

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

## **Arboricultural and Planning Integration Report: Land to the rear of 83-87 Manor Way, Ruislip, HA4 8HW**

1<sup>st</sup> June 2021

Ref: GHA/DS/122660:21

## 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	10
	Recommendations	10
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 Report

Location: Land to the rear of 83-87 Manor Way, Ruislip, HA4 8HW

Ref: GHA/DS/122660:21

Client: Progress Planning

Date: 1<sup>st</sup> June 2021

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

Date of Inspection: 25<sup>th</sup> May 2021

## **Instructions**

### **Issued by – Progress Planning**

**TERMS OF REFERENCE – GHA Trees were instructed to survey the subject trees within and adjacent to Land to the rear of 83-87 Manor Way, Ruislip, in order to assess their general condition and to provide a planning integration statement for the indicative proposed development that safeguards the long term well being 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 construct a pair of semidetached houses following the demolition of the existing garage buildings. The existing access from Manor Way will be used for the new development. The proposed scheme does not require the removal or pruning of any of the trees on site, or of trees within nearby adjacent sites; therefore, the landscape character of the site will be unaffected by the proposal. The retained trees require protection in accordance with industry best practice and BS 5837: 2012 – Trees in relation to design, demolition and construction – recommendations, in order to ensure their longevity.

## **Documents Supplied**

The client supplied the following documents:

1. Existing layout plans
2. 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 Underground services near to trees will need to be installed in accord with the guidance given in BS5837 together with the National Joint Utilities Group Booklet 4: 2007 Guidelines for the planning, installation and maintenance of utility services in proximity to trees (NJUG4).
- 1.10 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 Manor Way, a residential through road located to the north of Ruislip Manor.

## **The Subject Trees**

4.1 The details of the subject trees are set out in the Schedule at Appendix B.

4.2 The overall quality of the trees is modest and all have been assessed as BS category C.

## **The Proposal**

5.1 The proposal for the site is to construct a pair of semidetached houses following the demolition of the existing garage buildings.

5.2 The existing access from Manor Way will be used for the new development.

5.3 The proposed location of the above structures can be seen on the appended plan.

## **Arboricultural Impact Assessment**

### **PROPOSED TREE REMOVAL / RETENTION:**

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

### **TREE PRUNING TO 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, or shrubs.

6.3 There is no part of the new structure which will have tree canopies (from trees to be retained) overhanging it and the building works can progress safely without the need for any facilitation pruning.

### **ASSESSMENT OF RETAINED TREES ROOT PROTECTION AREAS**

- 6.4 Section 4.6.3 of BS 5837: 2012 states that the Root Protection Area (RPA) of each tree should be assessed by an arboriculturalist considering the likely morphology and disposition of the roots, when known to be influenced by past or existing site conditions.
- 6.5 Following the assessment described in section 6.5, the RPAs have all been drawn as notional circles as there are no existing site structures (visible from the available access) which are assessed to have the potential to significantly affect tree root morphology.

#### ASSESSED IMPACT ON RPAS BY PROPOSED STRUCTURES

- 6.6 The proposed new houses are situated outside of the assessed RPA's of all of the trees proposed for retention, therefore these trees pose no below ground constraints on these new structures or vice versa.

#### PROPOSED ACCESS TO THE NEW DEVELOPMENT

- 6.7 The area of new drive within the RPA of G7 already exists as hard surfacing and therefore there will not be any additional impact on these few value trees.

#### INSTALLATION OF SERVICES

- 6.8 The installation of underground apparatus and drainage systems with the use of mechanical excavators will undoubtedly sever any roots that may be present and can change the hydrology and structure of the nearby soil in a way that will adversely affect the health of any nearby trees. Particular care should therefore be taken when assessing the layout of new services and consideration MUST be given to the methods of installation of ALL underground apparatus.
- 6.9 New services should 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 building, and highly unlikely to give rise to any inconvenience.
- 7.2 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

It is essential for the future health of the trees to be retained on site, that **all** development activity is undertaken outside the root protection zone of these trees. 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 (EXISTING)

The hard surfacing that exists provides adequate ground protection and **MUST** therefore be retained *in situ* for the entirety of the site works.

