



Arboricultural opportunities and constraints assessment

Land North West of Goring Station

Alex Needs BA(Hons) MICFor MArborA RArborA

6th August 2020

20056-Constraints2-AN

Site location, report purpose, and notes on using the advice

Site location



This aerial image is provided courtesy of Google. The yellow line indicates the approximate site boundary and is illustrative only.

Report purpose

This arboricultural opportunities and constraints assessment is to provide sufficient tree information for the architect to prepare a preliminary layout, taking proper account of the tree constraints. This advice relates to significant trees at Land North West of Goring Station.

This report includes:

- A **Tree constraints plan** showing the significant trees and the constraints they impose.
- Advice describing the **Arboricultural opportunities and constraints assessment** (section 1 of the report).
- **Appendices (Appendix 1 – Background administrative information and data collection; and, Appendix 2 – Tree schedule and explanatory notes.)**

Notes on using this advice

Architects must read and heed the following notes on using this advice:

1. **It is only draft:** This information is strictly draft in nature to provide preliminary guidance. The report is based on a brief site inspection and it may be necessary to adjust any initial designs before they are suitable for final submission.
2. **Plans:** All plans are based on provided information and are illustrative for planning purposes. They should only be used relating to tree issues and are not suitable for any other purpose.
3. **Other constraints:** This plan only shows the tree constraints and does not consider any other constraints, e.g. ecological, archaeological, etc.



Site location, report purpose, and notes on using the advice

4. **Confidentiality:** This report is confidential to the Client and should not be released to any Third Party without prior consultation with us and consent from the Client.
5. **Proposed disturbance within RPAs:** We must be clearly notified of any disturbance proposed in RPAs so that we can advise on the implications before plans are finalised.
6. **Further consultation on tree issues:** Any design based on this report must be reviewed by us before submission to the local planning authority (LPA).



1: Arboricultural opportunities and constraints assessment

1.1 Place making opportunities

Place making is becoming an increasingly important aspect of modern planning, and trees can significantly contribute to making new developments interesting and pleasant places to live. However, this site lacks any useful tree features, which increases the importance of new structural tree planting as a means of creating a new landscape that is attractive and engaging for prospective purchasers. When starting with a blank canvas, careful tree planting along the primary entrance route can create a positive first impression and is often a cost-effective way of creating a memorable impact from a weak starting point. In this context it would be worth considering a significant tree feature around the show homes and marketing suite, and along the main access. This could include an avenue of trees leading into the site or a road layout that aligns to a landmark tree, or open space area.

Given the lack of substantial trees within or around the site, there may be opportunity to emphasise the importance of **G14** within the local landscape by locating it at the end of a central avenue. Likewise, although **G36** are relatively small and low-quality riparian trees, their prominence within could be emphasized though new planting of larger trees along the river bank to form a notable maturing feature.

Our experience is that LPAs are increasingly favouring designs that provide such information at the application stage, rather than leaving it to a condition. These are aspects that we could work up in a structural tree planting strategy as part of our overall submission, if you think it might be useful.

1.2 Guidance on how to use the tree constraints information

The notes on the tree constraints plan explain how the information is presented and how it should be used. Those notes must be read and understood to properly interpret the constraints advice.

1.3 Trees not shown on the topographical survey

Trees **T13**, **G14**, **T15**, **G17 (part)**, and **G23 (part)**, were not shown on the topographical survey, which is contrary to the BS advice. I have illustrated their approximate locations and canopies on the tree constraints plan, but these positions have not been accurately surveyed. I do not consider that this has affected the conclusions of this report, but if their locations are considered important, they should be accurately surveyed. It is likely that the LPA will require this information and I advise that they are accurately plotted before the final submission.

1.4 Potential constraints from G14

This is a large off-site group located due south of the site on the opposite side of the railway tracks. They have not been plotted on the topographical survey and as such their location is approximately shown on BT1. Whilst they are set at such a distance from the site that their RPAs or branch spread will not influence the site, they are very tall, and some consideration should be given to shading due to their orientation.

