



hugh.wilson@forestandtree.co.uk
07810 650084
01282 219311
www.forestandtree.co.uk

40 Church Street
Trawden
Lancashire
BB8 8RU

**Arboricultural Advice in accordance with
BS 5837:2012 Trees in relation to construction – Recommendations
Tree survey and Impact Assessment
1st March 2023**

Subject Property:	Claremount Holly Mount Lane Bury BL8 4LH
Completed by:	Hugh Wilson MSc BSc M.Arbor A. Forest & Tree Consulting Ltd 40 Church Street Trawden Lancashire BB8 8RU



Contents

1	INTRODUCTION.....	2
2	BS5837:2012 - THE ITERATIVE PROCESS.....	3
3	THE TREE SURVEY	5
	3.4 Tree Survey Schedule	8
5	SUMMARY & CONCLUSION	15
6	APPENDICES.....	16

1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Brief: We are instructed to carry out an arboricultural survey of a proposed development site Claremount, Holly Mount Lane, Bury, BL8 4LH and to provide a tree survey and arboricultural impact assessment in accordance with BS5837:2012 *Trees in relation to construction – Recommendations* (hereafter BS5837).

1.2 Qualifications and experience: This report is based on my site observations and the provided information, and I have come to conclusions in the light of my experience. I have experience and qualifications in arboriculture and list the details in Appendix 2. Observations or comments on structural engineering and the law are made from an arboricultural perspective. Specialist professional advice should be sought to clarify such observations.

1.3 Documents and information provided: I was provided with copies of the following documents:

- Existing site plans (Claremont siteplans email.dwg)
- Proposal plans (CLAREMOUNT PROP SITE PLAN 500.dwg)

1.4 Scope of this report: This report includes an assessment of the trees in relation to potential development in order to:

1. Record principle attributes (species, height, crown spread and stem diameter).
2. Determine their quality and value.
3. Identify their remaining contribution and retention grading.
4. To identify the level of tree retention and removal and to illustrate on a tree retention and removal plan.
5. To appraise the impact of tree losses arising as a result of the proposals.
6. To appraise the impact of the proposals on the retention trees.

1.5 Purpose of the report: This report utilises the tree survey data to detail the arboricultural impact of the proposed layout.

1.6 Caveats: This report is only concerned with trees in relation to construction. It includes a detailed assessment based on the site visit and the documents provided, listed in 1.3 above. All my observations were from ground level without detailed investigations. Aerial tree inspection, invasive procedures and sub-soil investigations are outside the scope of the report. Should further assessment involving any of these be required it will be highlighted in the report.

2 BS5837:2012 - THE ITERATIVE PROCESS

2.1 Trees and the planning system – BS5837 Annex B

2.1.1 Under the UK planning system, local authorities have a statutory duty to consider the protection and planting of trees when granting planning permission for proposed development. The potential effect of development on trees, whether statutorily protected (e.g. by a tree preservation order or by their inclusion within a conservation area) or not, is a material consideration that is taken into account in dealing with planning applications. Where trees are statutorily protected, it is important to contact the local planning authority and follow the appropriate procedures before undertaking any works that might affect the protected trees.

2.1.2 The nature and level of detail of information required to enable a local planning authority to properly consider the implications and effects of development proposals varies between stages and in relation to what is proposed. Table B.1 provides advice to both developers and local authorities on an appropriate amount of information. The term “minimum detail” is intended to reflect information that local authorities are expected to seek, whilst the term “additional information” identifies further details that might reasonably be sought, especially where any construction is proposed within the Root Protection Area (RPA)¹.

