LANTRA award for professional tree inspections
- I have run a successful tree surgery business in which I was involved with the hands-on aspect of organising and running the day to day operations and carrying out contract work, including Local Authority contract work to a high professional standard.
- I have over 18 years experience working in the public sector, during which time I have dealt with all aspects of trees and development in the town planning context, within the inner city; in a greater London Borough; and in the Green Belt. Typically, I have worked with planners, developers, architects and other professionals in the construction industry in which I provide advice and assistance in dealing with arboricultural matters.
- I have appeared at numerous appeals, informal hearings and public enquiries to make formal representations. I have also appeared as an expert witness in court with regard to breaches of Tree Preservations Orders.