

Arboricultural Report

Land to west of 36 Summerfield Road, Cowplain PO8 8XE

Prepared by

Jonathan Rodwell NCH (Arb.)

March 2013

Beechdown ref: B/0054/13/aia

Summerhill Road – arboricultural impact assessment – March 2013



CONTENTS

Page No.

Summary	1
1.0 Introduction	1
2.0 Documents provided	1
3.0 Development proposal	2
Arboricultural impact assessment	2
4.0 Below ground constraints – Root protection area (RPA)	2
5.0 Above ground constraints	2
6.0 Tree removal/pruning	3
7.0 Arboricultural method statement (heads of terms)	3
8.0 Conclusion	4
9.0 References	4

Appendix 1 - Draft tree protection plan

Summary:

- **An arboricultural impact assessment of a proposed development site was prepared;**
- **the development proposal does not impact upon the root protection area of any tree;**
- **the development proposal does not require the removal of any trees.**

1.0 INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 Further to our tree survey (ref: B/0054/13) of land to the west 36 Summerhill Road Beechdown Arboriculture Ltd has received instruction from Stephen Jupp MRTPI , on behalf of Laurence Blake, to prepare an arboricultural report with reference to the proposed development of the site.
- 1.2 The purpose of the instruction was to:
- **Prepare an arboricultural impact assessment evaluating the effects of the development proposal;**
 - **provide a draft tree protection plan.**
- 1.3 The report was prepared with reference to the guidelines detailed in BS 5837:2012 "Trees in relation to design, demolition and construction – Recommendations" and should be read in conjunction with tree survey (ref: B/0054/13).
- 1.4 Contents of the report are exclusively for the use of the client; liability does not extend to any third party without our written consent.

2.0 DOCUMENTS PROVIDED

- 2.1 Plans from Stephen Jupp.
- Sheet 3 – proposed site layout – plot 1

3.0 DEVELOPMENT PROPOSAL

- 3.1 The proposed layout plan indicates a potential development plot of approximately 500m² within the original survey site. T15-T27 of the survey are within the proposed development site.
- 3.2 The development proposal is for the construction of a detached two-storey dwelling.

ARBORICULTURAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT

4.0 BELOW GROUND CONSTRAINTS – ROOT PROTECTION AREA (RPA)

- 4.1 Section 3.7 of BS 5837: 2012 states that - *The Root Protection Area (RPA) 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.*
- 4.2 The RPA calculations have been produced using the information gathered from the tree survey and section 4.6.1 of BS 5837:2012. This indicates the RPA in m² and the minimum required all round radial distances for rooting zone protection and allows a view to be taken as to whether the trees can be retained safely without undue damage to their root systems.
- 4.3 Although the RPAs are marked on the plan as uniform polygons, tree root development can be affected by numerous factors including soil levels, type and structure; compacted or impervious surfaces and proximity to buildings and other structures. There are no indications of significant root development beyond the marked RPAs.
- 4.4 The proposed dwelling is not situated within the RPA of any tree; there are no requirements for tree removal to facilitate the development proposal.

5.0 ABOVE GROUND CONSTRAINTS

- 5.1 Consideration should be given to the effects that the current tree size, future growth potential, shade levels and leaf and fruit nuisance may have on the proposed development.

- 5.2 The proposed dwelling is situated in the open area beyond the canopies of the surveyed trees.
- 5.3 The tree survey identified ten trees that had been ring-barked and treated with a translocated herbicide, eight of which are in plot 1. The growth potential of these trees, closest to the proposed development, may not be consistent with healthy trees and regular monitoring and assessment of their condition will be required to determine their safe long-term retention.
- 5.4 Appendix 5 of the tree survey illustrates the shadow pattern of the trees through the greater part of the day. The current and likely future levels of shade are not considered to be a greater nuisance to the development proposal than they are to existing buildings.
- 5.5 Whilst the effect of autumn leaf fall is not considered a greater nuisance to the proposed dwelling than it currently is to existing buildings provision should be made for ease of maintenance of gutters and gullies.

6.0 TREE REMOVAL/PRUNING

- 6.1 No surveyed trees require removal to facilitate the proposed development.
- 6.2 Access facilitation pruning may require the removal of tips of low branches extending to the south from T17 and T18 to allow room for scaffolding.
- 6.3 Major deadwood was noted throughout the crown of T18 and, depending on levels of access, should be removed whether the development proceeds or not.
- 6.4 Reaction of trees 15, 16, 17, 18, 21, 22, 23 and 27 to ring-barking and herbicide will determine further pruning requirements.

7.0 ARBORICULTURAL METHOD STATEMENT (HEADS OF TERMS)

- 7.1 Although no excavation or construction is planned within the RPA of the trees an arboricultural method statement detailing the level and sequence of tree protection and other precautionary measures necessary to safeguard the trees throughout the construction process may be required to meet planning conditions.

7.2 The method statement will detail or comment on:

- Build sequence;
- protective barriers;
- construction exclusion zone;
- foundation design;
- infrastructure and access requirements;
- storage and mixing of materials;
- site monitoring.

8.0 CONCLUSION

- 8.1 The development proposal does not require any demolition, excavation, construction or hard surfacing within the RPAs of the surveyed trees.
- 8.2 No trees require removal to facilitate the development proposal.
- 8.3 Tree pruning requirements are limited to removal of deadwood and minor access facilitation pruning.
- 8.4 Future growth of the trees is likely to have less impact on the development proposal than on existing dwellings to the east and north of the site.
- 8.5 Regular monitoring of the ring-barked trees should be undertaken to assess condition and possible decline.
- 8.6 Although there are no requirements for tree removal a planting scheme mitigating the loss of trees removed prior to the tree survey may be appropriate.
- 8.7 An arboricultural method statement detailing the level and sequence of tree protection and other precautionary measures necessary to safeguard the trees throughout the construction process may be required to meet planning conditions.

9.0 REFERENCES

- 9.1 BS 5837: 2012 – Trees in relation to design, demolition and construction – Recommendations

Jonathan Rodwell NCH (Arb.)
Beechdown Arboriculture Ltd

March 2013

Beechdown Arboriculture Limited

1 Church Hill, Slindon, Arundel, W. Sussex BN18 0RB
Tel - 01243 814740 Email - jonathan.rodwell@beechdown.com

Land to west of 36 Summerhill Road Appendix 1 - draft tree protection plan

SCALE :
1:300 @ A4

DATE :
29/03/2013

Beechdown ref: B/0054/13/aia
Summerhill Road - arboricultural impact assessment - March 2013

Pear Technology Services Ltd. Email: info@peartechtechnology.co.uk
Maps based on Ordnance Survey MasterMap or 1:25000 Mid-scale data
with the permission of the Controller of HMSO. © Crown Copyright