2.1.3 Table B.1 Delivery of tree-related information into the planning system

Stage of process	Minimum detail	Additional information
Pre-application	Tree Survey	Tree retention/removal plan (draft)
Planning application	Tree survey (in the absence of pre-application discussions) Tree retention/removal plan (finalised) Retained trees and RPAs shown on proposed layout Strategic hard and soft landscape design, including species and location of new tree planting Arboricultural impact assessment	Existing and proposed finished levels Tree protection plan Arboricultural method statement – heads of terms Details for all special engineering within the RPA and other relevant construction details
Reserved matters/planning conditions	Alignment of utility apparatus (including drainage), where outside the RPA or where installed using a trenchless method Dimensioned tree protection plan Arboricultural method statement – detailed Schedule of works to retained trees, e.g. access facilitation pruning Detailed hard and soft landscape design	Arboricultural site monitoring schedule Tree and landscape management plan Post-construction remedial works Landscape maintenance schedule

¹ Root Protection Area is a layout design tool indicating the minimum area around a tree deemed to contain sufficient roots and rooting volume to maintain the tree’s viability, and where the protection of the roots and soil structure is treated as a priority.



2.1.4 In support of the application the following documents have been prepared:

- a. Tree survey compliant with BS 5837
- b. Tree constraints plan
- c. Arboricultural Impact Assessment

3 THE TREE SURVEY

3.1 Tree survey methodology

3.1.1 A tree survey was carried out compliant with BS5837. The collected data is included below and the pertinent information is shown graphically on the Tree Constraints Plan (Appendix 1).

3.1.2 Trees are categorised in accordance with the cascade chart in Table 1 of BS5837:2012. The purpose of the categorisation process is to differentiate the quality and value of the existing tree stock so that informed decisions can be made on the retention or removal of trees.

3.1.3 The tree categories are summarised thus:

Category U: Trees unsuitable for retention that will be lost within the short term for reasons of physiology or structural integrity.

Category A: Trees of particularly high quality in arboricultural, landscape or cultural/conservation terms

Category B: Moderate quality trees downgraded from the high category because of significant defects, groups with a collective value through numbers rather than individual tree quality or trees with identifiable cultural or conservation values.

Category C: Trees with low value in arboricultural, landscape or cultural/conservation terms. Also includes young trees with a stem diameter of less than 150mm.

For trees in categories A – C subcategories 1, 2 & 3 are given to reflect arboricultural, landscape and cultural values respectively.

3.2 Findings of the survey

3.2.1 In the course of the tree survey we identified 27 individual trees and 1 hedge. Of these it was found that they fell into the following quality and value grades:

QV Category	Description	No. of trees	%	No. of hedges	%
U	Trees lost in the short term (<10 years)	1	3.7	0	0
A	Trees of particularly high quality	2	7.5	0	0
B	Trees of moderate quality	14	51.8	0	0
C	Trees of low quality	10	37	1	100
		27	100	1	100

3.3 Tree Survey Schedule Explanatory Notes

- **ID no.:** Trees are recorded using a site-specific unique identification number. This identification number is used for all references throughout the report and associated plans
- **Species:** The species identification is based on visual observations and the common English name of what the tree appeared to be is listed. In some instances, it may be difficult to quickly and accurately identify a particular tree without further detailed investigations. Where there is some doubt of the precise species of tree, it is indicate it with a '?' after the name in order to avoid delay in the production of the report. The species listed for groups and hedges represent the main component and there may be other minor species not listed.
- **Estimated dimensions:** Estimated dimensions are *italicised*.
- **Height:** The height of the tree in metres.
- **Stem diameter(s):** This is measured at 1.5m above ground level and recorded in millimetres. Trees with low crowns are measured just above the root flare. For trees with multiple stems see 3.2.2 in main text. For groups the stem diameter for 80 percentile member is recorded
- **NSWE:** The branch spread is measured in metres at the four cardinal points of the compass to derive an accurate representation of the crown.
- **Ht 1_{st} branch:** Height above ground in metres of attachment point of first significant branch (cardinal point may be given indicating direction of lowest branch).
- **Crown Clearance:** Height of the crown above ground level at the lowest point.
- **Life Stage:** Assessed as Young, Semi-Mature, Early Mature, Mature, Over Mature and Veteran.
- **Phys. condition:** An assessment of the physiological condition (i.e. health/vitality) status of the tree summarised into:
 - Good: Generally in healthy condition
 - Fair: Condition satisfactory though below mean species performance
 - Poor: Tree in decline
 - Dead: Self-explanatory
- **Structural condition & Notes:** Notes on the structural integrity of the tree based on visual tree assessment, including damage, decay fungi, pests, etc. as appropriate, plus other pertinent observations
- **Management recommendations:** Recommendations for retention or removal in light of the development proposals.
- **Ret. Span:** An estimate of the remaining contribution span that the tree or group of trees is expected to have, based on species, condition and context. The following longevity bands are used, categorised accordingly:
 - <10 Tree is dead, dying, has a severe structural defect, or will become exposed following inevitable loss of companion shelter. Possibly requires sanitation felling
 - Unsuitable for retention