1.5 Off-site trees T26, G28, and G29

These moderate quality trees are located within the neighbouring garden and represent the best quality trees either on or directly adjacent to the site. As such the layout should be aware of both the zone 1 and zone 2 constraints showing on plan BT1. To emphasize the importance of these



1: Arboricultural opportunities and constraints assessment

trees within the landscape this area may be suitable for a LAP or a LEAP providing the RPAs can be respected through the use of specialist hard surfacing where required.

1.6 Drainage and other services

Drainage runs, soakaways, and the installation of other services, can cause disruption to RPAs and result in important trees being damaged. It is preferable to keep all such services out of RPAs because the more encroachment there is, the less likely the LPA is to find proposals acceptable. We advise that these matters are considered at an early stage to avoid a justifiable reason for refusal further into the design process. Our experience is that demonstrating services will not encroach into RPAs often saves delays in processing planning applications and can sometimes be the difference between a consent and a refusal.

1.7 New structures or surfacing within RPAs

If it is proposed to place any new structures or hard surfacing within RPAs, it is likely that the LPA will require detailed cross-sections as reassurance that what is proposed can be implemented without excavating into existing soil levels. These must be at a scale that allows the relationship between existing and proposed to be easily seen, i.e. it must clearly demonstrate that there will be no excessive disturbance of RPAs. There must be a separate cross-section for each significant tree that may be affected. Our experience is that providing this level of information at an early stage often saves delays in processing planning applications and can sometimes be the difference between a consent and a refusal.

1.8 Essential checks before carrying out any tree works

We have not confirmed whether the trees on this site are covered by a tree preservation order or located in a conservation area. You must check this before carrying out any works. If there is any statutory protection, it will be necessary to consult with the LPA before any works other than certain exemptions can be carried out.

1.9 Ecological constraints

The Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981, as amended by the Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000, provides statutory protection to birds, bats and other species that inhabit trees. These could impose significant constraints on the use and timing of access to the site in addition to any of the tree constraints set out in this report. These issues are beyond our area of expertise and we advise that you seek the advice from an ecologist on whether any such constraints apply to this site.

1.10 Further arboricultural consultation

This report is the first stage of arboricultural consultation to allow a draft layout to be produced. Invariably, all preliminary layouts need further review by an arboriculturist to confirm they have fully accounted for the tree constraints. Once this has happened and a final layout has been agreed, we will prepare an arboricultural impact appraisal report as supporting information for the final submission. If appropriate, this will include a detailed arboricultural method statement to set out the tree protection and implementation details, demonstrating that all the tree issues have been properly considered. Once the LPA has considered the submissions, its team may not agree with our assessment and it may be necessary to enter into further discussions to address any areas of concern. If this results in any design changes, we would normally update our final report to produce a formal agreed document suitable for reference in a planning condition.



1: Arboricultural opportunities and constraints assessment

1.11 Architect's summary checklist

In the context of our experience, we have drawn up the list of checks that we have found beneficial for the architect to consider. Early review of the following points may reduce delays in getting a final decision from the LPA:

1. Read the explanations on the tree constraints plan carefully to understand how the constraints zones are established and the implications they have on the layout
2. Do not design any disturbance in zone 1 without telling us and checking on the implications for trees
3. Carefully consider the specific points that apply to this site, as set out above
4. We must review any layout produced based on the information in this report before it is submitted
5. This report is confidential to the developer's team and must not be released to any other parties without proper authorisation
6. All future drawings that relate to tree issues must have all the trees shown and numbered as set out in this report



