Arboricultural Consultancy

GIFFORD TREE SERVICE

Picus Sonic Tree Testing

kimgifford@giffordtreeservice.co.uk www.giffordtreeservice.co.uk

REFUSE

BS 5837:2005 Tree Survey

HAVANT BOROUGH COUNCIL
11 JAN 2010
RECEIVED

52 Havant Road
Emsworth
Hampshire
PO10 7AW

16th November 2009

Consultant Mr. Kim Gifford, 38, Seafront, Hayling Island, Hampshire PO11 9HL
07831 488 456

Arboricultural Consultancy GIFFORD TREE SERVICE Picus Sonic Tree Testing

kimgifford@giffordtreeservice.co.uk www.giffordtreeservice.co.uk

Introduction

1. I have been instructed by Mr Jonathan Thompson of 52 Havant Road Emsworth Hampshire PO10 7AW to conduct a Tree Report to BS 5837:2005 *Trees in Relation to Construction – Recommendations. This report relates to designing an arboricultural method statement to protect and safeguard the Yew and Horse Chestnut during the proposed construction.*

The Site

2. The proposal detailed by John Groom Architects is to demolish an existing garage/ workshop and rebuild a new building in the same location. Adjacent to the proposal is a very mature Yew tree other significant trees included in this survey are a Sycamore and a very large mature Horse Chestnut. Access to the site is via an existing private drive and tarmacked parking area. All trees are in a raised beds.

Scope of Survey

3. I have assessed the trees with due regard to the recommendations and guidelines contained in BS 5837 2005 - 'Trees in Relation to Construction - Recommendations'. The tree details have been recorded in tabular form as a schedule and categorised accordingly below.

4. No trees with a stem diameter of 150mm or under have been included as a part of this Survey. Hedging Conifers and other assorted small trees and shrubs have not been included in this survey.

5. The trees were inspected from the ground utilising the Visual Tree Assessment method as developed by Mattheck and Breloer (The Body Language of Trees, DoE leaflet No.4).

Arboricultural Consultancy GIFFORD TREE SERVICE Picus Sonic Tree Testing

kimgifford@giffordtreeservice.co.uk www.giffordtreeservice.co.uk

6. BS 5837:2005 Tree Survey Schedule.

Ref/Tag No.	Species	Hgt (m)	SD (mm)	N-E-S-W (m)	Crown Clearance	Age Class	P.Cond	S.Cond	ERC	Category grading	Recommendations	Radius	RPA	Sq. Sides
A	Yew (Taxus baccata)	15	900	5,5,5,5	4	M	good	thinning crown foliage	20+	B	Remove deadwood,crown lift	9.0	254.5	16.0
B	Sycamore (Acer pseudoplatanus)	18	500	4,4,4,4	4	M	poor	poor fork union @ 3m/ ivy clad	<10	R	consider removal	6.0	113.1	10.6
C	Horse Chestnut (Aesculus hippocastanum)	20	1300	10,10,10,10	5	VM	good	good at the time of inspection	20>	B	continue to monitor	15.6	764.6	27.7

ARBORICULTURAL SURVEY - DEFINITIONS

Hgt Tree Height (in metres)

SD Stem diameter at 1.5 metres above ground level (in millimetres)

N-E-S-W Branch spread taken at four compass points (in metres)

Crown clearance Height of crown clearance above adjacent ground level (in metres)

Age Class **Y** - Young **SM** - Middle Ages **M** - Mature **OM** - Over Mature **V** - Veteran

P. Cond Physiological condition **G** - Good **F** - Fair **P** - Poor **D** - Dead

S. Cond Structural condition General comment on safety of tree.

Radius Root Protection radius (m)

RPA Root Protection area (m^2)

ERC Estimated remaining contribution in years.

Category grading

R - Existing condition is such that any existing value would be lost within 10 years and therefore should be removed for reasons of sound Arboricultural management.

A - High quality and value (40 yrs+)

B - Moderate quality and value (20 yrs+)

C - Low quality and value (10 yrs+)

Consultant Mr. Kim Gifford, 38, Seafront, Hayling Island, Hampshire PO11 9HL
07831 488 456

Tree Condition

7. As detailed in the tree schedule above both the Yew (A)and Horse Chestnut (C)are in a healthy condition at the time of inspection. The Sycamore (B) is in decline and is in a poor condition it is recommended that this specimen is considered for removal.

Presence of Statutory Protection

8. I have not contacted the Local Planning Authority to determine whether or not any trees are protected by a Tree Preservation Order (TPO) or situated within a Conservation Area (CA). Therefore I would advise that before undertaking any tree works the local planning authority be contacted to ascertain if any TPO's or CA's exist.

Arboricultural Impact Assessment

9. Arboricultural Impact Assessment has been undertaken with regard to this proposal and consideration has been given to protecting Root Protection Zones and designing appropriate foundation methods/ service runs to minimise root disturbance.

Effect of Development on Amenity Value

10. With regard to Amenity Value there will be no change to the Amenity Value of these specimens.

Above & Below Tree Constraints Plan.

11. The Re: John Groom Architects Plan and BS5837 schedule above show the calculation for the Root Protection Zone as 9m from the trunk of A. Yew. The proposed development incurs within the RPZ on one side only and certainly less then 20% of the area as provided for with the BS5837 specifications. It is noted that a pile and raft type foundation is proposed to limit potential root damage in this area. I would also recommend that the pile holes are 'hand dug' within the RPZ and provisions are made as detailed in the following method statement to limit all movement within the RPZ. The appropriate RPZ should be fenced off (see plan) and access to construction area via the drive and car park of the property only. Arboricultural supervision would be advisable during excavations being undertaken within the RPZ.