10+ Short-term longevity only: replacement planting generally appropriate

20+ Mid-term longevity

>40 Good longevity

- **QV Grade:** Quality & Value grade classification according to BS5837

U - Unsuitable for retention

A - High retention priority

B - Moderate retention priority

C - Low retention priority

+subcategories 1, 2 & 3 reflecting arboricultural, landscape and cultural values respectively.

- **Retention / removal colour code:**

Trees and groups to be retained

Trees and groups to be removed to facilitate development

Trees and groups to be removed for arboricultural reasons



3.4 Tree Survey Schedule

FTC Ref. No. (autoincrements)	Species	Ht. (m)	Crown Spread (m)				Ht. 1 st Br. (m)	Ht. Can. (m)	Stem Count	Stem Dia. (mm)					RPA Rad. (m)	RPA Area (m2)	Life Stage Y-SM-EM-M-OM	Phys. Condition G-F-P-D	Structural condition & Notes	Management recommendations	Ret. Span <10, 10+ 20+, >40	QV Grade U-A-B-C
			N	S	W	E				1 / mean	2	3	4	5								
1	Common lime	22	4.5	3.5	3.5	4.5	5.8 - W	1.2	1	630					7.56	179	M	F	Upright stem with relatively narrow crown. Prolific extends epicormic growth on stem to 10m forms almost entire of low crown. No observed dieback or disease and no sign of obvious decay	No action required at time of survey	20+	B1
2	Beech	20	6.5	8	5.5	5.5	11.5 - E	12	1	840					10.08	319	M	F	Tall and upright stem with high crown. Large open cavity at base to S. Sounding shows decay spreading through lower stem. No sign of fungal fruiting bodies at time of survey. No observed dieback or disease.	Reinspect tree annually to determine if extending decay is likely to require hazard mitigation works	10+	C1
3	Horse chestnut	18.5	6	9	4.5	3.5	4.3 - NE	1.3	1	700					8.40	222	M	P	Constrained and skewed crown due to adjacent larger trees. Extensive lower stem decay from 0-3m. Decay is soft rot. Degraded fungal fruiting bodies of 1.5m to W, likely remnant of laetiporus sulphaeus.	Fell to as low as reasonably practicable	10+	C1
4	Horse chestnut	16.5	0	11	4	3	2 - S	1.8	1	640					7.68	185	M	F	Highly skewed down to S with heavily inclined major leader from 2m. Evidence of compression stress on underside of inclined leader, showing subsiding material. No observed dieback or disease and no sign of obvious decay	No action required at time of survey	10+	C1
5	Beech	16.5	0	6.5	4.5	3	8.2 - SE	2.5	1	620					7.44	174	M	F	Cannot fully assess base of tree as tree is on 3rd party land. Heavily skewed crown to S due to adjacent larger trees. No observed dieback or disease and no sign of obvious decay	No action required at time of survey	20+	B1
6	Beech	22	8	7	8.5	6.5	12 - SW	5.5	1	850					10.20	327	M	G	Cannot fully assess base of tree as tree is on 3rd party land. Upright stem with full healthy crown. No apparent significant defect	No action required at time of survey	>40	A1
7	Common lime	21	4	3.5	2	4.5		4.1 - N	1	620					7.44	174	M	F	Somewhat skewed and constrained crown due to adjacent trees. Overgrown epicormic growth on lower stem to 8m forms all of lower crown. No observed dieback or disease and no sign of obvious decay	No action required at time of survey	20+	B1
8	Beech	25	9	8	8	9.5	8.4 - W	2.2	1	1100					13.20	547	M	F	Cannot fully assess base of tree as tree is on 3rd party land. Stem bifurcates at 2.2m with large included union extending to 4m. Further bifurcations of both leaders at 12-14m with further included unions observed. No observed dieback or disease and no sign of obvious decay	No action required at time of survey	20+	B1
9	Holly	8	2	2.2	3	2.5	1.8 - W	1.3	6	140					4.12	53	M	F	Multiple stems from 0.2m with included unions where stems meet. No observed dieback or disease and no sign of obvious decay	No action required at time of survey	20+	C1
10	Common lime	16.5	7	6.5	7	4	2.6 - N	2.2	1	710					8.52	228	M	G	Upright stem with full healthy crown. No apparent significant defect	No action required at time of survey	>40	A1
11	Common lime	18	7.5	8	4.5	4.5	8.5 - S	1.6	1	550					6.60	137	M	F	Upright stem leads to spreading crown from 10m. Major deadwood in upper crown. No observed dieback or disease and no sign of obvious decay	Remove deadwood	20+	B1
12	Beech	18	3.5	9.5	9	6.5	2.9 - SE	2.4	1	680					8.16	209	M	F	Stem bifurcates at 2.9m with included unions where stems meet. Crown skewed towards SE due to adjacent trees. No observed dieback or disease and no sign of obvious decay	No action required at time of survey	20+	B1