Appendix 1: Background administrative information and data collection

A1.1 Table 1: Background administrative information

	Background administrative information
Report date & reference	6 th August 2020; 20056-Constraints2-AN
Tree protection plan reference	BT2
Instructing client	Persimmon Homes Thames Valley
Instructions	Visit the site, assess the relevant trees, prepare a schedule of their details, advise on the constraints and opportunities, and prepare a tree constraints plan
Provided documents	Topographical survey, drawing number '1\001 to 004', received by email on 20 th February 2020
Report author and credentials	Alex Needs has passed the LANTRA Professional Tree Inspection course (https://www.lantra.co.uk/awards/product/professional-tree-inspection), is a Chartered Arboriculturist (www.charteredforesters.org), and a Registered Consultant of the Arboricultural Association (www.trees.org.uk), and is fully qualified to undertake the assessments in this report (https://www.barrelltreecare.co.uk/who-we-are/).
Report limitations	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• We have not checked if there is any statutory protection on the trees because this can delay the production of the report. If any tree works are proposed before a planning consent is given, then the possible existence of any statutory protection must be checked with the LPA.• This report does not consider ecological or archaeological issues, or any other matter beyond the assessment of the trees.

A1.2 Table 2: Data collection

	Data collection
Date of site visit	4 th March 2020
People present during site visit	Alex Needs
Weather & visibility	Dull, still, and raining, with average visibility
Limitations to observations	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• The inspection of the trees for the purposes of assessing their condition and work requirements was made on the basis that they will be annually inspected in the future to identify any changes in condition and review the original recommendations. For these reasons, the tree assessment advice only remains valid for one year from the date that the trees were last inspected.• All observations were of a preliminary nature and did not involve any climbing or detailed investigation beyond what was visible from accessible points at ground level.• Observations of trees outside the site boundaries are confined to what was visible from within the site.• All dimensions were estimated unless otherwise indicated.
Tree Preservation Orders (TPOs), Conservation Areas, and tree categorisation	TPOs cannot always be reliably interpreted from the documentation to identify which trees are protected, especially as time passes and site conditions change from when they were originally made. It is common for TPO plans to be inaccurate and schedules often become out of date as trees die or are removed. Frequently, trees deteriorate and, although they may be technically protected by the TPO, are in such poor condition or causing such unreasonable inconvenience that their suitability for retention becomes questionable. In a planning context, if poor trees are assessed as unsuitable



Appendix 1: Background administrative information and data collection

	Data collection
	for retention, then it would be inappropriate to show them as a material constraint in development planning. For these reasons, although TPOs do need to be considered, they do not form the primary basis for tree categorisation. Poor quality trees assessed as not worthy of retention will be shown as such, irrespective of whether they are protected or not. Similarly, good quality trees that are not protected will still be shown as material constraints. The same rationale will be applied to Conservation Areas.
Tree location and numbering	Each tree, hedge, and group, was inspected and the numbering scheme is indicated on the tree protection plan. Where important trees were found on site that were not included on the provided plan, their approximate positions and canopy extents are indicated on the plan.
Recording of tree data	For each identified tree, hedge, and group, the information collected was recorded on the tree schedule in Appendix 3 and the tree protection plan.
Compliance of data collection with BS 5837	The data collection is fully compliant with the advice in subsection 4.4.2 of BS 5837. When collecting this information, specific consideration was given to any low branches that may influence future use, age class, physiological condition, structural condition, and remaining contribution. Where appropriate, crown spreads were also noted where they differed from those shown on the provided land survey.
Calculation of RPAs	Following the recommendations in Table D1 of BS 5837, the diameter of each tree was rounded up to the next 2.5cm increment, with the radius of a nominal circle and the resultant RPA taken directly from that table. This information is listed for each tree in the tree schedule in Appendix 3.



Appendix 2: Tree schedule and explanatory notes

NOTE: Colour annotation is **A & B trees with green background;** **C & U trees with blue background;** **trees to be removed in red text.**