## 8.3 REMOVAL / DEMOLITION OF THE EXISTING STRUCTURES

Some existing structures located within the RPAs of retained trees will need to be removed. If these structures do not require removal to facilitate the development, they **MUST** be left *in situ* for the main phase of building works to offer additional protection and then removed as part of the landscaping phase, once all larger machinery has left site.

### METHODOLOGY:

- The sub-bases can be removed using a 360 excavator. The machine **MUST** work from outside the RPA. The machine **MUST** start work at the points nearest to any retained trees, working backward away from each tree so that the remaining hard surfacing can be used to support the load of the machine and protect the ground. (**NOTE: the size of any such machine should be checked before starting works, to ensure a) the existing surface will support the machines load and b) that there is sufficient crown clearances to avoid any potential for crown damage**). This work **MUST** be undertaken utilising a banksman.
- If during the work, any roots from the retained trees are discovered in excess of 25mm, the retained arboriculturalist **MUST** be contacted immediately to assess the roots and arrange subsequent working methods that will cause no damage to the tree(s).
- Care **MUST** be taken to avoid damage to the soil beneath these structures. If any roots are exposed, these should be covered immediately and the retained arboriculturalist **MUST** be contacted immediately to assess the roots and arrange subsequent working methods that will cause no damage to the tree(s).

## 8.4 BOUNDARY TREATMENTS

Boundary fencing installation / upgrades **MUST** be undertaken as part of the soft landscaping phase and **MUST** be installed ONLY when all machinery that is on site for the main build has permanently left the site (NB. If needed, boundary fencing can also be installed prior to the commencement of site works, i.e.. before any machinery has been bought onto the site). Where sections of new / upgraded fencing are located within the RPA of ANY tree that is to be retained, 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.

#### 8.5 SITE HUTS, WELFARE FACILITIES AND STORAGE OF EQUIPMENT, MATERIALS AND CHEMICALS

All site huts **MUST** be positioned outside of the retained trees RPA's.

#### 8.6 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.

#### 8.7 ON SITE SUPERVISION

Regular site supervision is essential to ensure all potentially damaging activities near to trees are correctly supervised. A pre start meeting will occur to ensure all parties are aware of their responsibilities relating to tree protection on site; this will include a site induction for key personnel.

#### 8.8 OTHER TREE PROTECTION PRECAUTIONS

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

#### 8.9 HARD / SOFT LANDSCAPING NEAR RETAINED TREES

All new pathways and hard landscaping areas within the Root Protection Areas (RPA's) 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.

#### 8.10 DISMANTLING PROTECTIVE BARRIERS

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

## **Conclusion**

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

### **Recommendations**

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

1<sup>st</sup> June 2021

Signed:

A handwritten signature in blue ink that reads "Glen Harding". The signature is fluid and cursive, with "Glen" on the top line and "Harding" on the bottom line.

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

**Appendix A**  
**TREE PLAN**  
**(see separate PDF)**

## **Appendix B**

## **TREE TABLE**

Tree Number	Tree Name (species)	Ht (m)	Calculated Stem Diameter (mm)	Number of Stems	Root Protection Area (Radius, m)	N (m)	E (m)	S (m)	W (m)	Age Class	Clearance (m)	Estimated life expectancy	BS Category	Comments / Recommendations
T1	Holly	4	80	1	0.96	1.2	1.2	1.2	1.2	MA	2	10-20	C1	Small tree of limited value in the wider landscape.
T2	Leyland cypress	17	700	1	8.40	5	5	5	5	M	3	10-20	C1	Off site - full inspection not possible. Some measurements estimated.
T3	Norway maple	11	300	1	3.60	5	5	2	5	M	3	10-20	C1	Off site - full inspection not possible. Some measurements estimated.
T4	Leyland cypress	17	700	1	8.40	5	5	5	5	M	3	10-20	C1	Off site - full inspection not possible. Some measurements estimated.
T5	Norway maple	13	339	2	4.07	5	3	5	6	M	3 over site	10-20	C1	Off site - full inspection not possible. Some measurements estimated.
G6	Mixed scrub - elder, hawthorn, laurel	6	100	1	1.20	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	MA	2 over site	10-20	C2	Scrub growth.
G7	Leyland cypress	6	350	1	4.20	0	1	3	1	M	6 over site	10-20	C2	Heavily topped in past.

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