13	Common lime	14.5	4.5	2.2	4	3	3.5 - SE	1.1	1	460					5.52	96	M	F	Relatively young tree in group has skewed crown due to adjacent larger trees. Stem bifurcates at 6.5m with included unions where stems meet. No observed dieback or disease and no sign of obvious decay	No action required at time of survey	20+	B1
14	Common lime	21	4.5	6	5	3.5	7.9 - S	6	1	610					7.32	168	M	F	Upright stem with somewhat spreading crown above 13m. No observed dieback or disease and no sign of obvious decay	No action required at time of survey	20+	B1
15	Horse chestnut	20	8	4	6.5	4	2.8 - W	3.5	1	740					8.88	248	M	P	Advanced dieback throughout crown with major deadwood above road.	Fell to as low as reasonably practicable	<10	U
16	Horse chestnut	12.5	7	7	3	2.5	3.8 - N	1.9	1	480					5.76	104	M	F	Heavily skewed/constrained crown due to adjacent trees. No observed dieback or disease and no sign of obvious decay	No action required at time of survey	20+	C1
17	Common lime	19.5	5.5	5.5	4.5	3.5	12 - NE	12	1	450					5.40	92	M	F	High crown upright stem. No observed dieback or disease and no sign of obvious decay	No action required at time of survey	20+	B1
18	Beech	22	10	8.5	4	3.5	3.4 - N	2.5	1	580					6.96	152	M	F	Bark wounds and loss on lower 4m of stem to SE possibly related to historic fire. Crown somewhat skewed due to adjacent trees. Moderate deadwood in lower crown. No observed dieback or disease and no sign of obvious decay	No action required at time of survey	20+	B1
19	Beech	16	9.5	1	4.5	3	2.8 - N	2.1	1	400					4.80	72	M	F	Heavily contorted lower stem leads to skewed crown to N. No observed dieback or disease and no sign of obvious decay	No action required at time of survey	20+	C1
20	Scots pine	18	4	4.5	4	4.5	12 - SE	11	1	530					6.36	127	M	F	Upright stem with full healthy crown. No apparent significant defect	No action required at time of survey	20+	B1
21	Common lime	21	3.5	9	4.5	7.5	8.2 - E	8	1	880					10.56	350	M	F	Burr growth over lower 2m of stem. Spreading crown from 12m. No observed dieback or disease and no sign of obvious decay	No action required at time of survey	20+	B1
22	Beech	15	2.5	5.5	2.5	1.5	2.8 - E	3	1	400					4.80	72	M	F	Contorted stem leads to constrained and skewed crown. Large area of bark loss likely from historic fire to N. Minor associated decay.	No action required at time of survey	20+	C1
23	Beech	24	2.5	3	3	3.5	5.4 - SE	3.5	1	500					6.00	113	M	F	Upright stem with relatively narrow crown. Extensive bark loss on lower 4m of stem, but only superficial decay and saprophytic fungi present. No observed dieback or disease	No action required at time of survey	20+	B1
24	Beech	21	6	9	7	6.5	4.7 - NE	6.5	1	720					8.64	234	M	F	Upright stem leads to full healthy crown. Extensive bark loss on lower 4m of stem likely due to historic fire. Multiple associated fungi here with oyster mushroom evident. Decay from pruning wound at 1.6m to NE appears to be extending into main stem.	Fell to as low as reasonably practicable	10+	C1
25	Beech	19.5	6.5	3.5	4.5	5	4.1 - NW	3.2	1	600					7.20	163	M	F	Upright stem leads to full healthy crown. Extensive bark loss on lower 4m of stem likely due to historic fire. Fungal fruiting bodies present on damaged timber, but all are saprophytic in nature, no primary decay fungi observed.	No action required at time of survey	10+	C1
26	Beech	20	2.5	6.5	4.5	3.5	2.9 - SE	2.6	1	580					6.96	152	M	F	Upright stem leads to full healthy crown. Extensive bark loss on lower 4m of stem likely due to historic fire. Fungal fruiting bodies present on damaged timber, but all are saprophytic in nature, no primary decay fungi observed.	No action required at time of survey	10+	C1
27	Silver birch	17.5	3.5	3	3.5	3	8.4 - S	10	1	380					4.56	65	M	F	Upright stem with full healthy crown. No apparent significant defect	No action required at time of survey	20+	B1