Tree No	Species	Height (m)	Diameter (cm) @ 1.5m	Maturity	Low Branches	Category	Notes	Tree Works	RPA radius (m)	RPA area (m ²)
All retained trees & hedges								Carry out safety check and lift over site to 3-4m as necessary.		
G1	Hazel, willow, ash, sycamore, holm oak	8	25	Maturing	-	C	On ditch bank	-	3.0	28
G2	Elm, ash	11	30	Maturing	-	C	-	-	3.6	41
G3	Sycamore	9	42.5	Maturing	-	C	On ditch bank	-	5.1	82
T4	hawthorn	6	30	Maturing	-	C	Multi-stemmed	-	3.6	41
T5	Elm	6	22.5	Maturing	-	C	-	-	2.7	23
G6	Elm, sycamore	8	22.5	Maturing	-	C	-	-	2.7	23
T7	Sycamore	15	80	Maturing	-	C	Deadwood, dieback, off-site tree	-	9.6	290
T8	Sycamore	8	40	Maturing	-	C	Multi-stemmed	-	4.8	72
T9	Sycamore	8	40	Maturing	-	C	Multi-stemmed	-	4.8	72
G10	Sycamore, holm oak	8	40	Maturing	-	C	-	-	4.8	72
G11	Elm, ash	5	22.5	Maturing	-	C	-	-	2.7	23
G12	Elm	7	20	Maturing	-	C	-	-	2.4	18
T13	Hawthorn	5	22.5	Maturing	-	C	Off-site tree	-	2.7	23
G14	Poplar, oak	25	60	Maturing	-	B	Off-site group	-	7.2	163
T15	Oak	4	22.5	Maturing	-	C	Off-site tree	-	2.7	23
G16	Elder, plum	3	25	Over-mature	-	C	Many dead and collapsed stems	-	3.0	28
G17	Elder	4	22.5	Mature	-	C	-	-	2.7	23
T18	Elm	7	22.5	Maturing	-	C	Dysfunction associated with Dutch Elm Disease	Fell for management	2.7	23



Appendix 2: Tree schedule and explanatory notes

Tree No	Species	Height (m)	Diameter (cm) @ 1.5m	Maturity	Low Branches	Category	Notes	Tree Works	RPA radius (m)	RPA area (m ²)
G19	Holly, elder, cherry, elm	7	25	Maturing	-	C	Off-site group	-	3.0	28
H20	Privet, elder, blackthorn	5	15	Maturing	-	C	-	-	1.8	10
H21	Privet	1.5	7.5	Maturing	-	C	-	-	0.9	3
T22	Cypress	9	32.5	Maturing	-	C	Reduced at 9m	-	3.9	48
G23	Cherry, elm	7	20	Maturing	-	C	-	-	2.4	18
H24	Privet	1.5	7.5	Maturing	-	C	-	-	0.9	3
T25	Magnolia	5	25	Maturing	-	C	Off-site tree	-	3.0	28
T26	Sweet chestnut	10	80	Mature	-	B	Off-site tree	-	9.6	290
H27	Beech, ash	2	10	Maturing	-	C	-	-	1.2	5
G28	Willow, birch	15	30	Mature	-	B	Off-site group	-	3.6	41
G29	Beech	17	45	Mature	-	B	Off-site group	-	5.4	92
H30	Privet	3	12.5	Maturing	-	C	-	-	1.5	7
G31	Elder, cherry, blackthorn	5	15	Maturing	-	C	-	-	1.8	10
G32	Willow, elm	9	35	Over-mature	-	C	Partially collapsed	-	4.2	55
H33	Cypress	2	10	Maturing	-	C	-	-	1.2	5
T34	Willow	7	22.5	Maturing	-	C	Off-site tree	-	2.7	23
G35	Elm	15	30	Maturing	-	C	Dysfunction associated with Dutch Elm Disease	-	3.6	41
G36	Willow, ash, sycamore	7	25	Maturing	-	C	Multi-stemmed riparian group growing on riverbank	-	3.0	28
G37	Sycamore	4	25	Maturing	-	C	Multi-stemmed riparian group growing on riverbank	-	3.0	28
G38	Elder	3	25	Mature	-	C	-	-	3.0	28
T39	Hawthorn	3	25	Mature	-	C	-	-	3.0	28