3.5 Explanatory Notes for Hedges

- **ID no.:** Unique tree group or woodland reference number.
- **Species:** The species identification is based on visual observations and the common English name of what the tree appeared to be is listed. The species listed represent the main components and there may be other minor species not listed.
- **Estimated dimensions:** Estimated dimensions are *italicised*. *N*
- **Height:** Height is to the nearest metre.
- **Stem diameter(s):** Stem diameter at 1.5m above ground level for 80 percentile member of TG, WG of H. Trees with larger diameters are identified on the plan at Appendix 3.
- **Width:** An estimated mean width of the hedge for trees at the 80-percentile size
- **Life Stage:** Assessed as Young, Semi-Mature, Early Mature, Mature, Over Mature and Veteran.
- **Phys. condition:** An assessment of the physiological condition (i.e. health/vitality) status of the tree summarised into:
 - Good: Generally in healthy condition
 - Fair: Condition satisfactory though below mean species performance
 - Poor: Tree in decline
 - Dead: Self-explanatory
- **Structural condition & Notes:** Notes on the structural integrity of the tree based on visual tree assessment, including damage, decay fungi, pests, etc as appropriate, plus other pertinent observations
- **Management recommendations:** Recommendations for intervention (e.g. tree surgery, felling, etc) prior to any development. Immediately hazardous trees will be notified to the client separately.
- **Ret. Span:** An estimate of the remaining contribution span that the tree or group of trees is expected to have, based on species, condition and context. The following longevity bands are used, categorised accordingly:
 - <10 Tree is dead, dying, has a severe structural defect, or will become exposed following inevitable loss of companion shelter. Possibly requires sanitation felling Unsuitable for retention
 - 10+ Short-term longevity only: replacement planting generally appropriate
 - 20+ Mid-term longevity
 - 40+ Good longevity
- **QV Grade:** Quality & Value grade classification according to BS5837:2012
 - U - Unsuitable for retention
 - A - High retention priority
 - B - Moderate retention priority
 - C - Low retention priority
 - +subcategories 2 & 3 reflecting arboricultural, landscape and cultural values respectively.



3.6 Tree Survey Data for Hedges

FTC Ref. No.	Species	Ht. (m)	Mean Width (m)	Length (m)	Mean Stem Dia. (mm)	Life Stage Y-SM-EM-M- OM	Phys. Condition G-F-P-D	Structural condition & Notes	Management recommendations	Ret. Span <10, 10+ 20+, >40	QV Grade U-A-B-C
H1	Laurel	1.8	1.2		60	M	F	Well maintained and healthy ornamental garden hedge.	No action required at time of survey	10+	C1

4 ARBORICULTURAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT

4.1 Tree retention and removal

4.1.1 The proposal is to build a single storey, flat roofed garden room within the existing garden rear garden area of Claremount as well as a single storey flat-roofed garage beside the existing driveway within the roadside area of the Claremount property. The garden room has folding glass doors on two sides as well as roof lights, the garage has a single large electronically opening door as well as standard sized door to its rear. The garage will be located partially on the existing levelled and prepared ground at the edge of the existing driveway. The existing house is present within a large plot with access driveway off Holly Mount Lane, this access will be retained, and no alterations of boundary features are proposed.

4.1.2 The proposed garden room is to be built using a steel beam structure with wooden stud wall infill between beams. Beams are to be placed on piled or concrete pad foundations with a concrete raft structure being laid on top of the pilings to form the internal floor. The garage is proposed to be built using piled foundations with a concrete raft also and have a concrete lock wall construction above ground.

4.1.3 The main Claremount House is flanked by gardens and driveway. From the roadside entrance to the existing car parking area there is an area of grass present on either side of the drive that is overstood by mature trees, almost entirely deciduous broadleaves, with no significant understorey. To the rear of the property and further from the road are two further areas of trees present around the boundaries of the property beside a large area of grass lawn and existing patio area. The trees here are also mature deciduous species. In the immediately adjacent property to the North, there are more similar trees present also.

4.1.4 The proposal requires no trees to be removed to facilitate it, but several trees on the site have been identified as being in poor structural conditions or have significant health concerns and require removal for sound arboricultural reasons. T3, T15 and T24 all are deemed to require removal to remove the risks they pose to the homeowners, and the wider public.

4.1.5 All other trees will be retained.

4.2 Construction in Root Protection Areas

4.2.1 There are a number of areas where construction is proposed in the RPA of retained trees. In the case of the garden room, construction is proposed within the RPA of T2, 4, 5, 6, 7 and 8. In the case of the garage, construction is proposed within the RPA of T12, 14, 16, 17, 18, 20 and 21.

4.2.2 The construction of both structures will change very little in the way of ground cover due to existing patio and driveway areas being present in the existing footprints. BS 5837 recommends, in section 7.4, that new hard surfacing within RPA's be constructed using methods that minimize the impact on the affected tree(s) and cover no more than 20% of the open ground within the RPA. The most appropriate means of construction here would be piled foundations with concrete raft placed on top. The underlying conditions of the site are well suited to this technique and I do not envisage any issues with installation. The proposed new surface will, although new, not change the coverage overall in any RPAs relating to the garden room as the area under the proposal is currently covered by a paving slab patio. The ground coverage change related to the garage are all well below the maximum of 20% recommended in BS 5837. As shown in the table below.