Appendix 2: Tree schedule and explanatory notes

Explanatory Notes

- **Abbreviations:**

G: Group
H: Hedge
T: Tree

- **Botanical tree names:**

Ash	: <i>Fraxinus excelsior</i>
Beech	: <i>Fagus sylvatica</i>
Blackthorn	: <i>Prunus spinosa</i>
Cherry	: <i>Prunus sp</i>
Cypress	: <i>Cupressus sp</i>
Elder	: <i>Sambucus nigra</i>
Elm	: <i>Ulmus sp</i>
Hazel	: <i>Corylus avellana</i>
Holm oak	: <i>Quercus ilex</i>
Holly	: <i>Ilex aquifolium</i>
Magnolia	: <i>Magnolia sp</i>
Oak	: <i>Quercus robur</i>
Plum	: <i>Prunus sp</i>
Privet	: <i>Ligustrum vulgare</i>
Sweet chestnut	: <i>Castanea sativa</i>
Sycamore	: <i>Acer pseudoplatanus</i>
Willow	: <i>Salix sp</i>

- **BS 5837 (2012) compliance:** All data has been collected based on the recommendations set out in subsection 4.4 of BS 5837.
- **Tree inspections and site limitations:** Each tree was subjected to a quick visual check level of inspection. Where there is restricted access to the base of a tree, its attributes are assessed from the nearest point of access. Climbing inspections are not carried out during this level of inspection and, if heavy ivy is present, tree condition is assessed from what can be seen from the ground. A separate note is recorded if further investigation may be required to clarify its status.
- **Crown spreads:** Crown spread dimensions are not listed in the tree schedule because they are illustrated on the land survey base to all the plans in this document. Where crown spreads of significant trees on site are found to deviate from those shown on the provided land survey, we have noted it in the text of the report and annotated it on our plans.
- **Dimensions:** All dimensions are estimated unless otherwise indicated with an asterisk (*) after the figure.
- **Species:** Species identification is based on visual observations. Where there is some doubt over tree identity, sp is noted after the genus name to indicate that the species cannot be reliably identified at the time of the survey. Where there is more than one species in a group, only the most frequent are noted and not all the species present may be listed.
- **Height:** Height is estimated to provide a broad indication of the size of the tree.
- **Trunk diameter:** Trunk diameter is estimated or measured (with a diameter tape), at the discretion of the consultant, and recorded in 2.5cm increments as advised in BS 5837 Table D1. Estimates may be made where access is restricted, direct measurement is prevented because of ivy on the trunk, or the tree is assessed as low quality. The point of measurement and the adjustments for stem variations are as advised in Figure C1 of BS 5837.
- **Maturity:** In planning context, maturity provides a simplistic indication of a tree's ability to cope with change and its potential for further growth. For the purposes of this report, young indicates a potential to significantly increase in size and a high ability to cope with change, maturing indicates some potential to increase in size and a medium ability to cope with change, and mature indicates little potential to increase in size and limited ability to cope with change.
- **Low branches:** Any low branches that would not be feasible for removal during normal management and should be considered as a design constraint are noted here and explained in the notes.
- **Category:** Our assessment automatically considered tree physiological/structural condition (BS 5837, 4.4.2.5h), and so these are not listed separately in the schedule. Additionally, the category accounts for the remaining



Appendix 2: Tree schedule and explanatory notes

contribution (BS 5837, 4.4.2.5i) as greater than 40 years for A trees, greater than 20 years for B trees, at least 10 years for C trees and less than 10 years for U trees, so this is also not listed separately in the schedule. Category A, B and C trees are automatically listed as sub-category 1 unless otherwise stated.

- **Notes:** Only relevant features relating to physiological or structural condition and low branches that may help clarify the categorisation are recorded. If there are no notes, then the presumption should be that no relevant features were observed.
- **Future tree safety inspections:** Due to the time that may elapse between the original survey and the start of development, all trees should be re-inspected as part of the standard risk management process before any works start on site. Our assessment of the trees was carried out on the basis that a re-inspection would be carried out within a year of the assessment visit and our advice on tree condition must be reviewed annually from the date of that visit.



Field House Fordingbridge Business Park Fordingbridge Hampshire SP6 1BD
☎ 01425 651470 ✉ info@barrelltreecare.co.uk 🌐 www.barrelltreecare.co.uk