4.2.3 Further to the above considerations new structures and hard-surfaces over RPAs change the availability of moisture and oxygen to the tree roots. In consideration of this BS5837 limits the percentage of new structures or hard surfaces covering currently open ground within an RPA to 20%. Below is a table detailing the impact of the affected trees:

Tree no.	RPA (m ²)	Open ground in RPA (m ²)	RPA under proposed build (m ²)	Percentage
12	209	196.5	6.3	3.2
14	168	144.5	6.7	4.6
16	104	71.6	2.1	2.9
17	92	68.4	0.5	1.3
18	152	112.5	3.8	3.4
20	127	127	21.9	17.2
21	350	350	1.5	0.4

4.2.4 From the above information it is readily apparent that in all incidences of ground cover change within the RPAs under the garage proposal are well below the acceptable maximum area set by BS5837, except in the case of T20 where, it is still below the maximum, but is towards the higher end of the limit at 17.2% Indeed in the cases of trees 12, 14, 16, 17, 18 and 21 I consider the level of change is sufficiently small to keep well within the recommendations of BS 5837:2012. Also these areas where construction is proposed are well away from the stems, meaning that the likelihood of impacting significant or large amounts of roots is highly unlikely. For tree 20 the likelihood of impacting larger amounts of roots or more significant roots is higher, but most of the area impacted is away from the stem root load is likely to be less and the use of the use of alternative construction techniques as detailed in 4.2.2 and 4.2.5 will minimise the potential of significant damage to an acceptable level.

4.2.5 In respect to the proposed garden room the RPAs of trees 2, 4, 5, 6, 7 and 8 will require construction within them. This can be undertaken as detailed in 4.2.2 and 4.2.5 as with the garage proposal. The potential to impact is greatest in T 7 and T8 due to the T7 being relatively

close to the main stem and T8's RPA covering the whole proposal. However in the case of T7 the sloping down and somewhat terraced nature of the ground between the tree stem (higher) and the proposal site (lower) as well as the area being previously hard landscaped, means that the likelihood of major roots being present within this area from this tree is greatly reduced. In the case of T8 the proposal falls entirely within its RPA, but as with T7 the topography of the land and already present hard landscaping, combined with the proposal being proportionally further away from the stem of T8, means that the likelihood of significant roots being present here is also greatly reduced. The careful hand-excavation and selective choice of location of the piling/foundation pads will remove the potential for significant damage being caused.

4.2.6 Localised excavation will be required to install pad foundations for the steel beam structure of the garden room proposal as well as concrete foundation piles being used for garage proposal. These will minimise the areas within the RPAs that require excavation and therefore minimise the amount of potential disturbance to roots within them. By excavating using hand tools to expose any roots within the areas where piling is undertaken it will be possible to alter the position when and if required. The distance of the excavations from the trees means structurally significant roots are highly unlikely to be present in both proposed locations. The excavations can be carried out by hand and, provided proper ground protection is put in place during works there will not to be any significant harm to the trees that compromises their structural integrity or long-term health. By installing concrete rafts on top of the piled foundations this further reduces the potential for harm to subsurface roots, as no excavation will be required to install a concrete slab foundation.

4.3 Pruning works to facilitate development.

4.3.1 No pruning is required to facilitate the proposed development. However two trees (T2 and 11) require sound arboricultural based tree works should be undertaken to remove the risks that they pose to the homeowners

4.4 Proximity of trees and structures.

4.4.1 Shading of the Garden room will take place not be significant during the majority of the day as the windows/doors are on the South and Eastern aspect of the structure meaning they will intercept the sun as it rises until mid to late afternoon when it passes to the West. However there is likely shading of the roof lights due to the trees adjacent (T6, 7 and 8) to the structure. This is unavoidable, but highly unlikely to cause any significant issues. This is acceptable set of circumstances. Shading is not an issue with regards to the garage as it serves only for storage and has no amenity or residential function.

4.4.2 The location, orientation and design of the roofs and gutters of both the garden room and the garage creates the potential to collect falling debris from the trees, and in particular leaves



from trees 6, 7, 8, 12, 14, 17, 18 and 20. This matter will need to be addressed with a guarding system included within the design.

4.5 Tree protection during construction.

4.3.1 Trees can be irreparably and unwittingly damaged in a few minutes during construction. Accordingly a tree protection scheme should be prepared in accordance with the guidance of BS 5837 for the proposal to ensure the successful long-term retention of the tree on the adjacent property.

4.4 Arboricultural Method Statement

4.4.1 The increased hard standing and fencing installation have the potential to cause harm to retention trees if constructed using conventional techniques. Therefore the methods for installing hard surfaces and for excavations in RPAs recommended in BS5837 should be followed. These methodologies should be provided as part of the tree protection plan.



5 SUMMARY & CONCLUSION

5.1 The proposal includes the loss of zero trees. However due to the poor structural condition of some trees at the property it is advised that three trees are felled to remove the potential risk they pose to the owners of the property and the wider public.

5.2 Some modest construction and remedial work is proposed within the root protection area of retention trees. This work is not particularly complex and within the recommendations of BS5837. An arboricultural method statement should be prepared to ensure the proposals are arboriculturally acceptable. As the works are minimal in impact and not particularly complex I suggest the presentation of the arboricultural method statement can reasonably be conditioned.

5.3 A tree protection plan should be prepared to ensure the successful prevention of harm to the retention trees during construction and therefore the long-term retention.

5.4 Given the above I am satisfied the proposal is workable and arboriculturally acceptable.

Hugh Wilson

Hugh Wilson MSc BSc M.Arbor A.

Director



6 APPENDICES

APPENDIX 1

TREE CONSTRAINTS PLAN

Note this drawing is scaled for printing at A3 and is intended to be read in colour



Tel: 01282 219311
 Mobile: 07810 650084
www.forestandtree.co.uk
hugh.wilson@forestandtree.co.uk

Site: Claremount, Hollymount Lane, Greenmount	1:250 @ A2
Drawing Title: Tree Constraints Plan	Feb 2023

Key:

- Category A
- Category B
- Category C
- Category U

Category Crown Spread
 Tree Number
 Root Protection Area

NOTE: Tree/group numbers marked with an * have approximate locations.



APPENDIX 2

ARBORICULTURAL METHOD STATEMENT

Note this drawing is scaled for printing at A3 and is intended to be read in colour



Tel: 01282 219311
 Mobile: 07810 650084
www.forestandtree.co.uk
hugh.wilson@forestandtree.co.uk

Site: Claremount, Hollymount Lane, Greenmount	1:250 @ A2
Drawing Title: Arboricultural Impact Assessment	Feb 2023

Key:

- Category A (Green dot)
- Category B (Blue dot)
- Category C (Grey dot)
- Category U (Red dot)

Category 13 (Diagram showing Crown Spread and Root Protection Area)

NOTE: Tree/group numbers marked with an * have approximate locations.



APPENDIX 3

Brief qualifications and experience of Hugh Wilson

1. Qualifications

- a. MSc Forest Ecology and Management – University of Edinburgh
- b. BSc hons (2:1) Environmental Science – University of Nottingham
- c. Professional Tree Inspection

2. Practical experience

- a. Southwick Arboriculture Ltd: Tree care operative
- b. Marishal Thompson Ltd: Tree Surveyor/Assistant Arboriculturalist
- c. ADAS Ltd: Vegetation Management/Wayleave Surveyor
- d. Forest & Tree Consulting Ltd: Director/Principle Consultant

3. Continuing Professional development:

Forest & Tree Consulting Ltd is committed to continuing professional development to ensure all staff continue to learn and develop throughout their careers so they keep their skills and knowledge up to date and are able to work safely, legally and effectively.

Sample of the seminars and conferences attended:

- Practitioners guide to Visual Tree Assessment
- Arboriculture Association conference 'New Horizons in Arboriculture'
- Visual Tree Assessment, Tree Safety Diagnosis and Failure Analysis seminar by Dr. Claus Mattheck
- The Institute of Chartered Foresters' conference Trees, People & the Built Environment

4. Membership of professional bodies:

- a. Professional member of the Arboricultural Association
- b. Associate member of the Institute of Chartered Foresters
- c. Member of the Royal Forestry Society
- d. Member of the Royal Scottish Forestry Society